Development Impact Fee Calculation and Nexus Report for the City of Huntington Beach, California

October, 2011

Copyright, 2009, 2010 & 2011 by Revenue & Cost Specialists, L.L.C.

All rights reserved. No part of this work covered by the copyright hereon may be reproduced or copied in any form or by any means — graphic, electronic, mechanical, including any photocopying, recording, taping or taping or information storage and retrieval systems without written permission of:

Revenue & Cost Specialists, L.L.C.
1519 East Chapman Avenue, Suite C
Fullerton, CA 92831
(714) 992-9020

Revenue & Cost Specialists, LLC

Serving Local Governments Since 1975

October 17, 2011

Honorable Mayor and City Council
Via Mr. Fred Wilson, City Manager
City of Huntington Beach - City Hall
2000 Main Street
Huntington Beach, CA 92648

RE: ***2011-12 Master Facilities Plan and Development Impact Fee (DIF) Calculation***

Honorable Mayor, Council and City Manager Wilson:

The City is experiencing private development of remaining vacant parcels and the on-going redevelopment of existing homes and businesses. This continuous development results in increased demand that must be absorbed (and accommodated) by the City's existing infrastructure and the Levels of Service (LOS) offered by that existing infrastructure. Revenue & Cost Specialists, L.L.C., was contracted to undertake a comprehensive identification of the capital projects and capital acquisitions necessary to accommodate all such new demands for municipal service. Such a study is necessary to preserve the existing ***Levels of Service (LOS)*** currently offered to and enjoyed by (after having been paid for by) the existing community from the diminution of those existing LOS due to the addition of new residential and business development in Huntington Beach and calculate the development impact fees (DIFs) necessary to fund those required projects.

Council and City staff, responsible for providing services to a continually expanding residential and business community, must recognize that the magnitude of the impact fees is **a direct function** of the nearly $403.4 million cost of the capital projects identified in the *Master Facilities Plan* as needed or required to accommodate new development. Regardless, anyone in the position of the Council members may find themselves reluctant to adopt the impact fees merely because they appear "too high". It is incumbent upon this Report and RCS Staff to convince the City Council of the justification and importance of the proposed impact fees

The following Report calculates some new and a few updated impact fees for the City of Huntington Beach based on the aforementioned changes and the City's changing requirements for public safety, streets and signals, storm drainage and other quality of life facilities. The adoption of the updated DIFs will enable this City Council, as well as succeeding Councils, to continue to ensure that the City will be able to meet the ***basic*** infrastructure needs of new growth, without unduly burdening the existing population and business community for these development-generated capital costs.

Internet: www.revenuecost.com
Voice 714.992.9020 1519 E. Chapman Avenue • Suite C • Fullerton, CA 92831 Fax 714.992.9021

Adoption of the recommended impact fees contained herein and imposition upon the numerous development opportunities in the City of Huntington Beach, would generate approximately $172.1 million in a combination of public improvement dedications and DIF revenues limited for use on the many capital expansion projects deemed as development generated.

Existing Impact Fee Fund balances ($3.5 million) and other revenues sources ($23.0 million) make up a significant amount of the difference between the capital total and the total revenue sources. This leaves a shortfall of $204.8 million (95% of which is $194.4 million in unfunded storm drainage projects). The identification of $403.4 million in capital needs mostly generated by new development, is not to be taken lightly, but must be examined in perspective to the cost of existing infrastructure, facilities, vehicles and equipment that a new development will share in the use and enjoyment of upon City review, approval, construction and finally, occupancy.

To offer such a perspective, a major element in this Report is a *proportional analysis*, or comparison of what is being asked of future residents, in the form of dedicated public improvements or an in-lieu (impact fee) payment, with the cost of the City's existing infrastructure (land, facilities, and equipment), contributed by the existing population and business community. The dedications, taxes and assessments contributed to date by the existing community over numerous decades of development have generated just over $2.1 billion (at current replacement costs) in infrastructure or capital improvements to the City of Huntington Beach. The following table identifies those existing asset commitments (or equity if you will), by infrastructure.

Service Provided	Current Equity Investment
Law Enforcement Facilities, Vehicles and Equipment	$71,246,699
Fire Suppression/Medic Facilities, Vehicles and Equipment	$61,234,227
Circulation (Street, Signals and Bridges) System	$533,539,375
Storm Drainage Collection System	$203,631,313
Public Library Facilities and Collection	$76,593,112
Community Use Facilities (community centers)	$56,649,600
Park Land and Park Facilities Development	$1,110,284,562
Total Existing Infrastructure Replacement Investment	$2,113,178,888

It is not intended for the recommended Development Impact Fee schedule to address all of the City's capital needs, as identified on the various schedules in this Report. As per California Government Code 66000 et. seq. and common fairness, development impact fees cannot address current capital deficiencies. The proposed fees will recognize and meet the needs of the City's growing population and business community. However, with the adoption of development impact fees, other City discretionary revenue resources that may have been used to meet growth-generated needs for expanded services and facilities will now be available for those accumulating replacement and rehabilitation projects.

The information required to develop the City's capital costs and equity data was generated by the Huntington Beach staff, without whose help and cooperation, this Report would have been impossible to complete. The following management and support personnel were instrumental in working with RCS staff to gather or generate the information and technical data so critically necessary for the legal support of impact fees through the *Master Facilities Plan* and/or the *Development Impact Fee Calculation and Nexus Report*. They are:

Stephanie Beverage, **Director of Library Services**
M. Todd Broussard, P.E, **Principal Engineer (Storm Drainage)**
David Brunetta, **Police Captain**
Luann Brunson, **Senior Administrative Analyst - Community Services**
David C. Dominguez, **Facilities Development/Concessions Manager**
Debbie Dove, **- Police Specialist**
Eric C. Enberg **- Fire Division Chief- Operations**
Jim B. Engle, **Community Services Director**
Scott Hess, **Director of Planning**
Mindy James **- Police Budget Manager**
Kevin Justen, **Senior Administrative Analyst - Fire**
Tung M. Kao, **- Information System/Network Specialist - Police**
Jeff Lopez, **Deputy Fire Marshall/Programs**
Darin Maresh, **Fire Department Specialist**
Mike McClanahan, **Deputy Fire Marshall/Training**
Shirley McNamee. **Police Personnel Analyst**
Tony Olmos, **City Engineer**
Ricky Ramos, **Senior Planner**
Bill Reardon, **Fire Marshall/Division Chief**
Dan Richards, **Information System GIS Manager**
Bob Stachelski. **Transportation Manager**
Chuck Thomas, **Police Captain**
Jerry Thompson, **General Services Manager**
Ashley Wallace, **Graduate Management Intern**
Darren Witt, **Fire Engineer**

Without their hard work and willingness to provide the best data available, this Report could not have been completed to the degree of accuracy and completeness that it has. I would like to highlight the efforts of Bob Hall, Deputy City Manager for his efforts in generating timely responses to RCS's many requests for critical information. The quality of information and resulting calculation were directly improved by all of the participating staff member's efforts.

The *Development Impact Fee Calculation and Nexus Report* and the *Master Facilities Plan* appendix are now submitted for your review and consideration. RCS is prepared to assist in increasing the Council's and community's understanding of this very significant part of the City's revenue structure.

Sincerely,

Scott Thorpe,
Vice President

CITY OF HUNTINGTON BEACH
DEVELOPMENT IMPACT FEE
CALCULATION AND NEXUS REPORT
and
MASTER FACILITIES PLAN

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page No.

Chapter 1 - Background and Introduction 1

Chapter 2 - Demographics and Findings 16

Schedule 2.1 Proposed Development Impact Fee Schedule 26

Chapter 3 - Law Enforcement Facilities, Vehicles and Equipment 27

Chapter 4 - Fire Suppression/Medic Facilities, Vehicles and Equipment 40

Chapter 5 - Circulation (Streets, Signals and Bridges) System 54

Chapter 6 - Storm Drainage Collection System 70

Chapter 7 - Public Library Facilities and Collection 82

Chapter 8 - Community Use Facilities 89

Chapter 9 - Park Land Acquisition and Park Facilities Development 95

Appendix A - Expanded Land-use Database 114

Appendix B - Summary of Recommendations 117

Appendix C - Master Facilities Plan 119

Chapter 1

Background and Introduction

The City of Huntington Beach has retained Revenue & Cost Specialists, L.L.C. to recalculate some of the City's existing Development Impact Fee (henceforth occasionally referred to as DIFs) schedules calculated at various points in time. Since that time, the City has experienced continued development of vacant land within the City. There is no reason to believe that the remaining undeveloped parcels will not also develop and underutilized parcels will redevelop, the current temporary economic building climate not-with-standing. The periodic review and adjustment of the Development Impact Fees that the City has committed to, are appropriate and warranted. Such updates are necessary to insure that the City collects sufficient DIF revenues to construct or acquire the additional infrastructure needed to accommodate new residents and businesses developing in the City.

This DIF calculation effort that staff has undertaken results in a complete list of projects to be financed by the recommended Development Impact Fee schedule.[1] The information contained in the *Development Impact Fee Calculation and Nexus Report* and the accompanying *Master Facilities Plan (MFP)* will allow the City Council to make more informed policy decisions. The DIF/MFP also combine to provide greater understanding or the need by the development community. It also provides an easier project tracking (and updating) system for the staff.

Proportional Analysis. For perspective on the total amount of the calculated DIFs this Report includes a *proportional analysis*, or a comparison of the infrastructure identified as required to accommodate continued development through General Plan build-out with that of the City's existing infrastructure. This proportional analysis is intended to reconcile any difference between the City's desired level-of-service (LOS) required of new development, per statements in the various General Plan elements, with that of the *de-facto* or actual level of service currently provided to the existing community. This addition will assist the Council in making many difficult policy decisions regarding the required additions of new development and will also recognize inter-generational equity along with common sense fairness.

Development Impact Fee Structure. The City's General Plan provides a range of potential densities for residential development. The DIFs for residential uses need to be calculated on a per dwelling unit basis to reflect more accurately the average impacts for a specific development. For example, a parcel zoned for development as detached dwelling units may contain from three to six units per acre. If fees are calculated on an acreage basis, the developer proposing three units per acre will pay the same amount as a developer constructing six units per acre. Development impact

fees for business uses are calculated on a square footage basis for commercial, office and industrial properties to reflect the impacts of different building intensities for this type of development. This structure addresses the issue of building expansion or intensification of commercial, office and industrial areas. For example, if a property owner of commercial, office or industrial property proposes an expansion to his building, the question exists about how to charge this proposed expansion for its impact on the City's streets, storm drainage system, and other infrastructures. A fee calculated on a building square footage basis will simplify this calculation.

CALCULATION OF DEVELOPMENT IMPACT FEES

In California, State legislation sets certain legal and procedural parameters for the charging of these fees. This legislation was passed as AB1600 by the California Legislature and is now codified as California Government Code Sections 66000 through 66009. This section of State Code became effective January 1, 1989.

AB1600 requires documentation of projects to be financed by Development Impact Fees prior to their levy and collection, and that the monies collected actually be committed within five years to a project of "direct benefit" to the development which paid the fees. Many states have such controlling statutes.

Specifically, AB1600 requires the following:

1. Delineation of the **PURPOSE** of the (development impact) fee.

2. Determination of the **USE** of the (development impact) fee.

3. Determination of the **RELATIONSHIP** between the use of the public facilities and the type of development paying the (development impact) fee.

4. Determination of the relationship between the **NEED** for the facility and the type of development project.

5. Determination of the relationship between the **AMOUNT** of the fee and the **COST** of the portion of the facility attributed to the specific development project.

This Report, with some additions, utilizes the basic methodology consistent with the above requirements of AB1600. Briefly, the following steps were undertaken in the calculation of impact fees for the City and are listed following:

1. Review the City's land use map and determine the existing mix of land uses and amount of undeveloped and developed land. The magnitude of growth and its impacts can thus be determined by considering this land use data when planning an infrastructure required to support General Plan build-out. This all-important inventory is summarized in Table 2-1 in Chapter 2 and detailed in Appendix A.

2. Define the level of service needed within the General Plan area for each project or acquisition identified as necessary. In some areas, certain statistical measures are commonly used to measure or define an acceptable level of service for a category of infrastructure. Street intersections, for instance, are commonly rated based on a Level of Service scale of "A" to "F" developed by transportation engineers. In some cases the identified level of service required of development may exceed that of what the City is currently providing. If so the reason must be explained and a methodology identified for raising the existing community's level of service without requiring new development to finance this increase.

3. Identify all additions to the capital facilities or equipment inventory necessary to maintain the identified levels of service in the area. Then, determine the cost of those additions.

4. Identify a level of responsibility of General Plan development, identifying the relative need for the facility or equipment necessary to accommodate additional growth as defined, and as opposed to current needs.

5. Distribute the costs identified as a result of development growth on a basis of land use demand. Costs are distributed between each land use based on their relative use, nexus or demand on that particular capital infrastructure system. For example, future street costs were distributed to each land use based on their trip generation characteristics (frequency and distance creating daily trip-miles).

OTHER ASSUMPTIONS OF THE REPORT

In addition to the land use assumptions contained in the next Chapter of this Report, other important assumptions of this study include the following:

Land Costs. Cost estimates for land acquisition were developed after discussions with City officials. Arguments for higher or lower costs can be made. However, the Report contains land costs (per acre) which are estimated to be the most appropriate figures for purposes of this study.

PROPORTIONALITY TEST

A test for proportionality is important, if for no other reason, than because it attempts to identify and achieve community inter-generational equity, i.e., fairness in balancing the infrastructure investment made by existing residents and businesses with the investment asked of new residents and businesses that will benefit from the existing infrastructure. In short, previous generations of businesses and residents have contributed to the development of the City's existing infrastructure and this fact should be recognized by future residents and businesses by contributing a like amount (but no more than) toward completing the various infrastructure systems. Mere replacements or the elimination of an existing deficiency cannot be required of new development.

It is one thing to identify the many public improvement projects needed through build-out. It is an entirely different thing to assume that all of the identified improvements are required to meet the demands of the new development. Clearly, some projects are *replacements* of the existing infrastructure while others are *capacity increasing* projects. Within the category of the latter, they may also be further classified into two categories;

1. Projects dealing with existing deficiencies, i.e., projects required regardless of whether there is additional development or not. An example[2] would be a traffic intersection currently controlled by stop signs that currently meets traffic warrants for a traffic signal, but is unfunded. However, some portion of that signal may be appropriate for impact fee financing. Another example would be the replacement of an existing but aged facility that creates no more capacity, but is merely the replacement of that same capacity.

2. Projects that are required as a result of development. An example of this would be a signal that is currently controlled quite adequately by stop signs, but because of development in the near and "downstream" areas, will ultimately need to be signalized.

All impact fee calculations claim to be fair. Government Code §66000 (also referred to as AB1600) takes only two pages of text to describe the *findings* that development impact fees must

adequately make, but does not explain specifically how to do so. Most DIF calculations will identify the desired or needed capital projects, ostensibly required *as a result of the new development*. Therefore, what is fair and equitable? Is it fair to require future residents and businesses in a city to construct, via payment of impact fees, a new Police Station when the current station is merely rented or leased space? On the other hand, if a community already has all of the water utility system they will need at build-out, are they precluded from imposing an impact fee to recoup some of that expenses incurred in the construction of the maximum needed water utility improvements prior to need for the maximum demand? These are difficult questions that may be made clearer and easier by reviewing the following examples.

Comparison of Needed Infrastructure with Existing Infrastructure. The answer to these difficult questions may best be answered by comparing various infrastructure scenarios. This can be accomplished by looking closely at our friends in the planned community of Happy Valley[3] for a few scenarios to explain the three possible conditions that can occur regarding the agency's current infrastructure and the demand upon them. We will use the provision of fire protection, a service that most of us as nonprofessional fire fighters can somewhat understand. These three "conditions" include that the fire suppression system infrastructure construction has:

1. been ***On-target.***
2. been ***Deficient.*** Or;
3. created ***Excess Service Capacity***.

Adoption of a Standard - According to the National Fire Protection Association (NFPA), a standard two-bay fire station (estimated for purposes of this example to cost about $3,000,000) can meet the needs of roughly 5,000 homes or 10,000,000 square feet of business pad. If these standards were adopted as Happy Valley's public safety element of the City's General Plan, they would be known as the *demure* or stated (or desired) standard (i.e., the standard the community would **like** to meet). This fee would be referred to as the ***General Plan Build-out Need-based Development Impact Fee***. The inductive development impact fees (or cost per proportional unit served) for this *de jure* standard would then be:

Table 1-1
Calculation of NFPA Impact Cost

Land Use	Station Cost	Units Served	Impact Fee
Residential Dwellings	$3,000,000	5,000	$600.00 per home
Business Square Feet	$3,000,000	10,000,000	$0.30 per S.F.

Service Base - Happy Valley's General Plan indicates that at General Plan build-out there will be 10,000 residential units and about 20,000,000 square feet of commercial/office/industrial space creating a need for four stations at build-out. The station calculation is as follows:

Table 1-2
Determination of Required Number of Stations

	Number of Units	Units served by One Station	Stations Required
Residential Dwellings	10,000	5,000	2 Stations
Business Square Feet	20,000,000	10,000,000	2 Stations
Required Stations at General Plan Build-out			4 Stations

The infrastructure is "On-target" - The need for four stations appears simple and the Happy Valley Council need only impose the impact fees identified in Table 1-1. Currently, Happy Valley has 6,250 residential units and 7,500,000 square feet of commercial/industrial building pad and is half "built-out" (in terms of fire calls for service). In this example, existing development within Happy Valley is generating half of the ultimate (General Plan build-out) fire calls-for-service. This is demonstrated in Table 1-3 following:

Table 1-3
Development of Current Infrastructure is "On-Target"

	Number of Units	Units served by One Station	Stations Required
Residential Dwellings	6,250	5,000	1.25 Stations
Business Square Feet	7,500,000	10,000,000	0.75 Stations
Total Number of Stations Required Currently			2.00 Stations

Conversely, Happy Valley has the remaining half of its fire demand (in terms of calls-for-service) yet to come. Left to build are 3,750 detached dwelling units and 12,500,000 square feet of business floor space, and when constructed would generate the following capital needs identified

on Table 1-4 following:

Table 1-4
Remaining Development and Station Requirement

	Number of Units	Units served by One Station	Stations Required
Residential Dwellings	3,750	5,000	0.75 Stations
Business Square Feet	12,500,000	10,000,000	1.25 Stations
# of New Stations Required from Land to be Developed			2.00 Stations

If the earlier calculated impact fees ($600 per residence and $0.30 per square foot of business pad) were adopted and imposed, Happy Valley would collect (by General Plan build-out) enough capital revenues to construct the remaining two stations and proportionality between existing and future residents and businesses would be evident. Table 1-5 following demonstrates this:

Table 1-5
Remaining DIF Collection

	Number of Units	Impact Fee	Amount Collected
Residential Dwellings	3,750	$600.00	$2,250,000
Business Square Feet	12,500,000	$0.30	$3,750,000
Amount Collected in Development Impact Fees			$6,000,000
Cost of a Single New Station			$3,000,000
Stations to be Built with Development Impact Fees			2.00

And everyone in the community of Happy Valley is adequately served by the four stations having been financed generally fairly by the total community.

The infrastructure is in Deficient Condition - Consider, however, the implications if the current Happy Valley residents and businesses had shown the earlier limited commitment to contribute

The infrastructure is in Deficient Condition - Consider, however, the implications if the current Happy Valley residents and businesses had shown the earlier limited commitment to contribute only enough financing to construct one station when, based upon their own adopted standards and level of development, they should have two stations? Clearly three more stations would be needed on the path to General Plan "build-out." The possibility of requiring the remaining future home and business owners to finance all three remaining stations would be completely inequitable. But would it be fair and equitable to charge new residents the $600 per home and new businesses the $0.30 per business square foot in order to acquire the remaining two stations required to meet the NFPA standards required of the new development?

The simple and direct answer is probably not. With only one station constructed at half build-out, the Happy Valley community has not demonstrated to a proportional commitment to meeting the NFPA standards, and as a result would not have a strong case to assert that others who build later need to contribute toward the construction of multiple (two) fire stations at a higher service rate by including the "missing" second station. The problem is in trying to identify a municipal revenue source imposed only on the existing development. Simply, there is none. Soon as a business pays its impact fees, constructs, that business becomes part of the existing community.

The service provided by the single existing station is the community's *de facto* (or"in fact") standard service level. In short, it is *difficult* (but possible) to claim that a higher level of service is required of new development when the City is somehow getting by with a lower level of service. With one station, the contributed equity to build the single station would be half of the impact fee proposed in Table 1-1, or $300/residential unit and $0.15/square foot of business space respectively (See Table 1-6, following).

Table 1-6
Development Impact Fee
at Deficient Condition

	Number of Units	Existing Contribution	Amount Collected
Residential Units	3,750	$300.00	$1,125,000
Business S.F.	12,500,000	$0.15	$1,875,000
Amount Contributed by Existing Community			$3,000,000
Cost of One New Station			$3,000,000
Station(s) built with Community's Contribution			1.00

If Happy Valley has only built one station at half General Plan build-out, we would be forced to conclude that the City is currently *deficient* by one station (or 50% of the amount required). If the future residents were asked to pay at a rate that would build two stations (the $600/$0.30 rates) the City would have three stations at General Plan build-out, one financed and built by the first half of the community, and ***two*** financed and built by the second half of the community. Considering that the fire department will respond to all calls-for-service within the entire community from one of the three completed fire stations, the first half of the community would, in effect "inherit" one half of a station at no cost to themselves. In short, Happy Valley would fail the proportionality test. The inequity would then be exacerbated when the community decides to build the final "missing" last (fourth) station from a Citywide assessment or from annual General Fund receipts, paid for by the entire community, including those who just paid for the two new stations via the adopted fire impact fees.

The only equitable option is for the City to adopt impact fees at the $300/residence and $0.15/square foot rates. Adoption of this fee would be referred to as the ***Current Community Financial Commitment or Investment-based Impact Fees***. Admittedly, the City will go further into a deficit position in terms of the number of required stations, from being deficient by one station at half General Plan build-out to a deficiency of two stations at General Plan build-out, *but the deficiency (or proportionality) would remain a constant 50% of the stations needed at either point in time.* The community, if they are truly serious about meeting the NFPA recommended Level of Service (or standard), would then need to assess the entire community to raise the needed money in some fashion for financing the remaining two stations either in the form of an assessment or dedication of general receipts of the City.

The Infrastructure has "Excess Capacity" - One final but important scenario remains and must be considered. In this scenario the existing residents of Happy Valley were the industrious sort and (at half General Plan build-out) had constructed three stations when they were at the point when they only needed two stations. Clearly there is excess capacity in each of the three existing stations. In this case, the Happy Valley's current *de facto* standard would be well above the *de-jure* or target standard. Statistically, each of the three stations would have 1/3 excess capacity (for providing services) and should be busy only about two-thirds of the time. Should the impact fee be limited only to the marginal $300 per residence and $0.15 per square foot for business space required to construct the one remaining required station or should the City be able to recover the costs for the existing capacity in the three stations through a recoupment impact fee? If so, the future residents receive a gift of the extra (third) station. If the excess capacity was recognized at the time the facilities were constructed and the excess capacity was identified for future use, there will be tough decisions ahead to be made by the Happy Valley City Council.

General Plan Build-out Needs-based Development Impact Fees or Recoupment Fee? The Happy Valley City Council should adopt, *at a minimum*, the $300/residence and $0.15/square foot business space rates to insure that the fourth station would be built. Again, referred to as the ***General Plan Build-out Needs-based*** impact fees. This would be a benevolent gesture, giving the new residents a free ride on the cost of the (already built and paid for) third station.

Or in the alternative, the Council can recognize that the $3,000,000 used to build the third station was a loan from the existing community's General Fund receipts, and should be repaid by the future community receiving an instantaneous level of fire protection the day they receive their occupancy permit[4], through the imposition and collection of impact fees.[5] In this case, the $600/residence and $0.30/square foot of business space impact fees should be adopted, imposed and collected. The impact fee would accumulate $6,000,000 through build-out, with $3,000,000 required to repay the General Fund in delayed revenue (for Station #3) and $3,000,000 necessary to construct the fourth station. This would be referred to as a ***Recoupment-based*** **Fee** at General Plan build-out. More important, long term equity at General Plan built-out would be achieved as each home and business would have contributed the same $600 per residence and $0.30 per square foot. This situation is usually fairly limited and should be supported by the appropriate element of General Plan.

Exceptions to Proportionality Test. The previous discussion applies particularly well to above ground or capacity-based services such as community use centers, pools, police and fire stations, civic centers, maintenance yards or other fixed location and finite capacity facilities that serve the entire population. However, it does not necessarily work well on ground level or below ***system*** infrastructures such as streets, utilities, and storm drainage, where the continuation of a deficient system into the future is not at all possible and the lack of additions would ensure the complete inability to approve any further private construction without creating unsafe conditions to a specific area. As an example, if the agency's storm drainage system is currently deficient and creates some period flooding but not necessarily in dangerous amounts, the agency may not be able to approve and allow any more future development unless the storm drainage runoff created by the new development, is properly collected and released at a river or flood control channel.

Additionally, a currently deficient water system, i.e., one with only the most minimal of distribution pipes, may not be able to serve any more future development without a substantial increase in the capacity of the water distribution system. However, a water utility with users rates can increase existing user fees to eliminate any existing deficiencies.

Specific Plan or Benefit to a Specific Area. An additional exception occurs when the need or benefit from a specific facility is generated by a finite or easily defined area such as a specific plan or a new area of the agency that is significantly outside of the existing agency's urban in-fill service area or the specific plan is primarily the sole beneficiary of the infrastructure to be

constructed. An example may be a small area of the City, proposed for say 2,000 homes, but separate from the rest of the City in such a way that, to meet the General Plan's stated fire suppression standard level of service of a five minute response time, it requires a separate fire station but serving less than any of the other stations, which on average serve 5,000 homes. There is little argument as to why the remaining residents and businesses should not need to finance that higher cost per home served. This is common in an area geographically separated from the major, or urban part of the community. An example would be a small area separated by a river or up on a hillside or in a canyon. These areas may need facilities specific to that area that are of little or no benefit to the rest of the community, such a bridge across a river that only benefits those live or work across the river.

Density may also be a factor. Fire infrastructure system improvements to date may be spread over a more compact density (say 4-5 homes per acre) than the remaining development in town (say 2-3 homes per acre). The fire system infrastructure costs per residential dwelling for a lower density area will likely be higher than a more compact area with a higher dwelling density.

Public Utilities. The treatment for municipal utilities is particularly clear in that the utility's operating and capital funds do not receive any General Fund financial support and they do not typically charge stand-by fees to vacant property. This means that the entire utility system has been supported only by what are called *utility user fees* (payments by the utility's customers). Or stated in another way, it is *user-financed*. In many cases the utility may have significant extra capacity because most infrastructures cannot be expanded in small defined portions that exactly match the pace of new development. An example would water reservoirs which are generally expanded on 1.0 million gallon portions, not 1,000 gallons at a time. To an individual user who has been contributing to the existing system over a period of time, it would appear quite fair for this excess capacity to be "purchased" for by new users that connect to the system who will benefit from the excess capacity has been constructed and identified. This holds particularly true for the purchase of water shares required for future water users.

A water distribution system may also have significant distribution system capacity to reach homes and businesses in more outlying areas. RCS recently worked with a city where the existing water users, currently representing some 55% of the water use demand at General Plan build-out, had already constructed nearly 70% of the General Plan build-out water system. The 15% difference amounted to just more than $7.0 million. Should any excess capacity paid for by existing users be a gift to the future users? Government Code §66000 et. seq. *appears* to prevent the city from trying to recoup the costs of the excess capacity purchased by the current users that will be the direct benefit of future users. Some excess capacity can and should be identified wherever possible, and recovered, providing that was identified as necessary for future development at the time it is created.[6] The excess capacity must be identified in terms of "existing project segment" and how it will benefit the future users must be identified.

Such equity is the attempt of this Report. Excess capacity is often difficult to identify and even more difficult to convince others of. The City is probably much like Happy Valley, with excess or overcapacity in some areas of the infrastructure, and perhaps slightly deficient[7] in others, as you will see in the remainder of the Report.

OTHER ISSUES

Some members of the building industry have claimed that the addition of impact fees unfairly creates an inflated resale price for existing homes. The argument is that if the public agency adopts a development impact fee of $20,000 to $25,000 per detached dwelling home, then the price for an existing home is artificially increased by that same amount. We will use the example of detached dwelling at a construction cost of $200,000 to complete to a point that the occupancy permit is approved.

Full Cost of a Residential Dwelling. The $200,000 represents only the above ground cost's construction. The true and actual *cost* of a new dwelling unit consists of the cost of acquiring the parcel, necessary government approvals and permits, construction supplies, labor, debt service on the above, on-site[8] public improvements, *and*

The hidden cost of extending public services[9] to that home.

The costs of extending public services includes (but is not limited to):

- The addition of law enforcement personnel requiring the expansion of the police station and response vehicles
- Additional fire stations and response vehicles.
- Widening of arterial and collector roads.
- Additional capacity in downstream storm drainage pipes.
- Additions to water delivery capability, including source, treatment, storage and delivery.
- Additions to the sewage capability, including collection, treatment and disposal.
- Additions to the maintenance capabilities (i.e., municipal corporation yard and maintenance vehicles) necessary to maintain the above added infrastructure.
- Additional parks, library, and public meeting space for recreational/social purposes.

Thus while the cost of constructing the above ground portion of a detached dwelling may be $325,000, the "downstream" costs identified above may be in the area of $20,000 to $30,000 per detached dwelling or in the area of 6% to 9%% of the above ground cost.

As an example, imagine a 2,800 square foot home, costing $325,000 to construct the above ground structure, located in the middle of an empty square mile, no roads, no utility service, no public safety response, no flood control and no recreational facilities. What is the market value of this home? Probably not even the $325,000 that it cost to construct the structure. The $25,000 development impact fee for all the infrastructures needed to support that one home, now seems like a relative bargain.

Thus, the true and complete cost of a new detached dwelling is the cost of building the structure and the cost of extending the municipal services to the home regardless of who pays for the actual costs of extending those services. To some degree these service-related infrastructure costs have been recognized. The only question remaining is, who should for pay the required improvements, existing or new residents?

Affect on Market Price. Again, let us assume that a cumulative $25,000 impact fee imposed upon *new* detached dwelling construction increases the market price of an *existing* detached dwelling. This additional amount is the recognition that the existing detached dwelling already has those physical links to the municipal services and thus has that value. A slightly different way of looking at this argument is that each existing detached dwelling has a "share" in a municipal corporation[10] and that share is valued at the cost of the connections to the various municipal utilities, circulation system, flood protection and public safety.

CHAPTER ORGANIZATION

Chapters three through six will have three fee cost/fee tables. These four chapters include:

Identification of Projects and Cost Allocation - This schedule identifies the various projects that the infrastructure manager has identified as required prior to General Plan build-out. These projects may be necessary in part or fully to accommodate new development. This schedule will identify the cost of the project and the portion of the project identified as resulting from new development.

General Plan Build-out Needs-based Development Impact Fee - This table will identify the set of impact fees that would need to be adopted to meet the basic, *or marginal needs,* capital needs identified in the Report. Adoption of this level of impact fees would allow City officials to claim that *new development is being approved and constructed without any additional cost to the existing residents and businesses*. You could not, however, claim that *new development is paying its "fair share."*

Existing Financial Commitment or Equity-based Proportionality Test Fees - This table will identify the cost (in current nominal dollar value) of the existing infrastructure, including land, physical improvements and capital equipment. This is the average amount "invested" by the existing community of residents and businesses. This equity will be expressed in terms of the cost to construct or acquire the assets at current costs.

If the average "equity" (for a detached dwelling for example) on this Table is greater then the average cost on the previous *General Plan Build-out Needs-based impact fee* Table, the infrastructure system is "front-ended" or has excess capacity. Stated slightly differently, the existing community has put more of the system into place than would be required of the remaining unbuilt portions of the community, (as they build). In effect, the existing community has advanced money to build capacity into the infrastructure system to meet the needs of residents and businesses not yet there! A good example of a *front-ended* system is the scenario where the City of Happy Valley had already built three fire stations while it only had the current actual demands for two stations.

If the *Existing Commitment-based* impact fees are less than the *General Plan Build-out Needs-based* impact fee, we must conclude that existing community may not have contributed the amount of equity that they have needed to and that the construction of a needed infrastructure to support that municipal service has been lagging and is *deficient*. When this occurs, the *Existing Community Financial Commitment or Investment-based* development impact fees may act as a ceiling or upper limit of the development impact fees.

A good example of a *deficient* system is the scenario where the City of Happy Valley had only built one fire station while it had current actual demands for two stations. In short, if the existing community has not been inclined to construct an infrastructure system proportionally as the community developed, what basis does the community have to require those future residents to invest more, thus by eliminating to some degree, the deficiencies created by the existing community? The answer is, there can be no such rational argument. To adopt the *General Plan Build-out Needs-based* impact fees, under these circumstances, would be an unfair attempt to eliminate the existing *deficiency* on the back of new development. Adoption of the *Existing Commitment-based* impact fees, under these circumstances, would allow City officials to claim that *new development is not being required to pay to eliminate existing deficiencies*.

[This space left vacant to place the following Chapter endnotes on a single page].

CHAPTER ENDNOTES

1. For greater detail of each project, refer to the City's *Master Facilities Plan* in Appendix C.

2. Examples using other infrastructure will be used from time to time in this report, even though the City may not provide that service.

3. "Happy Valley" has been used as an imaginary community for purposes of DIF example for about nine years. Clearly no insult is intended to any real or imagined community of Happy Valley. It is also a Happy Valley because there is no inflation and the value of a dollar remains nominal.

4. Actually, the permitted structure receives fire protection services as it is being constructed.

5. This example assumes that each of the existing three stations is debt-free and owned out-right.

6. This action would be more supportable with a recent appraisal of the existing utility assets.

7. Not necessarily in a manner that indicates a danger, just below the standard being asked of the future residents.

8. On-site improvements include local streets and medians, curbs and sidewalks, sewer lines, water lines, street lights, storm gutter or drainage pipes, electrical power lines and all of the other requirements of the Department's building requirements on the privately held property, hence the "on-site" reference. "Off-site" improvements are increased capacity need that occur "down-stream" from the private property. The on-site public improvements generally become a city asset upon acceptance of the on-site public improvements made by the developer while the property upon which the on-site improvements, is still privately owned.

9. This Report does not address all of these services. They are only highlighted to make a point about the types of public services typically required to support a residential dwelling.

10. Not unlike a share in a corporation such as I.B.M. or A.T. & T.

Chapter 2

Demographics and Findings

This Chapter provides an inventory of developed and undeveloped (and under-developed) land within the City. The City, surprisingly, still possesses areas of vacant land zoned for residential and business uses.

LAND USE ASSUMPTIONS

This Report contains an inventory of developed land and land with remaining development opportunities within Huntington Beach boundaries. The undeveloped land inventory columns form the base for distribution of the estimated infrastructure costs required to extend the existing levels of service to the new development. The developed land inventory also forms the base for distributing the cost of the existing infrastructure for comparison and for the *de-facto* identification of the existing levels of service (LOS) provided by those existing infrastructures. Table 2-1 below, summarizes the inventory of all private land uses contained within the current City limits. They are based upon General Plan data, Orange County projections, City records and a staff analysis of only privately held parcels.[1] Some of the vacant parcels have vested rights and would have the existing impact fees imposed. The acreage and unit data are detailed in Appendix A.

Table 2-1
Detailed Land Use Inventory

City of Huntington Beach	Developed		Net Increase		Total	
Total – Land Use Database	Acres	# of Units	Acres	# of Units	Acres	# of Units
Detached Dwelling Units (1)	6,436.0	38,616	295.00	1,749	6,731.00	40,365
Attached Dwelling Units	1,805.4	36,108	111.20	5,307	1,916.60	41,415
Mobile Home Dwelling Units (2)	204.6	2,865	1.00	9	205.60	2,874
Hotel/Motel Lodging Units	33.4	1,070	18.60	818	52.00	1,888
Resort Lodging Units	20.2	809	9.30	535	29.50	1,344
Commercial/Office Uses	841.9	12,836,000	39.80	2,417,000	881.70	15,253,000
Industrial/Manufacturing Uses	930.3	20,261,000	187.00	3,638,000	1,117.30	23,899,000
Total – City Limits	10,271.8	-----	661.90	-----	10,933.70	-----
Private Residences	8,446.0	77,589	407.2	7,065	8,853.2	84,654
Commercial Lodging Rooms	53.6	1,879	27.9	1,353	81.5	3,232
Business Square Feet	1,772.2	33,097,000	226.8	6,055,000	1,999.0	39,152,000

Land Use Definitions. This Report classifies properties as either one of three residential land uses or two different categories of commercial/industrial development. These land uses are defined below[2]:

Residential Land Uses:

- **Detached Dwelling Residential** - This category of land use is generally found in the City's General Plan designations of ***RL (Residential Low Density) and RM (Residential Medium Density)***.

- **Attached Dwelling Residential** - This category of land use is generally found in the City's General Plan designations of ***RM (Residential Medium Density), RMH (Residential Medium High Density)*** and ***RH (Residential High Density)***.

- **Mobile Home Residential** - This category of land use is generally found in any of the City's residential General Plan designations as noted above. With the more frequent replacement of a manufactured dwelling unit on an existing mobile home pad, it is important to note that such a replacement is not a development impact fee event. It is merely a replacement of an existing structure thus the demand already exists. No additional mobile home (or modular) units in private park like settings is are anticipated. However, one acre has been included in the calculations in order to calculate a development impact fee for that use should such an application be filed.

Business/Commerce Land Uses:

- **Hotel/Motel Lodging** - This category identifies the hotel and motel commercial lodging units and is generally found in the City's General Plan designations of ***CV (Commercial Visitor)*** and ***CG (Commercial General)***. It is limited to commercial lodging that is two stories or less and does not have an inordinate amount of meeting space.

- **Resort Lodging** - This is a recognition that in terms of commercial lodging, a resort facility, with more intensive banquets or convention space, most likely will incur differing municipal service demands than that of a typical hotel/motel facility. It is also generally found in the City's General Plan designation of ***CV (Commercial Visitor).*** Resort lodging has been defined as three stories or higher with significant amounts of square feet with which to accommodate large events such as conventions, business sessions and weddings, thus having a large drive-in population that does not necessarily stay at the facility overnight.

- **Commercial Uses** - As utilized in this Report, Commercial uses include the general category of retail services and thus includes outlets ranging from restaurants to auto repair shops to shopping centers. This category is generally found in the City's General Plan designations of ***CN (Commercial Neighborhood)***, ***CO (Commercial Office)***, ***CG (Commercial General))***, ***CR (Commercial Regional)***, and ***CV (Commercial Visitor)***. It would encompass all office uses.

- **Industrial Uses** - This category contains all businesses generally found in the City's General Plan designation of ***I (Industrial)***.

Definitions of Land Use Status. Each of the major land use categories detailed above is categorized as either *Developed* or *Net Increase*. Definitions are as follows:

Developed Acreage - Includes land in the City which is fully developed and, or land which has received a building permit but which is not yet constructed. Acreage in this category may also include non-conforming use areas of the City which contain extensive development prior to annexation or before changes to the General Plan were made. City staff has also included projections regarding properties which are currently classified as "Developed" but which may undergo redevelopment in the future. In fact, most of the development increases within the Beach/Edinger Specific Plan Corridor and Downtown Specific Plan areas consist of redevelopment of existing uses.

Net Increase Acreage - (Intensified/Redeveloped/or acreage available for development or redevelopment) - Refers to all non-public vacant acreage located within the City. This category also includes any parcels that may currently be partially developed but may have capacity for redevelopment.

Table 2-2, following, provides a summary of the detailed land use inventory, limited to privately held property more detailed on Table 2-1. Staff's land use inventory reveals that there are approximately 10,271.80 acres of privately-held developed land within the City's planning boundaries. There remain approximately 661.90 acres of vacant or land available to be redeveloped (and thus increased in terms of demand) in the City. Available (undeveloped land or available for redevelopment) land represents approximately 6.0% of the total 10,933.7 privately held acres within the City of Huntington Beach. Undeveloped parcels to be developed as detached dwellings constitute the greatest amount (at 2.7%) of available acreage of all the land uses.

[This space left vacant to place the following table on a single page].

Table 2-2
Summary of Undeveloped and Developed Acreage

	Developed Acres	Percent of Total	Vacant, Redeveloped or Intensified Acres	Percent of Total	Total Acres
Detached Dwelling Units	6,436.0	58.9%	(1) 295.0	2.7%	6,731.0
Attached Dwelling Units	1,805.4	16.5%	111.2	1.0%	1,916.6
Mobile Home Dwellings	204.6	1.9%	1.0	0.0%	205.6
Comm. Lodging Units	33.4	0.3%	18.6	0.2%	52.0
Resort Lodging Units	20.2	0.2%	9.3	0.1%	29.5
Commercial/Office Uses	841.9	7.7%	39.8	0.3%	881.7
Industrial/Manu. Uses	930.3	8.5%	187.0	1.7%	1,117.3
Total	10,271.8	94.0%	661.9	6.0%	10,933.7

(1) Only 34 of the 295 acres are vacant lots. The remaining 261 acres represents the subdivided acres necessary for the addition of 1,566 detached units (on their own lots) in areas already developed such as a lot split of a larger parcel with an existing detached dwelling unit. See Appendix A for greater detail.

General Plan Build-out is defined as that point in time when most if not all of the City's privately owned land is developed at maximum levels allowed by the City's General Plan.

Commercial/Industrial Development. In order to assess the costs of impact for commercial or industrial building intensification or building expansions, this Report includes a calculation of impact fees both on a per square foot basis for commercial and industrial development. In order to accomplish this, City Planning staff provided the typical maximum square feet of building allowable by the City's General Plan on a net acre of land. This percentage is sometimes referred to as the maximum Floor Area Ratio (or FAR), as shown following:

Commercial/Office Development - 15,246 G.S.F. per Acre (about 35% F.A.R.)
Industrial Development - 21,390 G.S.F. per Acre (about 50% F.A.R.)

POPULATION PROJECTIONS

A second component in determining the magnitude of impact of future development and the necessary facilities needed to mitigate that impact is a realistic assessment of the build-out population of the City. Many of the facilities contained in this Report are sized according to the estimated population at theoretical "build-out" or upon service levels which are based in part upon an estimation of the population to be served. Library facilities, parks and recreation facilities and community center facilities and equipment are examples of cost areas which rely heavily on population projections to determine space and facility needs. Park standards are usually stated in terms of the number of acres of park land per 1,000 persons, for instance.

There are at least two generally accepted methods for projecting future population levels in a City: (1) past growth trends projected forward and (2) population holding capacity based on the General Plan land-use element. Each of these methods can be useful even though both possess certain limitations.

There are several serious flaws in projecting the build-out population of a community using the past growth trend methodology. While this method is relatively simple and therefore easy for the general public to understand, it does not give consideration to when an area is actually built out. Eventually there comes a point in time where the amount of available land to build on is negligible. This technique does not help explain when that point is reached.

Also, the past growth trend approach is not sensitive to policy changes made by Council or land use issues contained in the City's General Plan. For these reasons, this technique is more useful in projecting short-term population levels and should not be used to forecast the built-out population of an area.

This Report relies on the methodology of ***holding-capacity***, (described in the following section), to project future service levels and facility requirements.

Holding Capacity Analysis. The methodology used in this Report to forecast the built-out population of City of Huntington Beach is the current holding capacity approach. This method calculates the sum of existing development and potential development allowable under current land use regulations, using average densities found in the City.

The first step in projecting the City's population using the holding capacity approach is to inventory the remaining undeveloped acres within the City limits, which was previously accomplished in Tables 2-1 and 2-2 of this Chapter. The next step is to estimate the potential

dwelling units allowed per acre and then multiply the potential number of units by the average number of residents per unit.

Table 2-3, on the following page, projects the additional number of dwelling units and potential population for the City of City of Huntington Beach through build-out. The number of potential new dwelling units was calculated by multiplying the amount of vacant acreage for each land use zone by the average densities (i.e., number of units allowed per acre) indicated in the City's General Plan.

The number of persons per unit for new residential units is based on the 2000 U.S. Census and ranges from 2.913 and 1.822 persons for detached dwelling units and mobile home dwelling units respectively to 2.257 persons for attached dwelling units. Based on these assumptions, future residential development is expected to generate approximately 17,089 additional residents[3] to City of Huntington Beach, joining the approximately 190,377 citizens already living in City. This results in a total estimated population at General Plan build-out of roughly 207,221 residents.[4]

The estimated General Plan build-out population of approximately 207,221 residents using this holding capacity approach is typically lower than the population forecasts based on the mathematical models described previously. This implies either that the City's period of residential build-out will actually be shorter than the 10 years indicated above or that the City's growth rate will decline from historical levels. This latter scenario is probably more likely to occur. As the residentially zoned land within the City's limits remaining to be developed continues to be developed during the next ten to twenty years, the City is likely to see fewer new dwelling units developed each year.

[This space left vacant to place the following table on a single page].

Table 2-3
City of City of Huntington Beach
Average Dwelling Occupancy, by Type
(2000 United States Census Data)

Existing Residential	Number of Units	Less Vacant	Number Occupied	Total Number of Occupants	Average Occupancy	Percentage Occupied
Detached Residential						
Detached Total	37,007	630	36,377	105,981	2.913	98.30%
Mobile Home Total	3,024	125	2,899	5,281	1.822	95.87%
Other	122	31	91	154	1.692	0.00%
Attached Residential						
Duplex to Quadplex	9,681	265	9,416	26,190	2.781	97.26%
Five or more	16,488	605	15,883	31,356	1.974	96.33%
Attached	9,471	329	9,142	20,186	2.208	96.53%
Total - MFR	35,640	1,199	34,441	77,732	2.257	96.64%
Existing - State Department of Finance 01/01/11 Population						190,377

Potential G.P. Build-out Population At Historic Occupancy Rates	*Anticipated Units*	*Occupancy Rate*	*Probable Occupancy*	*Dwelling Density*	*Anticipated Population*	
Undeveloped Detached Dwellings	1,749	98.30%	1,719	2.913	5,007	
Undeveloped Attached Dwellings	5,307	96.64%	5,129	2.257	11,576	
Undeveloped Mobile Home's	9	95.87%	9	1.822	16	
Population to be added development					16,599	16,599
Potential "Build-out" Population, at Historic Vacancy Rates.					206,976	206,976

Potential G.P. Build-out Population At 100% Occupancy Rate	*Anticipated Units*	*Occupancy Rate*	*Probable Occupancy*	*Dwelling Density*	*Anticipated Population*	
Undeveloped Detached Dwellings	1,749	100.00%	1,749	2.913	5,095	
Undeveloped Attached dwellings	5,307	100.00%	5,307	2.257	11,978	
Undeveloped Mobile Home's	9	100.00%	9	1.822	16	
Population to be added development					17,089	17,089
Potential Maximum "Build-out" Population.					207,466	207,466
Population at General Plan Build-out @ Low per Dwelling Resident Densities						206,976
Population at General Plan Build-out @ High per Dwelling Resident Densities						207,466
Average Population at General Plan Build-out						207,221

(1) Summary File 3 (SF3), available at http://factfinder.census.gov
(2) Current population based upon State of California Department of Finance data.

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

City staff identified just under $403.4 million in needed and desired capital improvement projects required through the City's General Plan build-out, including both projects related to existing deficiencies and those needed solely to support future growth. The adoption of the recommended *maximum* impact fees supported by the calculations in this Report (Schedule 2.1) would finance about 42.6% of the needed capital facilities by raising some $172.1 million. Existing fund balances of $3.6 will finance roughly 0.9% of the capital needs. Other sources, primarily existing agreements or intergovernmental support will finance about $23.0 million or 5.7%. Other capital revenue sources will need to be pursued for the remaining unfunded $205.5 million through build-out (50.8%). Roughly 95% (or $194.4 million) of the $204.8 million represents unfunded storm drainage projects that may never come to fruition.

Based on these costs and the schedules found at the end of each of the remaining chapters of this Report, costs attributable to future development were derived on a per unit basis for residential land uses and on a per square foot of pad basis for commercial and industrial land uses. Schedule 2.1, found at the end of this Chapter, provides a summary detail of the maximum DIFs for each type of infrastructure and land use category. The fees are summarized in Table 2-4, following:

Table 2-4
Summary of Recommended Development Impact Fees
(Based Upon the Lower of General Plan Build-out Needs or Equity-based Impact Fees)

Land Use	Recommended Development Impact Fees
Detached Dwelling Units	$25,890/Dwelling Unit
Attached Dwelling Units	$17,995/Dwelling Unit
Mobile Home Dwelling Units	$17,235/Dwelling Unit
Hotel/Motel Lodging Units	$2,854/Lodging Unit
Resort Lodging Units	$3,956/Lodging Unit
Commercial/Office Uses	$5.002/Square Foot
Industrial/Manufacturing Uses	$4.010/Square Foot

Specific impact fee rates for each land use can be found at the end of each chapter relating to each infrastructure. Schedule 2.1 at the end of this Chapter also identifies the probable impact fee revenue, the capital cost total and the difference, by individual infrastructure type (e.g., fire).

Given the magnitude of the City's project list, vis-a-vis the proposed list of projects, and the lack of previous findings regarding any excess capacity, there is no potential for recoupment of the costs of previous development-generated capital projects (excess capacity) as was described in Chapter One. Additionally, the detail of the existing value of the various systems, does not approach the level of accuracy required to adopt a recoupment style impact fee. The *recommended* Development Impact Fees are those indicated following in Schedule 2.1.

STRUCTURE OF THIS REPORT

The following chapters of this Report contain the detailed information relative to the calculation of DIFs recommended by RCS for the entire City. Appropriate textual explanations are contained in each chapter, with a chapter devoted to each of the nine sets of DIF cost schedules, listed below and three appendices.

CHAPTER 3 - Law Enforcement Facilities, Vehicles, and Equipment
CHAPTER 4 - Fire Suppression/Medic Facilities, Vehicles, and Equipment
CHAPTER 5 - Circulation (Streets, Signals and Bridges) System
CHAPTER 6 - Storm Drainage Collection System
CHAPTER 7 - Public Library Facilities and Collection
CHAPTER 8 - Community Use (community center type) Facilities
CHAPTER 9 - Park Land Acquisition and Park Facilities Development
APPENDIX A - Expanded Land-use Database
APPENDIX B - Summary of Recommendations
APPENDIX C - *Master Facilities Plan*

NOTE REGARDING TEXTUAL MATHEMATICS: It is important to note that the use of a computer provides for calculations to a large number of decimal points. Such data, when included in text and supporting textual tables, has been rounded to no more than two decimals for clarity and thus may be not replicated to the necessary degree of accuracy as the spreadsheet schedules at the end of each chapter. Should there be any difference between tables within a chapter and the schedules at the end of the same chapter, the schedules will prevail.

CHAPTER ENDNOTES

1. The figures are consistent with the City of Huntington Beach General Plan Land Use Element.

2. bid.

3. Assuming that the vacancy factor retains its traditionally high occupancy factor as evidenced in 2000 Census (averaging just under 97%). The estimated 16,844 additional residents is the average of full occupancy (17,089) and the roughly 97% average occupancy (16,599).

4. Ibid.

Schedule 2.1

City of Huntington Beach
Summary of Development Impact Fees By Type of Fee
(Fees per Residential Dwelling Unit, or Business Square Foot)
at Fair Share or Equity-based Development Impact Fees

	Law Enforcement Facilities, et. al.	Fire Suppression Facilities, et. al.	Circulation System Local Streets, Signals & Bridges	Storm Drainage Collection System	Public Library Facilities	Public Meeting Facilities	Park Land/Open Space Acquisition & Improvements	Development Impact Fee Total Per Unit or Square Foot
	Schedule 3.2	Schedule 4.2	Schedule 5.2	Schedule 6.2	Schedule 7.1	Schedule 8.1	Schedule 9.1 & 9.4	
Calculated Costs/DIFs								
Detached Dwelling Units (1)	$396	$922	$2,482	$3,061	$1,172	$867	$16,990	$25,890 per Unit
Attached Dwelling Units	$815	$382	$1,657	$397	$908	$672	$13,164	$17,995 per Unit
Mobile Home Dwelling Units (2	$369	$1,583	$1,299	$2,082	$733	$542	$10,627	$17,235 per Unit
Hotel/Motel Lodging Units	$455	$356	$1,105	$479	No Fee	No Fee	$459	$2,854 per Unit
Resort Lodging Units	$532	$794	$1,915	$356	No Fee	No Fee	$359	$3,956 per Unit
Commercial/Office Uses	$1.041	$0.329	$2.331	$0.347	No Fee	No Fee	$0.954	$5.002 per S.F.
Industrial/Manufacturing Uses	$0.443	$0.030	$1.621	$1.144	No Fee	No Fee	$0.772	$4.010 per S.F.
Anticipated DIF Collection								
Detached Dwelling Units (1)	$692,604	$1,612,578	$4,341,018	$5,353,689	$2,049,828	$1,516,383	$29,715,510	$45,281,610
Attached Dwelling Units	$4,325,205	$2,027,274	$8,793,699	$2,106,879	$4,818,756	$3,566,304	$69,861,348	$95,499,465
Mobile Home Dwelling Units (2	$3,321	$14,247	$11,691	$18,738	$6,597	$4,878	$95,643	$155,115
Hotel/Motel Lodging Units	$372,190	$291,208	$903,890	$391,822	$0	$0	$375,462	$2,334,572
Resort Lodging Units	$284,620	$424,790	$1,024,525	$190,460	$0	$0	$192,065	$2,116,460
Commercial/Office Uses	$2,516,097	$795,193	$5,634,027	$838,699	$0	$0	$2,305,818	$12,089,834
Industrial/Manufacturing Uses	$1,611,634	$109,140	$5,897,198	$4,161,872	$0	$0	$2,808,536	$14,588,380
Total	$9,805,671	$5,274,430	$26,606,048	$13,062,159	$6,875,181	$5,087,565	$105,354,382	$172,065,436
City-wide Impact Fee	$9,805,671	$5,274,430	$26,606,048	$13,062,159	$6,875,181	$5,087,565	$105,354,382	$172,065,436
Existing Fund Balance	$0	$0	$200,000	$0	$0	$0	$3,379,000	$3,579,000
Other Sources	$0	$700,000	$260,020	$0	$0	$22,000,000	$0	$22,960,020
Capital Total	$10,100,895	$11,941,972	$28,537,800	$207,494,050	$7,841,369	$28,750,000	$108,733,000	$403,399,086
Overage/(Shortfall)	($295,224)	($5,967,542)	($1,471,732)	($194,431,891)	($966,188)	($1,662,435)	$382	($204,794,630)

Chapter 3

Law Enforcement Facilities, Vehicles, and Equipment

The Existing System (or the infrastructure). The Police Department currently operates out of the 78,700 square foot facilities at the Civic Center on Main Street and the 7,050 square foot 5th Street Substation. These combined 85,780 square feet of the two facilities provide roughly 365 square feet per each of the 235 sworn (budget approved) officers. The facility meet's current needs but will not likely accommodate the space needs required for the additional officers necessary to accommodate the additional calls-for-service generated by new development at General Plan build-out, Certainly not at the same standards of service afforded to existing development. The Department will need to hire additional officers to maintain the existing levels of law enforcement services and the current static facility will ultimately prove insufficient to house the entire staff at General Plan build-out. An expansion of the City-owned facility will need to occur before General Plan build-out to allow the City to accommodate that new development. Due to size limitations of the current police station parcels, it may be difficult to enlarge the current buildings at either of the existing sites.

The existing facility space would cost approximately $53,423,178 to acquire at current land acquisition and construction costs. Additionally, the Department has a response fleet consisting of 231 vehicles installed with significant, and costly, amounts of sophisticated equipment costing some $12,640,310 to replace. The 235 General Fund-supported sworn officers are each assigned equipment such as various leathers, armaments, clothing, radios, protective vests, safety apparel costing an average of $9,930 per sworn officer for a total of $2,155,801 for the 235 current officers. The final key asset is the estimated $3,027,410 in law enforcement specialty equipment. These assets, totaling some $71,246,699, represent the cumulative commitment of the cumulative City Councils (and community) to the Police Department standards of service as supported by Law Enforcement Facilities, Vehicles and Equipment infrastructure.

Demand Upon Infrastructure Created by the Development of Under or Undeveloped Parcels. Residents/ businesses benefit from law enforcement services in three ways: directly, indirectly and through standby availability. Direct services are those involving an actual unit response, usually as a result of being the victim of a crime or other emergency situation. Direct service results in the form of a law enforcement officer *directly* contacting the victim. Indirect benefits, such as crime prevention programs, free patrol time and other more general services that serve all, are benefits that are more difficult to calculate. As an example, the burglar that is arrested today in some neighbors home, may have broken into your home tomorrow. Most residents and businesses may go for many years before ever requiring a direct call-for-service. These fortunate residents

and businesses *still* benefit for law enforcement services, if in no other way, than in the security that a law enforcement officer is available, through adequate planned stand-by, to respond if you require public safety assistance.

Everyone benefits from stand-by capabilities, which is just the fact that law enforcement services are simply there, staffed, trained, equipped and available to respond as they are needed. Sworn law enforcement officials are the first responders to emergency problems that can occur to anyone. They are trained to act and solve just about any law enforcement problem that might occur. The concept of stand-by service is similar to stand-by water service. Consider owning a vacant lot not requiring water service, regardless of the fact that others have built a functional water system near your vacant lot. At some point in time, that vacant lot is developed and needs a water meter and water service. Because of the forethought of others, the water service is available when the lot is developed. One may not feel they need law enforcement services, but some day they will, and because of the foresight of others, the service capability will be available.

The addition of new residential units and new businesses will increase the demand upon the law enforcement capacity to serve by creating more direct calls-for-service, more areas requiring preventive patrol, and in general, more opportunities for crimes to be committed.

The development of vacant parcels into residential or business units will also generate more calls. Residents and business-owners occupying those residences and businesses will create the increase in law enforcement calls-for-service. Simply stated, more homes and businesses will mean more responses to the additional burglaries, domestic disputes, noise complaints, shoplifting, and miscellaneous incidents that will occur in the new homes and businesses.

If the Law Enforcement capabilities (the base) are not expanded, then any increasing number of calls-for-service from development (the rate) will reduce the amount or free hours available for preventive patrol. This inability to expand the capabilities would ultimately drive the Department fully into a reactionary mode.

Table 3-1, following, summarizes an analysis of the calls-for-service received by the Police Department in recent twelve month period.[1] The table indicates the breakdown of calls into the land uses that generated them and divides them by the number of developed units (during the same period). This process generates a *calls-for-service* factor for the various land-uses.

[This space left vacant to place the following table on a single page].

Table 3-1
Law Enforcement Calls-for-Service Generated by Land Use (2009)

Land Use	Developed Dwellings or Acres	Calls For Service	Total Calls Per Dwelling or Acre
Detached Dwelling Units	38,616	13,185	0.341/Unit
Attached Dwelling Units	36,108	25,350	0.702/Unit
Mobile Home Dwelling Units	2,865	910	0.318/Unit
Hotel/Motel Units	1,070	420	0.393/Unit
Resort Lodging Units	809	371	0.459/Unit
Commercial Uses (in KSF)	12,836,000	11,514	0.897/KSF
Industrial Uses (in KSF)	20,261,000	7,729	0.381/KSF
Beach Area		1,806	

The previous Table representing the 59,479 annual police calls-for-service to privately-held developed parcels within the City's limits (for a recent twelve months reporting periods), identifies the differing demand caused by the differing land uses. As an example, there was approximately 13,168 calls-for-service requiring a response to one of the 38,616 existing detached dwellings in the City (during the tested twelve month sample). The result indicates that each residential detached dwelling unit will statistically generate just slightly more than one third of a call-for-service per year,[2] on average. The same analysis was undertaken for the other seven land uses. Obviously there are calls to incidents on publicly owned roads and right-of-way, in parks and other publicly held parcels, these calls represent approximately 3% of the annual calls-for-service. Calls-for-service to resort lodging facilities, typically larger than hotel/motel facilities (defined as three stories or more) have been separated in order to generate a more relevant calls-for-service rate for each of the two differing types of temporary lodging. Resort facilities have been shown to generate more calls-for-service, most likely due to their convention and banquet facilities. However, any such resorts constructed in the future would also have such amenities.

The annual calls-for-service was responded to by one of the City's existing 235 sworn officers establishing an average of about 260.79 calls-for-service per sworn officer annually.[3]

Average Demand as Determined by Calls-for-Service. The calls-for-service ratios are *on-average*, that is to say that not every detached dwelling unit will generate 0.341 annual calls-for-service. Since they are statistically representative of *averages* of how *calls-for-service* are generated in City of Huntington Beach, they can be used to project the number of additional law enforcement calls-for-service that can be expected at General Plan build-out. This process is accomplished by multiplying the average calls-for-service rate, per Table 3-1, by the number of anticipated additional residential dwellings or business square feet per Table 2-1. The result is approximately 8,697 *additional* annual calls-for-service at General Plan build-out. The number of additional officers necessary to meet the anticipated (net) additional 8,697 annual calls-for-service from future development (8,448 from development and 249 from public rights-of-way) is then divided by the average number of calls-for-service capacity that an officer currently responds to (or 260.79 per year per officer). This process indicates that an additional thirty-three sworn police officers will be necessary to accommodate the anticipated new development at the current standards of service provided to the existing community. Or in the contrary, without the doubling of the Police staff, the City would experience a roughly 14.2% reduction in the standards-of-service at General Plan build-out, as defined by the ability to respond to calls-for-service.

Information from Table 3-1 and Table 2-1 (Land-use Database) has been used to determine how many additional officers will be required at build-out. By multiplying the demand rate for detached dwelling units (0.341 calls-for-service per unit) times the 1,749 anticipated detached dwelling units to be constructed through General Plan build-out, the City could expect an additional 597.2 annual calls-for-service. The total 8,697 additional calls-for-service, (8,448 from development and 249 from the public beach area from all land-uses (and rights-of-way) divided by roughly 260.79 calls per officer per year indicates the need for thirty-three additional officers to be able to accommodate the additional calls generated by the new development at General Plan build-out without diminishing the existing standards of coverage to the existing community to do so. Table 3-2 identifies the calls-for-service anticipated for each of the seven major land uses.

[This space left vacant to place the following table on a single page].

Table 3-2
Additional Law Enforcement Calls (rounded)
Generated by New Development, by Land Use

Land Use	Anticipated Dwellings or S.F.	Total Calls Per Dwelling or Acre	Additional Calls-for-service
Detached Dwelling Units	1,749	0.341/Unit	597.18 Calls
Attached Dwelling Units	5,307	0.702/Unit	3,725.83Calls
Mobile Home Units (1)	9	0.318/Unit	2.86 Calls
Hotel/Motel Units	818	0.393/Unit	321.08 Calls
Resort Lodging Units	535	0.459/Unit	245.35 Calls
Commercial Uses (net in KSF)	2,417,000	0.897/KSF	1,268.07 Calls
Industrial Uses (KSF)	3,638,000	0.381/KSF	1,387.80 Calls
Proportional Beach Increase			248.96 Calls

NOTES: (1) Development of these types of units is not anticipated. One acre of units is included for calculation purposes..

Cumulatively, an additional (rounded) calls-for-service would be expected at General Plan build-out. It is important to note that the additional of the thirty-three officers (8,695 annual calls-for-service ÷ 260.79 calls/sworn officer) by General Plan build-out would merely *maintain the existing levels of service,* and would not increase the existing levels of service because of the additional 8,697 annual calls-for-service, or the 8,448 calls-for-service to the privately-held land-uses.

No judgement is made, regarded or offered about the existing standards-of-service (LOS) or the current ratio of officers to calls-for-service, or that it is the City's desired level-of-service or that it is optimum, it merely is the existing, or *defacto*, level-of-service (LOS).

The **Purpose** of the Fee. The purpose of the fee is to collect proportional contributions from new development to pay for additionally required law enforcement facilities, vehicles and equipment. Specifically, additional law enforcement calls-for-service can be expected, and the cost of adding sworn officers necessary to respond to these anticipated calls, and thus maintain the existing

levels-of-service afforded the existing residential and business community, can also be determined. The additional costs can be proportionally determined and translated to a fee, or an amount, necessary to offset the added costs of the required additional law enforcement staffing. Those impact costs include housing and equipping the additional required officers. Providing that the impact cost is adopted and imposed as a fee, new development will finance the capital costs of expansion of the City's Police Department. The annual operations cost of the annual salary and benefits for those additional officers, will need to come from the increases in the base amounts of property, sales and transient occupancy general tax increases generated by the new residences and businesses and their occupants.

The Use of the Fee. The fees collected will be used to fund the law enforcement facilities and equipment (identified in the *Master Facilities Plan*) that are necessary to accommodate the anticipated (and planned for) development identified in Table 2-1. The revenues raised for a properly calculated and legally-supported Law Enforcement Development Impact Fee would be limited to capital(ized) costs related to that growth. The fees would be used to expand or increase capacity within the law enforcement facilities, increase the number of response and investigator's vehicles, and specialty equipment. Conversely, the General Plan Build-out Needs-based Law Enforcement Development Impact Fee receipts cannot be used repair the existing building, replace existing vehicles, or re-outfit a new officer (due to normal vacancies of the existing 235 officers).

The Relationship Between the Use of the Fee and the Type of Development Paying the Fee. The fees collected from new development will be used to pay the proportional facility expansion costs generated by new development. As the development occurs, the impact (in the form of new or additional demands for service) is generated in differing amounts by differing land-uses and the development impact fees would be collected as the various types of development occurs (at a time in the development review and approval process determined by the City). The collected fee would be put to use to acquire law enforcement space, vehicles and equipment for the new (and additional) officers necessary to respond to those additional calls generated by that same new development, *without reducing the capability of responding to calls for the existing community*.

The Relationship Between the Need for the Public Facility and the Type of Development Project. As noted in this report, residents and businesses will generate calls-for-service at different rates. Thus, there is a need to establish a specific schedule of development impact fees to fund the law enforcement facilities needed to support the development anticipated in Table 2-1. To meet that need, Police Department calls-for-service records were used to verify that differing land uses generate differing amounts of calls-for-service. Anecdotally we can all recognize that a retail store would be more likely to suffer shoplifting incidents, whereas a residence is more likely to experience a domestic disturbance or break-in and thus would have differing demands. The data in this Chapter demonstrates those expected differences using data specific to the City of Huntington Beach. The collected impact fees would be used to acquire additional building space,

response vehicles and specialty and issued equipment for additional officers necessary to respond to the additional calls-for-service generated by private residential dwelling and business space.

It would take the construction of roughly 368 attached dwellings to generate the need for a one full police officer. Cumulatively over time, the calls generated by various new developments within the City will create the need for additional officers and ultimately an additional patrol beat. It is interesting to note that on an acreage basis, an acre of detached dwellings, yielding about six detached units, will generate about 2.0 annual calls-for-service, only 15% of that generated by an acre of attached dwellings, yielding about 47 units.

The Relationship Between the Amount of the Fee and the Cost of the Portion of the Facility Attributed to the Development Project. Each new development would finance a proportional amount of the expansion of the Police Station, vehicle response fleet and specialty law enforcement equipment and thus a proportional share of the costs. The existing Police Station, while quite large and is generally capable of meeting the needs of the existing staff required to serve the existing community, was not necessarily designed to meet the City's law enforcement needs at General Plan build-out. The two buildings combined 85,750 square feet provides about an average of about 364.89 square feet per existing officer, a reasonable target to maintain for future police officers[4]. Based upon the future addition of thirty-three officers to maintain the existing levels of staffing, a 12,041 square foot expansion of the existing facility, or some other City-owned facility would be needed, (33 X 364.89 = 12,041) to maintain the same ratio of space per officer that is currently afforded by the existing facility.

As a result of potential addition of thirty-three sworn officers, the City will also need to add thirty-three response vehicles at a total cost of $1,751,040 (or 33 vehicles X $54,720/vehicle) to maintain as close to the existing ratio of 0.98 vehicles per sworn officer as possible (231 vehicles divided by 235 officers = 0.98 vehicles per officer). The thirty-three new officers would each require a full set of personal equipment and armament at $9,930 each for a total of $327,690. Additional communications, telemetry and specialty operations equipment at an estimated total $425,000 has been included to maintain a similar ratio of specialty equipment to sworn officer.

General Plan Build-out Needs-based Development Impact Fee Schedule. Table, 3-3, following, summarizes the resulting General Plan Build-out Needs-based Development Impact Fees (see Schedule 3.2 for detailed calculation) for development to contribute financially to the expansion of the City's Law Enforcement capacity in order to allow the City to extend the same level-of-service to the City's newest citizens and businesses without diminishing the existing level-of-services offered to the existing residents and businesses.

Table 3-3
General Plan Build-out Needs-based Law Enforcement Impact Fees

Land Use	Allocation of Expansion Costs	Expansion Cost Per Unit or S.F.
Detached Dwelling Units	$692,944	$396/Unit
Attached Dwelling Units	$4,323,304	$815/Unit
Mobile Home Dwelling Units	$3,319	$369/Unit
Hotel/Motel Lodging Units	$372,568	$455/Unit
Resort Lodging Units	$284,694	$532/Unit
Commercial/Office Uses	$2,515,742	$1.041/S.F.
Industrial/Manufacturing Uses	$1,610,348	$0.443/S.F.

DIF Proportionality Test by Comparison with Existing Financial Commitment. The current equity in the City's law enforcement assets includes the 85,750 square feet of law enforcement facilities with a replacement cost of $53,423,178, the 231 law enforcement vehicles costing the City some $12,640,310, the inventory of assigned equipment for 239 officers at a total of $2,155,801, the specialty and communications equipment at $3,027,410. There is no existing Law Enforcement Development Impact Fee thus no existing fund balance. When this combined equity figure of $71,246,699 is distributed to the current community (via Table 3-4, following and detailed in Schedule 3.3), the existing community commitment, on a per unit basis, is just slightly less than the calculated Law Enforcement *General Plan Build-out Needs-based* Development Impact Fees (or cost) per unit, as indicated by the existing $71,246,699 invested in capital for the provision of law enforcement.

[This space left vacant to place the following table on a single page].

Table 3-4
Existing Financial Commitment or "Equity-based"
Law Enforcement Impact Fees

Land Use	Allocation of Equity	Total Equity Per Unit or SF
Detached Dwelling Units	$15,793,603	$409/Unit
Attached Dwelling Units	$30,365,403	$841/Unit
Mobile Home Units	$1,090,040	$380/Unit
Hotel/Motel Units	$503,096	$470Unit
Resort Lodging Units	$444,401	$549/Unit
Commercial/Office Uses	$13,792,002	$1.074/S.F.
Industrial Uses	$9,258,164	$0.475/S.F.

RESULTING DEVELOPMENT IMPACT FEES

The General Plan Build-out Needs-based impact fees, identified in Table 3-3, are slightly less than the Financial Commitment or Investment-based fees identified in Table 3-4 indicating that the existing commitment has kept relative pace with law enforcement asset expansion. In order to ensure that proportionality, and its underlying fairness, be maintained the development impact fee schedule identified in Table 3-3, (General Plan Build-out Need-based Development Impact Fees) are the most reasonable for both additional new development and the existing community. The adoption of Table 3-3, and detailed in Schedule 3.2 at the end of the Chapter, would also generate sufficient capital, about 97% of the full amount identified in the *Master Facilities Plan*, to construct most of the law enforcement facilities and capital equipment needed to absorb the new demands generated by the City's continued new development while maintaining proportionality with the commitment demonstrated by the existing community. The remaining 3% would need to come from other sources.

RECAP OF RECOMMENDED LAW ENFORCEMENT FACILITIES, VEHICLES AND EQUIPMENT DEVELOPMENT IMPACT FEES

- Adopt Schedule 3.2, General Plan Build-out Needs-based development Impact Fees for the seven basic new land-uses.

CHAPTER ENDNOTES

1. The twelve month period spanning 2009.

2. Stated slightly differently, we could expect that any randomly selected thirty homes would generate about ten calls in a given year.

3. Again, this is not intended to imply that each officers annul work effort is limited to only 260.79 calls-for-service. Patrol officers respond to a far greater number of calls-for-service. Investigators may spend an entire year on only a few cases, while officers involved in management of the Department do not necessarily respond to any. The 260.79 calls-for-service is only an average and represent the composite calls-for-service workload distributed between the entire 235 sworn officers.

4. This is almost the same as the average of 365.0 square foot per officer of six cities (with greater than 85 officers) where RCS has conducted similar analyses. Those six municipalities include Huntington Beach, Anaheim, Ontario, Riverside, Chino and Corona. The average for twenty cities (of all sizes) is 353.6 square feet per sworn officer.

Schedule 3.1

City of Huntington Beach
2011–12 Development Impact Fee Calculation and Nexus Report
Identification of Projects and Cost Allocation
Law Enforcement Facilities, Vehicles and Equipment

Line #	Description	Estimated Cost	Amount Allocated to Eliminate Existing Deficiencies: Percent Need	Amount Allocated to Eliminate Existing Deficiencies: Apportioned Dollar Cost	Amount Allocated to General Plan New Development: Percent Need	Amount Allocated to General Plan New Development: Apportioned Dollar Cost
LE-001	Additional Law Enforcement Facility Space	$7,597,165	2.95%	$224,116	97.05%	$7,373,049
LE-002	Acquire Additional Response Vehicles	$1,751,040	2.95%	$51,656	97.05%	$1,699,384
LE-003	Acquire Additional Sworn Office Issued Equipment	$327,690	2.95%	$9,667	97.05%	$318,023
LE-004	Acquire Law Enforcement Specialty Equipment	$425,000	2.95%	$12,538	97.05%	$412,463
	SUB-TOTAL ESTIMATED NEW PROJECT COSTS	$10,100,895	2.95%	$297,976	97.05%	$9,802,919
	LESS: Existing Law Enforcement Impact Fee Fund Balance	$0	0.00%	$0	0.00%	$0
	SUB-TOTAL ADJUSTMENTS	$0	0.00%	$0	0.00%	$0
	Total - Law Enforcement Capital Project Needs	$10,100,895	2.95%	$297,976	97.05%	$9,802,919
					Forward to Schedule 3.2	

NOTES:
1. Costs distribution based upon a 10% sampling of Police Department "Calls-for-Service" statistics.

Schedule 3.2

City of Huntington Beach
2010–11 Development Impact Fee Calculation and Nexus Report
General Plan Build-out Needs-based Development Impact Costs (Fees)
Law Enforcement Facilities, Vehicles and Equipment

Proposed Land Use	Net Increased Units Acres	Net Increased Units Units	Calls Generation Rate	Expected New Calls for Service	Percentage of Additional Service Calls	Allocation of Expansion Costs	Cost Distribution Per Acre	Average Units or Square Feet/Acre	Development Impact Fee per Unit or Square Foot
Detached Dwelling Units (1)	295.0	1,749	0.341	597.18	7.07%	$692,944	$2,349	5.93	*$396 per Unit*
Attached Dwelling Units	111.2	5,307	0.702	3,725.83	44.10%	$4,323,304	$38,879	47.72	*$815 per Unit*
Mobile Home Dwelling Units	1.0	9	0.318	2.86	0.03%	$3,319	$3,319	9.00	*$369 per Unit*
Hotel/Motel Lodging Units	18.6	818	0.393	321.08	3.80%	$372,568	$20,031	43.98	*$455 per Unit*
Resort Lodging Units	9.3	535	0.459	245.35	2.90%	$284,694	$30,612	57.53	*$532 per Unit*
Commercial/Office Uses	39.8	2,417,000	0.897	2,168.07	25.66%	$2,515,742	$63,210	60,729	*$1.041 per S.F.*
Industrial/Manufacturing Use	187.0	3,638,000	0.381	1,387.80	16.43%	$1,610,348	$8,611	19,455	*$0.443 per S.F.*
TOTAL	661.9	--	--	8,448.17	100.00%	$9,802,919	in Total Law Enforcement Capital Needs to Complete Syste		

Schedule 3.3

City of Huntington Beach
2010-11 Development Impact Fee Calculation and Nexus Report
Community Financial Commitment or Equity-based Proportionality Test Fees
Law Enforcement Facilities, Vehicles and Equipment

Proposed Land Use	Developed Acres	Developed Units	Call Generation Rate	Existing Calls for Service	Percentage of Existing Service Calls	Allocation of Infrastructure "Equity"	Distribution of "Equity" per Acre	Average Units or Square Feet/Acre	Current Financial Commitment per Unit or Square Foot
Detached Dwelling Units (1)	6,436.0	38,616	0.341	13,185.0	22.17%	$15,793,603	$2,454	6.00	*$409 per Unit*
Attached Dwelling Units	1,805.4	36,108	0.702	25,350.0	42.62%	$30,365,403	$16,819	20.00	*$841 per Unit*
Mobile Home Dwelling Units	204.6	2,865	0.318	910.0	1.53%	$1,090,040	$5,328	14.00	*$380 per Unit*
Hotel/Motel Lodging Units	33.4	1,070	0.393	420.0	0.71%	$503,096	$15,063	32.04	*$470 per Unit*
Resort Lodging Units	20.2	809	0.459	371.0	0.62%	$444,401	$22,000	40.05	*$549 per Unit*
Commercial/Office Uses	841.9	12,836,000	0.897	11,514.0	19.36%	$13,792,002	$16,382	15,246	*$1.074 per S.F.*
Industrial/Manufacturing Use	930.3	20,261,000	0.381	7,729.0	12.99%	$9,258,154	$9,952	21,779	*$0.457 per S.F.*
TOTAL	10,271.8	--	--	59,479.0	100.00%	$71,246,699	in Total Equity in Current Law Enforcement Assets		
						$53,423,178	in Equity in Current Law Enforcement Facilities.		
						$12,640,310	in Equity in Current Law Enforcement Vehicles.		
						$3,027,410	in Equity in Existing Specialty/Electronic Equipment		
						$2,155,801	in Equity in Current Law Enforcement Officer Equipment.		
						$0	in Existing Law Enforcement Impact Fee Fund Balance.		

Land Use	Units or Acres	Calls for Service	Annual Calls Per Unit
Detached Dwelling Units	38,616	13,185	0.341
Attached Dwelling Units	36,108	25,350	0.702
Mobile Home Units	2,865	910	0.318
Hotel/Motel Units	1,070	420	0.393
Resort Units	809	371	0.459
Commercial/Office KSF	12,836	11,514	0.897
Industrial KSF	20,261	7,729	0.381

Chapter 4

Fire Suppression/Medic Facilities, Vehicles, and Equipment

The Existing Fire Suppression/Medic Infrastructure. The Fire Department responds to calls for service from eight existing stations and trains at a facility consisting of a training (and drying) tower, classrooms, offices and support areas with specialty situation training mock-up implements. There is also a storage facility for reserve vehicles. The fire facilities are detailed as follows:

Fire Station #1 (Gothard) is a 10,200 square foot facility on parcel that is just under an acre (42,166 square feet) and is located at 18311 Gothard Street.

Fire Station #2 (Murdy) is a 11,500 square foot three-bays wide by two-vehicles deep facility also on a 42,166 square foot parcel at 16221 Gothard Street.

Fire Station #3 (Bushard) is a one-bay wide by one-vehicle deep, 5,700 square foot facility located on a 12,980 square foot parcel located at 19711 Bushard Street.

Fire Station #4 (Magnolia) is a 5,702 square foot, one-bay wide by one-vehicle deep facility located on a 21,780 square foot parcel located at 21441 Magnolia Street.

Fire Station #5 (Lake) is a 11,508 square foot, three-bays wide by two-vehicles deep facility on a 14,200 square foot parcel located at 530 Lake Street.

Fire Station #6 (Edwards) is a 13,000 square foot, three-bays wide by two-vehicles deep facility located on a 208,478 square foot parcel located at 18591 Edwards Street.

Fire Station #7 (Warner) is an 8,750 square foot, two-bays wide by one-vehicle deep facility located on a 53,273 square foot parcel at 3831 Warner Avenue.

Fire Station #8 (Heil) is a 5,712 square foot, two-bays wide by one-vehicle deep station on a 10,280 square foot parcel located at 5891 Heil Avenue.

The **Training** Facility is also located at 18301 Gothard next to Station #1 on a 77,580 square foot portion of a City parcel and consists of 7,081 square feet of classrooms and offices. The site also has numerous training exercise implements and a drafting pool.

Reserve Vehicle Storage Building - The facility is 2,525 square foot storage building and is located behind Fire Station #1 (Gothard).

The land and replacement construction cost of the existing stations and training facilities is approximately $52,999,718. Not surprisingly, the City also has a sizable fleet of City-owned response and prevention units (and equipment) consisting of:

- Four front line and three reserve ambulances;
- Two front line ladder trucks, one aerial platform and a large tiller ladder truck and one reserve tiller ladder truck;
- Eight front-line and four reserve engines;
- Two Battalion Chief incident command vehicles;
- Seven utility pick-up trucks of varying sizes (utility and specialty support);
- Three specialty vehicles, a decontamination vehicle, a HazMat vehicle and Light/Air support vehicle; and,
- Twenty-two administrative, inspection and investigation sedans.

The total investment in the Department's vehicle compliment is about $9,237,000. The City's investment in assigned fire fighter equipment is approximately $1,010,202 at $7,595.50 for each of the 133 sworn fire fighters. The City has also acquired approximately $537,780 in computers/Electronic equipment. There is no existing Fire Suppression/Medic Facilities, Vehicle and Equipment Impact Fee Fund thus no current year-end fund balance.

The current equity of the stations, parcels, specialty equipment and the response fleet is estimated to be $63,784,700. The sale of Station #8 (Heil), to allow it to be relocated, decreases this figure by a net $2,550,473 to $61,234,227. This figure represents what it would cost to establish the existing eight station (along with the reserve vehicle and training facilities) response capability at current vehicle, equipment, land acquisition and facility construction costs. The relevance of this figure will be established later in this Chapter.

Demand Upon Infrastructure Created by the Development of Under or Undeveloped Parcels. While it can be said that numerous factors are considered when determining the number of and location of fire stations in any city, it can be stated without any logical argument that all new (net) private development in the City will have an effect on the City's current ability to respond to fire, medic, and emergency calls-for-service. The effect, simplified but not trivialized, is twofold. Initially, each new residential and business development will create, on average, more calls-for-service increasing the likelihood of simultaneous (and thus competing) calls-for-service. Additionally, as development spreads further from any existing station or stations, as large-scale development is often likely to do, the distances (and thus response times) will increase, taking the existing engine companies out-of-service for greater lengths of time.

The capacity of any fire station to respond to calls-for-service is finite and will ultimately reach practical limits (through a combination of call-frequency and total time on that call). When that station's capacity is exceeded, the level-of-service afforded to existing development will be greatly diminished. Or stated in another way, if development continues without the addition of fire stations (additional capacity), the existing station will be overwhelmed (new demand), making a timely response for emergency service less likely. That is to say, the existing engine companies may not be available to respond to your needs as they may be out-of-service on a call in a different part of the community.

The **Purpose** of the Fee. The purpose of the fee is to collect proportional financial contributions from new development to pay for additional fire suppression/medic facilities, vehicles and specialty equipment. In order to be able to continue to be able to respond to an ever-increasing number of expected calls, the Fire Department staff has determined the need for the relocation of one new station (as opposed to adding a ninth) and an expansion of one existing station. Having the right type and inventory of fire stations in the right locations enables the City's policy makers to house fire fighters, apparatus, and equipment in a rational way for maximum use of resources.

Conversely, the penalties are high and extremely visible, for inadequate fire response capacity. Adverse effects are felt by the City's fire staff, the council, and indeed by the existing taxpayers. With poor response capacity response times, (via distance or out-of-service due to a previous call), can become excessive and if a tragedy occurs, the incident will be well publicized.

Often, *response time* is mistakenly referred to for only the first-in unit. This can be a grave error. More correctly, response time must consider the time necessary to assemble *all* of the fire resources necessary to place the incident under control. If the first unit arrives within five minutes but cannot provide the necessary water flow, undertake entry, or perform the needed functions due to a lack of staffing, the five minute response becomes insignificant and irrelevant. Thus an increase in the number and type of response vehicles is also necessary to match and equip the needed additional staff. The following sections identify the manner in which the City plans to meet the demands of additional calls-for-service and can thus accommodate new development.

The **Use** of the Fee. The development impact fee would be collected as the development occurs at some point of the development review process determined by the City. As the development occurs, the impact is generated. The collected fees would be put to use to acquire the additional fire-fighters' facilities necessary to respond to additional calls-for-service, *necessary to avoid reducing the capability of responding to calls from the existing community*. These fees will be used to finance the construction or acquisition of fire suppression/medic facilities, vehicles and specialty equipment (identified in the companion *Master Facilities Plan)* that have been identified as necessary to accommodate the anticipated (and planned for) development identified in Table 2-1.

The proposed fire suppression/medic facilities and equipment that are necessary to accommodate the anticipated (and planned for) in Table 2-1 are identified in the companion document the *Master Facilities Plan*. It is important to note that the fees would be used to acquire additional stations or expand existing stations (to increase the response capacity of that station) and increase the number of emergency response vehicles. Conversely, the Fire Suppression/Medic Facilities, Vehicles, and Equipment Impact Fee receipts could not be used to simply repair any existing fire station or replace any existing emergency response vehicles. Additional facility capacity is planned to come on-line, as needed, as development creates additional demands beyond the existing capability (frequency and distance) of the existing stations. The six capital projects expansions proposed by the City's fire staff will cost a net $11,241,972. They are described briefly:

FS-001 - Relocate Station #8 (Heil) - The proposed project involves the relocation of the existing station from it's current location on Heil Street just west of Springdale to a more northerly area near Graham Street, north of Edinger Street. The relocation is largely needed to meet the shifting and increasing demands resulting from the redevelopment/up-sizing of both the Downtown Specific Plan and the Beach/Edinger Specific Plan corridor. The proposed building would be a three-bay wide by two-vehicle deep facility. The project would need approximately an acre and a quarter.

FS-002 - Construct Station #8 (Heil) Apparatus Storage Facility - The reserve vehicle storage facility behind the existing Station #1 would need to be supplemented with a storage facility behind Station #8 as part of the above project but is not fully needed as result of the redevelopment of the two large specific plans. It is partly needed to accommodate existing reserve vehicles.

FS-003 - Construct a Single Bay/Quarters At Station #4 (Magnolia) - The project will add 2,400 square feet to the station. The additional space would consist of an additional 1,600 two vehicle deep bay to house and additional engine company and an ambulance.

FS-004 - Acquire an Additional Engine and Ambulance for Station #4 (Magnolia) - This project consists of the response vehicles in support of the Station #4 expansion.

FS-005 - Acquire an Additional Engine for Station #1 - This additional engine would be needed to assist in handling the additional call volume resulting from the development in both the Downtown Specific Plan and the southerly portion of the Beach/Edinger Specific Plan corridor.

FS-006 - Acquire an Additional Engine for Station #2 - This additional engine would be needed to assist in accommodating additional call-for-service volume resulting from the development in the Beach/Edinger Specific Plan corridor.

The proposed projects and costs are identified on Schedule 4.1 and are detailed in the Master Facilities Plan. The total cost of completing the fire infrastructure system is $11,941,972, which is mitigated by the $700,000 offset anticipated by the sale of the Station #8, Heil for a net total of $11,241,972. There is no existing Fire Suppression/Medic Development Impact Fee fund thus no fund balance.

The Relationship Between the Need for the Public Facility and the Type of Development Project. As noted in this report, residents and businesses will generate calls-for-service at different rates. Thus, there is a need to establish a specific schedule of development impact fees to finance the required expansion to the fire suppression/paramedic facilities et. al. needed to support the development anticipated and identified in Table 2-1. Fire suppression/medic response standards extended to new development should be consistent with the fire response currently enjoyed by the City's existing citizens and business community by constructing new facilities, or the result will be a deterioration in the level-of-service provided both to the existing residents and future citizens and businesses within the City. It follows that it is appropriate to assess future development to contribute additional fire suppression/medic facilities, vehicles and equipment.

To project the impact of future development on fire services, it was first necessary to quantify the current impact on services from each of the City's land uses. Then, a determination of the costs of future capital facilities necessary to meet this increased demand was made. The following section illustrates the relative impact from each land use on fire services and facilities.

The Relationship Between the Need for the Public Facility and the Type of Development Project. As noted in this report, residents and businesses will generate calls-for-service at different rates. Thus, there is a need to establish a specific schedule of development impact fees to fund the fire suppression/paramedic facilities needed to support the development anticipated in Table 2-1. To meet that need, actual Fire Department calls-for-service records[1] were used to verify that differing land uses generate differing numbers of calls. The data in this Chapter demonstrates those expected differences using data specific to City of Huntington Beach. The collected impact fees would be used to acquire equipment for additional fire fighters, vehicles and additional building space necessary to respond to the calls-for-service generated by private residential dwelling and business space.

The Relationship Between the Amount of the Fee and the Cost of the Portion of the Facility Attributed to the Development Project. Each new development would finance a proportional amount of the expansion of the fire station/company response capacity, vehicle response fleet and specialty response/paramedic equipment and thus a proportional share of the costs. It is unlikely that any specific development will generate the need to construct the additional fire station, but each one will pay for their proportional demands on that expansion.

The beach/City right-of-way areas generated 195 calls for service. Of residential land uses, the occupants of an attached dwelling unit are less likely, by less than half as much, to require an emergency fire service response at 0.051 annual responses *per unit*, than the occupants of a detached dwelling unit at 0.123 annual responses *per unit*. Commercial/Office development is shown to generate 0.044 responses *per 1,000 square feet* of building pad, while industrial development generates a minimal response demand of 0.004 calls *per 1,000 square feet* of building pad. The lower demand by industrial uses over commercial/office uses should be expected given the greater density of employees and patrons in a commercial or office establishment when compared to an industrial business of similar building size. However, it should be noted that while there are fewer calls for industrial properties, significant specialty training is required to be prepared for industrial responses, (i.e., confined space and hazardous materials training).

Table 4-2 indicates that, given the high density of rooms and accompanying facilities, an acre of resort development, creates the highest demand for fire services, thus the development impact fee for that land use is the highest, on an average acreage basis.

Table 4-2
Calls-for-service by Land-use
an Acre Basis

Land Use	Calls per Unit or KSF	Units or KSF per Acre	Annuals Calls per Acre
Detached Dwelling Units	0.123	6	0.74
Attached Dwelling Units	0.051	20	1.02
Mobile Home Dwelling Units	0.212	14	2.97
Hotel/Motel Lodging Units	0.048	32	1.53
Resort Lodging Units	0.106	40	4.25
Commercial/Office Uses (per KSF)	0.044	15,246	0.67
Industrial/Manufacturing Uses (KSF)	0.004	21,779	0.09

Based on the existing rate of responses by land use, the increased number of fire suppression/medic service responses generated by future residential, commercial/office and office

development was extrapolated. This was accomplished by multiplying the average responses per unit or 1,000 square feet (KSF), established in Table 4-1, by the number of anticipated dwelling units, commercial rooms or business KSF. Table 4-3, following, indicates the number of additional calls-for-service that could be anticipated from the development of currently vacant land within the City's planning area.

Table 4-3
Additional Annual Fire Suppression/Medic Responses
Generated by Future Anticipated Development

Land Use	Fire/Medic Responses Per Unit/KSF	Potential Units or KSF	Additional Annual Fire Responses
Detached Dwelling Units	0.123/unit	1,749 units	215.68 calls
Attached Dwelling Units	0.051/unit	5,307 units	271.32 calls
Mobile Home (in parks)	0.212/unit	9 units	1.91 calls
Hotel/Motel Units	0.048/unit	818 units	38.99 calls
Resort Lodging Units	0.106/unit	535 units	56.87 calls
Commercial/Office Uses	0.044/KSF	2,417 KSF	106.39 calls
Industrial Uses	0.040/KSF	3,638 KSF	14.72 calls
Total	--	--	705.88 calls

Proposed Capital Expenses. The total cost of the required improvements to the City's investment of fire suppression/medic facilities, vehicles and specialty equipment was previously estimated to be $11,941,972 with an offset of $700,000 from the proceeds of sale of the to-be vacated Heil Station #8. Roughly 46.4% has been identified as required to serve the net new calls-for-service resulting from development or up-sizing due to redevelopment. Projects FS-001 through FS-006 are capacity-increasing and have been determined by City staff to be necessary to accommodate the anticipated additional calls-for-service from new development or for a more appropriate aerial unit. When this cost is distributed the various land-uses and the demands created by each, a proportional cost is determined, by development unit. Table 4-4, summarized from Schedule 4.2, indicates the proportional cost by land-use unit.

Table 4-4
General Plan Build-out Needs Fire Facilities, Vehicles and Equipment Development Impact Fees

Land Use	Allocation of Costs	Total Cost Per Unit or SF
Detached Dwelling Units	$1,693,338	$968/Unit
Attached Dwelling Units	$2,130,176	$401/Unit
Mobile Home Units (in parks)	$14,996	$1,666/Unit
Hotel/Motel Units	$306,117	$374/Unit
Resort Lodging Units	$446,495	$835/Unit
Commercial/Office Uses	$835,285	$0.346/S.F.
Industrial Uses	$115,569	$0.032/S.F.

Existing City Financial Commitment. The replacement value of the existing fire infrastructure (parcel and station, response fleet and related safety/specialty equipment) at a net $61,234,227 (includes the potential sale of the Heil Station) was referenced earlier in this Chapter. This represents the current investment or *financial commitment* by the existing community toward fire suppression/medic capability/capacity. When this figure is distributed over the existing development in the same manner as were the future costs, by the land use demands, an average investment, or financial *commitment* (or *equity* for that matter) per unit is determined. The results are summarized in Table 4-5 (from Schedule 4.3). As an example, each detached dwelling unit has "invested" over the lifetime of the City, about $922 (as identified in Table 4-5 following) into fire suppression/medic capital, an amount that is about 95% of the General Plan Build-out Needs-based Development Impact Fee schedule identified in the previous Table 4-4 and detailed in Schedule 4.3.

The current community's commitment has established the eight response station capacities and was paid for through years of General Fund receipts. To allow future residents to benefit by use of all of the capital needs without contributing additional assets, could endanger the existing residents and businesses. Table 4-5, following, summarizes the distribution of the $ in replacement costs to the existing community, (Schedule 4.3 indicates this in greater detail).

Table 4-5
Existing Fire Suppression/Medic Existing
Community Financial Commitment

Land Use	Allocation of Equity	Total Equity Per Unit or SF
Detached Dwelling Units	$35,586,696	$922/Unit
Attached Dwelling Units	$13,795,263	$382/Unit
Mobile Home Units (in parks)	$4,536,145	$1,583/Unit
Hotel/Motel Units	$381,126	$356/Unit
Resort Lodging Units	$642,683	$792/Unit
Commercial/Office Uses	$4,222,277	$0.329/S.F.
Industrial Uses	$612,791	$0.030/S.F.
Other (beach area)	$1,457,246	NA

Of importance is the fact that the Community Financial Commitment or Equity-based costs on Table 4-5 are just slightly higher, at roughly 105%, than the proposed General Plan Build-out-based impact fees as demonstrated in Table 4-4. This indicates that the City is just slightly behind in its cumulative and proportional investment in needed fire suppression/medic facilities, vehicles and equipment.

RESULTING DEVELOPMENT IMPACT FEES

Since the equity position of the existing community is slightly less than the General Plan Build-out Needs-based development impact fees necessary for expansion, the current Community Financial Commitment or Equity-based Proportionality Test-based Development Impact Fees, as identified in Table 4-5 and Schedule 4.3, would be the most equitable fee schedule to adopt.

Resulting Development Impact Cost Distribution. The collection of the proposed development impact fee, through build-out would allow the City to provide a great deal (44.7%) of the proposed expansions and most of the equipment, but not all of it. It would fall about $6.0 million short of financing all of the required improvements attributed to new development.

OTHER NOTES AND ISSUES

1. The City will need to monitor the approval of conditional uses within industrial zoned development where newly constructed industrial developments. These land uses are initially have the lower industrial use development impact fees imposed when constructed as "spec" buildings but end up being used, with a CUP, for commercial/office uses. These commercial/office uses generate far greater demand than the industrial uses. If left unchecked, the Fire Department, as well as other City services, will be faced with the greater demand from the actual commercial/office uses but will be left only with the collection of the far lower industrial use development impact fee rates. To avoid this under collection, the City should impose an impact fee representing the difference between the commercial/office development impact fee and the previously paid industrial land-use impact fee when a CUP is approved and tenant improvement plans are submitted indicating a commercial or office use.

RECAP OF RECOMMENDED FIRE SUPPRESSION/MEDIC FACILITIES, VEHICLES AND EQUIPMENT DEVELOPMENT IMPACT FEES.

- Adopt Schedule 4.3 General Plan Build-out Needs-based for the seven basic land-uses.

CHAPTER ENDNOTES

1. The response data is generated from Department response incident data used to complete the annual National Fire Incident Report (NFIR's).

Schedule 4.1

City of Huntington Beach
2011-12 Development Impact Fee Calculation and Nexus Report
Identification of Projects and Cost Allocation
Fire Suppression/Medic Facilities and Vehicles

Line #	Description	Estimated Cost	Construction Needs Supported by Other Resources: Percent Need	Construction Needs Supported by Other Resources: Apportioned Dollar Cost	Construction Needs Generated by New Development: Percent Need	Construction Needs Generated by New Development: Apportioned Dollar Cost
FS-001	Relocate Station #8 (Heil)	$7,169,470	50.00%	$3,584,735	50.00%	$3,584,735
FS-002	Construct Second Apparatus Storage Facility (@ Heil Station)	$1,716,044	75.00%	$1,287,033	25.00%	$429,011
FS-003	Add Bay/Quarters at Station #4 (Magnolia)	$1,266,458	50.00%	$633,229	50.00%	$633,229
FS-004	Acquire Engine Company and Ambulance for Station #4 (Magnolia)	$740,000	50.00%	$370,000	50.00%	$370,000
FS-005	Acquire Engine Company for Station #1 (Gothard)	$525,000	50.00%	$262,500	50.00%	$262,500
FS-006	Acquire Engine Company for Station #2 (Murdy)	$525,000	50.00%	$262,500	50.00%	$262,500
	SUB-TOTAL ESTIMATED NEW PROJECT COSTS	$11,941,972	53.59%	$6,399,997	46.41%	$5,541,975
	LESS: Existing Fire Suppression Impact Fee Fund Balance	$0	100.00%	$0	0.00%	$0
	Sale of Property (Heil Station)	($700,000)	100.00%	($700,000)	0.00%	$0
	SUB-TOTAL ADJUSTMENTS	($700,000)	0.00%	($700,000)	0.00%	$0
	Total - Fire Suppression/Medic Capital Project Needs	$11,241,972	50.70%	$5,699,997	49.30%	$5,541,975
					Forward to Schedule 4.2	

NOTES:

1. The cost distribution is based upon annual Fire Department "Calls-for-Service" statistics (NFIRs).

Schedule 4.2

City of Huntington Beach
2011-12 Development Impact Fee Calculation and Nexus Report
General Plan Build-out Needs-based Development Impact Costs (Fees)
Fire Suppression/Medic Facilities and Vehicles

Proposed Land Use	Undeveloped Acres	Undeveloped Units	Call Generation Rate	Expected New Calls for Service	Percentage of Additional Service Calls	Allocation of Expansion Costs	Cost Distribution Per Acre	Average Units or Square Feet/Acre	Development Impact Fee per Unit or Square Foot
Detached Dwelling Units (1)	295.00	1,749	0.123	215.68	30.55%	$1,693,338	$5,740	5.93	*$968 per Unit*
Attached Dwelling Units	111.20	5,307	0.051	271.32	38.44%	$2,130,176	$19,156	47.72	*$401 per Unit*
Mobile Home Dwelling Units	1.00	9	0.212	1.91	0.27%	$14,996	$14,996	9.00	*$1,666 per Unit*
Hotel/Motel Lodging Units	18.60	818	0.048	38.99	5.52%	$306,117	$16,458	43.98	*$374 per Unit*
Resort Lodging Units	9.30	535	0.106	56.87	8.06%	$446,495	$48,010	57.53	*$835 per Unit*
Commercial/Office Uses	39.80	2,417,000	0.044	106.39	15.07%	$835,285	$20,987	60,729	*$0.346 per S.F.*
Industrial/Manufacturing Use	187.00	3,638,000	0.004	14.72	2.09%	$115,569	$618	19,455	*$0.032 per S.F.*
TOTAL	661.90	--	--	705.88	100.00%	$5,541,975	in Total Fire Suppression Capital Needs to Finish System		

Schedule 4.3

City of Huntington Beach
2011-12 Development Impact Fee Calculation and Nexus Report
Community Financial Commitment or Equity-based Proportionality Test Fees
Fire Suppression/Medic Facilities and Vehicles

Proposed Land Use	Developed Acres	Developed Units	Call Generation Rate	Existing Calls for Service	Percentage of Existing Service Calls	Allocation of Infrastructure "Equity"	Distribution of "Equity" per Acre	Average Units or Square Feet/Acre	Current Financial Commitment per Unit or Square Foot
Detached Dwelling Units (1)	6,436.00	38,616	0.123	4,762.0	58.12%	$35,586,696	$5,529	6.00	*$922 per Unit*
Attached Dwelling Units	1,805.40	36,108	0.051	1,846.0	22.53%	$13,795,263	$7,641	20.00	*$382 per Unit*
Mobile Home Dwelling Units	204.60	2,865	0.212	607.0	7.41%	$4,536,145	$22,171	14.00	*$1,583 per Unit*
Hotel/Motel Lodging Units	33.40	1,070	0.048	51.0	0.62%	$381,126	$11,411	32.04	*$356 per Unit*
Resort Lodging Units	20.20	809	0.106	86.0	1.05%	$642,683	$31,816	40.05	*$794 per Unit*
Commercial/Office Uses	841.90	12,836,000	0.044	565.0	6.90%	$4,222,277	$5,015	15,246	*$0.329 per S.F.*
Industrial/Manufacturing Use	930.30	20,261,000	0.004	82.0	1.00%	$612,791	$659	21,779	*$0.030 per S.F.*
Beach Area				195.0	2.38%	$1,457,246			
TOTAL	10,271.80	--	--	8,194.0	100.00%	$61,234,227	in Total Equity in Current Fire Suppression Assets		
						$52,999,718	in Existing Fire Suppression Facilities.		
						($3,250,473)	Less Heil Station #8 (to be relocated).		
						$700,000	Proceeds of Sale of Heil Station #8		
						$9,237,000	in Existing Fire Suppression Vehicles.		
						$537,780	in Existing Computer/Electronic Fire Equipment		
						$1,010,202	in Existing Fire-fighter Assigned Equipment.		
						$0	in Existing Fire Suppression Impact Fee Fund Balance.		

Chapter 5

Circulation (Streets, Signals and Bridges) System

The following Chapter will identify the street, traffic signal and bridge improvements (henceforth referred to as the Circulation System) planned for the City through General Plan Build-out of the existing City limits as identified in the Land-use Database Table in Chapter 2.

RCS recommends the continuation of the City's comprehensive *Circulation System Development Impact Fee*, i.e., a fee that combines the required street, signal and bridge expansions, all of which are related to the movement of primarily vehicles. The reasons are practical in that combining these three components will provide greater flexibility in establishing priorities in what is essentially a singular circulation issue with a common nexus, traffic or as stated in trip-mile generation. It is fairly common that a single circulation system capital improvement project will involve both a street improvement (or intersection) and signal improvement.

The Existing Circulation System. The City currently has and maintains an extensive system of roadways available for transportation of goods and services, as well as for educational, recreational, and social purposes. Streets that fall under the jurisdiction of City of Huntington Beach are classified as one of four types of roadways for the purposes of this Report. Roadways are defined in part (in the City's General Plan Circulation Element)[2] as:

- **Freeway** - Very high mobility with limited access to arterial streets and no access to adjacent land use. *[The City is not responsible for the construction of freeways but will likely have to financially assist CALTRANS with any alteration to an existing access/egress ramps].*

- **Arterial** - High mobility with access to collectors, some access to local streets and major traffic generators.

- **Collector** - Limited mobility connecting local streets with arterials; also provides good access to adjacent land uses.

- **Local** -Limited mobility but provides very good access to adjacent land uses and collector streets.

Typically, *locals* would be constructed upon the developer's private property and generally only benefits those new residential or business buildings. Assuming that the design criterion has been met and that the right-of-way improvements meet inspection requirements, the City then accepts

the local street improvements along with the responsibility to maintain the improvement *in perpetuity*. In short, local streets are of little benefit to the Citywide circulation system, and these costs are not shared by other developers, as the collector and arterial system improvements are. For these reasons, the cost of all *local* streets is excluded from the Circulation System Development Impact Fee calculation.

Demand Upon Infrastructure Created by the Development of Undeveloped Parcels. Undeveloped parcels create few trip-ends beyond an occasional visit to the site for weed abatement purposes or to consider a sale or development of the vacant parcel. None of these trip-ends are on a routine basis. However, a developed parcel will generate a statistically predictable number of trip-ends, depending upon the specific land use of the development. Thus it can be stated that a vacant parcel, when developed into a specific use, i.e., residential or business, will generate more traffic than it did when it was vacant. Similarly, a change in the use of the parcel may also increase the number of daily trip-ends. A good example would be the demolition of a low trip-generating insurance office which is reconstructed as a new high trip-generating fast-food restaurant.

All new development contributes to cumulative traffic impacts, which are difficult to measure and mitigate on a project-by-project, basis but which have significant and widespread cumulative impacts on the City's existing road system. Factors that will increase the competition for existing lane miles (and freeway crossings) include, (as measured by trip-miles defined later in Chapter text) the following:

- An increase in the City's full-time population through the construction of about 7,065 additional dwelling units contributing approximately 183,270 new trip-miles *daily* or just more than 49.4% of the newly expected daily trip-miles.

- The construction of 1,353 commercial lodging units (resort and hotel/motel) will generate 26,882 daily trip-miles, not quite 7.3% of the total new trip-miles annually.

- The construction of private commercial and office uses on the (net) 40 acres currently identified as undeveloped commercial or office uses will generate 78,553 new daily trip-miles, or about 21.2% of the total new trip-miles expected at General Plan build-out. This figure could vary significantly depending upon the type of commercial uses constructed and possible zoning changes or conditional use permits issued.

- The addition of 187 acres of industrial development (and Institutional Uses) generating the potential for an additional 82,219 daily trip-miles, just under a quarter of the total new trip-miles at 22.1%. Again, it is possible that some parcels zoned for industrial uses will end up being commercial uses after obtaining a Conditional Use Permit. There

are likely many existing industrial buildings contiguous to the City's many arterials and collectors that have become commercial uses.

When all (or most) of the available vacant land is developed, the City can expect an additional 370,924 daily trip-miles. For perspective, the City currently experiences approximately 3,135,213 daily trip-miles from the existing residences and businesses. The 370,924 anticipated trip-miles represents an approximate 11.8% increase over the existing 3,135,213 daily trip-miles.

The **Purpose** of the Fee. The purpose of the fee is to collect proportional contributions from new development to pay for additional circulation system capacity and by creating more lane miles or *more efficient* lane miles with which to accommodate the additional trip-miles created by and anticipated from new development. Additionally there are circulation projects required to alter existing arterials, collectors or intersections that currently exist, but due to additional trip-miles are becoming ineffective at moving vehicles. An example would be the intersection of Beach Boulevard and Edinger Avenue (ST-001). This project is required because additional citizens and business-owners will use the existing intersections along with the current users rendering it, again, ineffective at moving traffic at a reasonable pace, primarily during the a.m. and p.m. peak hour of traffic. Acceptable traffic paces can be maintained with a combination of road widening, freeway access/egress, proper signalization and turn lane channelization. The simple answer to increasing demand for lane miles is to construct additional lane miles. Unfortunately there are little if any opportunities to construct additional lane miles of arterials or collectors within the City's limits without the impractical and acquisition of very expensive right-of-way.

Thus, given the size of City of Huntington Beach and the magnitude of growth projected in this Report, numerous intersection improvements and construction of technologically improved traffic signals will be the primary methodology employed by the City to avoid congestion and gridlock in the future. Traffic planners have long known that the critical constraint in a typical roadway network is usually not the roadway itself but the many intersections of arterial and collector roadways. While the street capacity may be theoretically adequate to carry traffic volumes at build-out, motorists may experience congestion and even gridlock at the intersections of the arterial/collector. While the City will likely undertake, some street widening projects where possible, the installation of traffic signals and lane reconfiguration at critical intersections in the City is perhaps a more important component of traffic circulation.

The importance of traffic signals is twofold. First, the City can build only so many major collector streets and there are limits as to how wide they can be, indeed there are no more practical opportunities for additional lane-miles. Second, a north-south arterial/collector, by definition, will intersect with an east-west arterial/collector assuring that *someone* will have to stop, either at a stop sign or a traffic signal, adding time to their tasks. The traffic carrying capacity of each

collector can only be maximized by assuring orderly flow of traffic by efficient signalization of those intersecting arterial/collector roadways.

None of this is intended to eliminate the time-honored practice of the developer constructing the full width roadway and being reimbursed for the portion greater than would otherwise be required of the developer. This impact fee calculation and resulting fee collection would simply improve the reimbursement capability.

The City's *Master Facilities Plan* Circulation System section identifies fifteen circulation projects costing a net $28,539,780. The individual projects and costs are identified on Schedule 5.1 at the end of the Chapter and detailed in the *Master Facilities Plan*. A total of $26,608,410 has been identified by staff as capacity increasing, leaving $1,929,390 to be supported by other financial resources such as assessment districts, State (CALTRANS) assistance, General Funds, etc. There is an existing Circulation System Development Impact Fee Fund balance of $200,000 leaving some $1,469,370 with unidentified revenue sources.

The Use of the Fee. The continued collection of the Circulation System Development Impact Fee would be used to construct the projects (or portions of projects) identified in Schedule 5.1 at the conclusion of this Chapter's text. The collected fees will be used to create additional lane miles with which to accommodate the additional 370,924 additional daily trip-miles that will be generated by the scope of development identified in Table 2-1. Nineteen specific signal modification/intersection modification improvement projects have been included in the list of proposed projects. They include:

Beach Boulevard - Seven signal modification/intersection improvement projects would be constructed along Beach Boulevard at the intersections with Edinger, Heil, Warner, Slater, Talbert, Garfield, and Yorktown Avenues.

Pacific Coast Highway - Three signal modification/intersection improvement projects would improve traffic flow along Pacific Coast Highway at Warner Avenue, Goldenwest and Brookhurst Streets.

Newland Street - Three signal modification/intersection improvement projects along Newland Street include the intersections with Talbert, Warner and Yorktown Avenues.

Goldenwest Street - There are two such projects planned at the intersections of Goldwest Street with Bolsa and Slater Avenues.

Gothard Street - There are also two signal/intersection improvement projects planned at the intersection of Gothard Street with Slater and Talbert.

There are two more signal improvement projects, one at the intersection of Ward Street and Garfield Avenue and one at Brookhurst Street and Adams Avenue as well as a few minor intersection improvements that will be identified as development projects arise. There is a minor amount for a facility addition at the City yard to store replacement signal equipment.

The Relationship Between the Use of the Fee and the Type of Development Paying the Fee. There is a reasonable relationship between the fees' use and the types of projects on which the fees are imposed. The fees will be used to provide for a fair share contribution for transportation system improvements, including various street, signal and bridge project improvements needed to accommodate additional development of residential units and business square feet. The development impact fee to be imposed and collected will be based on the ratio of projected number of trip-miles the proposed development will generate in relationship to the total 370,924 additional projected trip-miles at General Plan build-out. Any amount imposed as a *Circulation System Development Impact Fee* will continue to be placed in a separate fund as the current City practice (collecting interest) and is to be used only on the projects identified on Schedule 5.1 as development-related.

From time to time the City may require an applicant of a private project to construct a street or signal improvement (or portion thereof) that is on the list of required improvements at the end of this Chapter. This method is often undertaken to expedite the project at the request of the applicant/developer. The developer should receive a credit representing the cost of those required improvements, against their mathematically calculated impact fee, for any money expended on this required improvement against any circulation projects. Should one not exist, a portion of the ordinance addressing the issue of credits should be prepared and added to the City of Huntington Beach Municipal Code.

The following table identifies some of the key system attributes of the Circulation System. The attributes identify that approximately 89.4% of the total trip-miles at "build-out" are represented by the existing community who have contributed a similar, but larger amount (96.2%) of the cost of the entire system. The traffic system yet to be built represents about 3.9% of the total trip-mile supporting system when the City is fully developed. Since there is a finite amount of room for additional major roads, traffic signals must be constructed at the intersection of major arterials. All of this generally indicates that the City is "on target" in terms of the construction of a circulation infrastructure. Or another way to state it is that the current drivers will generate 89.4% of the ultimate "build-out" trip-miles, have constructed about 96.2%, (in terms of cost) of the required infrastructure. It would be appropriate to assume that the remaining 10.6% of the traffic trip-mile generators contribute the remaining 3.9% of the infrastructure.

[This space left vacant to place the following table on a single page].

Table 5-1
Comparison of Circulation System Attributes

Infrastructure Factor	Existing Community	Future Community	Total at Build-out
Number of Trip-miles	3,135,213	370,924	3,506,137
Percentage of Total	89.4%	10.6%	100.0%
Cost of Total System	$533,539,375	$26,608,410	$560,147,785
Percentage of Total	95.2%	4.8%	100.0%

The Relationship Between the Need for the Facility and the Type of Development Project. There is a reasonable relationship between the need for the proposed circulation projects and the types of developments on which the fees would be imposed. New residents and new business owners will utilize the community's existing circulation system which will then require a number of street, signal and bridge improvements to maintain the existing level-of-service (LOS) enjoyed by the existing community. Schedule 5.1 identifies the additional traffic to be generated by new development, by type of development. The technical volume, Trip Generation (Manual) 7th Edition, produced by the Institute of Traffic Engineers, has been used to identify part of the *nexus*, or the relationship between the type of development and the projected number of trips that development will generate. The nexus will be based upon the combined factors of trip *frequency* and trip *distance*.

New Trip Adjustment for *Pass-by* or *Diverted* Trips (trip frequency factors). Schedule 5.2 contains a sub-schedule that identifies adjustments to new total ***trip-ends***. As an example, an acre of general commercial use would be expected, on average, to generate about 381 daily trip-ends. However, approximately 15% of those trip-ends, or about 57 trip-ends per day, are **pass-by** trip-***ends***, in that, the trip-***end*** is not truly an ***end*** but is actually a one in a series of stops, i.e. at various commercial establishments, with a different location such as a residence as the final trip-***end*** or destination of the series of trip-***ends***. In order to be considered a pass-by trip, the location of the stop must be contiguous to the ***generator***[3] route, i.e. the route that would have been used even if the temporary stop had not been made[4]. The Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) indicates that:

> Thus when forecasted trips based upon the trip generation rates are distributed to the adjacent streets, some reduction is made to account for those trips already there that will be attracted to the proposed development.[5]

Pass-by trip-ends are fully adjusted (reduced at 100%) from the average trip-ends (per day) generated by the eleven land uses identified in Schedules 5.2 and 5.3.

A *diverted* trip is similar to a *pass-by* trip-end in that it is an extra stop between, as an example, a motorist's work site and his or her residence. A *diverted* trip differs slightly in that it requires a minor deviation from the normal ***generator*** route and the temporary stop. In short, a *diverted* trip-end creates a separate side trip using additional (and different) lane miles from that of the normal route from the motorist's place of employment and his or her home[6]. These trip-ends increase the traffic volume from the generator route only for brief distances. The ITE adds that diverted trips:

> are produced from traffic volume on roadways within the vicinity of the generator (route) and require a diversion from that roadway to another roadway with access to the site. These roadways could include streets or freeways adjacent to the generator but without access to the generator.[7]

These *diverted* trip-ends will be adjusted (reduced at an assumed 50%) from the full trip-end count for each of the land uses identified in the Chapter 2.

Again, the trip-end adjustment schedule at the bottom of Schedule 5.2 indicates the total daily trip-ends reduced by the number of pass-by trips (at 100%) and diverted trips (at 50%). The trip pass-by and diversion percentages were generated by a study conducted by the San Diego Association of Governments (SANDAG) in conjunction with various U.S. and California agencies[8].

Average Trip Distances by Land Use (trip distance factors). Additionally, the same SANDAG data schedule referenced above provides information for a trip distance factor component to the nexus. Based upon that data, a trip to an industrial work-site has the greatest distance at 9.0 miles. A trip to an office average 8.8 miles, a residential trip averages 7.9 miles, a trip from a hotel or motel (once in residence) averages 7.6 miles, and an average trip to a commercial site is the shortest at 4.3 miles. This indicates that drivers are generally willing travel further distances to work and for treatment at medical offices than they are to shop. Both frequency (trip-ends) and distances (average miles per trip) have been combined into the nexus by combining frequency and distance, the two major factors of circulation master planing.

When the trip frequency and trip distance factors are combined, a 200-unit attached dwelling residential specific plan would generate about 4,620 daily trip-miles (200 unit's X 23.1 daily trip-

miles per unit) and a ten-acre commercial-retail development would generate 4,955 daily trip-miles (10 acres X 32.6 trip-miles/K.S.F. X 15,246/1,000 S.F.). Each would pay their proportionate share of the total 370,924 newly created trip-miles expected at General Plan build-out. In the case of the detached dwelling development, the 4,620 daily trip-miles generated by the new 200 attached dwellings represents about 1.25% of the 370,924 total new trip-miles anticipated at build-out, thus they would be required to contribute financially to the DIF fund or construct projects on the DIF list to an amount equal to 1.49% of the total development-related project costs. The 4,955 daily trip-miles generated by the ten acres of commercial development represent 1.34% of the total 370,924 new trip-miles anticipated at build-out. As a result they would be required to contribute financially to the DIF fund or construct projects on the DIF list to an amount equal to 1.34% of the total development-related project costs.

The Relationship Between the Amount of the Fee and the Cost of the portion of the Facility Attributed to the Development Project. Again, the calculation of the Circulation System Development Impact Fee is based upon the recognition that differing types of developments generate differing numbers of trip-ends. The fee is based upon the projected number of trip-miles generated by the proposed private development project. Circulation System Development Impact fee receipts will be accumulated until they reach the amount necessary to construct a meaningful project to alleviate or mitigate the demands of those new developments. Table 5-2 (summarized from Schedule 5.2) following, identifies the General Plan Build-out based Circulation System Impact Fee Schedule based upon the net $26,608,410 in identified capacity-increasing projects.

Table 5-2
General Plan Build-out Based Circulation System Impact Fees

Land Use	Allocation of Costs	Total Cost Per Unit or SF
Detached Dwelling Units	$4,341,072	$2,482/Unit
Attached Dwelling Units	$8,794,196	$1,657/Unit
Mobile Home Units (in parks)	$11,693	$1,299/Unit
Hotel/Motel Units	$903,562	$1,105/Unit
Resort Lodging Units	$1,024,741	$1,915/Unit
Commercial/Office Uses	$5,635,037	$2.331/S.F.
Industrial/Manufacturing Uses	$5,898,019	$1.621/S.F.

Again, adoption of this set of proposed fees would generate the total revenue necessary to construct a significant portion (about 93%) of the needed street, traffic signal and bridge construction projects. The shortfall is largely due to removing new "passthrough" trips from new development outside of the City limits from the calculation. These figures, however, need to be compared to the existing community financial commitment demonstrated by the existing circulation assets to identify the level of fairness in adopting this schedule of development impact fees.

Proportionality Test. Table 5-3, following (and summarized from Schedule 5.3) identifies the assets of the existing system (at current construction and acquisition costs). The $533,539,375 consists of the existing $431.6 million in circulation plan arterial/collector streets, $96.8 million in traffic signals and intersection improvements and $5.0 million in major bridges inventory. There is also a $200,000 balance in the Circulation System Development Impact Fee fund balance. When the combined $533.6 million is distributed over the existing community, using the identical nexus factor used for distribution future costs, the existing community has contributed the following, on average, by land use:

Table 5-3
Existing Circulation System Community
Commitment Comparison Development Impact Fees

Land Use	Allocation of Costs	Total Cost Per Unit or SF
Detached Dwelling Units	$227,375,119	$5,888/Unit
Attached Dwelling Units	$141,943,317	$3,931/Unit
Mobile Home Dwelling Units	$8,824,837	$3,080/Unit
Hotel/Motel Lodging Units	$2,804,166	$2,621/Unit
Resort Lodging Units	$3,675,809	$4,544/Unit
Commercial/Office Uses	$70,992,504	$5.531/S.F.
Industrial/Manufacturing Uses	$77,923,618	$3.846/S.F.

Of importance is that the existing community has contributed, on average, far more, (at nearly 237%) than would be required of future development to meet the General Plan build-out needs for all users. This indicates that there is no proportionality issue as the future community is being asked to contribute at a far lesser amount (at about 42%) than has been contributed by the existing community.

Alternative Cost Methodology. A more precise calculation of costs for specific types of land uses (i.e., banks, hospitals, convalescent homes, etc.) can be determined by multiplying the average cost per trip of $71.74 by the applicable daily trip-mile rate. An example of this calculation can be found in Schedule 5.3 at the end of the Chapter and applied to Table 5-4, on the following page. These tables list trip-mile rates and costs for various residential, resort, industrial and commercial developments. A fee system based on a lengthy schedule of trip-mile rates theoretically provides greater accuracy and therefore greater equity in determining specific uses demand on the City's circulation system, but at the same time may increase the City's administrative costs to administer the fee. A more extensive listing of traffic generators by land use is available in Trip Generation as published by the Institute of Transportation Engineers, New York, NY and SANDAG.

[This space left vacant to place the following table on a single page].

Table 5-4
Detail of Circulation System Financial Commitment-based Impact Fees for Specific Business Uses

LAND USE	Adjusted Trip-ends	Average Distance	Trip-end to Trip	Additional Trip-miles	Cost per Trip-mile	Cost per 1,000 Square Feet or Dwelling Unit
RESIDENTIAL LAND USES (per Unit):						
Detached Dwelling	8.76	7.9	0.5	34.60	$71.74	$2,482.20 /Unit
Apartment	6.15	7.9	0.5	24.3	$71.74	$1,743.28 /Unit
Condominium/Townhome	5.36	7.9	0.5	21.2	$71.74	$1,520.89 /Unit
Mobile Home Dwelling	4.57	7.9	0.5	18.1	$71.74	$1,298.49 /Unit
RESORT/TOURIST (per Unit or Entry Door):						
Hotel	6.29	7.6	0.5	23.9	$71.74	$1,714.59 /Room
All Suites Hotel	3.77	7.6	0.5	14.3	$71.74	$1,025.88 /Room
Motel	4.34	7.6	0.5	16.5	$71.74	$1,183.71 /Room
INDUSTRIAL (per 1,000 SF):						
General Light Industrial	6.17	9.0	0.5	27.8	$71.74	$1,994.37 /KSF
Heavy Industrial	5.97	9.0	0.5	26.9	$71.74	$1,929.81 /KSF
Manufacturing	2.73	9.0	0.5	12.3	$71.74	$882.40 /KSF
Warehousing	4.39	9.0	0.5	19.8	$71.74	$1,420.45 /KSF
COMMERCIAL (per 1,000 SF):						
Office Park	7.42	8.8	0.5	32.6	$71.74	$2,338.72 /KSF
Research Park	5.01	8.8	0.5	22.0	$71.74	$1,578.28 /KSF
Business Park	9.34	8.8	0.5	41.1	$71.74	$2,948.51 /KSF
Bldg. Materials/Lumber Store	29.35	4.3	0.5	63.1	$71.74	$4,526.79 /KSF
Garden Center	23.45	4.3	0.5	50.4	$71.74	$3,615.70 /KSF
Movie Theater	2.47	4.3	0.5	5.3	$71.74	$380.22 /KSF
Church	5.92	4.3	0.5	12.7	$71.74	$911.10 /KSF
Medical-Dental Office	22.21	8.8	0.5	97.7	$71.74	$7,009.00 /KSF
General Office Building	7.16	8.8	0.5	31.5	$71.74	$2,259.81 /KSF
Shopping Center	30.20	4.3	0.5	64.9	$71.74	$4,655.93 /KSF
Hospital	11.42	4.3	0.5	24.6	$71.74	$1,764.80 /KSF
Discount Center	62.93	4.3	0.5	135.3	$71.74	$9,706.42 /KSF
High-Turnover Restaurant	8.90	4.3	0.5	19.1	$71.74	$1,370.23 /KSF
Convenience Market	43.57	4.3	0.5	93.7	$71.74	$6,722.04 /KSF
Walk-in Bank	13.97	4.3	0.5	30.0	$71.74	$2,152.20 /KSF
Other: (not available "per KSF")						
Cemetary (per acre)	3.07	4.3	0.5	6.6	$71.74	$473.48 /Acre
Service Station/Market (avg)	107.69	4.3	0.5	231.5	$71.74	$16,607.81 /FP/Day (4)
Service Station and Car Wash	99.35	4.3	0.5	213.6	$71.74	$15,323.66 /FP/Day (4)

NOTES:
1. *ADT = Average Daily Trips*
2. *KSF = Thousand Square Feet of Gross Floor Area*
3. *Adjusted for Pass-by and Diverted Trips.*
4. *FP/Day = per "Fueling Position" per day.*

RESULTING DEVELOPMENT IMPACT FEES

The contribution of the existing community as evidenced in Table 5-3, Community Financial Commitment-based Proportionality Test Fees is far greater than what is to asked of future development (Table 5-2) the General Plan Build-out Needs-based Development Impact Fee schedule is adequate and reasonable for adoption. It would be more than adequate for the usual and normal application to the seven broad land-uses. as the fairest schedule of impact fees. However, it is further recommended that there should also be the option for the engineering staff to apply the *per trip-mile fee* from Schedule 5.2 multiplied by the specific use Table 5-4 or the more extensive listing of traffic generators by land use (available in Trip Generation as published by the Institute of Transportation Engineers, New York, N.Y.) multiplied by the SANDAG land-use trip distances.

RECAP OF RECOMMENDED (LOCAL) CIRCULATION SYSTEM, VEHICLES AND EQUIPMENT DEVELOPMENT IMPACT FEES.

- Adopt Schedule 5.2. for the seven basic new land-uses including the *per Daily Trip-mile* rate with standard ITE trip-end rates for the application to unusual or highly specific development proposals.

- Adopt Table 5-4 for application on specific business uses as necessary by engineering staff, as well as the table at the bottom of Schedule 5.2 to allow City staff to calculate specific Circulation System DIFs, based upon ITE data not necessarily highlighted on Table 5-4.

[This space left vacant to place the Chapter Endnotes on a single page].

CHAPTER ENDNOTES

2. For complete definitions and standards, see the City of Huntington Beach General Plan Circulation Element as part of the Infrastructure and Community Services Chapter page III-CE-1. Further description of the components of the Element are on page III-CE-2 and III-CE-3.

3. The normal route between a daily work-site and the residence of the motorist.

4. As an example, a motorist travels the same route from work to home daily. On some number of occasions, the motorist stops at a market along the route to pick up some groceries. These stops at the market would be considered pass-by trips in that they do not generate an additional trip along that route.

5. *Trip Generation*, Institute of Traffic Engineers, 525 School Street, SW., Ste. 410, Washington D.C. 20024-2729, Chapter III, Definition of Terms, Pass-by Trips, page I-7.

6. An example of a diverted trip would be a single trip where, along the way from work, a motorists evening drive home deviates from the normal route taken home to stop at perhaps a preferred grocery store, drop mail off at a post office and pick up a child from piano lesson before continuing home. Each of these three stops would be considered diverted trips.

7. *Trip Generation*, Institute of Traffic Engineers, 525 School Street, SW., Ste. 410, Washington D.C. 20024-2729, Chapter III, Definitions of Terms, Diverted Linked Trips, I-5.

8. *Traffic Generators*, San Diego Association of Governments, 401 B Street, Suite 800, San Diego, CA 92101, Brief Guide to Traffic Generation Rates compiled in conjunction with the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, U.S. Department of Transportation, the California Department of Transportation and the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, July 1995.

Schedule 5.1

City of Huntington Beach
2011-12 Development Impact Fee Calculation and Nexus Report
Identification of Projects and Cost Allocation
Circulation (Streets, Signals and Bridges) System

Line #	Description	Estimated Cost	Construction Needs Supported by Other Resources: Percent Need	Construction Needs Supported by Other Resources: Apportioned Dollar Cost	Construction Needs That Increase Infrastructure Capacity: Percent Need	Construction Needs That Increase Infrastructure Capacity: Apportioned Dollar Cost
ST-001	Beach Boulevard and Edinger Avenue	$600,000	25.00%	$150,000	75.00%	$450,000
ST-002	Beach Boulevard and Heil Avenue	$1,000,000	5.00%	$50,000	95.00%	$950,000
ST-003	Beach Boulevard and Warner Avenue	$400,000	5.00%	$20,000	95.00%	$380,000
ST-004	Beach Boulevard and Slater Avenue	$500,000	5.00%	$25,000	95.00%	$475,000
ST-005	Beach Boulevard and Talbert Avenue	$1,000,000	38.00%	$380,000	62.00%	$620,000
ST-006	Beach Boulevard and Garfield Avenue	$1,000,000	5.00%	$50,000	95.00%	$950,000
ST-007	Beach Boulevard and Yorktown Avenue	$500,000	5.00%	$25,000	95.00%	$475,000
ST-008	Pacific Coast Highway and Warner Avenue	$2,000,000	5.00%	$100,000	95.00%	$1,900,000
ST-009	Pacific Coast Highway and Goldenwest Street	$750,000	12.00%	$90,000	88.00%	$660,000
ST-010	Pacific Coast Highway and Brookhurst Street	$750,000	5.00%	$37,500	95.00%	$712,500
ST-011	Golden West Street and Bolsa Avenue	$500,000	5.00%	$25,000	95.00%	$475,000
ST-012	Golden West Street and Slater Avenue	$50,000	5.00%	$2,500	95.00%	$47,500
ST-013	Newland Street and Talbert Avenue	$500,000	5.00%	$25,000	95.00%	$475,000
ST-014	Newland Street and Warner Avenue	$30,000	5.00%	$1,500	95.00%	$28,500
ST-015	Newland Street and Yorktown Avenue	$300,000	5.00%	$15,000	95.00%	$285,000
ST-016	Gothard Street and Slater Avenue	$500,000	5.00%	$25,000	95.00%	$475,000
ST-017	Gothard Street and Talbert Avenue	$264,000	5.00%	$13,200	95.00%	$250,800
ST-018	Ward Street and Garfield Avenue	$8,800	5.00%	$440	95.00%	$8,360
ST-019	Brookhurst Street and Adams Avenue	$10,000,000	5.00%	$500,000	95.00%	$9,500,000
ST-020	Miscellaneous Traffic Signals/Intersection Improvements	$5,000,000	5.00%	$250,000	95.00%	$4,750,000
ST-021	Public Works Maintenance Building	$2,820,000	5.00%	$141,000	95.00%	$2,679,000
ST-022	Public Works Maintenance Vehicles	$65,000	5.00%	$3,250	95.00%	$61,750
	SUB-TOTAL ESTIMATED NEW PROJECT COSTS	$28,537,800	6.76%	$1,929,390	93.24%	$26,608,410
	LESS:					
	Local Circulation Impact Fee Fund Balance	($200,000)	100.00%	($200,000)	0.00%	$0
	Support from Other Agencies	($260,020)	100.00%	($260,020)	0.00%	$0
	SUB-TOTAL ADJUSTMENTS	($460,020)	100.00%	($460,020)	0.00%	$0
	Total - Local Circulation-related Capital Project Needs	$28,077,780	5.23%	$1,469,370	94.77%	$26,608,410
					Forward to Schedule 5.2	

NOTES:
1. There are no notes.

Schedule 5.2

City of Huntington Beach
2011-12 Development Impact Fee Calculation and Nexus Report
General Plan Build-out Needs-based Development Impact Costs (Fees)
Circulation (Streets, Signals and Bridges) System

Proposed Land Use	Undeveloped Acres	Undeveloped Units	Daily Trip-end Generation Rate	Additional Daily Trip-miles	Percentage of Additional Trip-miles	Allocation of Expansion Costs	Cost Distribution Per Acre	Average Units or Square Feet/Acre	Development Impact Fee per Unit or Square Foot
Detached Dwelling Units	295	1,749	34.60	60,515	16.31%	$4,341,072	$14,715	5.93	*$2,482 per Unit*
Attached Dwelling Units	111	5,307	23.10	122,592	33.05%	$8,794,196	$79,084	47.72	*$1,657 per Unit*
Mobile Home Dwelling U	1	9	18.10	163	0.04%	$11,693	$11,693	9.00	*$1,299 per Unit*
Hotel/Motel Lodging Unit	19	818	15.40	12,597	3.40%	$903,652	$48,583	43.98	*$1,105 per Unit*
Hotel/Motel Lodging Unit	9	535	26.70	14,285	3.85%	$1,024,741	$110,187	57.53	*$1,915 per Unit*
Commercial/Office Uses	40	2,417,000	32.50	78,553	21.18%	$5,635,037	$141,584	60,729	*$2.331 per S.F.*
Industrial/Manufacturing	187	3,638,000	22.60	82,219	22.17%	$5,898,019	$31,540	19,455	*$1.621 per S.F.*
TOTAL	662			370,924	100.0%	$26,608,410	in Capital project Needs to Finish Circulation System		

ALTERNATIVE FEE METHODLOGY	*370,924*		*$26,608,410*	*$71.74 per Daily Trip-mile*

Trip-ends Adjustment Calculation Land Use	Daily Total Trips	Percent of Diverted Trips	Diverted Trip % Adjustment	Diverted Trip Percent	Percent of Pass-by Trips (1)	Combined Diverted and Pass-by	Remaining Trip % as Adjustment %	Adjusted Trip Rate, Adjustment % X Total Trips	*Average Trip Length*	*Trip-ends X 0.5 X Length*
Detached Dwellings	9.57	11.0	0.50	5.5	3.0	8.5	91.50%	8.76	*7.9*	*34.6*
Attached Dwellings	6.39	11.0	0.50	5.5	3.0	8.5	91.50%	5.85	*7.9*	*23.1*
Mobile Home Units	4.99	11.0	0.50	5.5	3.0	8.5	91.50%	4.57	*7.9*	*18.1*
Hotel/Motel Lodging	5.27	38.0	0.50	19.0	4.0	23.0	77.00%	4.06	*7.6*	*15.4*
Resort Lodging	9.13	38.0	0.50	19.0	4.0	23.0	77.00%	7.03	*7.6*	*26.7*
Commercial Uses (KSF)	23.25	40.0	0.50	20.0	15.0	35.0	65.00%	15.11	*4.3*	*32.5*
Industrial Uses (KSF)	5.68	19.0	0.50	9.5	2.0	11.5	88.50%	5.03	*9.0*	*22.6*

(1) Pass-by trips adjusted at 100%.

Schedule 5.3

City of Huntington Beach
2011–12 Development Impact Fee Calculation and Nexus Report
Community Financial Commitment or Equity–based Proportionality Test Fees
Circulation (Streets, Signals and Bridges) System

Proposed Land Use	Developed Acres	Developed Units	Daily Trip-end Generation Rate	Existing Daily Trip-miles	Percentage of Existing Trip-miles	Allocation of Infrastructure "Equity"	Distribution of "Equity" per Acre	Average Units or Square Feet/Acre	Current Financial Commitment per Unit or Square Foot
Detached Dwelling Units	6,436	38,616	34.60	1,336,114	42.62%	$227,375,119	$35,329	6.00	*$5,888 per Unit*
Attached Dwelling Units	1,805	36,108	23.10	834,095	26.60%	$141,943,317	$78,622	20.00	*$3,931 per Unit*
Mobile Home Dwelling U	205	2,865	18.10	51,857	1.65%	$8,824,837	$43,132	14.00	*$3,080 per Unit*
Hotel/Motel Lodging Unit	33	1,070	15.40	16,478	0.53%	$2,804,166	$83,957	32.04	*$2,621 per Unit*
Resort Lodging Units	20	809	26.70	21,600	0.69%	$3,675,809	$181,971	40.05	*$4,544 per Unit*
Commercial/Office Uses	842	12,836,000	32.50	417,170	13.31%	$70,992,504	$84,324	15,246	*$5.531 per S.F.*
Industrial/Manufacturing	930	20,261,000	22.60	457,899	14.61%	$77,923,618	$83,762	21,779	*$3.846 per S.F.*
TOTAL	10,272	--	--	3,135,213	100.00%	$533,539,375	in Total Equity in Current Circulation System Assets		
						$431,589,375	in General Plan Circulation Major Streets		
						$0	in General Plan Major Streets R.O.W.		
						$5,000,000	in General Plan Circulation Bridges.		
						$62,500,000	in General Plan Circulation Intersections		
						$34,250,000	in General Plan Circulation Signals.		
						$200,000	in Circulation Impact Fee Fund Balance.		

ALTERNATIVE FEE METHODLOGY	*3,135,213*		*$533,539,375*	*$170.18 per Daily Trip-mile*

Chapter 6

Storm Drainage Collection System

The Existing System. The City's existing storm drainage network is composed of street gutter facilities, inlets and a pipeline network of storm drain lines, ranging from 24" to 96" pipe"[1]. This combination of improvements conveys storm water runoff to various larger lines and Flood Control District storm channels located throughout the City leading directly into the Santa Ana River to the north. There are also numerous small outlets which lead directly into the Pacific Ocean. The system, with minor exceptions, functions well to remove storm water runoff and protect developed parcels and other City infrastructure. However, as the City continues to develop currently vacant or underutilized parcels, the existing City-owned storm drainage lines will approach maximum capacity reducing the ability of the existing drainage lines to sufficiently and adequately collect and remove additional runoff.

The City currently has more than 532,000 linear feet of storm drain pipe sized from 24" to 96" creating some 5.3 million cubic feet of storm drainage capacity. The system consists of roughly 1,000 inlet boxes and 2,000 junction/combination boxes[2]. The system also has 9,000 linear feet of reinforced concrete box providing additional large flow capacity. The estimated replacement value of the existing (non-local) storm drainage collection line's system assets are approximately $158,631,313. There are also fifteen storm drainage pump stations with a replacement value of $45,000,000. The City has in place an existing Storm Drainage Collection System Development Impact Fee but that fund currently has a zero fund balance.

Property-based Benefit Reasoning. Initially, separate zones was considered for each drainage basin within the City because each area has specific capital needs for storm-water collection. Storm-water runoff from along the northerly area of Beach Boulevard may not directly impact the homeowner near Huntington Harbour; similarly, a 24" collection line near Adams Avenue and the Santa Ana River required to handle runoff from the homes in that area may provide little direct benefit to a business in the downtown area of the City. In each case, there can be some distinct property-related areas of benefit for each drainage basin.

User-based Benefit Reasoning, the Human Element. The owners and users of all developed and undeveloped parcels benefit, directly and indirectly, from all Citywide existing and future storm drainage improvements. As the various systems within the greater community of the City of Huntington Beach develop, the benefits are generally recognized as:

1. Proposed development projects can only be approved by the City when precautions, generally in the form of infrastructure improvements, have been made that assure that developed and undeveloped downstream parcels will not be adversely affected (i.e., inundated, flooded, cut off from access in and out), by storm water from the project being proposed. The avoidance of downstream or down-zone damage from the development of an upstream parcel may not be a major concern to a developer, but the City must concern itself with such issues when approving private development proposals.

2. The private development being assessed a development impact fee will receive the same storm-water protection from other development projects upstream or up-zone from their own developments.

3. Storm water must be adequately controlled and removed to large scale flood control channels or creeks to assure access by public safety vehicles to all parts of the City, regardless of which zone a call for service is in. Fire suppression and other paramedic calls, as well as law enforcement and public works responses cannot wait during heavy rainstorms. To the contrary, the number of emergency calls-for-service probably increases during such storm events and the City's public safety and maintenance units must be able to respond, ***to all zones***.

4. The City of Huntington Beach's citizens and business owners/employees must also be able to travel safely in heavy rain through one storm drainage zone to another. An adequate and sufficient storm drainage system will provide such protection.

For the above stated four reasons, RCS recommends the adoption of a single storm drainage development impact fee to be applied Citywide. Storm runoff does recognize a boundary between downtown and the other areas. It will leave one part of the City and pass through another to reach its southwest ultimate location, the Pacific Ocean.

Demand Upon Infrastructure Created by the Development of Underdeveloped or Undeveloped Parcels. The construction of flood control and storm drainage facilities is essential to the preservation of private property, public streets, curbs and other facilities. The county or a regional level of government is generally responsible for *flood control*[3], and cities are generally responsible for *storm drainage*. The building of new homes and businesses on presently undeveloped land will increase the amount of *runoff* and thus accelerate the need for additional storm drainage facilities to handle increased *runoff* from these developing areas. As vacant and underdeveloped parcels are developed and pervious surfaces are replaced with impervious rooftop, parking lots, driveways, pools, and sidewalks, greater amounts of the rainfall *runs off* of the developed parcel. The amount of the runoff varies with differing types of development (i.e., land-

use) and the varying amounts are referred to as the *runoff coefficients*. Approximately 0.775 (or 77.5%) of rainfall that falls on a parcel developed with detached dwelling residences, exits that developed parcel. The rate for attached dwelling residences runoff is little much higher at 0.810 (81.0%). Most business uses such as a hotel/motel, resort, retail/office and industrial have a runoff coefficient of between 0.875 and 87.5% with industrial acres to 0.950 or 95%. Clearly, water runoff increases when a vacant property is developed with impervious roof-top, sidewalks and driveways/parking lots. The cumulative effects of additional runoff must be managed with the appropriate capital facilities to move the water and, in some cases such as during heavy downpours, detain the storm water prior to releasing it slowly into the downstream storm drain. The costs of the new storm drainage will be distributed by the coefficients of drainage, i.e., the percentage of property that will end up with impervious coverage such as asphalt or cement-based concrete drives or parking lots, rooftop, pools and any other hard surface that do not allow any absorption into the soil.

The **Purpose** of the Fee. The purpose of the development impact fee is to collect fair share contributions from the various land-uses to finance the proportional acquisition of additional storm drainage system improvements needed to collect that additional storm water runoff from the that same proposed development. The cost of extending the same level of storm drainage protection to the newly developing homes and businesses as is provided to the existing community, (that has largely paid for the existing system), can be calculated, an impact fee imposed and collected. The impact fee revenues can then be used to expand the storm drainage facilities necessary to extend the existing level-of-services. The City's Storm Drainage Plan identifies a total of $207,494,225 in storm drainage collection system capacity-increasing projects required to fully complete the City's General Plan build-out network of pipes, small channels and detention ponds. This cost cannot be mitigated by Storm Drainage System Development Impact Fee fund balance.

The **Use** of the Fee. The construction of storm drainage collection facilities in the City of Huntington Beach is essential to the preservation of private property, and the millions of dollars invested in public streets, curbs, parks and other public facilities. The building of new residences and businesses on presently undeveloped (or underdeveloped) land will require the installation of additional storm drainage collection lines and inlets to handle the ever increasing runoff from this same new development. This Chapter reviews the costs of expanding the storm drainage collection system facilities needed to accommodate the drainage generated by future development.

The revenues raised from a properly calculated and supported Storm Drainage Collection System Development Impact Fee would be limited to capital(ized) costs related to that growth. The fees would be used to construct additional or parallel storm drainage lines (to increase the drainage capacity of the system). Conversely, the Storm Drainage Impact Fee receipts would not be used to repair, replace or rehabilitate any existing storm drainage lines with adequate capacity.

The Relationship Between the Need for The Public Facilities and the Type of Development Project. There is a reasonable relationship between the need for the public facilities and the types of developments on which the fees are imposed. New residents and businesses utilize and impact the community's existing storm drainage system which requires various storm drainage improvements. Upon the identification of the costs of storm drainage facilities, generated by future development, costs must be further distributed for each of the land uses (i.e., commercial and residential uses) based on their estimated storm runoff. Detached and attached residential dwelling development provides the most landscape percentage per parcel and thus the greatest percolation and conversely the least runoff of storm-water. As such, these land uses should not bear the same cost as Commercial/Office or Industrial use developments, both of which generally will have lesser landscape area (or stated another way, have a higher percentage of impervious area) and therefore generate a higher amount of storm water runoff.

Schedule 6.1 contains the list of storm water projects identified [4] as necessary to control the storm water runoff resulting from the creation of an impervious surface by future development and also continue to protect the existing developed community. The list consists of hundreds of small projects in six storm drainage zones estimated to cost $207,494,050. For this Report, costs were distributed between land uses on established runoff coefficients. Table 6-1 is the listing of these runoff coefficients employed in this Report.[5]

Table 6-1
Storm Drainage Runoff Coefficients
(@ a 2"/hour rainfall)

Proposed Land Use	Coefficient of Runoff
Detached Dwelling Units	0.775
Attached Dwelling Units	0.810
Mobile Home Dwelling Units	0.800
Hotel/Motel Lodging Units	0.900
Resort Lodging Units	0.875
Commercial/Office Uses	0.900
Industrial/Manufacturing Uses	0.950

Since this development impact fee category is an acre-based calculation, (as opposed to the number of units built on an acre), it is determined by applying a drainage factor to the type of land use zone. Differences result between what the City's development rules allows (for the General Plan Build-out Need-based Impact Fee) and what has actually been approved in the past (for the Community Financial Commitment or Proportionality Test) can significantly skew the resulting figures. As, an example, the City anticipates future approval of 5,307 attached dwelling units at roughly 48 units per acre density. However, the 36,108 existing attached dwelling units generate an average density of closer to 20 to 25 units per acre. Assuming a storm drainage impact fee of $5,000 per acre, each existing unit would have an equity share of about $200, ($5,000 per acre ÷25 units per acre = $200/unit) while the future units would be assessed about $100, ($5,000 per acre ÷ 48 units per acre = $104/unit).

Schedule 6.1 identifies the six storm drainage zones and the projects necessary to provide flood protection and insure the ability to traverse the City during a heavy storm. The project costs total $207,494,050 without any mitigation by Development Impact Fee fund balance.

Table 6-2, following, indicates that the 8,303.18 acres of acre-runoff factor created by the currently developed community represents about 92.7%of the total acre-runoff factor that can be expected at General Plan build-out.

Table 6-2
Comparison of Storm Drainage System Attributes

Infrastructure Factor	Existing Community	Future Community	Total at Build-out
Total Runoff Acre Factor	8,303.18	557.85	8,861.03
Percentage of Total	92.7%	6.3%	100.0%
System Cost Contribution	$203,631,313	$207,494,050	$411,175,363
Percentage of Total	49.5%	50.5%	100.0%

At the same time the currently developed community's investment in the existing storm drainage system, at $203,631,313 is a lesser proportion at about 49.5% of the cost of the total system at projected General Plan build-out. Conversely that means that the current vacant and underdeveloped parcels will generate the remaining 6.3% of the demand expected at General Plan build-out but would, if allocated all of the remaining storm drainage projects would need to

finance the remaining 50.5% of the total General Plan cost of the system at a guaranteed preventive (and assuredly illegal) development impact fee of about $370,000 per acre. This clearly indicates that the City's storm drainage collection system has not been constructed proportionally and ratably with the amount of storm runoff generated by the development in the City to date. Stated slightly differently, with 92.7% of the City's acreage developed, the storm drainage system should also be close to 92.7%developed. However, such is not the case. Such a statement can be said of virtually all of Southern California's cities. The most likely reason is that the storm drainage system, without an exclusive revenue source, must compete with other far more needed (or desired) capital projects within the City's limited General Fund. As an example, a $1.0 million dollar signal modification that eliminates significant traffic delays daily, would more likely be funded as compared to a $1.0 million storm drainage project that benefits the community during a few hours of the few rainiest days of the year.

A fair cost allocation would be to recognize that future additional drainage represents approximately 6.3% of the total at General Plan build-out thus should be allocated roughly 6.3% of the total cost of the remaining projects. Table 6-3, following, indicates the impact fee amounts that would need to be imposed to pay for the cost of completing the portion of the system's collection pipes and channels identified by staff to be financed with impact fees. It would be reasonable to expect future development to finance its proportional share of the identified storm drainage needs without violating the proportionality rule as has been done with other development impact fees in this report.

Table 6-3
General Plan Build-out Needs Storm Drainage Facilities Impact Fees

Land Use	Allocation of Project Costs	Cost Distribution per Acre	Total Cost Per Unit or SF
Detached Dwelling Units	$5,354,096	$18,149	$3,061/Unit
Attached Dwelling Units	$2,109,274	$18,968	$397/Unit
Mobile Home Dwelling Units	$18,735	$18,735	$2,082/Unit
Hotel/Motel Lodging Units	$392,020	$18,149	$479/Unit
Resort Lodging Units	$190,624	$20,497	$356/Unit
Commercial/Office Uses	$838,839	$21,076	$0.347/S.F.
Industrial/Manufacturing Uses	$4,160,238	$22,247	$1.144/S.F.

The Relationship Between the Use of the Fee and the Type of Development Paying the Fee. There is a reasonable relationship between the fees' use and the types of projects on which the fees are imposed. The Storm Drainage Collection System Development Impact Fees that are imposed and collected will be used to mitigate the storm water runoff generated by the various types of development. If the development is a commercial/office or industrial/manufacturing property generating a significant amount of runoff, the fee collected will be proportionally higher and will be enough to construct the required additions to the storm drainage system downstream from this development.

From time to time the City may require an applicant of a private project to construct an improvement (or portion thereof) that is on the list of required improvements at the end of this Chapter. This is often done to expedite the project for the applicant/developer. The developer should receive a credit for any money expended on this required improvement against their calculated storm drainage collection system impact fee. An ordinance clearly addressing the issue of credits should be prepared and added to the City of Huntington Beach Municipal Code should one not fully exist at this time.

The Relationship Between the Amount of the Fee and the Cost of the Portion of the Facility Attributed to the Development Project. Each new development, or demand increasing redevelopment, would finance a proportional amount of the expansion of the City's storm drainage collection system. Similar to the previous findings, the relationship is based upon the projected amount of storm water to be collected, contained and safely transported to flood control channels or rivers as a proportion of the entire amount of storm water to be so conveyed. The downstream collection lines (lines further down from the proposed project but prior the outfall into a river or flood control channel) need to be sized to handle all of the storm-water collected upstream. Storm-water that is collected in one location accumulates with feeder lines along the way and thus the downstream system must be built increasingly larger (at increasing higher material and construction costs) the further it gets away from its source.

Table 6-4 distributes the total existing community financial commitment (or equity value) of the existing system, at $203,631,313, consisting of the actual storm drainage pipe, channels and detention basins. Please note that the resulting development impact cost, by land use, is in terms of *units* such as residential dwellings or commercial/office and industrial/manufacturing square feet of building pad (including multiple floors).

[This space left vacant to place the following table on a single page].

Table 6-4
Distribution of Current Equity-based Commitment in Storm Drainage System Collection (or Proportionality Verification)

Land Use	Allocation of Equity Costs	System Equity per Acre	Total Cost Per Unit or SF
Detached Dwelling Units	$122,325,402	$19,006	$3,168/Unit
Attached Dwelling Units	$35,863,547	$19,865	$993/Unit
Mobile Home Dwelling Units	$4,013,573	$19,617	$1,401/Unit
Hotel/Motel Lodging Units	$737,145	$22,070	$689/Unit
Resort Lodging Units	$433,735	$21,472	$536/Unit
Commercial/Office Uses	$18,583,394	$22,073	$1.448/S.F.
Industrial/Manufacturing Uses	$21,674,517	$23,298	$1.070/S.F.

Of note is the fact that Table 6-4 summarizing Schedule 6.3, the investment "investment" (albeit General Plan proportionally deficient) of the current community is slightly greater, (at about 8%) of the previously exhibited General Plan Build-out Needs-based fees identified in Table 6-3 summarizing Schedule 6.2. Based upon these proportional facts, the adoption of the General Plan Build-out Needs-based fees identified in Schedule 6.2 and summarized in Table 6-3, would be reasonable and equitable.

RESULTING DEVELOPMENT IMPACT FEES

The adoption of Schedule 6.2 at the end of this chapter, as summarized in Table 6-3 and based upon as the Storm Drainage Collection System Development Impact Fees would generate approximately $13.0 million in capital revenues with which to construct a portion of the remaining $207.4 million in the storm drainage infrastructure required to complete the system. The City should adopt both the ***per unit*** fees, i.e., the dwelling unit fees and the square foot business construction square foot fees and the ***per acre*** figures under the column heading titled *Cost Distribution per Acre* on Schedule 6.2. The former is for application to projects that include a building creating new demand for all infrastructure and the latter for projects merely creating additional runoff (e.g. a parking structure).

RECAP OF RECOMMENDED STORM DRAINAGE COLLECTION SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT IMPACT FEES.

- Adopt Schedule 6.2. for the seven basic new land-uses, and;

- Adopt the Schedule 6.2, "Cost per Acre" column for construction of parking lots and other private construction causing additional runoff but few other impacts.

CHAPTER ENDNOTES

1. Storm drainage pipe below the size of 21" is almost exclusively used for "local" or tract storm water collection and is thus not included in the equity calculation. In Huntington Beach this amounts to an additional 80,100 linear foot of reinforced concrete pipe that is 18" to 21" and considered to be "local" in nature and thus not included in this calculation.

2. Roughly assumes inlet boxes constructed at 425 linear foot intervals, combination boxes at 750 foot intervals and junction boxes at 300 linear foot intervals.

3. Projects of major importance generally involving the control of large quantities of flood water (over 500 C.F.S.) through numerous cities and unincorporated areas.

4. The projects individual scope and cost estimates have been provided by the City's contractual engineering firm *Kennedy/Jenks Consultants,* Engineers and Scientists, Irvine, CA 92612-1311.

5. San Bernardino County Hydrology Manual, Williamson and Schmidt, Civil Engineers, Irvine, California, August, 1986, Runoff Index Number 56.

Schedule 6.1

City of Huntington Beach
2011-12 Development Impact Fee Calculation and Nexus Report
Identification of Projects and Cost Allocation
Storm Drainage Collection System

Line #	Description	Estimated Cost	Construction Needs Supported by Other Resources: Percent Need	Construction Needs Supported by Other Resources: Apportioned Dollar Cost	Construction Needs That Increase Infrastructure Capacity: Percent Need	Construction Needs That Increase Infrastructure Capacity: Apportioned Dollar Cost
SD-001	Santa Ana River & Talbert Channel Region (SD Region #1)	$23,728,000	93.70%	$22,234,085	6.30%	$1,493,915
SD-002	Coastal and Bolsa Chica Wetlands Region (SD Region #2)	$21,527,000	93.70%	$20,171,660	6.30%	$1,355,340
SD-003	Slater Channel Region (SD Region #3)	$34,236,000	93.70%	$32,080,501	6.30%	$2,155,499
SD-004	Wintersburg Channel Region (SD Region #4)	$28,749,000	93.70%	$26,938,963	6.30%	$1,810,037
SD-005	Bolsa Chica Channel & Harbour Region (SD Region #5)	$98,549,000	93.70%	$92,344,355	6.30%	$6,204,645
SD-006	Public Works Maintenance Building	$705,050	93.70%	$660,660	6.30%	$44,390
	SUB-TOTAL ESTIMATED NEW PROJECT COSTS	$207,494,050	93.70%	$194,430,225	6.30%	$13,063,825
	LESS: Existing Storm Drainage Impact Fee Fund Balance	$0	0.00%	$0	0.00%	$0
	Other Revenue Sources	$0	0.00%	$0	0.00%	$0
	SUB-TOTAL ADJUSTMENTS	$0	0.00%	$0	0.00%	$0
	Total - Storm Drainage Collection System Capital Project Needs	$207,494,050	93.70%	$194,430,225	6.30%	$13,063,825
					Forward to Schedule 6.2	

NOTES:
There are no notes.

Schedule 6.2

City of Huntington Beach
2011-12 Development Impact Fee Calculation and Nexus Report
General Plan Build-out Needs-based Development Impact Costs (Fees)
Storm Drainage Collection System

Proposed Land Use	Undeveloped Acres	Undeveloped Units	Coefficient of Drainage Factor	Storm Drainage Run-off	Percentage of Additional Service Calls	Allocation of Expansion Costs	Cost Distribution Per Acre	Average Units or Square Feet/Acre	Development Impact Fee per Unit or Square Foot
Detached Dwelling Units (1)	295.00	1,749	0.775	228.63	40.98%	$5,354,096	$18,149	5.93	*$3,061 per Unit*
Attached Dwelling Units	111.20	5,307	0.810	90.07	16.15%	$2,109,274	$18,968	47.72	*$397 per Unit*
Mobile Home Dwelling Units	1.00	9	0.800	0.80	0.14%	$18,735	$18,735	9.00	*$2,082 per Unit*
Hotel/Motel Lodging Units	18.60	818	0.900	16.74	3.00%	$392,020	$21,076	43.98	*$479 per Unit*
Resort Lodging Units	9.30	535	0.875	8.14	1.46%	$190,624	$20,497	57.53	*$356 per Unit*
Commercial/Office Uses	39.80	2,417,000	0.900	35.82	6.42%	$838,839	$21,076	60,729	*$0.347 per S.F.*
Industrial/Manufacturing Use	187.00	3,638,000	0.950	177.65	31.85%	$4,160,238	$22,247	19,455	*$1.144 per S.F.*
TOTAL	661.90	--	--	557.85	100.00%	$13,063,825	in Total Storm Drainage Capital Needs to Finish System		

Schedule 6.3

City of Huntington Beach
2011–12 Development Impact Fee Calculation and Nexus Report
Community Financial Commitment or Equity–based Proportionality Test Fees
Storm Drainage Collection System

Proposed Land Use	Developed Acres	Developed Units	Coefficient of Drainage Factor	Storm Drainage Run-off	Percentage of Existing Service Calls	Allocation of Infrastructure "Equity"	Distribution of "Equity" per Acre	Average Units or Square Feet/Acre	Current Financial Commitment per Unit or Square Foot
Detached Dwelling Units (1)	6,436.00	38,616	0.775	4,987.90	60.07%	$122,325,402	$19,006	6.00	*$3,168 per Unit*
Attached Dwelling Units	1,805.40	36,108	0.810	1,462.37	17.61%	$35,863,547	$19,865	20.00	*$993 per Unit*
Mobile Home Dwelling Units	204.60	2,865	0.800	163.68	1.97%	$4,013,573	$19,617	14.00	*$1,401 per Unit*
Hotel/Motel Lodging Units	33.40	1,070	0.900	30.06	0.36%	$737,145	$22,070	32.04	*$689 per Unit*
Resort Lodging Units	20.20	809	0.875	17.68	0.21%	$433,735	$21,472	40.05	*$536 per Unit*
Commercial/Office Uses	841.90	12,836,000	0.900	757.71	9.13%	$18,583,394	$22,073	15,246	*$1.448 per S.F.*
Industrial/Manufacturing Use	930.30	20,261,000	0.950	883.78	10.64%	$21,674,517	$23,298	21,779	*$1.070 per S.F.*
TOTAL	10,271.80	--	--	8,303.18	100.00%	$203,631,313	in Total Equity in Current Law Enforcement Assets		
						$158,631,313	in Equity in Storm Drainage Collection System Facilities.		
						$45,000,000	in Equity in Storm Drainage Basins.		
						$0	in Existing Storm Drainage Impact Fee Fund Balance.		

Chapter 7

Public Library Facilities and Collection

The Existing System. The City's library system consists of five library facilities providing a total of 127,400 square feet. When the 127,400 square feet of the library building space is divided by the City's residential population of 190,377[1], a *space standard* of 0.669 square feet/resident is established, (127,400 square feet of library space ÷ 190,377 residents). The City's library operations also house an extensive inventory of 410,594 collection items contained within the five libraries. When the 410,594 collection items are divided by the City's residential service population of 190,377[2], a *collection item* standard of 2.157 library collection items/resident is established, (410,594 collection item's ÷ 190,377 residents).

Demand Upon Infrastructure Created by the Development of Underdeveloped or Undeveloped Parcels. Stated simply, the 127,400 square feet of library facilities utilized by the City will accommodate only a finite number of collection items and residents/patrons. Additional residential development will increase the demand on the existing square feet of library pad and the existing collection items.

The **Purpose** of the Fee. The purpose of the fee is to enable the City to collect a fee that would allow the City to construct additional square feet that would ensure that the City's existing and new residents would have adequate and sufficient access to and enjoyment of the library space and collection. The calculation in Table 7-1, following, establishes the City's existing de-facto library standards.

[This space left vacant to place the following table on a single page]

Table 7-1
Calculation of Existing City
Library Facilities/Collection Items Standard

	Library Facility S.F.	Collection Items
Banning Library	2,400	27,637
Central Library	115,000	314,921
Graham Library	1,200	14,920
Main Street Library	4,500	30,429
Oak View Library	4,300	22,687
Total Library Resources	127,400	410,594
Current Residential Population	190,377	190,377
Existing Standard/Resident	0.669	2.157

Table 7-2, following, indicates that the remaining residential dwelling development and typical number of residents per type of residential dwelling will generate a need for 11,443 additional square feet in order to maintain the existing library facility standard of 0.669 square feet per person.

Table 7-2
Square Feet Required to Maintain Existing Facility Standard

Residential Land-Use	Number of Units	Persons per Dwelling	Resident Yield
Detached Dwellings Units	1,749	3.053	5,095
Attached Dwellings Units	5,307	2.257	11,978
Mobile Home Dwelling Units	9	1.660	16
Additional Residential Population to be Served			17,089
Square Foot per Person Existing Standard			0.669
Square Feet Required to Maintain Existing Standard			11,433

The library system also has a collection of 410,594 collection items[3] generating a collection standard of 2.157 collection items per resident within the system (410,594 collection item's ÷190,377 persons). Table 6-3, following, indicates the additional number of residents to be served and the number of collection items required to maintain the existing standard. The City will need to acquire roughly 36,861 collection items to maintain the existing 2.028 collection items per person in light of the additional 17,089 additional Huntington Beach residents expected at General Plan build-out.

Table 7-3
Collection items Required to Maintain Existing Standard

Residential Land-Use	Number of Units	Persons per Dwelling	Resident Yield
Detached Dwellings	1,749	2.913	5,095
Attached Dwellings	7,207	2.257	11,978
Mobile Home Dwellings	9	1.822	16
Additional City Population to be Served			17,089
Collection Items per Person Existing Standard			2.157
Collection Items Required to Maintain Existing Standard			36,861

The Use of the Fee. The fee, if adopted, would be imposed, collected, and, as needed (and desired), expended on expansion of the amount of library facility space in the two libraries and the number of collection items in the system's collection. The library staff has indicated that the proceeds of any Library development impact fee would be used to expand the Banning Library from its 2,400 square feet to approximately 12,500 square feet and expansion of the existing 4,500 square feet Main Street Branch Libraries into the remaining 4,804 square feet (for a total of 9,304 square feet) in the same building after the current tenant chooses to move elsewhere. Collection items would be expanded in proportion with the population increase, most likely into the additional proposed library space.

The Relationship Between the Need for the Fee and the Type of Development Project. The development of any acreage zoned for residential uses, increases the demand on the finite amount of library space and collection items. Thus, those residential land uses that generate higher numbers of residents (i.e., detached dwelling) will be charged a proportionally higher amount.

There is no information available demonstrating a substantive link between library use and local businesses. Library use is primarily by residents as opposed to business persons.

The Relationship Between the Use of the Fee and the Type of Development Paying the Fee. Additional square feet will be constructed with the DIFs collected from residential development and additional collection items will be added to the existing collection. If not adopted and used to expand the City's existing Library standards' the level of service will decrease by about 8.3% to 0.620 square feet and 1.98 collection items per resident at General Plan build-out. The Library DIFs, if adopted, imposed and collected, cannot be used for any other purpose than their stated use of maintaining the existing library standards.

The Relationship Between the Amount of the Fee and the Cost of the Portion of the Facility Attributed to the Development Project. The cost of acquiring land for additional library space and construction is about $520.63 per square foot[4], (per Schedule 6.1). The 127,400 square feet of library space, when divided by the 190,377 existing potential patrons create a standard of 0.669 square feet of library space per City resident. The standard of 0.669 square foot standard multiplied by the $520.63 per square foot of pad cost of library construction results in a charge of $348.30 per additional City resident. Table 7-4 following, demonstrates this.

Table 7-4
Establishment of the Library Facilities Standard and Cost per Person to Maintain the Standard

Library Facilities Owned Square Feet	127,400
Current City Service Population	190,377
Square Feet per Resident Standard	0.669
Cost of Library Building Construction per Square Foot	$520.63
Square Feet per Resident Standard	0.669
Cost per Additional Resident	$348.30

The cost of acquiring additional collection items, called the accession process[5], (per Schedule 6.1) is estimated by the Library staff to cost roughly $25.00 per collection item. The 410,594 collection items, when divided by the City's 190,377 population create a standard of 2.028 collection items per City resident. The standard of 2.157 collection item standard multiplied by the $25.00 per collection item results in a cost of $53.93 per additional City resident, in order to maintain the existing standard. Table 7-5 following, demonstrates this.

Table 7-5
Establishment of the Library Collection Standard and Cost per Person to Maintain the Standard

Library Collection Items	410,594
Current City Service Population	190,377
Collection Items per Resident Standard	2.157
Cost of Library Collection per Collection item	$25.00
Collection Items per Resident Standard	2.157
Cost per Additional Resident	$53.93

Resulting Impact Costs. The combined cost per new resident is $402.23, consisting of $348.30 for 0.669 square feet of library space and $53.93 for 2.157 additional collection items. Table 7-6, following, indicates the amount required for pro-rata expansion of the library space per Schedule 7.1. If adopted and imposed on the remaining development, it would collect enough to acquire land for and construct an additional 11,432 square feet of public library space and an additional 36,861 collection items.

Table 7-6
Summary of Library Space and Collection Impact Costs

Land Use	Residents per Dwelling	Cost per Resident	Impact Cost Per Unit
Detached Dwelling Units	2.913	$402.23	$1,172/Dwelling
Attached Dwelling Units	2.257	$402.23	$908/Dwelling
Mobile Home Dwelling Units	1.822	$402.23	$733/Dwelling

RECOMMENDED DEVELOPMENT IMPACT FEES

- Adopt Schedule 7.1 which contains the recommended City Library Facilities and Collection (item) Development Impact Fees and is summarized in Table7-6.

- Establish a General Plan square foot standard for *Library Facilities square feet per resident* and a standard for *Collection Items per resident*.

Chapter Endnotes

1. Based upon the 2011 State of California Department of Finance City population estimate of 190,377.

2. The current population of 190,377 establishes the existing standard.

3. A collection item is generally a book but can also be a CD, magazine subscription, video tape or some other like item with a similar cost and accession cost.

4. Based upon the construction cost of a 30,000 square foot library constructed in Highland, CA at a cost of $11,500,000 and increased by the *Engineering News Record* construction cost index increase of 14.95% over the 01/06 construction date (or $441.63 per square foot) and land acquisition at a cost of $20 per square foot of land with a FAR (floor area ratio) of 0.20 requiring five square feet of land per square foot of building pad. 06/2010 ENR- CCI = 8805 divided by the 01/06 ENR - CCI of 7660 = 14.95 percent increase.

5. The accession process includes: needs research, ordering, receipt, preparation, entering it into the computer and actual placement on the shelves.

Schedule 7.1

City of Huntington Beach
2011-12 Development Impact Fee Calculation and Nexus Report
Public Library Facilities and Collection

	Library Space	Library Collection
Banning Library	2,400	27,637
Central Library	115,000	314,921
Graham Library	1,200	14,920
Main Street Library	4,500	30,429
Oak View Library	4,300	22,687
Existing Square Feet of Library Space	127,400	
Existing Library Collection Items		410,594
Calculation of Existing Standards:		
Current Population (Residents)	190,377	190,377
S.F. of Library Space/Resident	0.669	
Collection Items/Resident		2.157
Library Construction/Square Foot 06/2010	$440.63	
Land Acquisition at $20.00/S.F. and 0.25 FAR.	$80.00	
Land Acquisition and Construction per Square Foot	$520.63	
Cost per Collection Item		$25.00
Cost per Square Foot or Collection Item	$520.63	$25.00
Existing City Library Standard(s)	0.669	2.157
Cost of Space per Resident	$348.30	
Cost of Collection Item per Resident		$53.93

Type of Residential Dwelling Unit	Density per Dwelling Unit	Library Space Component	Library Collection Component	Total Library Impact Fee
Detached Dwelling Unit	2.913	$1,015	$157	$1,172
Attached Dwelling Unit	2.257	$786	$122	$908
Mobile Home Dwelling Unit	1.822	$635	$98	$733

Chapter 8

Community Use Facilities

The Existing System. The City has a number of facilities dedicated for Community Use. The existing 118,020 square feet of *Community Use Facilities* are identified in Table 8-1, following.

Table 8-1
Inventory of Existing Community Use Facilities

Community Use Facility	Square Feet
Beach Public Service Center	2,561
City Gymnasium and Pool Facility	23,600
Edison Community Center	11,065
Harbor View Clubhouse	2,203
Huntington Beach Municipal Art Center	11,092
Huntington Beach Youth Shelter	5,600
Junior Lifeguard Headquarters	5,922
Lake Park Clubhouse	3,000
Lake View Clubhouse	2,000
LeBard Clubhouse	1,000
Murdy Community Center	11,000
Newland Barn	6,000
Newland House Museum	2,750
Oak View Community Center	10,000
Rodgers Senior Center	14,000
Seniors Outreach Center	2,700
Shipley Nature Center Interpretive Building	1,863
Terry Park Community Center	1,664
Total Community Use Facilities Square Feet	118,020

This category of facilities differs from general facilities which are facilities generally used by the City staff in the commission of their government tasks and duties on behalf of the community's many residents and businesses. *Community Use Facilities* are typically made available to community groups for social, community and educational group uses.

Based upon an existing City population of approximately 190,377, as identified in Schedule 8.1, the City's 118,020 square feet designated for use as Community Use facilities create a standard of 0.620 square feet per resident. While there is no nationally recommended standard for Community Use facilities, RCS staff typically finds that most cities have an actual standard ranging anywhere from 0.300 to a 1.000 square foot per person standard[1]. While the City's overall standard of 0.619 square feet per person compares well with other municipal agencies, the offerings of the combined facilities may not provide the City with the most desired configuration of space for the many differing needs of the community. As a result, the City may desire to either expand one of the existing community centers or construct additional such facilities to obtain the additional space to accommodate the growing public needs for social, recreational, educational and cultural needs of residents of varying ages and interests that will result from the anticipated seven thousand additional residential dwelling units expected at General Plan Build-out. Table 8-2, following, demonstrates the calculation of the existing *Community Use Facilities* square foot standard:

Table 8-2
Establishment of the Community Use Facilities Square Foot Standard and Cost per Person to Maintain Said Standard

City-owned Community Use Facilities Square Feet	118,020
Current City Service Population	190,377
Square Foot per Resident	0.620
Cost of Community Use Facilities Construction (S.F.)	$480.00
Cost per Additional Resident	$297.60

Table 8-3, following, indicates the additional number of residents to be served and the number of square feet of additional Community Use space required to maintain the existing standard of 0.620 square feet per resident.

Table 8-3
Square Feet Required to Maintain Existing Standard

Residential Land-Use	Number of Units	Persons per Dwelling	Density Yield
Detached Dwelling Units	1,749	2.913	5,095
Attached Dwelling Units	5,307	2.257	11,978
Mobile Home Dwelling Units	9	1.822	16
Maximum Additional Population to be Served			17,089
Square Foot per Person Existing Standard			0.620
Square Feet Required to Maintain Existing Standard			10,595

Demand Upon Infrastructure Created by the Development of Under or Undeveloped Parcels. Simply stated, additional residential dwelling units will increase of the population placing demands upon the existing community centers. The construction of a detached dwelling will house, on average 2.913 potential new potential community center facilities users. The addition of a new attached dwelling will create 2.257 potential new users. The addition of mobile home dwelling units in park-like settings, although unlikely, would generate approximately 1.822 residents per dwelling unit.

The **Purpose** of the Fee. The purpose of the fee is to determine the cost of proportionally expanding the community center to meet the added demands created by the construction of additional residential dwelling units and imposing it in order to maintain the current standard.

The **Use** of the Fee. The fee, if adopted, would be imposed, collected, and spent on the construction of additional *Community Use Facilities* space that accommodates additional City of Huntington Beach residents, but would not be used on the rehabilitation of any existing *Community Use* facility.

The Relationship Between the Need for the Fee and the Type of Development Project. Different types of residential dwellings generally have differing densities of people dwelling in them. Census data indicates the following occupancy statistics for the City:

Detached Dwelling Units . . . . . 2.913 Persons Per Unit
Attached Dwelling Units . . . . . 2.257 Persons Per Unit
Mobile Home Dwelling Units . . . . . 1.822 Persons Per Unit

The Relationship Between the Use of the Fee and the Type of Development Paying the Fee. The fee will be used to expand the amount of community center square feet in proportions consistent with the average persons per dwelling unit. ***Community Use Facilities*** would be expanded/constructed in the following amounts, following, by type of residential dwelling:

Detached Dwelling Unit . . . . . 2.913 Persons Per Unit x 0.620 Square Feet = 1.806 Square Feet
Attached Dwelling Unit . . . . . 2.257 Persons Per Unit x 0.620 Square Feet = 1.399 Square Feet
Mobile Home Dwelling Unit . . . . . 1.822 Persons Per Unit x 0.620 Square Feet = 1.130 Square Feet

The Relationship Between the Amount of the Fee and the Cost of the Portion of the Facility Attributed to the Development Project. The cost of adding 0.620 square feet of building space per person is roughly $297.60 based upon a $480.00 per square foot land acquisition and construction cost. A detached dwelling unit with 2.913 persons requires 1.806 square feet of Community Use facilities' space at $480.00/square foot for a total cost of $867.00 (or 2.913 additional residents multiplied by the $297.60 cost per resident, rounded). An attached dwelling unit requires 1.399 square feet of community use meeting space at a cost of $672.00 (1.399 square feet X $480.00 per square foot, rounded).

Resulting Development Impact Fee Schedule. Table 8-4, following, indicates the proposed *Community Use Facilities* Development Impact Fee Schedule.

Table 8-4
Summary of Community Use Facilities Development Impact Fee

Residential Land Use	Impact Fee Per Unit
Detached Dwelling Units	$867
Attached Dwelling Units	$672
Mobile Home Dwelling Units	$542

[This space left vacant to place the Chapter Recommendations and Endnotes on a single page].

RECAP OF RECOMMENDED COMMUNITY USE FACILITIES DEVELOPMENT IMPACT FEES.

- Adopt Schedule 8.1 for the three basic residential land-uses.
- Establish a General Plan square foot standard for *Community Use Facilities*.

CHAPTER ENDNOTES

1. RCS is not recommending any particular size of Community Use facility. That is a matter for the Council and community to decide and set a General Plan standard. However, it appears from visual experience that any facility smaller than 3,500 square foot in size tends to have little flexibility and may not meet the needs of the community. Regardless of desired size, the development impact fee is based upon the actual standard created by the existing 118,020 square feet of Community Use facilities and the existing population of 190,377. Any higher standard could be construed as unreasonable to the development community and those purchasing the new homes.

Schedule 8.1

City of Huntington Beach
2011-12 Development Impact Fee Calculation and Nexus Report
Community Use Facilities

	Building Size
Beach Public Service Center	2,561
City Gymnasium and Pool Facility	23,600
Edison Community Center	11,065
Harbor View Clubhouse	2,203
Huntington Beach Municipal Art Center	11,092
Huntington Beach Youth Shelter	5,600
Junior Lifeguard Headquarters	5,922
Lake Park Clubhouse	3,000
Lake View Clubhouse	2,000
Lebard Clubhouse	1,000
Murdy Community Center	11,000
Newland Barn	6,000
Newland House Museum	2,750
Oak View Community Center	10,000
Rodgers Seniors Center	14,000
Seniors Outreach Center	2,700
Shipley Nature Center Interpretive Building	1,863
Terry Park Community Center	1,664
Existing City-owned Public Use Facilities Square Feet	118,020
Current Population	190,377
Square Foot per Resident Standard	0.620
Average Construction Cost per Square Foot (1) & (2)	$400.00
Land Cost @ $20.00/S.F. and 0.25 Floor Area Ratio	$80.00
Total Cost for one Square Foot of Public Use Space	$480.00
Total Cost for one Square Foot of Public Use Space	$480.00
Square Foot per Resident Standard	0.620
Cost per New Resident	$297.60

Type of Dwelling Unit	Residents per Unit	Proposed Impact Fee
Detached Dwelling Units	2.913	$867
Attached Dwelling Units	2.257	$672
Mobile Home Dwelling Units	1.822	$542

Notes:
(1) Includes, grading, design, permits, engineering, inspection and furnishings.
(2) Assuming a Floor Area Ratio of 25%, so four times as much land is required as pad.

Chapter 9

Park Land Acquisition and Park Facilities Development (including Open Space)

This Chapter summarizes the City's existing inventory of parks and identifies the ratio of park land per resident allowable under the Quimby Act (§66477 of the Government Code[1]) for residential developments involving the subdivision of land and AB1600 (§66000) for the construction of residential developments not involving the subdivision of land. The existing per capita standard is then utilized to calculate the park dedication requirement for future residential development.

EXISTING PARKS AND RECREATION SYSTEM

Open space notwithstanding, intensive parks and recreational facilities constitute one of the City of City of Huntington Beach's greatest needs both with respect to facilities for current residents and future citizens. The provision of a well-planned park system, with a variation in the size and nature of facilities offered, is an important amenity to residents of any city, the City of City of Huntington Beach included. A mixture of passive and active uses and facilities and programs which appeal to a broad spectrum of potential park and trail users are considered optimal in most urban cities. The City currently has at its disposal (and within general control) some 999.09 acres of park, beach and specialty uses for use by the City's many residents. However, not all of these acres are owned by the City, many are leased or owned by other agencies made available to the City via a joint use agreements with the various school districts or are S.C.E. right-of-way.

The current acres dedicated to park use (and owned or under long-term control by the City) can reasonably well serve the City's current needs. However if the number of owned park acres remains static at 778.41 acres, the City may not be able to continue to meet recreational demands in light the probable 9.0% increase in the City's population. At an attempt to achieve a high level of fairness, the City's owned park acreage will be used as the standard for calculating the park standard and the development impact fee schedule. The figure is a Government Code statute-based calculation and thus does not include other park opportunities in the area such as Harriet Weider Regional Park, which while clearly serving the City residents, are not City-facilities and thus cannot be programmed by the City. The City has a General Plan standard target of 5.0 acres per 1,000 acres per residents and the calculation of target does include the park acres of other agencies (i.e. the regional park and state-owned beach land) within the calculation of that General Plan

target. That is completely acceptable for General Plan issues, and the City does meet that General Plan standard.

Future residential development, by increasing the City's population, will impact the City's park system by requiring additional athletic fields and adequate space for various athletic activities. Given the magnitude of growth projected in this and other reports, the challenge facing the City will be to provide new facilities and park land to serve the recreational needs of these new residents. Without additional park land acquisition and development of currently owned but underutilized park land during the remaining period of private residential development, the City's parks will become overcrowded and overused, with the ultimate result becoming a negative experience for park users.

Existing Park Land and Open Space Land. Currently, the City owns (or has long-tern control of) approximately 778.41 acres of traditional park land, about 87.9%(683.9 acres) of it, developed. The entire list of parks and their acreage is identified on Schedule 9.1 at the conclusion of this Chapter with a summary by type in Table 9-1. Central Park is the largest developed park, representing just under a half of the park system acreage and provides the greatest variety of sports and passive uses.

Table 9-1
Current Park Total Inventory

	Total Park Acres	City Owned Acres
Neighborhood Parks	183.79	129.74
Community/Sports Parks	546.82	470.81
Other (beaches, etc)	268.48	177.86
Total Acres (Owned)	999.09	778.41

City Park Standard. Table 9-2, following, is a comparison of the acreage of parks to the City of Huntington Beach's current population and indicates that the City presently possesses a total standard of 5.248 acres of park land per 1,000 residents, (999.09 park acres ÷ [190,377 resident's ÷ 1,000], rounded). However as stated previously, the owned acreage will be used to calculate the standard and resulting impact fee. The City presently owns 778.41 acres and thus possesses an owned standard of 4.089 acres of owned park land per 1,000 residents, (778.41 owned park acre's ÷ [190,377 resident's ÷ 1,000], rounded). This is above the benchmark of 3.0 acres per

1,000 persons contained in Section 66477 of the California Government Code relating to dedication of parks.

Table 9-2
Calculation of Actual City-owned and Developed Park Acres Standard

	All Park Acres	Owned Park Ares
Current Park Acres	999.09	778.41
Current City Population	190,377	190,377
Population Stated in Thousands	190.377	190.377
Park Acres per 1,000 Population	5.248	4.089

The Quimby Act, to be discussed later, allows a minimum standard of 3.0 acres per thousand resident's *even if the City has not attained that standard*. However, the *park acres owned* standard for the City of Huntington Beach, at 4.089 acres per 1,000 resident's, exceeds that minimum standard and thus the Quimby allowable minimum standard of 3.0 acres per 1,000 new residents is irrelevant and the 4.089 acres/1,000 resident's standard will be used for *Park Land Acquisition and Park Facilities Development*. Though not particularly relevant[2] to the City of Huntington Beach, the Quimby Act has a cap on land dedications required as a part of the subdivision of land of 5.0 acres per thousand (Government Code §66447 (a)(2).

Planned Improvements. In addition to the ongoing improvement of the remaining 115.85 acres[3] available for increased residential development, the City will need to acquire 70.5 additional park acres, per Table 9-3, and develop these new parks to serve the additional 17,089 residents anticipated to live in City of Huntington Beach at General Plan build-out.

[This space left vacant to place the following tabe on a single page]

Table 9-3
Calculation of Required
Park Acres per Allowable Standard

Future Added Population	17,089
Population Stated in Thousands	17.089
Allowable City of Huntington Beach Park Standard	4.128
Parks Acres Required to Maintain Standard	70.5

The 70.5 acres could be constructed in any of the following configurations:

Mini or "Pocket" Parks - This type is the smallest of the park type designations, usually an acre or less. Mini parks are generally not planned due to higher maintenance costs. They are usually the result of the acquisition of an unusual parcel oftentimes with historical or community significance. Tarbox, Booster, Trinidad or Baily Parks are good examples of this category.

Local or Neighborhood Parks - These parks are generally 3.0 to six acres and serve local (walk-in distance) users. Not surprisingly, the City has a number of these parks, roughly forty-nine at an average of about 3.5 acres in size. Neighborhood Parks, per the category title, are intended to serve walk-in populations nearby the park and typically are not highly programmed with City-run activities.

Community - These parks, to be functional, are usually closer to ten acres or larger and are designed to meet the needs of the entire community. These needs include youth and adult sports organizations, clubs or associations and large scale community events such as 4th of July celebrations or festivals. Langenbeck, Baca, Bartlett, Carr and Gisler Parks are good examples of a broad-based use community park.

Sport Parks - These park, again as titled, are highly infrastructure-developed to meet the active sports needs of both youth and adults. Edison and Greer Parks are good examples of the City's sports parks.

The proposed park improvements that could be contained within the roughly 65 needed acres and the existing standard (Table 9-2) are consistent with the City's Park and Recreation Element of the General Plan. The City's 3.785 acres per 1,000 population standard speaks reasonably well for the City as a three-acre per 1,000 population standard is the common minimum, but frequently

unmet, target of municipalities and recreation and park special districts throughout California. City staff has plans and has identified parcels that would assist help reach the 5.0 acres per 1,000 standard at General Plan build-out.

CALCULATION OF PARK DEDICATION STANDARD

Unlike the other facilities discussed in this Report, the California Government Code contains specific enabling legislation for the acquisition and development of community and neighborhood parks by a City. This legislation, codified as Section 66477 of the Government Code and known commonly as the "Quimby Act," establishes criteria for charging new development for park facilities based on specific park standards. This Report will recommend the adoption of Quimby-style park fees over an AB 1600-style development impact fee for developments requiring the subdivision of land and an AB 1600 fee for non subdivided land.

Allowable Park Standard As stated earlier, under Section 66477 of the Government Code, the City may charge new residential development based on a standard of 3.0 acres per 1,000 population if the City does not presently possess a ratio of 3.0 acres per 1,000 for the existing population. The Government Code also enables a city to charge development based on a standard higher than 3.0 acres (to a maximum of 5.0 acres) if the City currently exceeds the minimum benchmark ratio of 3.0 acres per 1,000 persons. Schedule 9.1 indicates that the City exceeds that minimum standard (with 3.785 acres/1,000 residents) and may then impose a fee in order to maintain that standard.

The law states that "if the amount of existing neighborhood and community park area ... exceeds the [3 acres of park area per 1,000 person] limit ... the legislative body may adopt the calculated amount as a higher standard not to exceed 5 acres per 1,000 persons."[4] Park fees may be required by the City provided that the City meets certain conditions including:

- The amount and location of land to be dedicated or the fees to be paid shall bear a reasonable relationship to the use of the park by the future inhabitants of the subdivision.
- The legislative body has adopted a general plan containing a recreational element, and the park and recreational facilities are in accordance with definite principles and standards contained therein.
- The city ... shall develop a schedule specifying how, when, and where it will use the land or fees, or both, to develop park or recreational facilities ... Any fees collected under the ordinance shall be committed within five years after the payment of such fees.

Once a per capita standard for parks is determined, the cost of residential development's impact on the City's park system can then be computed as follows:

Park-land Acquisition Costs. Land costs will vary significantly from one park to another. The park land to be acquired must be suitable for park construction and is somewhat conservatively estimated at approximately $871,200 per acre (or $20.00/square foot) which has been used in the park development impact fee calculation, *as a default park development impact fee* for ordinary residential dwelling development. This is consistent with the cost of recent development for detached dwelling development in the more northerly areas of the City of Huntington Beach area. However, the use of this $20.00 per square foot figure could be criticized if a developer can show that the cost of the residential land they are developing is currently valued at less than the $871,200/acre figure. Conversely the City should retain the ability to increase this impact fee in areas where the cost of land exceeds the $20.00 per square foot figure. The fee recommendation at the end of the Chapter will recognize this need for flexibility.

Park Development Costs. Park development costs are based upon the very recent construction of Schedule 9.3, a current schedule of common park costs and typical improvements by type of park. Schedule 9.2 identifies the three types parks[5] that the City will likely construct over General Plan build-out[6] and the costs of the types and numbers of improvements generally included in each.[7] *Community Use Facilities* were not included in the cost calculation (see Chapter 8)Table 9-4, following and summarized from Schedule 9.2, identifies the factors in the average costs to develop an acre of park land for the three types, based on figures which are consistent with the probable improvements and costs to build similar parks incurred by other communities. For cost estimate purposes, roughly forty-five acres of Central Park has been identified as higher cost sports park acres with the remainder as Community Park. Sixty acres of beach land has been categorized as neighborhood park due to the nature of the more limited improvement costs. The table also indicates the three major types of parks. The existing 834.06 developed park acres[8] cost the City an estimated $258,698,242 construct as parks for an average construction cost of $310.168 per acre.

Table 9-4
Average Park Construction Cost per Acre

Type of Park	Park Acres	Cost/ Acre	Average Construction Cost
Neighborhood/Mini Park	271.01	$223,441	$60,559,816
Community Park	229.15	$289,296	$66,292,242
Sports/Regional Park	333.90	$394,884	$131,851,622
Total Cost			$258,698,242
Total Acres	834.06		834.06
Cost/Acre (rounded)			$310,168

The $310,168/acre is then increased by 15% to $356,693 to account for the park architectural costs and 24% to $442,299/acre to account for project administration, plan check, engineering, inspection and materials testing costs. Lastly, the $422,299 per acre figure is increased by 15% to $508,644 for a typical park project contingency. Schedule 9.2 shows this in numeric detail. Schedule 9.3 shows the average park construction cost by type of park.

Average Park Acquisition and Development Cost per Capita. The combined park acquisition and development cost is $1,379,846 per acre ($871,200/acre for acquisition and $508,644 per acre for development). If the City were to charge development for the maximum allowable amount of park acreage as allowed in the Quimby Act and as recommended here, then the City would need to acquire 4.128 acres of new park land for every potential 1,000 new residents to the City. The 4,128 acres of land acquisition and development per 1,000 persons would be $5,832,415 or about $5,832.42 per new resident. Table 9-5 and Schedule 9.1 calculates the cost, per type of residential dwelling, to develop 4.089 acres, which represents the required park land cost for 1,000 persons.

Table 9-5
Summary of Quimby Park/AB1600 Development Impact Fees for Residential Dwelling Construction

Residential Land Use	Persons per Dwelling	Fee per Resident	Impact Fee Per Unit
Detached Dwelling Units	2.913	$5,832.42	$16,990
Attached Dwelling Units	2.257	$5,832.42	$13,164
Mobile Home Dwelling Units	1.822	$5,832.42	$10,627

The development impact fees for residential detached dwelling development involving the subdivision of land, as identified in Table 9-5, should be adopted under the auspices of the Quimby Act. The development impact fees for residential dwelling units not requiring the subdivision of a parcel, will need to be adopted as an AB 1600-supported development impact fee.

BUSINESS USE PARK OPEN SPACE IMPACT FEE COMPONENT

Open Space Fees for Business Uses. Imagine a community without any (or very little) park or open space. There a small number of such communities in the greater Los Angeles area. All private development benefits from the acquisition of land that is never developed, and exists, at

a minimum, as a buffer from all other businesses. Schedule 9.4 identifies the cost for park land (as open space) for the business type land-uses. Again, the City owns 778.4 acres of park space which at a minimum acts as open space for all land uses. There are 10,271.8 acres of privately held developed land within the City's limits. As a result there is 0.0758 acres of park/open space for each developed privately held acre. The 0.0758 acres of open space per privately held acre is the recommended standard to be applied to the development of vacant parcels zoned for the business uses of commercial and resort lodging, commercial/office and industrial/manufacturing uses. The open space land acquisition cost will be limited to the $20.00 per square foot (or $871,200 per acre) acquisition cost only based upon the argument that business use benefit largely from the open space component and do not require the benefits of developed parks. The cost to acquire that 0.0578 acre of park land would be $16,605. Again the cost is limited to only open space land acquisition, but does not include the development component of that land as a park. That will fall to the developers of residentially zoned land that will generate park users (residents). Business acres benefit from the parks as open areas that make the City a desirable location for that business.

The $300,000 per acre of development will be divided by the varying units from the three differing types of business uses in Table 9-6. Schedule 4.5 is summarized in Table 4-9 on the following page.

Table 9-6
Cost Calculation for Business Uses

Residential Land Use	Units or S.F per Acre	Cost/Acre of Open Space	Cost per Keyed Room or Square Foot
Commercial Lodging Unit	36	$16,505	$458
Resort Lodging Unit	46	$16,505	$359
Commercial/Office Square Feet	17,300	$16,505	$0.954
Industrial Square Feet	21,390	$16,505	$0.772

Note: A lodging unit is defined as *keyed room*.

Land Acquisition Cost Adjustment Challenge. As mentioned previously, the use of $871,200/acre as the default park land acquisition cost is based upon the assumption that parks acreage would likely be close in proximity and thus similar in cost to residential land value of the private project the park is intended to serve. However, if the developer or contractor of a home can provide evidence (acceptable to the City), in the form of a recent purchase agreement or appraisal of the property they will be developing that the current land value is worth less than the $871,200/acre

(or a $20.00/square foot), the development impact fee could be adjusted accordingly by placing the actual cost of land acquisition into the Schedule 9.1 calculation. Again, if the City wishes to adopt such an adjustment, the terms under which the challenge may be made and proved should be included in the Development Impact Fee Ordinance. Similarly, if a development is closer to the beach area and land costs are higher, the City should be able to impose a park development impact fee consistent with the local land acquisition costs. Schedule 9.1 shows this calculation.

RECAP OF RECOMMENDED PARK LAND ACQUISITION AND PARK FACILITIES DEVELOPMENT IMPACT FEES.

- Schedule 9.1 contains the maximum Park Land Acquisition and Park Facilities Development Impact Fees to be imposed upon residential development based upon the facts presented in this Chapter for default or standard residential developments.

- Schedule 9.4 contains the maximum Park/Open Space Land Acquisition Impact Fees to be imposed upon business development based upon the facts presented in this Chapter.

CHAPTER ENDNOTES

1. Adoption of a Quimby Act fee requires a Park "plan".

2. The figure has relevance for municipalities that have large tracts of land available for subdivisions in the thousands or more.

3. The Quimby Act does allow use of revenues raised by the adoption of a Quimby Act Park Impact Fee to be used for rehabilitation of existing parks.

4. California Government Code, Title 7, Division 2, Section 66477 (b).

5. Totaling the roughly 64.7 acres of park land acquisition and development that could be expected to be financed by imposing the proposed development impact fees over General Plan build-out.

6. Mini parks are not included in the mix as they are very costly to construct on a per acre cost and generally are expensive maintenance factors. Mini parks are rarely planned for but generally occur as a result of a land donation or as the recognition of a historical site.

7. Community Use facilities are not included in the cost calculations and they have been removed and placed separately in Chapter 8.

8. Based upon the 1,006.58 acres of parkland available, less the 45.01 acre Weider County Regional Park and the 127.51 un-improved park acres of City Parks.

Schedule 9.1

City of Huntington Beach
2011–12 Development Impact Fee Calculation and Nexus Report
Park Quimby Fee for Dwellings on a Sub–divided Parcel, and;
AB1600 Fee for Dwelling on Non–subdivided Parcels

	Park Size	City Owned Parkland	Developed Parkland
Arevelos Park	2.58	0.00	2.58
Baca Park	14.35	14.35	14.35
Bailey Park	0.59	0.59	0.59
Banning/Magnolia Park	1.18	1.18	0.00
Bartlett Park	27.73	27.73	2.00
Bauer Park	2.04	2.04	2.04
Beach, City–owned	60.20	60.20	60.20
Beach, City–leased	90.62	0.00	90.62
Bluff Top Park	19.66	19.66	19.66
Bolsa View Park	2.70	2.70	2.70
Booster Park	0.85	0.85	0.85
Burke Park	2.50	2.50	2.50
Bushard Park	2.38	2.38	2.38
Carr Park	10.72	10.72	10.72
Circle View Park	2.31	0.00	2.31
Clegg–Stacey Park	2.80	0.00	2.80
College View Park	2.70	0.00	2.70
Conrad Park	2.71	2.71	2.71
City Gym/Pool Site	0.50	0.50	0.50
Davenport Beach	0.46	0.46	0.46
Discovery Well Park	6.60	6.60	6.60
Drew Park	2.28	2.28	2.28
Eader Park	2.68	2.68	2.68
Edison Community Park	39.69	26.97	39.69
Farquhar Park	3.52	3.52	3.52
Finley Park	0.56	0.56	0.56
Franklin Park	1.52	0.00	1.52
French Park	0.33	0.33	0.33
Gibbs Park	6.83	6.83	6.83
Gisler Park	11.67	1.17	11.67
Glen View Park	3.02	0.00	3.02
Golden View Park	2.81	0.00	2.81
Green Park	4.04	4.04	4.04
Greer Park	10.44	10.44	10.44
Harbour View Park	4.02	0.00	4.02
Haven View Park	2.95	0.00	2.95
Hawes Park	2.68	0.00	2.68
Helme Park	2.02	2.02	2.02
Hope View Park	3.61	0.00	3.61
Humbolt Beach Park	0.48	0.48	0.48
Huntington Central Park	343.24	343.24	253.24
Irby Park	10.91	10.91	2.91

Schedule 9.1

City of Huntington Beach
2011-12 Development Impact Fee Calculation and Nexus Report
Park Quimby Fee for Dwellings on a Sub-divided Parcel, and;
AB1600 Fee for Dwelling on Non-subdivided Parcels

	Park Size	City Owned Parkland	Developed Parkland
Lake Park	4.75	0.00	4.75
Lake View Park	2.16	2.16	2.16
Lamb Park	2.60	2.60	0.00
Lambert Park	3.50	3.50	3.50
Langenbeck Park	17.02	9.24	17.02
Lark View Park	3.65	0.00	3.65
LeBard Park	4.99	3.01	4.99
Manning Park	2.46	2.46	2.46
Marina Park	9.34	9.34	9.34
Marine View Park	2.96	0.00	2.96
McCallen Park	5.84	5.84	5.84
Meadowlark Golf Course	98.00	98.00	98.00
Moffett Park	2.38	2.38	2.38
Murdy Park	16.04	16.04	16.04
Newland Park	2.94	2.94	2.94
Oak View Center Park	1.31	0.00	1.31
Weider Regional (County-owned)	45.01	0.00	23.01
Pattinson Park	3.51	3.51	3.51
Perry Park	1.88	1.88	1.88
Pleasant View Park	2.17	0.00	2.17
Prince Park	0.22	0.22	0.22
Robinwood Park	1.41	0.00	1.41
Rodgers Senior Center Site	2.01	2.01	2.01
Schroeder Park	2.37	0.00	2.37
Seabridge Park	3.91	3.91	3.91
Seeley Park	3.37	3.37	3.37
Sowers Park	2.65	2.65	2.65
Sun View Park	2.45	0.00	2.45
Talbert Park	5.44	5.44	5.44
Tarbox Park	0.44	0.44	0.44
Terry Park	4.81	4.81	4.81
Triangle Park	1.11	1.11	1.11
Trinidad Park	0.75	0.75	0.75
Wardlow Park	8.36	8.36	8.36
Wieder Park	4.80	4.80	4.80
Worthy Community Park	7.00	7.00	7.00
Total Acres (Owned/Developed)	999.09	778.41	849.58
Current Population	190,377	190,377	190,377
Population/1,000	190.38	190.38	190.38
Current Standard	5.248	4.089	4.463

Schedule 9.1

City of Huntington Beach
2011–12 Development Impact Fee Calculation and Nexus Report
Park Quimby Fee for Dwellings on a Sub–divided Parcel, and;
AB1600 Fee for Dwelling on Non–subdivided Parcels

	Park Size	City Owned Parkland	Developed Parkland	
Acres/1,000 Population Standard	5.248	4.089	4.463	
Quimby Maximum Allowable	5.000	4.089	4.463	
Acquisition Cost per Acre (1)		$871,200		
Construction Cost per Acre (2)			$508,644	
Cost X Standard		$3,562,337	$2,270,078	Total Fee
Population Served by Standard		1,000.0	1,000.0	Per Person
Cost per Resident		$3,562.34	$2,270.08	$5,832.42

	Occupants/ Dwelling	Land Acquistion	Park Development	Land and Development
Detached Dwelling Units	2.913	$10,377	$6,613	$16,990
Attached Dwelling Units	2.257	$8,040	$5,124	$13,164
Mobile Home Dwelling Units	1.822	$6,491	$4,136	$10,627

1. Current estimate of $20.00 per acre acquisition cost for land consistent with park use.
2. See Schedule 9.3 for typical park amenity construction cost details.

Schedule 9.2

City of Huntington Beach
Park Site Inventory Improvement Cost
Residential Park Development Impact Fee
Calculation of Average Park Acre Construction Cost

	Park Size	Average Cost per Acre	Total Cost for Park
Prince Park	0.22	$223,441	$49,157
French Park	0.33	$223,441	$73,736
Tarbox Park	0.44	$223,441	$98,314
Davenport Beach	0.46	$223,441	$102,783
Humbolt Beach Park	0.48	$223,441	$107,252
City Gym/Pool Site	0.50	$223,441	$111,721
Finley Park	0.56	$223,441	$125,127
Bailey Park	0.59	$223,441	$131,830
Trinidad Park	0.75	$223,441	$167,581
Booster Park	0.85	$223,441	$189,925
Triangle Park	1.11	$223,441	$248,020
Banning/Magnolia Park	0.00	$223,441	$0
Oak View Center Park	1.31	$223,441	$292,708
Robinwood Park	1.41	$223,441	$315,052
Franklin Park	1.52	$223,441	$339,631
Perry Park	1.88	$223,441	$420,070
Rodgers Senior Center Site	2.01	$223,441	$449,117
Helme Park	2.02	$223,441	$451,351
Bauer Park	2.04	$223,441	$455,820
Lake View Park	2.16	$223,441	$482,633
Pleasant View Park	2.17	$223,441	$484,868
Drew Park	2.28	$223,441	$509,446
Circle View Park	2.31	$223,441	$516,149
Schroeder Park	2.37	$223,441	$529,556
Bushard Park	2.38	$223,441	$531,790
Moffett Park	2.38	$223,441	$531,790
Sun View Park	2.45	$223,441	$547,431
Manning Park	2.46	$223,441	$549,665
Burke Park	2.50	$223,441	$558,603
Arevelos Park	2.58	$223,441	$576,478
Lamb Park	0.00	$223,441	$0
Sowers Park	2.65	$223,441	$592,119
Eader Park	2.68	$223,441	$598,823
Hawes Park	2.68	$223,441	$598,823
Bolsa View Park	2.70	$223,441	$603,291
College View Park	2.70	$223,441	$603,291
Conrad Park	2.71	$223,441	$605,526
Clegg-Stacey Park	2.80	$223,441	$625,636
Golden View Park	2.81	$223,441	$627,870
Newland Park	2.94	$223,441	$656,917
Haven View Park	2.95	$223,441	$659,152
Marine View Park	2.96	$223,441	$661,386
Glen View Park	3.02	$223,441	$674,793
Seeley Park	3.37	$223,441	$752,997
Lambert Park	3.50	$223,441	$782,044

Schedule 9.2

City of Huntington Beach
Park Site Inventory Improvement Cost
Residential Park Development Impact Fee
Calculation of Average Park Acre Construction Cost

	Park Size	Average Cost per Acre	Total Cost for Park
Pattinson Park	3.51	$223,441	$784,279
Farquhar Park	3.52	$223,441	$786,513
Hope View Park	3.61	$223,441	$806,623
Lark View Park	3.65	$223,441	$815,561
Seabridge Park	3.91	$223,441	$873,655
Harbour View Park	4.02	$223,441	$898,234
Green Park	4.04	$223,441	$902,703
Lake Park	4.75	$223,441	$1,061,346
Wieder Park	4.80	$223,441	$1,072,518
Terry Park	4.81	$223,441	$1,074,752
LeBard Park	4.99	$223,441	$1,114,972
Talbert Park	5.44	$223,441	$1,215,520
McCallen Park	5.84	$223,441	$1,304,897
Discovery Well Park	6.60	$223,441	$1,474,712
Gibbs Park	6.83	$223,441	$1,526,104
Wardlow Park	8.36	$223,441	$1,867,969
Marina Park	9.34	$223,441	$2,086,941
Meadowlark Golf Course	98.00	$223,441	$21,897,243
Carr Park	10.72	$289,296	$3,101,256
Irby Park	2.91	$289,296	$841,852
Gisler Park	11.67	$289,296	$3,376,088
Baca Park	14.35	$289,296	$4,151,402
Langenbeck Park	17.02	$289,296	$4,923,823
Bluff Top Park	19.66	$289,296	$5,687,565
Bartlett Park	2.00	$289,296	$578,593
Beach, City-leased	90.62	$289,296	$26,216,029
Beach, City-owned	60.20	$289,296	$17,415,636
Worthy Park	7.00	$394,884	$2,764,185
Greer park	10.44	$394,884	$4,122,584
Murdy Park	16.04	$394,884	$6,333,932
Edison Park	47.18	$394,884	$18,630,607
Huntington Central Park	253.24	$394,884	$100,000,314
Total	834.06		$258,698,680
Total Park Acres			834.06
Average Construction Cost/Acre			$310,168
Community Input, Design, Engineering			115.00%
Sub-total Park Construction Cost			$356,693
Project Administation, Soils<Materials Testing, etc.			124.00%
Sub-total Park Construction Cost			$442,299
Contingency			115.00%
Total Park Construction Cost			$508,644

Schedule 9.3
City of Huntington Beach
Development Impact Fee Calculation Report
Park Improvement Cost Estimates, by Type of Park

	Unit Cost, Installed		5 Acre Neighborhood		20 Acre Community Park	
Pub Imps, Road/curb, gutter, etc.	$200	Linear Foot	1,040	$208,000	2,704	$540,800
Lg Pk Grading/Irrigation/Turf	$37,500	Acre	0	$0	15	$562,500
Sm Pk Grading/Irrigation/Turf	$42,750	Acre	5	$213,750	0	$0
Plant Material:						
Trees-5, 24 gallon box/acre	$149	Each	60	$8,940	225	$33,525
Trees-15, 15 gallon/acre	$290	Each	30	$8,700	75	$21,750
Shrubs-10, five gallon	$30	Each	40	$1,200	150	$4,500
Shrubs-30, one gallon	$8	Each	120	$960	450	$3,600
Play apparatus						
Curbing, 450' per large	$41.30	Linear Foot	0	$0	450	$18,585
Curbing, 225' per small	$41.30	Linear Foot	225	$9,293	225	$9,293
Play equipment - large	$123,750	Lot	0	$0	1	$123,750
Play equipment - medium	$99,000	Lot	1	$99,000	0	$0
Play equipment - small	$67,500	Lot	0	$0	2	$135,000
Sand/Other Surfacing	$5,775	Lot	1	$5,775	3	$17,325
Buildings:						
Restroom - Small	$132,000	Each	1	$132,000	1	$132,000
Restroom - Large	$181,500	Each	0	$0	1	$181,500
Equipment storage facility	$99,000	Each	0	$0	0	$0
Combined Restroom/Concession	$297,000	Each	0	$0	1	$297,000
Parking Lot						
4" A.C. W/6" Rock base	$8.30	Square foot	12,000	$99,600	40,000	$332,000
V-gutter	$13.20	Linear Foot	300	$3,960	800	$10,560
Drain Inlet	$990	Each	1	$990	2	$1,980
Drain Inlet connector	$330	Each	1	$330	2	$660
Storm drain line	$19.80	Linear Foot	300	$5,940	200	$3,960
Drive approach	$2,970	Each	1	$2,970	4	$11,880
Perimeter curbing	$16.50	Linear Foot	490	$8,085	800	$13,200
Striping	$0.50	Linear Foot	400	$200	1,300	$650
Lighting	$2,970	Each	2	$5,940	18	$53,460
Lot signage	$330	Lot	1	$330	3	$990
Entrance	$4,950	Lot	1	$4,950	3	$14,850
Curb and Gutter	$15.27	Linear Foot	3,780	$57,721	3,232	$49,353
Storm Drainage Facilities						
Inlets	$1,320	Each	2	$2,640	4	$5,280
Connections	$2,145	Each	2	$4,290	4	$8,580
Lateral (to arterial)	$82.50	Linear Foot	45	$3,713	80	$6,600
Sewer Facilities						
Connection to arterial	$4,125	Lot	1	$4,125	1	$4,125
Line in street	$107.30	Linear Foot	29	$3,112	80	$8,584
Line in park	$24.80	Linear Foot	125	$3,100	1,500	$37,200

Schedule 9.3
City of Huntington Beach
Development Impact Fee Calculation Report
Park Improvement Cost Estimates, by Type of Park

	Unit Cost, Installed		5 Acre Neighborhood		20 Acre Community Park	
Fire Hydrant	$4,950	Each	1	$4,950	6	$29,700
Street Lights						
Standards	$2,475	Each	3	$7,425	20	$49,500
Duct work/wiring	$1,568	Each	3	$4,704	12	$18,816
Water Facilities						
3″ metered service	$4,125	Each	1	$4,125	1	$4,125
Backflow device	$4,125	Each	1	$4,125	1	$4,125
Line in street	$19.80	Linear Foot	1,320	$26,136	120	$2,376
Water fountains	$1,155	Each	1	$1,155	8	$9,240
Fountain lines in park	$19.80	Linear Foot	200	$3,960	1,000	$19,800
Benches/Tables						
Tables, cement pads	$2,475	Each	4	$9,900	60	$148,500
Individual grills	$825	Each	2	$1,650	30	$24,750
Benches, cement pads	$908	Each	4	$3,632	30	$27,240
Bleachers	$5,775	Each	0	$0	0	$0
Large Covered Picnic Area (lot)	$123,750	Each	0	$0	2	$247,500
Individual Covered Picnic Pad	$24,750	Each	1	$24,750	10	$247,500
User Electrical Service park	$16,500	Each	0	$0	1	$16,500
Electrical Service per Area	$2,063	Each	1	$2,063	6	$12,378
Game Courts				$0		$0
Basketball Courts	$66,000	Each	1.0	$66,000	1	$66,000
Basketball Court Lighting	$57,750	Each	0	$0	0	$0
Fenced Tennis Courts	$99,000	Each	0	$0	2	$198,000
Tennis Court Lighting	$57,750	Each	0	$0	0	$0
Baseball Field – Competitive	$82,500	Each	0	$0	0	$0
Ballfield Lighting	$412,500	Per two fields	0	$0	0	$0
Baseball Field – Recreational	$24,750	Each	1	$24,750	6	$148,500
Pedestrian Walkway						
5' Wide	$22.28	Linear Foot	500	$11,140	2,000	$44,560
6' Wide	$28.88	Linear Foot	100	$2,888	500	$14,440
9' Wide	$37.13	Linear Foot	100	$3,713	500	$18,565
Miscellaneous Flatwork	$6.20	Linear Foot	500	$3,100	8,500	$52,700
Small Park Signage	$4,538	Lot	1	$4,538	0	$0
Large Park Signage	$24,750	Lot	0	$0	1	$24,750
Bike Rack/Pad	$2,890	Each	1	$2,890	6	$17,340
Natural Element Improvement (Lake, e	$825,000	Each	0	$0	0	$0
Small Concrete Stage	$41,250	Each	0	$0	0	$0
Small Ampitheater stage only, graded	$82,500	Each	0	$0	0	$0
Large Ampitheater with bowl	$247,500	Each	0	$0	1	$247,500
	Total Cost			1,117,206		$4,339,444
	Total Acres			5		15
	Average Cost per Acre			$223,441		$289,296

Schedule 9.3
City of Huntington Beach
Development Impact Fee Calculation Report
Park Improvement Cost Estimates, by Type of Park

	Unit Cost, Installed		20 Acre Sports Park	
Pub Imps, Road/curb, gutter, etc.	$200	Linear Foot	2,704	$540,800
Lg Pk Grading/Irrigation/Turf	$37,500	Acre	20	$750,000
Sm Pk Grading/Irrigation/Turf	$42,750	Acre	0	$0
Plant Material:				
Trees-5, 24 gallon box/acre	$149	Each	150	$22,350
Trees-15, 15 gallon/acre	$290	Each	50	$14,500
Shrubs-10, five gallon	$30	Each	100	$3,000
Shrubs-30, one gallon	$8	Each	300	$2,400
Play apparatus				
Curbing, 450' per large	$41.30	Linear Foot	450	$18,585
Curbing, 225' per small	$41.30	Linear Foot	225	$9,293
Play equipment - large	$123,750	Lot	0	$0
Play equipment - medium	$99,000	Lot	1	$99,000
Play equipment - small	$67,500	Lot	2	$135,000
Sand/Other Surfacing	$5,775	Lot	3	$17,325
Buildings:				
Restroom - Small	$132,000	Each	1	$132,000
Restroom - Large	$181,500	Each	1	$181,500
Equipment storage facility	$99,000	Each	1	$99,000
Combined Restroom/Concession	$297,000	Each	2	$594,000
Parking Lot				
4" A.C. W/6" Rock base	$8.30	Square foot	40,000	$332,000
V-gutter	$13.20	Linear Foot	800	$10,560
Drain Inlet	$990	Each	2	$1,980
Drain Inlet connector	$330	Each	2	$660
Storm drain line	$19.80	Linear Foot	200	$3,960
Drive approach	$2,970	Each	4	$11,880
Perimeter curbing	$16.50	Linear Foot	800	$13,200
Striping	$0.50	Linear Foot	1,300	$650
Lighting	$2,970	Each	18	$53,460
Lot signage	$330	Lot	3	$990
Entrance	$4,950	Lot	3	$14,850
Curb and Gutter	$15.27	Linear Foot	1,664	$25,409
Storm Drainage Facilities				
Inlets	$1,320	Each	4	$5,280
Connections	$2,145	Each	4	$8,580
Lateral (to arterial)	$82.50	Linear Foot	80	$6,600
Sewer Facilities				
Connection to arterial	$4,125	Lot	1	$4,125
Line in street	$107.30	Linear Foot	80	$8,584
Line in park	$24.80	Linear Foot	1,500	$37,200

Schedule 9.3
City of Huntington Beach
Development Impact Fee Calculation Report
Park Improvement Cost Estimates, by Type of Park

	Unit Cost, Installed		20 Acre Sports Park	
Fire Hydrant	$4,950	Each	1	$4,950
Street Lights				
Standards	$2,475	Each	20	$49,500
Duct work/wiring	$1,568	Each	5	$7,840
Water Facilities				
3″ metered service	$4,125	Each	1	$4,125
Backflow device	$4,125	Each	1	$4,125
Line in street	$19.80	Linear Foot	120	$2,376
Water fountains	$1,155	Each	8	$9,240
Fountain lines in park	$19.80	Linear Foot	1,000	$19,800
Benches/Tables				
Tables, cement pads	$2,475	Each	30	$74,250
Individual grills	$825	Each	10	$8,250
Benches, cement pads	$908	Each	15	$13,620
Bleachers	$5,775	Each	8	$46,200
Large Covered Picnic Area (lot)	$123,750	Each	0	$0
Individual Covered Picnic Pad	$24,750	Each	4	$99,000
User Electrical Service park	$16,500	Each	1	$16,500
Electrical Service per Area	$2,063	Each	4	$8,252
Game Courts				$0
Basketball Courts	$66,000	Each	3	$198,000
Basketball Court Lighting	$57,750	Each	8	$462,000
Fenced Tennis Courts	$99,000	Each	8	$792,000
Tennis Court Lighting	$57,750	Each	8	$462,000
Baseball Field – Competitive	$82,500	Each	8	$660,000
Ballfield Lighting	$412,500	Per two fields	4	$1,650,000
Baseball Field – Recreational	$24,750	Each	0	$0
Pedestrian Walkway				
5' Wide	$22.28	Linear Foot	1,000	$22,280
6' Wide	$28.88	Linear Foot	250	$7,220
9' Wide	$37.13	Linear Foot	250	$9,283
Miscellaneous Flatwork	$6.20	Linear Foot	4,000	$24,800
Small Park Signage	$4,538	Lot	0	$0
Large Park Signage	$24,750	Lot	1	$24,750
Bike Rack/Pad	$2,890	Each	6	$17,340
Natural Element Improvement (Lake, e	$825,000	Each	0	$0
Small Concrete Stage	$41,250	Each	1	$41,250
Small Ampitheater stage only, graded	$82,500	Each	0	$0
Large Ampitheater with bowl	$247,500	Each	0	$0
	Total Cost			$7,897,671
	Total Acres			20.00
	Average Cost per Acre			$394,884

Schedule 9.4

City of Huntington Beach
2011–12 Development Impact Fee Calculation and Nexus Report
Open Space Land Acquisition for Business Uses
Land Acquisition Development Impact Fee Calculation

Total City–owned Park/Open Space Acres	778.4
Current City–wide Privately Developed Acres	10,271.8
Current Open Space Standard per Developed Acre	0.0758
Acres/Developed Acre Standard	0.0758
Acquisition Cost per Acre	$871,200
Cost X Open Space Standard	$16,509

	Units/SF per Acre	Open Space Acquisition	
Commercial Lodging Keyed Units	36	$459	per Keyed Unit
Resort Lodging Keyed Units	46	$359	per Keyed Unit
Commercial Acres (in Square Feet)	17,300	$0.954	per Square Foot
Industrial Uses (in Square Feet)	21,390	$0.772	per Square Foot

APPENDIX A

Expanded Land-use Database

City of Huntington Beach Total – Land Use Database	Developed		Net Increase		Total	
	Acres	# of Units	Acres	# of Units	Acres	# of Units
Detached Dwelling Units (1)	6,436.0	38,616	295.00	1,749	6,731.00	40,365
Attached Dwelling Units	1,805.4	36,108	111.20	5,307	1,916.60	41,415
Mobile Home Dwelling Units (2)	204.6	2,865	1.00	9	205.60	2,874
Hotel/Motel Lodging Units	33.4	1,070	18.60	818	52.00	1,888
Resort Lodging Units	20.2	809	9.30	535	29.50	1,344
Commercial/Office Uses	841.9	12,836,000	39.80	2,417,000	881.70	15,253,000
Industrial/Manufacturing Uses	930.3	20,261,000	187.00	3,638,000	1,117.30	23,899,000
Total – City Limits	10,271.8	-----	661.90	-----	10,933.70	-----
Private Residences	8,446.0	77,589	407.2	7,065	8,853.2	84,654
Commercial Lodging Rooms	53.6	1,879	27.9	1,353	81.5	3,232
Business Square Feet	1,772.2	33,097,000	226.8	6,055,000	1,999.0	39,152,000

Existing Community as Currrently Developed	Developed		To Be Developed		Total	
	Acres	# of Units	Acres	# of Units	Acres	# of Units
Detached Dwelling Units (1)	6,436.0	38,616	34.0	183	6,470.00	38,799
Attached Dwelling Units	1,805.4	36,108	15.0	159	1,820.40	36,267
Mobile Home Dwelling Units (2)	204.6	2,865	1.0	9	205.60	2,874
Hotel/Motel Lodging Units	33.4	1,070	0.0	0	33.40	1,070
Resort Lodging Units	20.2	809	3.4	300	23.60	1,109
Commercial/Office Uses	841.9	12,836,000	4.5	69,200	846.40	12,905,200
Industrial/Manufacturing Uses	930.3	20,261,000	44.0	958,320	974.30	21,219,320
Existing Community	10,271.8	-----	101.90	-----	10,373.70	-----

Additional Units from Intensification of Existing Uses	Developed		Intensified/Redeveloped		Total	
	Acres	# of Units	Acres	# of Units	Acres	# of Units
Detached Dwelling Units (1)	0.0	0	261.0	1,566	261.00	1,566
Attached Dwelling Units	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.00	0
Mobile Home Dwelling Units (2)	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.00	0
Hotel/Motel Lodging Units	0.0	0	14.6	468	14.60	468
Resort Lodging Units	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.00	0
Commercial/Office Uses	0.0	0	106.2	2,313,817	106.20	2,313,817
Industrial/Manufacturing Uses	0.0	0	143.0	2,679,680	143.00	2,679,680
Redeveloped	0.0	-----	524.80	-----	524.80	-----

Specific Plan A Beach and Edinger	Developed		Intensified/Redeveloped		Total	
	Acres	# of Units	Acres	# of Units	Acres	# of Units
Detached Dwelling Units (1)	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.00	0
Attached Dwelling Units	0.0	0	80.0	4,500	80.00	4,500
Mobile Home Dwelling Units (2)	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.00	0
Hotel/Motel Lodging Units	0.0	0	4.0	350	4.00	350
Resort Lodging Units	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.00	0
Commercial/Office Uses	0.0	0	37.0	850,400	37.00	115 850,400
Industrial/Manufacturing Uses	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.00	0
Sub-total Specific Plan A	0.0	-----	121.00	-----	121.00	-----

Specific Plan B Downtown	Developed		Intensified/Redeveloped		Total	
	Acres	# of Units	Acres (3)	# of Units	Acres	# of Units
Detached Dwelling Units (1)	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.00	0
Attached Dwelling Units	0.0	0	16.2	648	16.20	648
Mobile Home Dwelling Units (2)	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.00	0
Hotel/Motel Lodging Units	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.00	0
Resort Lodging Units	0.0	0	5.9	235	5.90	235
Commercial/Office Uses	0.0	0	13.1	398,583	13.10	398,583
Industrial/Manufacturing Uses	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.00	0
Sub-total Specific Plan B	0.0	-----	35.20	-----	35.20	-----

Specific Plan A Removal	Developed		Intensified/Redeveloped		Total	
	Acres	# of Units	Acres	# of Units	Acres	# of Units
Detached Dwelling Units (1)	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.00	0
Attached Dwelling Units	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.00	0
Mobile Home Dwelling Units (2)	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.00	0
Hotel/Motel Lodging Units	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.00	0
Resort Lodging Units	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.00	0
Commercial/Office Uses	0.0	0	(121.0)	(1,215,000)	(121.00)	(1,215,000)
Industrial/Manufacturing Uses	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.00	0
Sub-total Specific Plan A	0.0	-----	(121.00)	-----	(121.00)	-----

NOTES:

(1). Only 34 of the 295 acres are vacant lots. The remaining 261 acres represents acres for the addition of 1,566 detached dwelling units in areas already developed such as a lot split of a larger parcel parcel with an existing detached dwelling units.

(2). The inclusion of one acre of Mobile (or modular) Home Dwelling Units (in parks) is to establish such a fee and does not imply that that the City anticipates such a private proposal.

(3). The 35.2 acres is not intended to suggest there is 35.2 acres of vacant acres in the downtown area. The 35.2 acres is the result of anticipating 648 additional units at roughly 40 units per acre.

APPENDIX B

Summary of Recommended Impact Fees

SUMMARY OF DEVELOPMENT IMPACT FEE SCHEDULE RECOMMENDATIONS

Chapter 3 - Law Enforcement Facilities and Equipment

- Adopt Schedule 3.2, page 38, General Plan Build-out Need-based Development Impact Fees.

Chapter 4 - Fire Facilities, Vehicles and Equipment

- Adopt Schedule 4.3, page 53, Community Financial Commitment-based Development Impact Fees.

Chapter 5 - Circulation (Streets, Signals and Bridges) System

- Adopt Schedule 5.2, page 68, General Plan Build-out Need-based Development Impact Fees along with the per Trip-mile rate for application to Table 5-4 (page 64) or for staff calculation per the Table on the bottom of Schedule 5.2.

Chapter 6 - Storm Drainage Collection System

- Adopt Schedule 6.2, page 80, General Plan Build-out Need-based Development Impact Fees for the seven specific land uses and the "per acre" cost for unusual uses not involving a structure.

Chapter 7 - Public Library and Collection

- Adopt Schedule 7.1, page 88.
- Formalize a General Plan square foot and collection item per resident standard.

Chapter 8 - Community Use Facilities

- Adopt Schedule 8.1 page 94, (Current Standard).
- Formalize a General Plan square foot per resident standard.

Chapter 9- Park (and Open Space) Land Acquisition and Park Land Development

- Create Quimby Act Park Land Acquisition and Development Impact Fee Fund, Note (1).
- Adopt Schedule 9.1, page 104-106, for residential uses requiring the subdivision of land for Quimby Act application.
- Create AB1600 Park Land Acquisition and Development Impact Fee Fund, Note (1)
- Adopt Schedule 9.1 page 104-106, for residential uses not requiring the subdivision of land for AB1600 application.
- Adopt Schedule 9.4, page 113, for business uses for application to business use development.
- Adopt alternative process for residential developments with significantly varying land values from the *standard* or *default* calculation embodied in Schedule 9.1 and 9.4.

(1). Separate Park Land Acquisition and Development Funds are necessary because the Quimby Act allows use of receipts for rehabilitation of existing facilities whereas theAB1600 requirements prevent such expenditures.

APPENDIX C

Master Facilities Plan

(See Separate Document)

End of Document

Master Facilities Plan for the City of Huntington Beach, California

October, 2011

Copyright, 2009, 2010 & 2011 by Revenue & Cost Specialists, L.L.C.

All rights reserved. No part of this work covered by the copyright hereon may be reproduced or copied in any form or by any means -- graphic, electronic, mechanical, including any photocopying, recording, taping or taping or information storage and retrieval systems without written permission of:

Revenue & Cost Specialists, L.L.C.
1519 East Chapman Avenue, Suite C
Fullerton, CA 92831
(714) 992-9020

Revenue & Cost Specialists, LLC

Serving Local Governments Since 1975

October 17, 2011

Honorable Mayor and City Council
Via Mr. Fred Wilson, City Manager
City of Huntington Beach - City Hall
2000 Main Street
Huntington Beach, CA 92648

RE: ***City of Huntington Beach Master Facilities Plan***

Honorable Mayor, City Council, and City Manager Wilson,

The following Document, the proposed Master Facilities Plan (MFP) is hereby submitted for City Council review and consideration. The proposed MFP is the result of many hours of work between City staff and Revenue & Cost Specialists, L.L.C. staff. This document represents a long-range program of identification and recognition of the entirety of infrastructure and physical needs necessary to meet the service demands of an ever-growing residential population and business community. The information included in this proposed MFP identifies capital needs throughout the community and is primarily based on the numerous elements of the Huntington Beach Comprehensive General Plan, it's many elements, Master Plans and other official documents.

The City's five-year Capital Improvement Plan and the proposed development impact fees will be a function of the entire list of proposed projects listed in this document. Stated in a slightly different way, the list of projects contained herein needs to be agreed to by the City Council in order to increase the validity of both of the two above mentioned documents.

This Master Facilities Plan contains the following:

- A Table of Contents
- A Guide to the Master Facilities Plan
- A Project Summary schedule
- A section containing all *Law Enforcement* capital needs
- A section containing all of the *Fire Suppression/Medic* capital needs
- A section containing all of the *Streets, Bridges and Signals* projects
- A section containing all of the *Storm Drainage System* improvements
- A section containing the future *Public Library and Collection* expansion needs.

Internet: www.revenuecost.com
Voice 714.992.9020 1519 E. Chapman Avenue • Suite C • Fullerton, CA 92831 Fax 714.992.9021

- A section containing all of the *Community Use Facilities* projects.
- A section containing all of the *Park Land Acquisition and Development of Recreation Facilities* projects.

In addition to the efforts of Bob Hall, Deputy City Manager in coordinating the flow of information, the following staff were instrumental in identifying the required projects:

M. Todd Broussard, P.E.- Principal Civil Engineer (Storm Drainage)
David C. Dominguez - Facilities Development and Concessions Manager
Eric G. Enberg - Division Chief/Fire Operations
Jim B. Engle Community Services Director
Kevin Justen,- Senior Administrative Analyst - Fire
Tung M. Kao - Info Systems Specialist
Darrin Maresh, Fire Development Specialist
Tony Olmos - City Engineer
Jerry Thompson - General Services Manager
Bill Reardon - Fire Marshall/Division Chief
Dan Richards - Customer Support/GIS Manager
Bob Stachelski - Transportation Manager
Chuck Thomas - Police Captain
Jerry Thompson - General Services Manager
Bob Wingenroth - Director of Finance

RCS appreciates the efforts of the listed staff and any others whose efforts RCS may have been unaware of for their assistance in generating the information provided within this Master Facilities Plan, and we look forward to meeting with the City Council in order to implement and achieve maximum use this comprehensive report.

Sincerely,

SCOTT THORPE
Vice President

City of Huntington Beach
Master Facilities Plan
Table of Contents

Guide to Master Facilities Plan	i–vi
Master Facilities Plan Cost Summary – All Projects	1
Law Enforcement Facilities, Vehicles and Equipment	**4**
Law Enforcement Facilities, Vehicles and Equipment Cost Summary	5
LE–001 Additional Law Enforcement Facility Space	6
LE–002 Acquire Additional Response Vehicles	7
LE–003 Acquire Additional Sworn Office Issued Equipment	8
LE–004 Acquire Law Enforcement Specialty Equipment	9
Fire Suppression/Medic Facilities, Vehicles and Equipment	**10**
Fire Suppression/Medic Facilities, Vehicles and Equipment Cost Summary	11
FS–001 Relocate Station #8 (Heil)	12
FS–002 Construct Station #8 (Heil) Apparatus Storage Facility	13
FS–003 Construct a Single Bay/Quarters at Station #4 (Magnolia)	14
FS–004 Acquire an Engine Company and Ambulance for Station #4 (Magnolia	15
FS–005 Acquire an Engine Company for Station #1 (Gothard)	16
FS–006 Acquire an Engine Company for Station #2 (Murdy)	17
Circulation (Streets, Bridges and Signals) System	**18**
Circulation (Streets, Bridges and Signals) System Cost Summary	19
ST–001 Beach Boulevard and Edinger Avenue	21
ST–002 Beach Boulevard and Heil Avenue	22
ST–003 Beach Boulevard and Warner Avenue	23
ST–004 Beach Boulevard and Slater Avenue	24
ST–005 Beach Boulevard and Talbert Avenue	25
ST–006 Beach Boulevard and Garfield Avenue	26
ST–007 Beach Boulevard and Yorktown Avenue	27
ST–008 Pacific Coast Highway and Warner Avenue	28
ST–009 Pacific Coast Highway and Goldenwest Street	29
ST–010 Pacific Coast Highway and Brookhurst Street	30
ST–011 Goldenwest Street and Bolsa Avenue	31
ST–012 Goldenwest Street and Slater Avenue	32
ST–013 Newland Street and Talbert Avenue	33
ST–014 Newland Street and Warner Avenue	34
ST–015 Newland Street and Yorktown Avenue	35
ST–016 Gothard Street and Slater Avenue	36
ST–017 Gothard Street and Talbert Avenue	37

City of Huntington Beach
Master Facilities Plan
Table of Contents

ST-018	Ward Street and Garfield Avenue	38
ST-019	Brookhurst Street and Adams Avenue	39
ST-020	Miscellaneous Traffic Signals/Intersection Improvements	40
ST-021	Public Works Maintenance Building	41
ST-022	Public Works Maintenance Vehicles	42
	Storm Drainage Collection System	**43**
Storm Drainage Collection System Cost Summary		44
SD-001	Santa Ana River & Talbert Channel Region (SD Region #1)	45
SD-002	Coastal and Bolsa Chica Wetlands Region (SD Region #2)	46
SD-003	Slater Channel Region (SD Region #3)	47
SD-004	Wintersburg Channel Region (SD Region #4)	48
SD-005	Bolsa Chica Channel & Harbour Region (SD Region #5)	49
SD-006	Public Works Maintenance Building	50
	Public Library Facilities and Collection	**51**
Public Library Facilities and Collection Cost Summary		52
PL-001	Expand Banning Library	53
PL-002	Expand Main Street Library	54
PL-003	Expand Library Collection Items	55
	Community Use Facilities	**56**
Community Use Facilities Cost Summary		57
CF-001	Central Park Senior Center	58
CF-002	Edison Community Center Gymnasium	59
CF-003	Murdy Community Center Gymnasium	60
CF-004	Oak View Recreation Center Expansion	61
	Park Land Acquisition and Park Facilities Development	**62**
Park Land Acquisition and Park Facilities Development Cost Summary		63
PK-001	Bartlett Park Conceptual Plan and EIR	65
PK-002	Irby Park Phase II	66
PK-003	Central Park Former Gun Range EIR, RAP and Development	67
PK-004	Le Bard Park Expansion Master Plan and Development plan	68
PK-005	Blufftop Park Trail Improvements	69
PK-006	Edinger Dock Development	70
PK-007	Wardlow Field Reconfiguration Design/Construction	71
PK-008	City-Wide Parks Master Plan	72

City of Huntington Beach
Master Facilities Plan
Table of Contents

PK-009	Central Park Habitat Plan	73
PK-010	Central Park Acquisiton of Encyclopedia Lots	74
PK-011	Central Park Development of Remaining 86 Acres	75
PK-012	Central Park Rebuild Two Restaurant Facilities	76
PK-013	General Youth Sports Facilities Grants	77
PK-014	Murdy Youth Sports Complex Phase II	78
PK-015	Beach Playground	79
PK-016	Central Park Development of Former Gun Range	80
PK-017	Warner Dock Renovation and Expansion	81
PK-018	Lamb Park Design and Development	82
PK-019	Central Park Sports Complex Team Room	83
PK-020	Future Parks Acquisition (Possible Closed School Sites)	84

CITY OF HUNTINGTON BEACH

GUIDE TO THE MASTER FACILITIES PLAN

The *Master Facilities Plan* is a compilation of projects identified by City staff as being needed for the City of Huntington Beach through theoretical General Plan build-out of the City. The Plan is based on input from City staff, recommended projects contained in the City's several Master Plans for infrastructure and an occasional recommendation from RCS staff.

The *Master Facilities Plan* generally provides for three major types of projects. The first group of projects provides for the maintenance, repair and rehabilitation of the City's varied infrastructure, including its streets, storm drains and other public facilities. These projects represent a very small portion of the needed replacement of the City's fixed assets identified at more than $1.435 million of depreciable fixed assets which are being consumed, conservatively, at an annual rate of just over $19.1 million, (assuming a conservative 75 year infrastructure lifetime). The $1.435 billion figure excludes owned park land, not subject to depreciation, at $678.2 million. The following table indicates the replacement values of the various infrastructure owned by the City.

Table MFP-1
Replacement Value of Existing Infrastructure

Infrastructure	Replacement Value
Law Enforcement	$71,246,699
Fire Suppression/Medic	$61,234,227
Circulation System (1)	$533,539,375
Storm Drainage System (1)	$203,631,313
Library Space/Collection	$76,593,112
Community Use Centers	$56,649,600
Park Improvements	$432,133,770
Total	$1,435,028,096

(1) Does not include millions of dollars owned in land right-of-way and Excludes "local" facilities, those limited to neighborhood facilities.

The second group of projects are needed to serve future development and include such projects as widening of streets, creation of additional parkland or construction of a new fire station. These projects are proposed to be funded through the development impact fees recommended in the companion to this document called *Development Impact Fee Calculation and Nexus Report for City of Huntington Beach*.

The last group of projects are proposed to enhance the quality of life for all City residents and spur economic growth in the community. These projects include the construction of a community centers, libraries and parks that expand the existing level of service.

Goal of the *Master Facilities Plan.* The *Master Facilities Plan* is not intended to be the final word on capital improvement projects needed for the City, but rather a starting point for discussions between policy-makers (i.e., the City Council), City management staff and the public prior to the formulation of a Five- or Six-Year Capital Improvement Plan (CIP). The *Master Facilities Plan* begins the process of identifying **all** growth-related capital projects required to accommodate new City development through General Plan build-out. This document, as all capital improvement programs should be, is rooted in the philosophy that for the document to have any meaningful value to future residents and staff members, it must be constantly updated and revised as new legislation is adopted and as the environment and the City itself changes over the years.

In short, the *Master Facilities Plan* is intended as a fluid, not static, document. Thus, it is essential that periodic updates be performed to add new projects or delete completed or no longer needed projects.

The *Master Facilities Plan* represents the starting point for fulfillment of the following purposes:

Planning - The Plan implements the standards and goals contained in the City's General Plan when applicable and proposes improvement projects which are constructed and located in conformance with the General Plan.

Financial Planning - A Facilities Plan or CIP should consider the scheduling and availability of financing sources in order to achieve an orderly and comprehensive process. Individual project descriptions in this document detail the project's relationship to other recommended improvements and other scheduling constraints. This effort should always be a high priority of the City in order to insure that efforts between departments are coordinated and to avoid construction made more costly by duplication of construction efforts (i.e. a water pipe installed one year after a road is constructed).

A sound capital planning process can also help to rationally plan projects for the purposes of long-term financing. Taxpayers can accrue savings when capital financing is coordinated such that long-term financing can be sized and timed to achieve the lowest possible financing costs.

Budgeting - The following projects should provide the outline for preparation of the Five-Year Capital Improvement Plan in the future. The first year of the CIP then is incorporated into the City's Annual Budget. Note: the scope of services did not include the

identification of what year the projects will be needed therefore the project costs default to the last column.

Master Facilities Planning Process. The *Master Facilities Plan* represents an interdepartmental effort to identify needed projects through the theoretical point of build-out of the City. Management staff was then asked to allocate projects as a first step towards prioritizing all projects for the Plan. Criteria considered by the management team in evaluating projects included:

- Does the project generate operating savings or otherwise enhance the ability of the department to deliver services?
- Did the project reduce or eliminate safety or health hazards?
- Was the project needed to provide adequate levels of service to future residents or prevent deterioration of service to existing residents?
- Was the project recommended in any of the City's engineering or planning Master Plans, the Corporate Plan or any other adopted City document?
- Did the project have a significant positive effect on the community?

Funding Analysis. The following summary section of this Plan includes a projection of historical and potential revenue sources for the financing of the listed capital improvement projects. Development impact fee revenues were estimated based on the proposed rates recommended in the *Development Impact Fee Calculation and Nexus Report*. For the purposes of this Report it was assumed that development will occur evenly over the period of build-out for the City.

Other revenue sources were projected based on discussions with City staff, but are shown only for informational purposes. Given the magnitude of costs shown in this Report, RCS recommends that a more detailed financial strategy for construction of these improvements (i.e., a Capital Financing Plan) be conducted by the City within the immediate future. Such a document would seek to further identify and quantify potential financing sources for the City.

It should be noted that the *Master Facilities Plan* emphasizes the total capital needs of the City, in contrast to the more traditional Capital Improvement Program approach which places more of an emphasis on reducing total needs to only reasonably assured revenue sources. The process of further scheduling projects on a year-to-year basis should continue onward during the Capital Improvement Program process.

Organization of the *Master Facilities Plan*. The *Master Facilities Plan* is divided into eight major sections, according to the category of capital improvement. Each will ultimately be quantified as

a separate development impact fee in the companion document. The eight types of improvements are:

Law Enforcement Facilities, Vehicles and Equipment - These are projects needed for the City's Police Department, including expansion of the Police Station and acquisition of additional communication equipment and response vehicles.

Fire Suppression/Medic Facilities and Response Vehicles - This program includes facilities necessary to accommodate new development support with the existing level of service provided by the City's Fire Department. This section contains the need for one fire station relocation, expansion of second, construction of additional vehicle storage space and a number of additional response apparatus.

Circulation (streets, bridges and signals) System - These projects consists of future street additional traffic signals and intersection improvements.

Storm Drainage Collection System - These projects include the construction of new storm drain lines, channels and other facilities for the purposes of storm drainage.

Public Library Facilities and Collection - This program provides for the expansion of the City-owned library facilities. The project consists of the building expansion and expansion of the collection inventory.

Community Use Facilities - This project includes the construction of a community/recreation centers for classes, meetings and other general public uses.

Park Land Acquisition and Park Facilities Development - The acquisition and development of new parks, the construction of recreational facilities for the City and improvement of existing undeveloped parklands are accomplished through this program. It also includes open space acquisition.

At the beginning of each of these sections is a summary of projects in that category and proposed project cost. Next, is an individual project description for each project submitted, detailing the proposed scope of the project, the submitting department, justification and listing of related projects.

The table on the following page indicates the total project expenditures ($403,399,086) identified as necessary through build-out. Some of this amount, about $22.3 million would be financed by other revenues or government agencies.

Table MFP-2
Cost of Future Infrastructure

Infrastructure	Project Totals
Law Enforcement Facilities, et. al.	$10,100,895
Fire Suppression/Medic Facilities et. al.	$11,941,972
Circulation (Streets/Bridges/Signals)	$28,537,800
Storm Drainage Collection System	$207,494,050
Library Facilities/Collection	$7,841,369
Community Use Centers	$28,750,000
Park Land Acquisition & Improvements	$108,733,000
Total	$403,399,086

Fairness and reason (as well as the more important State and Federal statutes and court decisions) dictate that not all of the projects will qualify for development impact fee funding (i.e. some projects are replacements or service level increasing, etc.). If the City adopts the development impact fees that represent the General Plan Build-out need-based impact fees (Schedule 2.1 in the companion *Development Impact Fee Calculation and Nexus Report*), 42.6% of the required funding (or $172.1 million) would be raised with development impact fees. Existing Development Impact Fee Fund balances of $3.6 million will provide 0.9% of the total project funding and other sources (inter-governmental support) will finance 5.7% ($23.0 million) This leaves 50.8%, or $204.8 million of the total project costs as unfunded, to be financed by other sources such as fees, rates, existing taxes or voter approved additional taxes, inter-governmental transfers and the rare occasional grant.

Relationship to Development Impact Fee Report. The *Master Facilities Plan* was prepared in conjunction with the City's *Development Impact Fee Calculation and Nexus Report*, also prepared by RCS, LLC. Projects listed in the *Development Impact Fee Calculation and Nexus Report* correspond to projects found in this document and contain the same numbering sequence as the *Master Facilities Plan*. The *Development Impact Fee Calculation and Nexus Report* is also contains eight chapters specific to each one of these infrastructure sections according to the same category of projects described on the previous page.

Thus, a reader who wants to find more information on Law Enforcement Project No.1 (Additional *Law Enforcement Facility Space* found on Schedule 3.1 of the *Development Impact Fee*

Calculation and Nexus Report may turn to Project No. LE-001 of the *Master Facilities Plan*. For readers of the *Master Facilities Plan* who wish to understand the determination of development impact fee financing more fully, refer to the *Development Impact Fee Calculation and Nexus Report*, Chapter One.

Huntington Beach

Master Facilities Plan
Master Project List

		Total Thru G.P. Build-Out
LE001	Additional Law Enforcement Facility Space	$7,597,165
LE002	Acquire Additional Response Vehicles	$1,751,040
LE003	Acquire Additional Sworn Officer Issued Equipment	$327,690
LE004	Acquire Law Enforcement Specialty Equipment	$425,000
FS001	Relocate Fire Station #8 (Heil)	$7,169,470
FS002	Construct Station #8 (Heil) Apparatus Storage Facility	$1,716,044
FS003	Construct A Single Bay/Quarters At Station #4 (Magnolia)	$1,266,458
FS004	Acquire An Engine And Ambulance For Station #4 (Magnolia)	$740,000
FS005	Acquire An Additional Engine For Station #1 (Gothard)	$525,000
FS006	Acquire An Additional Engine For Station #2 (Murdy)	$525,000
LG001	Beach Boulevard And Edinger Avenue	$600,000
LG002	Beach Boulevard And Heil Avenue	$1,000,000
LG003	Beach Boulevard And Warner Avenue	$400,000
LG004	Beach Boulevard And Slater Avenue	$500,000
LG005	Beach Boulevard And Talbert Avenue	$1,000,000
LG006	Beach Boulevard And Garfield Avenue	$1,000,000
LG007	Beach Boulevard And Yorktown Avenue	$500,000
LG008	Pacific Coast Highway And Warner Avenue	$2,000,000
LG009	Pacific Coast Highway And Goldenwest Street	$750,000
LG010	Pacific Coast Highway And Brookhurst Street	$750,000
LG011	Goldenwest Street And Bolsa Avenue	$500,000
LG012	Goldenwest Street And Slater Street	$50,000
LG013	Newland Street And Talbert Avenue	$500,000
LG014	Newland Street And Warner Avenue	$30,000
LG015	Newland Street And Yorktown Avenue	$300,000

Huntington Beach

Master Facilities Plan
Master Project List

		Total Thru G.P. Build-Out
LG016	Gothard Street And Slater Avenue	$500,000
LG017	Gothard Street And Talbert Avenue	$264,000
LG018	Ward Street And Garfield Avenue	$8,800
LG019	Brookhurst Street And Adams Avenue	$10,000,000
LG020	Miscellaneous Traffic Signal/Intersection Improvements	$5,000,000
LG021	Public Works Maintenance Building	$2,820,000
LG022	Public Works Maintenance Vehicles	$65,000
SD001	Santa Ana River & Talbert Channel Region (SD Region #1)	$23,728,000
SD002	Coastal And Bolsa Chica Wetlands Region (SD Region #2)	$21,527,000
SD003	Slater Channel Region (SD Region #3)	$34,236,000
SD004	Wintersburg Channel Region (SD Region #4)	$28,749,000
SD005	Bolsa Chica Channel & Harbour Region (SD Region #5)	$98,549,000
SD006	Public Works Maintenance Building	$705,050
PL-001	Expand Banning Branch Library	$5,268,470
PL-002	Expand Main Street Branch Library	$1,651,375
PL-003	Expand Library Collection Items	$921,524
CF001	Central Park Senior Center	$22,000,000
CF002	Edison Community Center Gymnasium	$2,975,000
CF003	Murdy Community Center Gymnasium	$2,975,000
CF004	Oak View Recreation Center Expansion	$800,000
PK001	Bartlett Park Conceptual Plan And EIR	$5,400,000
PK002	Irby Park Phase II	$500,000
PK003	Central Park Former Gun Range EIR, RAP And Development	$4,325,000
PK004	Le Bard Park Expansion Master Plan And Development Plan	$1,450,000
PK005	Blufftop Park Trail Improvements	$1,000,000

Huntington Beach

Master Facilities Plan
Master Project List

		Total Thru G.P. Build-Out
PK006	Edinger Dock Development	$700,000
PK007	Wardlow Field Reconfiguration Design/Construction	$1,000,000
PK008	City-Wide Parks Master Plan	$350,000
PK009	Central Park Habitat Plan	$250,000
PK010	Central Park Acquisiton Of Encyclopedia Lots	$1,020,000
PK011	Central Park Development Of Remaining 86 Acres	$20,000,000
PK012	Central Park Rebuild Two Restaurant Facilities	$800,000
PK013	General Youth Sports Facilities Grants	$39,600,000
PK014	Murdy Youth Sports Complex Phase II	$2,500,000
PK015	Beach Playground	$350,000
PK016	Central Park Development Of Former Gun Range Area	$3,000,000
PK017	Warner Dock Renovation And Expansion	$800,000
PK018	Lamb Park Design And Development	$1,100,000
PK019	Central Park Sports Complex Team Room	$100,000
PK020	Future Parks Acquisition (Possible Closed School Sites)	$24,488,000
	Total All Projects	$403,399,086

City of Huntington Beach

Law Enforcement Facilities, Vehicles and Equipment

Huntington Beach
Master Facilities Plan
Fire Suppression/Medic Facilities, Vehicles And Equipment

		2011 - 12	2012 - 13	2013 - 14	2014 - 15	2015 - 16 Through Build Out	Project Build Out Total
FS -001	Relocate Fire Station #8 (Heil)	$0	$0	$0	$0	$7,169,470	$7,169,470
FS -002	Construct Station #8 (Heil) Apparatus Storage Facility	$0	$0	$0	$0	$1,716,044	$1,716,044
FS -003	Construct A Single Bay/Quarters At Station #4 (Magnolia)	$0	$0	$0	$0	$1,266,458	$1,266,458
FS -004	Acquire An Engine And Ambulance For Station #4 (Magnolia)	$0	$0	$0	$0	$740,000	$740,000
FS -005	Acquire An Additional Engine For Station #1 (Gothard)	$0	$0	$0	$0	$525,000	$525,000
FS -006	Acquire An Additional Engine For Station #2 (Murdy)	$0	$0	$0	$0	$525,000	$525,000
	TOTALS	$0	$0	$0	$0	$11,941,972	$11,941,972

Notes:
1) If project timing is not a component of this effort, then all projects default to their "Thru Build Out" amount.

Huntington Beach

Master Facilities Plan Project Detail

Infrastructure: Law Enforcement Facilities, Vehicles And Equipment

Project Number:/ Title LE 001 Additional Law Enforcement Facility Space

Submitting Departments: Police Department

Project Description:

Acquire land (or replacement land is placed at City Hall) for and construct 12,041 square feet of law enforcement space. The department will need to hire an additional 33 sworn officers at General Plan build-out to accommodate the additional 14.6% (8,697) in calls-for-service demand over the current 59,479 annual calls-for-service. Roughly 249 of these would be to the beach area. The additional space could be in the main station or could be located elsewhere in the City. The space would be necessary to expand, patrol, investigation, traffic control or any of the many specialty support services such as communications or records.

Justification / Consequences of Avoidance:

Annually the City currently experiences roughly 61,285 calls-for-sevice, 97.05% of which are from privately-held properties within the City's limits. The land-use database indicates the addition of 7,065 residential dwellings, 1,353 commercial lodging rooms and 7.3 million square feet of additional business (commercial, office and industrial) space which will generate, on average, an additional 8,448 annual calls-for-service, or a 14.6% increase. While the existing station is adequate to meet the current needs, the addition of 34 sworn officers will generate the need for a proportionally greater amount of space.

Relationship to General Plan Development:

The project primarily addresses additional calls-for-service from new development (97.05%) and thus is allocated 97.05% to new General Plan development.

Allocation To General Plan Buildout: 97.05%

Reference Document:

Project Timing:

The project timing would be dependent upon both the rate of development and collection of Development Impact Fees.

PROPOSED EXPENDITURES	2011 - 12	2012 - 13	2013 - 14	2014 - 15	2015 - 16 through Build-out	Total all Years
1. Design / Engineering / Administratic	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	568,524.00	568,524.00
2. Land Acquisition / Right Of Way	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1,033,801.00	1,033,801.00
3. Construction	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	5,173,493.00	5,173,493.00
4. Contingency	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	309,604.00	309,604.00
5. Equipment / Other	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	511,743.00	511,743.00
TOTAL COST:	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	7,597,165.00	7,597,165.00

Huntington Beach

Master Facilities Plan Project Detail

Infrastructure: Law Enforcement Facilities, Vehicles And Equipment

Project Number:/ Title LE 002 Acquire Additional Response Vehicles

Submitting Departments: Police Department

Project Description:

Acquire thirty-two additional response or specialty vehicles at an average cost of $54,720 each in order to maintain the existing ratio of 0.98 vehicles per officer. Approximately 97.05% of these vehicles are required to serve private sector development.

Justification / Consequences of Avoidance:

The Department currently has 231 law enforcement vehicles that are used by the 235 sworn officers creating an existing standard of 0.98 vehicles per sworn officer. With that the addition of 33 officers needed to respond to the annual calls-for-service likely to be generated by future General Plan development, the City will need to acquire an additional 32 vehicles in order to maintain the 0.98 ratio of vehicle per sworn officer. Failure to maintain the current ratio of vehciels per officer could reduce the City's ability to maintain beat strength and would certainly accelerate vehilce turnover.

Relationship to General Plan Development:

The acquisition addresses only the future additional calls-for-service from General Plan new development and thus is allocated 97.05 percent to new development.

Allocation To General Plan Buildout: 97.05%

Reference Document:

Project Timing:

The project timing would be dependent upon both the rate of development and collection of Development Impact Fees.

PROPOSED EXPENDITURES	2011 - 12	2012 - 13	2013 - 14	2014 - 15	2015 - 16 through Build-out	Total all Years
1. Design / Engineering / Administratic	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
2. Land Acquisition / Right Of Way	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
3. Construction	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
4. Contingency	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
5. Equipment / Other	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1,751,040.00	1,751,040.00
TOTAL COST:	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1,751,040.00	1,751,040.00

Huntington Beach

Master Facilities Plan Project Detail

Infrastructure: Law Enforcement Facilities, Vehicles And Equipment

Project Number:/ Title LE 003 Acquire Additional Sworn Officer Issued Equipment

Submitting Departments: Police Department

Project Description:

Acquire additional equipment assigned to the additional 33 sworn officers necessary to accommodate General Plan development. The capitalized list of equipment includes (but is not limited to): a protective vest, handgun, baton, compliment of leathers, handcuffs, uniforms, helmet, raincoat and heavy duty flashlight. The costs, at $9,930 includes a nominal background check, medical/physical check and polygraph exam for the sucessful candidates.

Justification / Consequences of Avoidance:

The equipment and related costs ar necessary for an officer to function in the field. The list is mostly safety equipment but also includes the costs absorbed by the City in identifying an appropriate candidate. Roughly 97.05% of the required new officers would be necessary to serve new General Plan development.

Relationship to General Plan Development:

The project primarily addresses additional calls-for-service from new development (97.05%) and thus is allocated 97.05% to new General Plan development.

Allocation To General Plan Buildout: 97.05%

Reference Document:

Project Timing:

The project timing would be dependent upon both development and collection of development impact fees.

PROPOSED EXPENDITURES	2011 - 12	2012 - 13	2013 - 14	2014 - 15	2015 - 16 through Build-out	Total all Years
1. Design / Engineering / Administratic	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
2. Land Acquisition / Right Of Way	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
3. Construction	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
4. Contingency	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
5. Equipment / Other	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	327,690.00	327,690.00
TOTAL COST:	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	327,690.00	327,690.00

Huntington Beach

Master Facilities Plan Project Detail

Infrastructure: Law Enforcement Facilities, Vehicles And Equipment

Project Number:/ Title LE 004 Acquire Law Enforcement Specialty Equipment

Submitting Departments: Police Department

Project Description:

Acquire specialty equipment to support the additional 33 officers needed to accommodate new development. Approximately 97% of that figure are needed to accommodate new development of private property.

Justification / Consequences of Avoidance:

The amount and type of crime is ever increasing. The City will need to acquire additional information-sharing computer capacity as well as specialty equipment such as bikes, dogs, hand-held radios, etc.

Relationship to General Plan Development:

The project primarily addresses additional calls-for-service from new development (97.05%) and thus is allocated 97.05% to new General Plan development.

Allocation To General Plan Buildout: 97.05%

Reference Document:

Project Timing:

The project timing would be dependent upon both development and collection of development impact fees.

PROPOSED EXPENDITURES	2011 - 12	2012 - 13	2013 - 14	2014 - 15	2015 - 16 through Build-out	Total all Years
1. Design / Engineering / Administratic	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
2. Land Acquisition / Right Of Way	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
3. Construction	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
4. Contingency	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
5. Equipment / Other	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	425,000.00	425,000.00
TOTAL COST:	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	425,000.00	425,000.00

City of Huntington Beach

Fire Suppression/Medic Facilities, Vehicles and Equipment

Huntington Beach
Master Facilities Plan
Fire Suppression/Medic Facilities, Vehicles And Equipment

		2011 - 12	2012 - 13	2013 - 14	2014 - 15	2015 - 16 Through Build Out	Project Build Out Total
FS -001	Relocate Fire Station #6 (Heil)	$0	$0	$0	$0	$7,169,470	$7,169,470
FS -002	Construct Station #8 (Heil) Apparatus Storage Facility	$0	$0	$0	$0	$1,716,044	$1,716,044
FS -003	Construct A Single Bay/Quarters At Station #4 (Magnolia)	$0	$0	$0	$0	$1,266,458	$1,266,458
FS -004	Acquire An Engine And Ambulance For Station #4 (Magnolia)	$0	$0	$0	$0	$740,000	$740,000
FS -005	Acquire An Addition Engine For Station #1 (Gothard)	$0	$0	$0	$0	$525,000	$525,000
FS -006	Acquire An Addition Engine For Station #2 (Murdy)	$0	$0	$0	$0	$525,000	$525,000
	TOTALS	$0	$0	$0	$0	$11,941,972	$11,941,972

Notes:
1) If project timing is not a component of this effort, then all projects default to their "Thru Build Out" amount.

Huntington Beach

Master Facilities Plan Project Detail

Infrastructure: Fire Suppression/Medic Facilities, Vehicles And Equipment

Project Number:/ Title FS 001 Relocate Fire Station #8 (Heil)

Submitting Departments: Fire Department

Project Description:

Relocate Station #8 from it's current location on Heil Avenue just west of Springale Street to a more northerly area near Graham Street just north of Edinger Street. The proposed 11,350 square foot facility would be a be a five vehicle configuration and would require roughly 1.25 acres. The facility would be capable of housing up to three companies and battalion chief. The facility would provide 3,550 square feet of vehicle bay space, 1,290 square feet of mechanical/technical space, 6,150 square feet of living quarters consisting of (a maximum of 24) bunks, lockers, restrooms/showers, a physical training room, kitchen, dining and a dayroom. The parcel is also planned to house a reserve apparatus storage facility (see FD-002).

Justification / Consequences of Avoidance:

The forty-five year-old station, once state-of-the-art, has numerous limitations in addition to mere aging. In addition to asbestos removal needs, the station design does not allow for mixed gender accommodation or the assignment of an aerial response truck. Since the station needs to be reconstructed, relocation more northerly, about 1.25 miles, would improve the first-in engine, truck and paramedic ALS response capacity to that area of the City. Redevelopment along the Edinger/Beach corridor and the Downtown Specific Plan will result in a greater number of calls-for-service changing the response dynamics of the existing eight stations. If the station were not relocated, the area in question would receive longer response times.

Relationship to General Plan Development:

Relocating Station #8 (Heil) is consistent with the City's General Plan Public Safety response time commitments and would improve the average engine, aerial truck and ALS paramedic response time through-out the City, in particular the Edinger/Beach corridor area.

Allocation To General Plan Buildout: 50.00%

Reference Document:

Project Timing:

The redevelopment along the Edinger/Beach corridor and the Downtown Specific Plans would likely be the trigger point for the timing of this relocation effort. The station age and limitations are also be an issue and could trigger the construction timing.

PROPOSED EXPENDITURES	2011 - 12	2012 - 13	2013 - 14	2014 - 15	2015 - 16 through Build-out	Total all Years
1. Design / Engineering / Administratic	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	532,561.00	532,561.00
2. Land Acquisition / Right Of Way	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1,026,097.00	1,026,097.00
3. Construction	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	4,963,827.00	4,963,827.00
4. Contingency	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	285,204.00	285,204.00
5. Equipment / Other	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	361,781.00	361,781.00
TOTAL COST:	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	7,169,470.00	7,169,470.00

Huntington Beach

Master Facilities Plan Project Detail

Infrastructure: Fire Suppression/Medic Facilities, Vehicles And Equipment

Project Number:/ Title FS 002 Construct Station #8 (Heil) Apparatus Storage Facility

Submitting Departments: Fire Department

Project Description:

Construct a 3,620 square foot reserve apparatus storage facility upon relocation of the existing Station #8 (Heil) to it's proposed future location. The facility would consist of a 2,660 square foot, two bays wide by two vehicle deep storage building for up to four reserve response vehicles. There would also be a contiguous 960 square foot basic storage room. The facility would be constructed on the rear portion of the parcel near the hose tower and hose storage building.

Justification / Consequences of Avoidance:

The proposed storage building is necessary for proper storage of the reserve vehicles and other specialty equipment not used on a routine basis, but important none-the-less. The existing vehicle storage facility cannot store all of the reservse vehciels that will be needed at General Plan build-out. The existing vehicle storage building will be inadequate for storage of all reserve vehicles at GeneralPlan build-out.

Relationship to General Plan Development:

The additional storage space is necessary, in part, to new deveopment and also because of the limited capaciaty of the single existing reserve vehicle storage facility and the existing apparatus inventory.

Allocation To General Plan Buildout: 25.00%

Reference Document:

Project Timing:

The facility would likely be constructed at the same time as the proposed relocation of station #8 (Heil),. However, the construction could be completed at a different time.

PROPOSED EXPENDITURES	2011 - 12	2012 - 13	2013 - 14	2014 - 15	2015 - 16 through Build-out	Total all Years
1. Design / Engineering / Administratic	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	120,415.00	120,415.00
2. Land Acquisition / Right Of Way	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	327,266.00	327,266.00
3. Construction	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1,122,703.00	1,122,703.00
4. Contingency	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	64,210.00	64,210.00
5. Equipment / Other	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	81,450.00	81,450.00
TOTAL COST:	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1,716,044.00	1,716,044.00

Huntington Beach

Master Facilities Plan Project Detail

Infrastructure: Fire Suppression/Medic Facilities, Vehicles And Equipment

Project Number:/ Title FS 003 Construct A Single Bay/Quarters At Station #4 (Magnolia)

Submitting Departments: Fire Department

Project Description:

Construct a 2,400 square foot addition to Station #4 (Magnolia). The plans consist of an additional bay and sufficient living quarters/training/storage space to be added to the existing two-bay Station #4 (Magnoila). The additional 1,400 square foot vehicle bay would allow for two additonal response vehicles, in this case an engine and an ambulance. The 1,000 square foot living quarters expansion would increase storage/locker space by approximately 200 square feet and living/training space by approximately 800 square feet.

Justification / Consequences of Avoidance:

The expanded facility will be needed to accommodate the additional calls-for-servce demands from the planned density-inceasing redevelopment from the Downtown Specific Plan and along the southerly portion of the Edinger/Beach Specific Plan corridor. Increased call-load must be balanced by having adequate fire station quarters and apparatus in order to meet the City's General Plan emergency response goals. Without the additional facilities, the response goals will be unachievable with the greater demands.

Relationship to General Plan Development:

The facility expansion is required to accommodate higher densities resulting from development consistent with the Downtown Specific Plan and the southerly portion of the Edinger/Beach Specific Plan corridor as well for multiple response vehicle demands to other parts of the City.

Allocation To General Plan Buildout: 50.00%

Reference Document:

Project Timing:

As needed and as development impact fee receipts and other revenues become available.

PROPOSED EXPENDITURES	2011 - 12	2012 - 13	2013 - 14	2014 - 15	2015 - 16 through Build-out	Total all Years
1. Design / Engineering / Administratic	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	109,650.00	109,650.00
2. Land Acquisition / Right Of Way	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
3. Construction	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1,020,000.00	1,020,000.00
4. Contingency	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	60,308.00	60,308.00
5. Equipment / Other	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	76,500.00	76,500.00
TOTAL COST:	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1,266,458.00	1,266,458.00

Huntington Beach

Master Facilities Plan Project Detail

Infrastructure: Fire Suppression/Medic Facilities, Vehicles And Equipment

Project Number:/ Title FS 004 Acquire An Engine And Ambulance For Station #4 (Magnolia)

Submitting Departments: Fire Department

Project Description:

Add an engine company and an ambulance to the Station #4 (Magnolia) apparatus inventory. Project FD-003 details the proposed 2,400 square foot quarters/bay expansion required to house the new engine and ambulance as well as staff.

Justification / Consequences of Avoidance:

Increased call-load must be balanced by having adequate fire station bays/quarters and response apparatus necessary to meet the City's General Plan emergency response goals. Without the additional resources, the response goals will become unachievable with the greater demands from continued development. The expanded vehicles are needed to accommodate the additional calls-for-service demands from the planned density-inceasing redevelopment from the Downtown Specific Plan and along the southerly portion of the Edinger/Beach Specific Plan corridor.

Relationship to General Plan Development:

The facility expansion is required to accommodate higher densities resulting from development consistent with the Downtown Specific Plan and the southerly portion of the Edinger/Beach Specific Plan corridor as well for multiple vehicle response demands to other parts of the City.

Allocation To General Plan Buildout: 50.00%

Reference Document:

Project Timing:

As needed and as development impact fee receipts and other revenues become available.

PROPOSED EXPENDITURES	2011 - 12	2012 - 13	2013 - 14	2014 - 15	2015 - 16 through Build-out	Total all Years
1. Design / Engineering / Administratic	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
2. Land Acquisition / Right Of Way	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
3. Construction	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
4. Contingency	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
5. Equipment / Other	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	740,000.00	740,000.00
TOTAL COST:	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	740,000.00	740,000.00

Huntington Beach

Master Facilities Plan Project Detail

Infrastructure: Fire Suppression/Medic Facilities, Vehicles And Equipment

Project Number:/ Title FS 005 Acquire An Additional Engine For Station #1 (Gothard)

Submitting Departments: Fire Department

Project Description:

Add a standard engine company at Station #1 (Gothard). The engine would be fully stocked with an appropriate and sufficient amount of hose, appurtenances and other safety/rescue equipment.

Justification / Consequences of Avoidance:

The expanded facility will be needed to accommodate the additional calls-for-servce demands from the planned density-inceasing redevelopment from the Downtown Specific Plan and along the Edinger/Beach Specific Plan corridor. Increased call-load must be balanced by having adequate and sufficient apparatus in order to meet the City's General Plan emergency response goals. Without the additional apparatus, the response goals will be unachievable with the greater demands.

Relationship to General Plan Development:

The facility expansion is required to accommodate higher densities resulting from development consistent with the Downtown Specific Plan and the Edinger/Beach Specific Plan corridor as well for multiplevehicle response demands to other parts of the City.

Allocation To General Plan Buildout: 50.00%

Reference Document:

Project Timing:

As needed and as development impact fee receipts and other revenues become available.

PROPOSED EXPENDITURES	2011 - 12	2012 - 13	2013 - 14	2014 - 15	2015 - 16 through Build-out	Total all Years
1. Design / Engineering / Administratic	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
2. Land Acquisition / Right Of Way	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
3. Construction	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
4. Contingency	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
5. Equipment / Other	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	525,000.00	525,000.00
TOTAL COST:	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	525,000.00	525,000.00

Huntington Beach

Master Facilities Plan Project Detail

Infrastructure: Fire Suppression/Medic Facilities, Vehicles And Equipment

Project Number:/ Title FS 006 Acquire An Additional Engine For Station #2 (Murdy)

Submitting Departments: Fire Department

Project Description:

Add a standard engine company at Station #2 (Murdy). The engine would be fully stocked with an appropriate and sufficient amount of hose, appurtenances and other safety/rescue equipment.

Justification / Consequences of Avoidance:

The apparatus will be needed to accommodate the anticipated additional calls-for-servce demands from the planned density-inceasing redevelopment along the Edinger/Beach Specific Plan corridor. Increased call-load must be balanced by having adequate apparatus in order to meet the City's General Plan emergency response goals. Without the additional apparatus the response goals will be unachievable with the greater demands.

Relationship to General Plan Development:

The facility expansion is required to accommodate higher densities along Edison/Beach Specific Plan Corridor and the possibility of multiple apparatus response demands to other parts of the City.

Allocation To General Plan Buildout: 50.00%

Reference Document:

Project Timing:

As needed and as development impact fee receipts and other revenues become available.

PROPOSED EXPENDITURES	2011 - 12	2012 - 13	2013 - 14	2014 - 15	2015 - 16 through Build-out	Total all Years
1. Design / Engineering / Administratic	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
2. Land Acquisition / Right Of Way	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
3. Construction	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
4. Contingency	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
5. Equipment / Other	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	525,000.00	525,000.00
TOTAL COST:	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	525,000.00	525,000.00

City of Huntington Beach

Circulation (Streets, Signals and Bridges) System

Huntington Beach
Master Facilities Plan
Local Circulation (Streets, Signals And Bridges) System

		2011 - 12	2012 - 13	2013 - 14	2014 - 15	2015 - 16 Through Build Out	Project Build Out Total
LC -001	Beach Boulevard And Edinger Avenue	$0	$0	$0	$0	$600,000	$600,000
LC -002	Beach Boulevard And Heil Avenue	$0	$0	$0	$0	$1,000,000	$1,000,000
LC -003	Beach Boulevard And Warner Avenue	$0	$0	$0	$0	$400,000	$400,000
LC -004	Beach Boulevard And Slater Avenue	$0	$0	$0	$0	$500,000	$500,000
LC -005	Beach Boulevard And Talbert Avenue	$0	$0	$0	$0	$1,000,000	$1,000,000
LC -006	Beach Boulevard And Garfield Avenue	$0	$0	$0	$0	$1,000,000	$1,000,000
LC -007	Beach Boulevard And Yorktown Avenue	$0	$0	$0	$0	$500,000	$500,000
LC -008	Pacific Coast Highway And Warner Avenue	$0	$0	$0	$0	$2,000,000	$2,000,000
LC -009	Pacific Coast Highway And Goldenwest Street	$0	$0	$0	$0	$750,000	$750,000
LC -010	Pacific Coast Highway And Brookhurst Street	$0	$0	$0	$0	$750,000	$750,000
LC -011	Goldenwest Street And Bolsa Avenue	$0	$0	$0	$0	$500,000	$500,000
LC -012	Goldenwest Street And Slater Street	$0	$0	$0	$0	$50,000	$50,000
LC -013	Newland Street And Talbert Avenue	$0	$0	$0	$0	$500,000	$500,000
LC -014	Newland Street And Warner Avenue	$0	$0	$0	$0	$30,000	$30,000
LC -015	Newland Street And Yorktown Avenue	$0	$0	$0	$0	$300,000	$300,000
LC -016	Gothard Street And Slater Avenue	$0	$0	$0	$0	$500,000	$500,000
LC -017	Gothard Street And Talbert Avenue	$0	$0	$0	$0	$264,000	$264,000
LC -018	Ward Street And Garfield Avenue	$0	$0	$0	$0	$8,800	$8,800
LC -019	Brookhurst Street And Adams Avenue	$0	$0	$0	$0	$10,000,000	$10,000,000
LC -020	Miscellaneous Traffic Signal/Intersection Improvements	$0	$0	$0	$0	$5,000,000	$5,000,000
LC -021	Public Works Maintenance Building	$0	$0	$0	$0	$2,820,000	$2,820,000
LC -022	Public Works Maintenance Vehicles	$0	$0	$0	$0	$65,000	$65,000

Huntington Beach

Master Facilities Plan

Local Circulation (Streets, Signals And Bridges) System

	2011 - 12	2012 - 13	2013 - 14	2014 - 15	2015 - 16 Through Build Out	Project Build Out Total
TOTALS	$0	$0	$0	$0	$28,537,800	$28,537,800

Notes:
1) If project timing is not a component of this effort, then all projects default to their "Thru Build Out" amount.

Huntington Beach

Master Facilities Plan Project Detail

Infrastructure: Local Circulation (Streets, Signals And Bridges) System

Project Number:/ Title LC 001 Beach Boulevard And Edinger Avenue

Submitting Departments: Public Works - Engineering

Project Description:

To maximize the capability to move vehicles and pedestrians across the intersection (in all directions), the following improvements to the intersection are proposed: 1) Add 4th northbound through lane, and 2) Add a 3rd westbound through lane. Beach Boulevard, being a State Highway, makes this a CALTRANS managed project. Since the project would not be managed by the City, the estimated cost consists of the entire project cost, but does not separate those costs into engineering and contingency components.

Justification / Consequences of Avoidance:

There are few opportunities to add additional lane miles through out the City, thus maximum movement of traffic across major circulation routes is critical. Failure to or inability to increase circulation capacity where warranted and needed would reduce the Level of Service (or LOS) traffic flow at intersections of major streets to a Level "E" by acting as a bottleneck. Level "E" is "Unstable Flow:" and is identified as "long queues of vehicles waiting upstream of the intersection". Level "E", "Forced Flow" creates "Jammed conditions, back-ups from other locations restrict or prevent movement".

Relationship to General Plan Development:

All new development will impact existing intersections within the City, making some of them require improvements or the LOS will drop to unacceptable levels like "D", "E" or "F". Development anticipated over the next twenty years will generate 307,924 additional daily trip-miles. This is a 11.8% increase daily over the City's existing demand of 3,135,213 daily trip-miles, all of which will compete for use of a static number of major roadway lane miles. The 370,924 added daily trip-miles represents an 10.6% of the total 3,506,137 daily trip-miles at the twenty-year development horizon.

Allocation To General Plan Buildout: 75.00%

Reference Document:

Project Timing:

The project will be constructed within normal review of priorities and as adequate and sufficient revenues are collected.

PROPOSED EXPENDITURES	2011 - 12	2012 - 13	2013 - 14	2014 - 15	2015 - 16 through Build-out	Total all Years
1. Design / Engineering / Administratic	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
2. Land Acquisition / Right Of Way	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
3. Construction	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	600,000.00	600,000.00
4. Contingency	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
5. Equipment / Other	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
TOTAL COST:	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	600,000.00	600,000.00

Huntington Beach

Master Facilities Plan Project Detail

Infrastructure: Local Circulation (Streets, Signals And Bridges) System

Project Number:/ Title LC 002 Beach Boulevard And Heil Avenue

Submitting Departments: Public Works - Engineering

Project Description:

To maximize the capability to move vehicles and pedestrians across the intersection (in all directions), the following improvements to the intersection are proposed: 1) Add 2nd northbound left-turn lane. An alternative would be to construct: 1) A de-facto westbound right turn lane, and 2) add a de-facto southbound right turn lane. Beach Boulevard, being a State Highway, makes this a CALTRANS managed project. Since the project would not be managed by the City, the estimated cost consists of the entire project cost, but does not separate those costs into engineering and contingency components.

Justification / Consequences of Avoidance:

There are few opportunities to add additional lane miles through out the City, thus maximum movement of traffic across major circulation routes is critical. Failure to or inability to increase circulation capacity where warranted and needed would reduce the Level of Service (or LOS) traffic flow at intersections of major streets to a Level "E" by acting as a bottleneck. Level "E" is "Unstable Flow:" and is identified as "long queues of vehicles waiting upstream of the intersection". Level "E", "Forced Flow" creates "Jammed conditions, back-ups from other locations restrict or prevent movement".

Relationship to General Plan Development:

All new development will impact existing intersections within the City, making some of them require improvements or the LOS will drop to unacceptable levels like "D", "E" or "F". Development anticipated over the next twenty years will generate 307,924 additional daily trip-miles. This is a 11.8% increase daily over the City's existing demand of 3,135,213 daily trip-miles, all of which will compete for use of a static number of major roadway lane miles. The 370,924 added daily trip-miles represents an 10.6% of the total 3,506,137 daily trip-miles at the twenty-year development horizon.

Allocation To General Plan Buildout: 95.00%

Reference Document:

Project Timing:

The project will be constructed within normal review of priorities and as adequate and sufficient revenues are collected.

PROPOSED EXPENDITURES	2011 - 12	2012 - 13	2013 - 14	2014 - 15	2015 - 16 through Build-out	Total all Years
1. Design / Engineering / Administratic	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
2. Land Acquisition / Right Of Way	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
3. Construction	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1,000,000.00	1,000,000.00
4. Contingency	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
5. Equipment / Other	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
TOTAL COST:	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1,000,000.00	1,000,000.00

Huntington Beach

Master Facilities Plan Project Detail

Infrastructure: Local Circulation (Streets, Signals And Bridges) System

Project Number:/ Title LC 003 Beach Boulevard And Warner Avenue

Submitting Departments: Public Works - Engineering

Project Description:

To maximize the capability to move vehicles and pedestrians across the intersection (in all directions), the following improvements to the intersection are proposed: 1) Add a separate westbound right turn lane. An alternative would be to construct the following: 1) A de-facto westbound right turn lane, and 2) add a separate northbound right turn lane. Beach Boulevard, being a State Highway, makes this a CALTRANS managed project. Since the project would not be managed by the City, the estimated cost consists of the entire project cost, but does not separate those costs into engineering and contingency components.

Justification / Consequences of Avoidance:

There are few opportunities to add additional lane miles through out the City, thus maximum movement of traffic across major circulation routes is critical. Failure to or inability to increase circulation capacity where warranted and needed would reduce the Level of Service (or LOS) traffic flow at intersections of major streets to a Level "E" by acting as a bottleneck. Level "E" is "Unstable Flow:" and is identified as "long queues of vehicles waiting upstream of the intersection". Level "E", "Forced Flow" creates "Jammed conditions, back-ups from other locations restrict or prevent movement".

Relationship to General Plan Development:

All new development will impact existing intersections within the City, making some of them require improvements or the LOS will drop to unacceptable levels like "D", "E" or "F". Development anticipated over the next twenty years will generate 307,924 additional daily trip-miles. This is a 11.8% increase daily over the City's existing demand of 3,135,213 daily trip-miles, all of which will compete for use of a static number of major roadway lane miles. The 370,924 added daily trip-miles represents an 10.6% of the total 3,506,137 daily trip-miles at the twenty-year development horizon.

Allocation To General Plan Buildout: 95.00%

Reference Document:

Project Timing:

The project will be constructed within normal review of priorities and as adequate and sufficient revenues are collected.

PROPOSED EXPENDITURES	2011 - 12	2012 - 13	2013 - 14	2014 - 15	2015 - 16 through Build-out	Total all Years
1. Design / Engineering / Administratic	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
2. Land Acquisition / Right Of Way	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
3. Construction	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	400,000.00	400,000.00
4. Contingency	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
5. Equipment / Other	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
TOTAL COST:	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	400,000.00	400,000.00

Huntington Beach

Master Facilities Plan Project Detail

Infrastructure: Local Circulation (Streets, Signals And Bridges) System

Project Number:/ Title LC 004 Beach Boulevard And Slater Avenue

Submitting Departments: Public Works - Engineering

Project Description:

To maximize the capability to move vehicles and pedestrians across the intersection (in all directions), the following improvement to the intersection is proposed: 1) Add a separate eastbound right turn lane. Beach Boulevard, being a State Highway, makes this a CALTRANS managed project. Since the project would not be managed by the City, the estimated cost consists of the entire project cost, but does not separate those costs into engineering and contingency components.

Justification / Consequences of Avoidance:

There are few opportunities to add additional lane miles through out the City, thus maximum movement of traffic across major circulation routes is critical. Failure to or inability to increase circulation capacity where warranted and needed would reduce the Level of Service (or LOS) traffic flow at intersections of major streets to a Level "E" by acting as a bottleneck. Level "E" is "Unstable Flow:" and is identified as "long queues of vehicles waiting upstream of the intersection". Level "E", "Forced Flow" creates "Jammed conditions, back-ups from other locations restrict or prevent movement".

Relationship to General Plan Development:

All new development will impact existing intersections within the City, making some of them require improvements or the LOS will drop to unacceptable levels like "D", "E" or "F". Development anticipated over the next twenty years will generate 397,924 additional daily trip-miles. This is a 11.8% increase daily over the City's existing demand of 3,135,213 daily trip-miles, all of which will compete for use of a static number of major roadway lane miles. The 370,924 added daily trip-miles represents an 10.6% of the total 3,506,137 daily trip-miles at the twenty-year development horizon.

Allocation To General Plan Buildout: 95.00%

Reference Document:

Project Timing:

The project will be constructed within normal review of priorities and as adequate and sufficient revenues are collected.

PROPOSED EXPENDITURES	2011 - 12	2012 - 13	2013 - 14	2014 - 15	2015 - 16 through Build-out	Total all Years
1. Design / Engineering / Administratic	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
2. Land Acquisition / Right Of Way	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
3. Construction	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	500,000.00	500,000.00
4. Contingency	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
5. Equipment / Other	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
TOTAL COST:	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	500,000.00	500,000.00

Huntington Beach

Master Facilities Plan Project Detail

Infrastructure: Local Circulation (Streets, Signals And Bridges) System

Project Number:/ Title LC 005 Beach Boulevard And Talbert Avenue

Submitting Departments: Public Works - Engineering

Project Description:

To maximize the capability to move vehicles and pedestrians across the intersection (in all directions), the following improvements to the intersection are proposed: 1) Add a 2nd westbound left turn lane, 2) add a de-facto westbound right turn lane, 3) add a separate northbound right turn lane, 4) add a 2nd eastbound left turn lane, and 5) stripe a de-facto eastbound right turn lane. Beach Boulevard, being a State Highway, makes this a CALTRANS managed project. Since the project would not be managed by the City, the estimated cost consists of the entire project cost, but does not separate those costs into engineering and contingency components.

Justification / Consequences of Avoidance:

There are few opportunities to add additional lane miles through out the City, thus maximum movement of traffic across major circulation routes is critical. Failure to or inability to increase circulation capacity where warranted and needed would reduce the Level of Service (or LOS) traffic flow at intersections of major streets to a Level "E" by acting as a bottleneck. Level "E" is "Unstable Flow:" and is identified as "long queues of vehicles waiting upstream of the intersection". Level "E", "Forced Flow" creates "Jammed conditions, back-ups from other locations restrict or prevent movement".

Relationship to General Plan Development:

AAll new development will impact existing intersections within the City, making some of them require improvements or the LOS will drop to unacceptable levels like "D", "E" or "F". Development anticipated over the next twenty years will generate 307,924 additional daily trip-miles. This is a 11.8% increase daily over the City's existing demand of 3,135,213 daily trip-miles, all of which will compete for use of a static number of major roadway lane miles. The 370,924 added daily trip-miles represents an 10.6% of the total 3,506,137 daily trip-miles at the twenty-year development horizon.

Allocation To General Plan Buildout: 62.00%

Reference Document:

Project Timing:

The project will be constructed within normal review of priorities and as adequate and sufficient revenues are collected.

PROPOSED EXPENDITURES	2011 - 12	2012 - 13	2013 - 14	2014 - 15	2015 - 16 through Build-out	Total all Years
1. Design / Engineering / Administratic	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
2. Land Acquisition / Right Of Way	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
3. Construction	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1,000,000.00	1,000,000.00
4. Contingency	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
5. Equipment / Other	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
TOTAL COST:	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1,000,000.00	1,000,000.00

Huntington Beach

Master Facilities Plan Project Detail

Infrastructure: Local Circulation (Streets, Signals And Bridges) System

Project Number/ Title LC 006 Beach Boulevard And Garfield Avenue

Submitting Departments: Public Works - Engineering

Project Description:

To maximize the capability to move vehicles and pedestrians across the intersection (in all directions), the following Option #1 improvements to the intersection are proposed: 1) Add a separate northbound right turn lane, and 2) add a de-facto southbound right turn lane. An alternative would to those improvements would be to: 1) Add a 2nd northbound left turn lane, and 2) add a 2nd southbound left turn lane. Beach Boulevard, being a State Highway, makes this a CALTRANS managed project. Since the project would not be managed by the City, the estimated cost consists of the entire project cost, but does not separate those costs into engineering and contingency components.

Justification / Consequences of Avoidance:

There are few opportunities to add additional lane miles through out the City, thus maximum movement of traffic across major circulation routes is critical. Failure to or inability to increase circulation capacity where warranted and needed would reduce the Level of Service (or LOS) traffic flow at intersections of major streets to a Level "E" by acting as a bottleneck. Level "E" is "Unstable Flow:" and is identified as "long queues of vehicles waiting upstream of the intersection". Level "E", "Forced Flow" creates "Jammed conditions, back-ups from other locations restrict or prevent movement".

Relationship to General Plan Development:

All new development will impact existing intersections within the City, making some of them require improvements or the LOS will drop to unacceptable levels like "D", "E" or "F". Development anticipated over the next twenty years will generate 307,924 additional daily trip-miles. This is a 11.8% increase daily over the City's existing demand of 3,135,213 daily trip-miles, all of which will compete for use of a static number of major roadway lane miles. The 370,924 added daily trip-miles represents an 10.6% of the total 3,506,137 daily trip-miles at the twenty-year development horizon.

Allocation To General Plan Buildout: 95.00%

Reference Document:

Project Timing:

The project will be constructed within normal review of priorities and as adequate and sufficient revenues are collected.

PROPOSED EXPENDITURES	2011 - 12	2012 - 13	2013 - 14	2014 - 15	2015 - 16 through Build-out	Total all Years
1. Design / Engineering / Administratic	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
2. Land Acquisition / Right Of Way	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
3. Construction	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1,000,000.00	1,000,000.00
4. Contingency	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
5. Equipment / Other	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
TOTAL COST:	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1,000,000.00	1,000,000.00

Huntington Beach

Master Facilities Plan Project Detail

Infrastructure: Local Circulation (Streets, Signals And Bridges) System

Project Number:/ Title LC 007 Beach Boulevard And Yorktown Avenue

Submitting Departments: Public Works - Engineering

Project Description:

To maximize the capability to move vehicles and pedestrians across the intersection (in all directions), the following improvement to the intersection is proposed: 1) Add a separate westbound right turn lane. Beach Boulevard, being a State Highway, makes this a CALTRANS managed project. Since the project would not be managed by the City, the estimated cost consists of the entire project cost, but does not separate those costs into engineering and contingency components.

Justification / Consequences of Avoidance:

There are few opportunities to add additional lane miles through out the City, thus maximum movement of traffic across major circulation routes is critical. Failure to or inability to increase circulation capacity where warranted and needed would reduce the Level of Service (or LOS) traffic flow at intersections of major streets to a Level "E" by acting as a bottleneck. Level "E" is "Unstable Flow:" and is identified as "long queues of vehicles waiting upstream of the intersection". Level "E", "Forced Flow" creates "Jammed conditions, back-ups from other locations restrict or prevent movement".

Relationship to General Plan Development:

All new development will impact existing intersections within the City, making some of them require improvements or the LOS will drop to unacceptable levels like "D", "E" or "F". Development anticipated over the next twenty years will generate 307,924 additional daily trip-miles. This is a 11.8% increase daily over the City's existing demand of 3,135,213 daily trip-miles, all of which will compete for use of a static number of major roadway lane miles. The 370,924 added daily trip-miles represents an 10.6% of the total 3,506,137 daily trip-miles at the twenty-year development horizon.

Allocation To General Plan Buildout: 95.00%

Reference Document:

Project Timing:

The project will be constructed within normal review of priorities and as adequate and sufficient revenues are collected.

PROPOSED EXPENDITURES	2011 - 12	2012 - 13	2013 - 14	2014 - 15	2015 - 16 through Build-out	Total all Years
1. Design / Engineering / Administratic	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
2. Land Acquisition / Right Of Way	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
3. Construction	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	500,000.00	500,000.00
4. Contingency	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
5. Equipment / Other	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
TOTAL COST:	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	500,000.00	500,000.00

Huntington Beach

Master Facilities Plan Project Detail

Infrastructure: Local Circulation (Streets, Signals And Bridges) System

Project Number/ Title LC 008 Pacific Coast Highway And Warner Avenue

Submitting Departments: Public Works - Engineering

Project Description:

To maximize the capability to move vehicles and pedestrians across the intersection (in all directions), the following improvement to the intersection is proposed: 1) Add a 3rd northbound through lane. Pacific Coast Highway, being a State Highway, makes this a CALTRANS managed project. Since the project would not be managed by the City, the estimated cost consists of the entire project cost, but does not separate those costs into engineering and contingency components.

Justification / Consequences of Avoidance:

There are few opportunities to add additional lane miles through out the City, thus maximum movement of traffic across major circulation routes is critical. Failure to or inability to increase circulation capacity where warranted and needed would reduce the Level of Service (or LOS) traffic flow at intersections of major streets to a Level "E" by acting as a bottleneck. Level "E" is "Unstable Flow:" and is identified as "long queues of vehicles waiting upstream of the intersection". Level "E", "Forced Flow" creates "Jammed conditions, back-ups from other locations restrict or prevent movement".

Relationship to General Plan Development:

All new development will impact existing intersections within the City, making some of them require improvements or the LOS will drop to unacceptable levels like "D", "E" or "F". Development anticipated over the next twenty years will generate 307,924 additional daily trip-miles. This is a 11.8% increase daily over the City's existing demand of 3,135,213 daily trip-miles, all of which will compete for use of a static number of major roadway lane miles. The 370,924 added daily trip-miles represents an 10.6% of the total 3,506,137 daily trip-miles at the twenty-year development horizon.

Allocation To General Plan Buildout: 95.00%

Reference Document:

Project Timing:

The project will be constructed within normal review of priorities and as adequate and sufficient revenues are collected.

PROPOSED EXPENDITURES	2011 - 12	2012 - 13	2013 - 14	2014 - 15	2015 - 16 through Build-out	Total all Years
1. Design / Engineering / Administratic	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
2. Land Acquisition / Right Of Way	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
3. Construction	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	2,000,000.00	2,000,000.00
4. Contingency	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
5. Equipment / Other	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
TOTAL COST:	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	2,000,000.00	2,000,000.00

Huntington Beach

Master Facilities Plan Project Detail

Infrastructure: Local Circulation (Streets, Signals And Bridges) System

Project Number:/ Title LC 009 Pacific Coast Highway And Goldenwest Street

Submitting Departments: Public Works - Engineering

Project Description:

To maximize the capability to move vehicles and pedestrians across the intersection (in all directions), the following improvements to the intersection are proposed: 1) Add a 2nd eastbound left turn lane, and 2) allow southbound right turn overlap.Pacific Coast Highway, being a State Highway, makes this a CALTRANS managed project. Since the project would not be managed by the City, the estimated cost consists of the entire project cost, but does not separate those costs into engineering and contingency components.

Justification / Consequences of Avoidance:

There are few opportunities to add additional lane miles through out the City, thus maximum movement of traffic across major circulation routes is critical. Failure to or inability to increase circulation capacity where warranted and needed would reduce the Level of Service (or LOS) traffic flow at intersections of major streets to a Level "E" by acting as a bottleneck. Level "E" is "Unstable Flow:" and is identified as "long queues of vehicles waiting upstream of the intersection". Level "E", "Forced Flow" creates "Jammed conditions, back-ups from other locations restrict or prevent movement".

Relationship to General Plan Development:

All new development will impact existing intersections within the City, making some of them require improvements or the LOS will drop to unacceptable levels like "D", "E" or "F". Development anticipated over the next twenty years will generate 307,924 additional daily trip-miles. This is a 11.8% increase daily over the City's existing demand of 3,135,213 daily trip-miles, all of which will compete for use of a static number of major roadway lane miles. The 370,924 added daily trip-miles represents an 10.6% of the total 3,506,137 daily trip-miles at the twenty-year development horizon.

Allocation To General Plan Buildout: 88.00%

Reference Document:

Project Timing:

The project will be constructed within normal review of priorities and as adequate and sufficient revenues are collected.

PROPOSED EXPENDITURES	2011 - 12	2012 - 13	2013 - 14	2014 - 15	2015 - 16 through Build-out	Total all Years
1. Design / Engineering / Administratic	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
2. Land Acquisition / Right Of Way	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
3. Construction	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	750,000.00	750,000.00
4. Contingency	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
5. Equipment / Other	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
TOTAL COST:	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	750,000.00	750,000.00

Huntington Beach

Master Facilities Plan Project Detail

Infrastructure: Local Circulation (Streets, Signals And Bridges) System

Project Number:/ Title LC 010 Pacific Coast Highway And Brookhurst Street

Submitting Departments: Public Works - Engineering

Project Description:

To maximize the capability to move vehicles and pedestrians across the intersection (in all directions), the following improvements to the intersection are proposed: 1) Add a 2nd eastbound left turn lane and, 2) allow southbound right turn overlap.Pacific Coast Highway, being a State Highway, makes this a CALTRANS managed project. Since the project would not be managed by the City, the estimated cost consists of the entire project cost, but does not separate those costs into engineering and contingency components.

Justification / Consequences of Avoidance:

There are few opportunities to add additional lane miles through out the City, thus maximum movement of traffic across major circulation routes is critical. Failure to or inability to increase circulation capacity where warranted and needed would reduce the Level of Service (or LOS) traffic flow at intersections of major streets to a Level "E" by acting as a bottleneck. Level "E" is "Unstable Flow:" and is identified as "long queues of vehicles waiting upstream of the intersection". Level "E", "Forced Flow" creates "Jammed conditions, back-ups from other locations restrict or prevent movement".

Relationship to General Plan Development:

All new development will impact existing intersections within the City, making some of them require improvements or the LOS will drop to unacceptable levels like "D", "E" or "F". Development anticipated over the next twenty years will generate 307,924 additional daily trip-miles. This is a 11.8% increase daily over the City's existing demand of 3,135,213 daily trip-miles, all of which will compete for use of a static number of major roadway lane miles. The 370,924 added daily trip-miles represents an 10.6% of the total 3,506,137 daily trip-miles at the twenty-year development horizon.

Allocation To General Plan Buildout: 95.00%

Reference Document:

Project Timing:

The project will be constructed within normal review of priorities and as adequate and sufficient revenues are collected.

PROPOSED EXPENDITURES	2011 - 12	2012 - 13	2013 - 14	2014 - 15	2015 - 16 through Build-out	Total all Years
1. Design / Engineering / Administratic	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
2. Land Acquisition / Right Of Way	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
3. Construction	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	750,000.00	750,000.00
4. Contingency	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
5. Equipment / Other	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
TOTAL COST:	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	750,000.00	750,000.00

Huntington Beach

Master Facilities Plan Project Detail

Infrastructure: Local Circulation (Streets, Signals And Bridges) System

Project Number:/ Title LC 011 Golderwest Street And Bolsa Avenue

Submitting Departments: Public Works - Engineering

Project Description:

To maximize the capability to move vehicles and pedestrians across the intersection (in all directions), the following improvements to the intersection are proposed: 1) Add a second southbound left turn lane, 2) Add a separate northbound right turn lane and 3). Allow westbound right turn overlap. This would be a City-managed project.

Justification / Consequences of Avoidance:

There are few opportunities to add additional lane miles through out the City, thus movement of traffic across major circulation routes. Failure to or inability to increase circulation capacity where warranted and needed would reduce the Level of Service (or LOS) traffic flow at intersections of major streets to a Level "E" by acting as a bottleneck. Level "E" is "Unstable Flow:" and is identified as "long queues of vehicles waiting upstream of the intersection". Level "E", "Forced Flow" creates "Jammed conditions, back-ups from other locations restrict or prevent movement".

Relationship to General Plan Development:

All new development will impact existing intersections within the City, making some of them require improvements or the LOS will drop to unacceptable levels like "D", "E" or "F". Development anticipated over the next twenty years will generate 307,924 additional daily trip-miles. This is a 11.8% increase daily over the City's existing demand of 3,135,213 daily trip-miles, all of which will compete for use of a static number of major roadway lane miles. The 370,924 added daily trip-miles represents an 10.6% of the total 3,506,137 daily trip-miles at the twenty-year development horizon.

Allocation To General Plan Buildout: 95.00%

Reference Document:

Project Timing:

The project will be constructed within normal review of priorities and as adequate and sufficient revenues are collected.

PROPOSED EXPENDITURES	2011 - 12	2012 - 13	2013 - 14	2014 - 15	2015 - 16 through Build-out	Total all Years
1. Design / Engineering / Administratic	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	60,000.00	60,000.00
2. Land Acquisition / Right Of Way	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
3. Construction	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	400,000.00	400,000.00
4. Contingency	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	40,000.00	40,000.00
5. Equipment / Other	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
TOTAL COST:	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	500,000.00	500,000.00

Huntington Beach

Master Facilities Plan Project Detail

Infrastructure: Local Circulation (Streets, Signals And Bridges) System

Project Number:/ Title LC 012 Goldenwest Street And Slater Street

Submitting Departments: Public Works - Engineering

Project Description:

To maximize the capability to move vehicles and pedestrians across the intersection (in all directions), the following improvement to the intersection is proposed: 1) Add a 2nd southbound left turn lane. An alternative would to that improvement would be to: 1) Convert a separate northbound right turn lane to a third northbound through lane. This would be a City-managed project.

Justification / Consequences of Avoidance:

There are few opportunities to add additional lane miles through out the City, thus maximum movement of traffic across major circulation routesis critical. Failure to or inability to increase circulation capacity where warranted and needed would reduce the Level of Service (or LOS) traffic flow at intersections of major streets to a Level "E" by acting as a bottleneck. Level "E" is "Unstable Flow;" and is identified as "long queues of vehicles waiting upstream of the intersection". Level "E", "Forced Flow" creates "Jammed conditions, back-ups from other locations restrict or prevent movement".

Relationship to General Plan Development:

All new development will impact existing intersections within the City, making some of them require improvements or the LOS will drop to unacceptable levels like "D", "E" or "F". Development anticipated over the next twenty years will generate 307,924 additional daily trip-miles. This is a 11.8% increase daily over the City's existing demand of 3,135,213 daily trip-miles, all of which will compete for use of a static number of major roadway lane miles. The 370,924 added daily trip-miles represents an 10.6% of the total 3,506,137 daily trip-miles at the twenty-year development horizon.

Allocation To General Plan Buildout: 95.00%

Reference Document:

Project Timing:

The project will be constructed within normal review of priorities and as adequate and sufficient revenues are collected.

PROPOSED EXPENDITURES	2011 - 12	2012 - 13	2013 - 14	2014 - 15	2015 - 16 through Build-out	Total all Years
1. Design / Engineering / Administratic	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	6,000.00	6,000.00
2. Land Acquisition / Right Of Way	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
3. Construction	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	40,000.00	40,000.00
4. Contingency	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	4,000.00	4,000.00
5. Equipment / Other	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
TOTAL COST:	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	50,000.00	50,000.00

Huntington Beach

Master Facilities Plan Project Detail

Infrastructure: Local Circulation (Streets, Signals And Bridges) System

Project Number:/ Title LC 013 Newland Street And Talbert Avenue

Submitting Departments: Public Works - Engineering

Project Description:

To maximize the capability to move vehicles and pedestrians across the intersection (in all directions), the following improvement to the intersection is proposed: 1) Add a 2nd eastbound left turn lane. This would be a City-managed project.

Justification / Consequences of Avoidance:

There are few opportunities to add additional lane miles through out the City, thus maximum movement of traffic across major circulation routes is critical. Failure to or inability to increase circulation capacity where warranted and needed would reduce the Level of Service (or LOS) traffic flow at intersections of major streets to a Level "E" by acting as a bottleneck. Level "E" is "Unstable Flow:" and is identified as "long queues of vehicles waiting upstream of the intersection". Level "E", "Forced Flow" creates "Jammed conditions, back-ups from other locations restrict or prevent movement".

Relationship to General Plan Development:

All new development will impact existing intersections within the City, making some of them require improvements or the LOS will drop to unacceptable levels like "D", "E" or "F". Development anticipated over the next twenty years will generate 307,924 additional daily trip-miles. This is a 11.8% increase daily over the City's existing demand of 3,135,213 daily trip-miles, all of which will compete for use of a static number of major roadway lane miles. The 370,924 added daily trip-miles represents an 10.6% of the total 3,506,137 daily trip-miles at the twenty-year development horizon.

Allocation To General Plan Buildout: 95.00%

Reference Document:

Project Timing:

The project will be constructed within normal review of priorities and as adequate and sufficient revenues are collected.

PROPOSED EXPENDITURES	2011 - 12	2012 - 13	2013 - 14	2014 - 15	2015 - 16 through Build-out	Total all Years
1. Design / Engineering / Administratic	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	60,000.00	60,000.00
2. Land Acquisition / Right Of Way	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
3. Construction	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	400,000.00	400,000.00
4. Contingency	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	40,000.00	40,000.00
5. Equipment / Other	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
TOTAL COST:	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	500,000.00	500,000.00

Huntington Beach

Master Facilities Plan Project Detail

Infrastructure: Local Circulation (Streets, Signals And Bridges) System

Project Number:/ Title LC 014 Newland Street And Warner Avenue

Submitting Departments: Public Works - Engineering

Project Description:

To maximize the capability to move vehicles and pedestrians across the intersection (in all directions), the following improvements to the intersection are proposed: 1) Convert a separate westbound right turn lane to a de-facto right turn lane, and 2) add a 3rd westbound through lane. This would be a City-managed project.

Justification / Consequences of Avoidance:

There are few opportunities to add additional lane miles through out the City, thus maximum movement of traffic across major circulation routes is critical. Failure to or inability to increase circulation capacity where warranted and needed would reduce the Level of Service (or LOS) traffic flow at intersections of major streets to a Level "E" by acting as a bottleneck. Level "E" is "Unstable Flow:" and is identified as "long queues of vehicles waiting upstream of the intersection". Level "E", "Forced Flow" creates "Jammed conditions, back-ups from other locations restrict or prevent movement".

Relationship to General Plan Development:

All new development will impact existing intersections within the City, making some of them require improvements or the LOS will drop to unacceptable levels like "D", "E" or "F". Development anticipated over the next twenty years will generate 307,924 additional daily trip-miles. This is a 11.8% increase daily over the City's existing demand of 3,135,213 daily trip-miles, all of which will compete for use of a static number of major roadway lane miles. The 370,924 added daily trip-miles represents an 10.6% of the total 3,506,137 daily trip-miles at the twenty-year development horizon.

Allocation To General Plan Buildout: 95.00%

Reference Document:

Project Timing:

The project will be constructed within normal review of priorities and as adequate and sufficient revenues are collected.

PROPOSED EXPENDITURES	2011 - 12	2012 - 13	2013 - 14	2014 - 15	2015 - 16 through Build-out	Total all Years
1. Design / Engineering / Administratic	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	3,600.00	3,600.00
2. Land Acquisition / Right Of Way	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
3. Construction	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	24,000.00	24,000.00
4. Contingency	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	2,400.00	2,400.00
5. Equipment / Other	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
TOTAL COST:	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	30,000.00	30,000.00

Huntington Beach

Master Facilities Plan Project Detail

Infrastructure: Local Circulation (Streets, Signals And Bridges) System

Project Number:/ Title LC 015 Newland Street And Yorktown Avenue

Submitting Departments: Public Works - Engineering

Project Description:

To maximize the capability to move vehicles and pedestrians across the intersection (in all directions), the following improvement to the intersection is proposed: 1) Re-stripe westbound right turn lane to a 2nd westbound through lane. This would be a City-managed project.

Justification / Consequences of Avoidance:

There are few opportunities to add additional lane miles through out the City, thus maximum movement of traffic across major circulation routes is critical. Failure to or inability to increase circulation capacity where warranted and needed would reduce the Level of Service (or LOS) traffic flow at intersections of major streets to a Level "E" by acting as a bottleneck. Level "E" is "Unstable Flow:" and is identified as "long queues of vehicles waiting upstream of the intersection". Level "E", "Forced Flow" creates "Jammed conditions, back-ups from other locations restrict or prevent movement".

Relationship to General Plan Development:

All new development will impact existing intersections within the City, making some of them require improvements or the LOS will drop to unacceptable levels like "D", "E" or "F". Development anticipated over the next twenty years will generate 307,924 additional daily trip-miles. This is a 11.8% increase daily over the City's existing demand of 3,135,213 daily trip-miles, all of which will compete for use of a static number of major roadway lane miles. The 370,924 added daily trip-miles represents an 10.6% of the total 3,506,137 daily trip-miles at the twenty-year development horizon.

Allocation To General Plan Buildout: 95.00%

Reference Document:

Project Timing:

The project will be constructed within normal review of priorities and as adequate and sufficient revenues are collected.

PROPOSED EXPENDITURES	2011 - 12	2012 - 13	2013 - 14	2014 - 15	2015 - 16 through Build-out	Total all Years
1. Design / Engineering / Administratic	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	36,000.00	36,000.00
2. Land Acquisition / Right Of Way	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
3. Construction	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	240,000.00	240,000.00
4. Contingency	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	24,000.00	24,000.00
5. Equipment / Other	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
TOTAL COST:	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	300,000.00	300,000.00

Huntington Beach

Master Facilities Plan Project Detail

Infrastructure: Local Circulation (Streets, Signals And Bridges) System

Project Number:/ Title LC 016 Gothard Street And Slater Avenue

Submitting Departments: Public Works - Engineering

Project Description:

To maximize the capability to move vehicles and pedestrians across the intersection (in all directions), the following improvement to the intersection is proposed: 1) Add a 2nd northbound left turn lane. This would be a City-managed project.

Justification / Consequences of Avoidance:

There are few opportunities to add additional lane miles through out the City, thus maximum movement of traffic across major circulation routes is critical. Failure to or inability to increase circulation capacity where warranted and needed would reduce the Level of Service (or LOS) traffic flow at intersections of major streets to a Level "E" by acting as a bottleneck. Level "E" is "Unstable Flow:" and is identified as "long queues of vehicles waiting upstream of the intersection". Level "E", "Forced Flow" creates "Jammed conditions, back-ups from other locations restrict or prevent movement".

Relationship to General Plan Development:

All new development will impact existing intersections within the City, making some of them require improvements or the LOS will drop to unacceptable levels like "D", "E" or "F". Development anticipated over the next twenty years will generate 307,924 additional daily trip-miles. This is a 11.8% increase daily over the City's existing demand of 3,135,213 daily trip-miles, all of which will compete for use of a static number of major roadway lane miles. The 370,924 added daily trip-miles represents an 10.6% of the total 3,506,137 daily trip-miles at the twenty-year development horizon.

Allocation To General Plan Buildout: 95.00%

Reference Document:

Project Timing:

The project will be constructed within normal review of priorities and as adequate and sufficient revenues are collected.

PROPOSED EXPENDITURES	2011 - 12	2012 - 13	2013 - 14	2014 - 15	2015 - 16 through Build-out	Total all Years
1. Design / Engineering / Administratic	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	60,000.00	60,000.00
2. Land Acquisition / Right Of Way	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
3. Construction	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	400,000.00	400,000.00
4. Contingency	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	40,000.00	40,000.00
5. Equipment / Other	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
TOTAL COST:	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	500,000.00	500,000.00

Huntington Beach

Master Facilities Plan Project Detail

Infrastructure: Local Circulation (Streets, Signals And Bridges) System

Project Number/ Title LC 017 Gothard Street And Talbert Avenue

Submitting Departments: Public Works - Engineering

Project Description:

To maximize the capability to move vehicles and pedestrians across the intersection (in all directions), the following improvement to the intersection is proposed: 1) Add a 2nd southbound left turn lane. An alternative to that improvement would be: 1) Convert a separate eastbound right turn to a 2nd eastbound through lane. This would be a City-managed project.

Justification / Consequences of Avoidance:

There are few opportunities to add additional lane miles through out the City, thus maximum movement of traffic across major circulation routes is critical. Failure to or inability to increase circulation capacity where warranted and needed would reduce the Level of Service (or LOS) traffic flow at intersections of major streets to a Level "E" by acting as a bottleneck. Level "E" is "Unstable Flow:" and is identified as "long queues of vehicles waiting upstream of the intersection". Level "E", "Forced Flow" creates "Jammed conditions, back-ups from other locations restrict or prevent movement".

Relationship to General Plan Development:

All new development will impact existing intersections within the City, making some of them require improvements or the LOS will drop to unacceptable levels like "D", "E" or "F". Development anticipated over the next twenty years will generate 307,924 additional daily trip-miles. This is a 11.8% increase daily over the City's existing demand of 3,135,213 daily trip-miles, all of which will compete for use of a static number of major roadway lane miles. The 370,924 added daily trip-miles represents an 10.6% of the total 3,506,137 daily trip-miles at the twenty-year development horizon.

Allocation To General Plan Buildout: 95.00%

Reference Document:

Project Timing:

The project will be constructed within normal review of priorities and as adequate and sufficient revenues are collected.

PROPOSED EXPENDITURES	2011 - 12	2012 - 13	2013 - 14	2014 - 15	2015 - 16 through Build-out	Total all Years
2. Land Acquisition / Right Of Way	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
3. Construction	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	240,000.00	240,000.00
4. Contingency	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	24,000.00	24,000.00
5. Equipment / Other	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
TOTAL COST:	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	264,000.00	264,000.00

Huntington Beach

Master Facilities Plan Project Detail

Infrastructure: Local Circulation (Streets, Signals And Bridges) System

Project Number/ Title LC 018 Ward Street And Garfield Avenue

Submitting Departments: Public Works - Engineering

Project Description:

To maximize the capability to move vehicles and pedestrians across the intersection (in all directions), the following improvements to the intersection are proposed: 1) Add a 2nd eastbound left turn lane, and 2) remove a separate eastbound right turn lane. This would be a City-managed project.

Justification / Consequences of Avoidance:

There are few opportunities to add additional lane miles through out the City, thus maximum movement of traffic across major circulation routes is critical. Failure to or inability to increase circulation capacity where warranted and needed would reduce the Level of Service (or LOS) traffic flow at intersections of major streets to a Level "E" by acting as a bottleneck. Level "E" is "Unstable Flow:" and is identified as "long queues of vehicles waiting upstream of the intersection". Level "E", "Forced Flow" creates "Jammed conditions, back-ups from other locations restrict or prevent movement".

Relationship to General Plan Development:

All new development will impact existing intersections within the City, making some of them require improvements or the LOS will drop to unacceptable levels like "D", "E" or "F". Development anticipated over the next twenty years will generate 307,924 additional daily trip-miles. This is a 11.8% increase daily over the City's existing demand of 3,135,213 daily trip-miles, all of which will compete for use of a static number of major roadway lane miles. The 370,924 added daily trip-miles represents an 10.6% of the total 3,506,137 daily trip-miles at the twenty-year development horizon.

Allocation To General Plan Buildout: 95.00%

Reference Document:

Project Timing:

The project will be constructed within normal review of priorities and as adequate and sufficient revenues are collected.

PROPOSED EXPENDITURES	2011 - 12	2012 - 13	2013 - 14	2014 - 15	2015 - 16 through Build-out	Total all Years
2. Land Acquisition / Right Of Way	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
3. Construction	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	8,000.00	8,000.00
4. Contingency	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	800.00	800.00
5. Equipment / Other	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
TOTAL COST:	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	8,800.00	8,800.00

Huntington Beach

Master Facilities Plan Project Detail

Infrastructure: Local Circulation (Streets, Signals And Bridges) System

Project Number:/ Title LC 019 Brookhurst Street And Adams Avenue

Submitting Departments: Public Works - Engineering

Project Description:

To maximize the capability to move vehicles and pedestrians across the intersection (in all directions), the following improvements to the intersection are proposed: 1) Add a 4th through lane in each of the four directions, 2) add a separate northbound right turn lane, 3) allow northbound right turn overlap and 4) allow westbound right turn overlap. This would be a City-managed project.

Justification / Consequences of Avoidance:

There are few opportunities to add additional lane miles through out the City, thus maximum movement of traffic across major circulation routes is critical. Failure to or inability to increase circulation capacity where warranted and needed would reduce the Level of Service (or LOS) traffic flow at intersections of major streets to a Level "E" by acting as a bottleneck. Level "E" is "Unstable Flow:" and is identified as "long queues of vehicles waiting upstream of the intersection". Level "E", "Forced Flow" creates "Jammed conditions, back-ups from other locations restrict or prevent movement".

Relationship to General Plan Development:

All new development will impact existing intersections within the City, making some of them require improvements or the LOS will drop to unacceptable levels like "D", "E" or "F". Development anticipated over the next twenty years will generate 307,924 additional daily trip-miles. This is a 11.8% increase daily over the City's existing demand of 3,135,213 daily trip-miles, all of which will compete for use of a static number of major roadway lane miles. The 370,924 added daily trip-miles represents an 10.6% of the total 3,506,137 daily trip-miles at the twenty-year development horizon.

Allocation To General Plan Buildout: 95.00%

Reference Document:

Project Timing:

The project will be constructed within normal review of priorities and as adequate and sufficient revenues are collected.

PROPOSED EXPENDITURES	2011 - 12	2012 - 13	2013 - 14	2014 - 15	2015 - 16 through Build-out	Total all Years
1. Design / Engineering / Administratic	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1,200,000.00	1,200,000.00
2. Land Acquisition / Right Of Way	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
3. Construction	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	8,000,000.00	8,000,000.00
4. Contingency	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	800,000.00	800,000.00
5. Equipment / Other	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
TOTAL COST:	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	10,000,000.00	10,000,000.00

Huntington Beach

Master Facilities Plan Project Detail

Infrastructure: Local Circulation (Streets, Signals And Bridges) System

Project Number:/ Title LC 020 Miscellaneous Traffic Signal/Intersection Improvements

Submitting Departments: Public Works - Engineering

Project Description:

Construct, on average, one traffic signal (and supportive intersection improvements) per year over a twenty-year development window. The intersections would be selected on an as-needed basis from an existing prioritized list of proposed intersections. The improvements would include, but not necessarily be limited to, concrete curb, sidewalk and disabled ramp alterationss, new signals infrastructure, consisintg of light arms, lights, electrical control boxes, off-site controls. In addition there may be a need for lane restriping and left-turn and right turn pockets. These projects would be a City-managed.

Justification / Consequences of Avoidance:

There are few opportunities to add additional lane miles through out the City, thus movement of traffic across major circulation routes. Failure to or inability to increase circulation capacity where warranted and needed would reduce the Level of Service (or LOS) traffic flow at intersections of major streets to a Level "E" by acting as a bottleneck. Level "E" is "Unstable Flow:" and is identified as "long queues of vehicles waiting upstream of the intersection". Level "E", "Forced Flow" creates "Jammed conditions, back-ups from other locations restrict or prevent movement".

Relationship to General Plan Development:

All new development will impact existing intersections within the City, making some of them require improvements or the LOS will drop to unacceptable levels like "D", "E" or "F". Development anticipated over the next twenty years will generate 307,924 additional daily trip-miles. This is a 11.8% increase daily over the City's existing demand of 3,135,213 daily trip-miles, all of which will compete for use of a static number of major roadway lane miles. The 370,924 added daily trip-miles represents an 10.6% of the total 3,506,137 daily trip-miles at the twenty-year development horizon.

Allocation To General Plan Buildout: 95.00%

Reference Document:

Project Timing:

The project will be constructed within normal review of priorities and as adequate and sufficient revenues are collected.

PROPOSED EXPENDITURES	2011 - 12	2012 - 13	2013 - 14	2014 - 15	2015 - 16 through Build-out	Total all Years
1. Design / Engineering / Administratic	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	600,000.00	600,000.00
2. Land Acquisition / Right Of Way	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
3. Construction	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	4,000,000.00	4,000,000.00
4. Contingency	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	400,000.00	400,000.00
5. Equipment / Other	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
TOTAL COST:	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	5,000,000.00	5,000,000.00

Huntington Beach

Master Facilities Plan Project Detail

Infrastructure: Local Circulation (Streets, Signals And Bridges) System

Project Number:/ Title LC 021 Public Works Maintenance Building

Submitting Departments: Public Works - Engineering

Project Description:

Construct a 10,000 square foot, split-face block, general-use circulation system maintenance building. The facility would have full utilities and a number of roll-up doors. Approximately 80% of the cost of the additional space would benefit circulation system maintenance. The remaining 20% would be required for the growing storm drainage collection system maintenance needs and would thus be financed with Storm Drainage System Development Impact Fee proceeds. The cost below represents 80% of the proposed cost of the facility.

Justification / Consequences of Avoidance:

The additional space needs is required tro support the roughly $40.0 million in additional equipment and supply space needs resulting from the addition of major circulation and strom drainage improvements as well as an untold amount of local street miles and local strom drainage lines.

Relationship to General Plan Development:

The facility expansion is limited to the demand created by the new infrastructure required to support new development.

Allocation To General Plan Buildout: 95.00%

Reference Document:

Project Timing:

The project would be constructed based upon normal review of priorities and as adequate and sufficient DIF revenues are collected.

PROPOSED EXPENDITURES	2011 - 12	2012 - 13	2013 - 14	2014 - 15	2015 - 16 through Build-out	Total all Years
1. Design / Engineering / Administratic	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	265,000.00	265,000.00
2. Land Acquisition / Right Of Way	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
3. Construction	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	2,410,000.00	2,410,000.00
4. Contingency	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	145,000.00	145,000.00
5. Equipment / Other	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
TOTAL COST:	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	2,820,000.00	2,820,000.00

Huntington Beach

Master Facilities Plan Project Detail

Infrastructure: Local Circulation (Streets, Signals And Bridges) System

Project Number:/ Title LC 022 Public Works Maintenance Vehicles

Submitting Departments: Public Works - Maintenance

Project Description:

Acquire an additional maintenance utility truck and a traffic signal lift truck.

Justification / Consequences of Avoidance:

The additional maintenance vehicle would be required to support the additional demands from the roughly $25.0 million in additional circulation system improvements.

Relationship to General Plan Development:

The circulation system maintenance fleet expansion is limited to the demands created by new infrastructure required to support new development.

Allocation To General Plan Buildout: 95.00%

Reference Document:

Project Timing:

The proposed afleet additions would be acquired based upon normal review of priorities and as adequate and sufficient DIF revenues are collected.

PROPOSED EXPENDITURES	2011 - 12	2012 - 13	2013 - 14	2014 - 15	2015 - 16 through Build-out	Total all Years
1. Design / Engineering / Administratic	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
2. Land Acquisition / Right Of Way	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
3. Construction	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
4. Contingency	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
5. Equipment / Other	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	65,000.00	65,000.00
TOTAL COST:	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	65,000.00	65,000.00

City of Huntington Beach

Storm Drainage Collection System

Huntington Beach
Master Facilities Plan
Storm Drainage Collection System

		2011 - 12	2012 - 13	2013 - 14	2014 - 15	2015 - 16 Through Build Out	Project Build Out Total
SD -001	Santa Ana River & Talbert Channel Region (SD Region #1)	$0	$0	$0	$0	$23,728,000	$23,728,000
SD -002	Coastal And Bolsa Chica Wetlands Region (SD Region #2)	$0	$0	$0	$0	$21,527,000	$21,527,000
SD -003	Slater Channel Region (SD Region #3)	$0	$0	$0	$0	$34,236,000	$34,236,000
SD -004	Wintersburg Channel Region (SD Region #4)	$0	$0	$0	$0	$28,749,000	$28,749,000
SD -005	Bolsa Chica Channel & Harbour Region (SD Region #5)	$0	$0	$0	$0	$98,549,000	$98,549,000
SD -006	Public Works Maintenance Building	$0	$0	$0	$0	$705,050	$705,050
	TOTALS	$0	$0	$0	$0	$207494,050	$207494,050

Notes:
1) If project timing is not a component of this effort, then all projects default to their "Thru Build Out" amount.

Huntington Beach

Master Facilities Plan Project Detail

Infrastructure: Storm Drainage Collection System

Project Number:/ Title SD 001 Santa Ana River & Talbert Channel Region (SD Region #1)

Submitting Departments: Public Works - Engineering

Project Description:

The 788 individual projects within Area 1are required to remove storm drainage water from the City's street surfaces and other public areas and safely conveying it to the proper outlet. Sub-drainage region #1 drains the lower central to east and southerly areas of the City. It is generally bordered on the east by the Santa Ana River Channel, on the southwest by the Pacific Coast Highway and the Pacific Ocean, on the west mainly by Alabama and Main Streets, and on the north by Garfield and Ellis Avenues. It encompasses the Santa Ana River and the Talbert Channel Water Quality Planning Area and is represented in watershed Drainage Maps 20-27,29-32, 40, and 41.

Justification / Consequences of Avoidance:

These improvements are needed to provide efficient removal of storm water from the City's streets, roads and other public areas. Storm water will increase in amounts proportional to the amount of impervious surface reducing the capability of the ground to absorb water. The amount ranges from a low of 0.745 for detached dwellings to a high of 0.830 for commercial properties. If not completed, there would be the potential for flooding of downstream creeks, washes and other storm drainage collection pipes. Emergency vehicle response by the City's Police, Fire and Public Works crews could be effected to all areas of the City.

Relationship to General Plan Development:

A proportional amount of the projects, vis-a-vis the cost of the entire system, is appropriate.

Allocation To General Plan Buildout: 7.52%

Reference Document:

Project Timing:

The project will be constructed within normal review of priorities and as adequate and sufficient revenues are collected.

PROPOSED EXPENDITURES	2011 - 12	2012 - 13	2013 - 14	2014 - 15	2015 - 16 through Build-out	Total all Years
1. Design / Engineering / Administratic	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	2,847,360.00	2,847,360.00
2. Land Acquisition / Right Of Way	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
3. Construction	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	18,982,400.00	18,982,400.00
4. Contingency	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1,898,240.00	1,898,240.00
5. Equipment / Other	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
TOTAL COST:	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	23,728,000.00	23,728,000.00

Huntington Beach

Master Facilities Plan Project Detail

Infrastructure: Storm Drainage Collection System

Project Number:/ Title SD 002 Coastal And Bolsa Chica Wetlands Region (SD Region #2)

Submitting Departments: Public Works - Engineering

Project Description:

The 235 projects within Area #2 are required to remove storm drainage water from the City's street surfaces and other public areas and safely convey it to the proper outlet. Sub-drainage region # 2 drains the central southwest area of the City, and is generally bordered by Lake and Main Streets on the east, Pacific Coast Highway on the south and west, Seapoint Avenue and Edwards Street on the west, and Ellis Avenue on the north. Sub-drainage 2 also includes the community surrounding the Springdale/Talbert intersection. It encompasses the Bolsa Chica Wetlands and the Coastal Water Quality Planning Area and is represented in watershed Drainage Maps 16-19.

Justification / Consequences of Avoidance:

These improvements are needed to provide efficient removal of storm water from the City's streets, roads and other public areas. Storm water will increase in amounts proportional to the amount of impervious surface reducing the capability of the ground to absorb water. The amount ranges from a low of 0.745 for detached dwellings to a high of 0.830 for commercial properties. If not completed, there would be the potential for flooding of downstream creeks, washes and other storm drainage collection pipes. Emergency vehicle response by the City's Police, Fire and Public Works crews could be effected to all areas of the City.

Relationship to General Plan Development:

A proportional amount of the projects, vis-a-vis the cost of the entire system, is appropriate.

Allocation To General Plan Buildout: 7.52%

Reference Document:

Project Timing:

The project will be constructed within normal review of priorities and as adequate and sufficient revenues are collected.

PROPOSED EXPENDITURES	2011 - 12	2012 - 13	2013 - 14	2014 - 15	2015 - 16 through Build-out	Total all Years
1. Design / Engineering / Administratic	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	2,583,240.00	2,583,240.00
2. Land Acquisition / Right Of Way	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
3. Construction	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	17,221,600.00	17,221,600.00
4. Contingency	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1,722,160.00	1,722,160.00
5. Equipment / Other	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
TOTAL COST:	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	21,527,000.00	21,527,000.00

Huntington Beach

Master Facilities Plan Project Detail

Infrastructure: Storm Drainage Collection System

Project Number:/ Title SD 003 Slater Channel Region (SD Region #3)

Submitting Departments: Public Works - Engineering

Project Description:

The 270 projects within Area #3 are required to remove storm drainage water from the City's street surfaces and other public areas and safely convey it to the proper outlet. Sub-drainage region 3 drains the central section of the City, including a portion of the City of Fountain Valley, and is generally bordered by Newland and Magnolia Avenues on the east, Ellis, Taylor and Talbert Avenues on the south, Graham and Bolsa Chica Streets on the west, and Warner Avenue on the north. Sub-drainage 3 consists of the Slater Channel Water Quality Planning Area and is represented in watershed Drainage Maps 10-15.

Justification / Consequences of Avoidance:

These improvements are needed to provide efficient removal of storm water from the City's streets, roads and other public areas. Storm water will increase in amounts proportional to the amount of impervious surface reducing the capability of the ground to absorb water. The amount ranges from a low of 0.745 for detached dwellings to a high of 0.830 for commercial properties. If not completed, there would be the potential for flooding of downstream creeks, washes and other storm drainage collection pipes. Emergency vehicle response by the City's Police, Fire and Public Works crews could be effected to all areas of the City.

Relationship to General Plan Development:

A proportional amount of the projects, vis-a-vis the cost of the entire system, is appropriate.

Allocation To General Plan Buildout: 7.52%

Reference Document:

Project Timing:

The project will be constructed within normal review of priorities and as adequate and sufficient revenues are collected.

PROPOSED EXPENDITURES	2011 - 12	2012 - 13	2013 - 14	2014 - 15	2015 - 16 through Build-out	Total all Years
1. Design / Engineering / Administratic	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	4,108,320.00	4,108,320.00
2. Land Acquisition / Right Of Way	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
3. Construction	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	27,388,800.00	27,388,800.00
4. Contingency	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	2,738,880.00	2,738,880.00
5. Equipment / Other	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
TOTAL COST:	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	34,236,000.00	34,236,000.00

Huntington Beach

Master Facilities Plan Project Detail

Infrastructure: Storm Drainage Collection System

Project Number:/ Title SD 004 Wintersburg Channel Region (SD Region #4)

Submitting Departments: Public Works - Engineering

Project Description:

The 220 projects within Area #4 are required to remove storm drainage water from the City's street surfaces and other public areas and safely convey it to the proper outlet.Sub-drainage region 4 includes the northern and northeastern parts of the City, and is generally bordered by Newland Street on the east, Heil and Warner Avenues on the south, Springdale Street on the west, and McFadden Avenue on the north. Sub-drainage 4 corresponds to the Wintersburg Water Quality Channel Planning Area and is represented in watershed Drainage Maps 6-9.

Justification / Consequences of Avoidance:

These improvements are needed to provide efficient removal of storm water from the City's streets, roads and other public areas. Storm water will increase in amounts proportional to the amount of impervious surface reducing the capability of the ground to absorb water. The amount ranges from a low of 0.745 for detached dwellings to a high of 0.830 for commercial properties. If not completed, there would be the potential for flooding of downstream creeks, washes and other storm drainage collection pipes. Emergency vehicle response by the City's Police, Fire and Public Works crews could be effected to all areas of the City.

Relationship to General Plan Development:

A proportional amount of the projects, vis-a-vis the cost of the entire system, is appropriate.

Allocation To General Plan Buildout: 7.52%

Reference Document:

Project Timing:

The project will be constructed within normal review of priorities and as adequate and sufficient revenues are collected.

PROPOSED EXPENDITURES	2011 - 12	2012 - 13	2013 - 14	2014 - 15	2015 - 16 through Build-out	Total all Years
1. Design / Engineering / Administratic	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	3,449,880.00	3,449,880.00
2. Land Acquisition / Right Of Way	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
3. Construction	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	22,999,200.00	22,999,200.00
4. Contingency	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	2,299,920.00	2,299,920.00
5. Equipment / Other	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
TOTAL COST:	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	28,749,000.00	28,749,000.00

Huntington Beach

Master Facilities Plan Project Detail

Infrastructure: Storm Drainage Collection System

Project Number:/ Title SD 005 Bolsa Chica Channel & Harbour Region (SD Region #5)

Submitting Departments: Public Works - Engineering

Project Description:

The 278 projects within Area #5 are required to remove storm drainage water from the City's street surfaces and other public areas and safely convey it to the proper outlet. Sub-drainage region 5 covers the northwestern section of the City, including a portion of the City of Westminster. Bub-drainage 5 corresponds to the Harbor Water Quality Planning Area and the Bolsa Chica Channel Water Quality Planning Area and is represented in watershed Drainage Maps 1-5.

Justification / Consequences of Avoidance:

These improvements are needed to provide efficient removal of storm water from the City's streets, roads and other public areas. Storm water will increase in amounts proportional to the amount of impervious surface reducing the capability of the ground to absorb water. The amount ranges from a low of 0.745 for detached dwellings to a high of 0.830 for commercial properties. If not completed, there would be the potential for flooding of downstream creeks, washes and other storm drainage collection pipes. Emergency vehicle response by the City's Police, Fire and Public Works crews could be effected to all areas of the City.

Relationship to General Plan Development:

A proportional amount of the projects, vis-a-vis the cost of the entire system, is appropriate.

Allocation To General Plan Buildout: 7.52%

Reference Document:

Project Timing:

The project will be constructed within normal review of priorities and as adequate and sufficient revenues are collected.

PROPOSED EXPENDITURES	2011 - 12	2012 - 13	2013 - 14	2014 - 15	2015 - 16 through Build-out	Total all Years
1. Design / Engineering / Administratic	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	11,825,880.00	11,825,880.00
2. Land Acquisition / Right Of Way	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
3. Construction	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	78,839,200.00	78,839,200.00
4. Contingency	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	7,883,920.00	7,883,920.00
5. Equipment / Other	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
TOTAL COST:	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	98,549,000.00	98,549,000.00

Huntington Beach

Master Facilities Plan Project Detail

Infrastructure: Storm Drainage Collection System

Project Number:/ Title SD 006 Public Works Maintenance Building

Submitting Departments: Public Works - Engineering

Project Description:

.Construct a 10,000 split-face block general use, maintenance building. The facility would be have full utilities and a number of roll-up doors. Approximately 20% of the cost of an additional 10,000 square foot building in support of General Fund Public Works maintenance from Storm Drainage System Development Impact Fees. The remaining 80% would be financed with Circuation System Development Impact Fees.

Justification / Consequences of Avoidance:

The additional space needs would be required to support the additional maintenance demands from the construction of additional circulation and storm drainage infrastructure improvements.

Relationship to General Plan Development:

The facility expansion is limited to the demands created by the new infrastructure required to support new development.

Allocation To General Plan Buildout: 100.00%

Reference Document:

Project Timing:

The project will be constructed within normal review of priorities and as adequate and sufficient revenues are collected.

PROPOSED EXPENDITURES	2011 - 12	2012 - 13	2013 - 14	2014 - 15	2015 - 16 through Build-out	Total all Years
1. Design / Engineering / Administratic	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	66,250.00	66,250.00
2. Land Acquisition / Right Of Way	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
3. Construction	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	602,500.00	602,500.00
4. Contingency	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	36,300.00	36,300.00
5. Equipment / Other	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
TOTAL COST:	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	705,050.00	705,050.00

City of Huntington Beach

Public Library Facilities and Collection

Huntington Beach
Master Facilities Plan
Public Library Facilities And Collection

		2011 - 12	2012 - 13	2013 - 14	2014 - 15	2015 - 16 Through Build Out	Project Build Out Total
PL -001	Expand Banning Branch Library	$0	$0	$0	$0	$5,268,470	$5,268,470
PL -002	Expand Main Street Branch Library	$0	$0	$0	$0	$1,651,375	$1,651,375
PL -003	Expand Library Collection Items	$0	$0	$0	$0	$921,524	$921,524
	TOTALS	$0	$0	$0	$0	$7,841,369	$7,841,369

Notes:
1) If project timing is not a component of this effort, then all projects default to their "Thru Build Out" amount.

Huntington Beach

Master Facilities Plan Project Detail

Infrastructure: Public Library Facilities And Collection

Project Number:/ Title PL 001 Expand Banning Branch Library

Submitting Departments: Library Services

Project Description:

Expand the Banning Branch Library facilities by 10,100 square feet from the current 2,400 square feet to 12,500 square feet to assit in maintain the existing levels of service and extend those same levels of service to the 17,089 new residents expected to be added through General Plan build-out.

Justification / Consequences of Avoidance:

The current defacto library standard of space is 0.669 square feet per resident. Added 17,089 residents from new General Plan development will create additional demands upon the existing level of service provided by the library. Without increasing library space, the existing standard would decrease to about 0.614 square feet per resident.

Relationship to General Plan Development:

The proposed improvements are required to meet the demands of an increasing residential population.

Allocation To General Plan Buildout: 100.00%

Reference Document:

Project Timing:

Based upon the rate of construction of residential units and thus collection of any imposed development Impact Fees.

PROPOSED EXPENDITURES	2011 - 12	2012 - 13	2013 - 14	2014 - 15	2015 - 16 through Build-out	Total all Years
1. Design / Engineering / Administratic	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	535,260.00	535,260.00
2. Land Acquisition / Right Of Way	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	808,000.00	808,000.00
3. Construction	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	3,568,370.00	3,568,370.00
4. Contingency	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	356,840.00	356,840.00
5. Equipment / Other	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
TOTAL COST:	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	5,268,470.00	5,268,470.00

Huntington Beach

Master Facilities Plan Project Detail

Infrastructure: Public Library Facilities And Collection

Project Number:/ Title PL 002 Expand Main Street Branch Library

Submitting Departments: Library Services

Project Description:

Expand the Main Street Branch Library facilities by 4,804 square feet from the current 4,500 square feet to 9,304 square feet to assist in the maintenance of the existing levels of service and extend those same levels of service to the 17,089 new residents expected to be added through General Plan build-out. The project consists taking 4,804 square feet of the current building that house the branch library currently used by a non-City tenant and turning it into library space. There is no current effort to oust the current tenant, however, ultimately the non-library space could easily be converted as librray space.

Justification / Consequences of Avoidance:

The current defacto library standard of space is 0.669 square feet per resident. Added 17,089 residents from new General Plan development will create additional demands upon the existing level of service provided by the library. Without increasing library space, the existing standard would decrease to about 0.614 square feet per resident.

Relationship to General Plan Development:

The proposed improvements are required to meet the demands of an increasing residential population.

Allocation To General Plan Buildout: 100.00%

Reference Document:

Project Timing:

Based upon the rate of construction of residential units and thus collection of any imposed development Impact Fees.

PROPOSED EXPENDITURES	2011 - 12	2012 - 13	2013 - 14	2014 - 15	2015 - 16 through Build-out	Total all Years
1. Design / Engineering / Administratic	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	198,165.00	198,165.00
2. Land Acquisition / Right Of Way	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
3. Construction	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1,321,100.00	1,321,100.00
4. Contingency	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	132,110.00	132,110.00
5. Equipment / Other	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
TOTAL COST:	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1,651,375.00	1,651,375.00

Huntington Beach

Master Facilities Plan Project Detail

Infrastructure: Public Library Facilities And Collection

Project Number:/ Title PL 003 Expand Library Collection Items

Submitting Departments: Library Services

Project Description:

Expand the public library collection items inventory by roughly 36,861 items to maintain the existing 2.157 collection items per resident currently offered by the City's library system.

Justification / Consequences of Avoidance:

Added population from new residential construction will increase the City's residential population by approximately 17,089 additional residents. Without expanding the library collection items inventory, that standard would drop to approximately 1.979 items per resident.

Relationship to General Plan Development:

The proposed improvements are required to meet the demands of an increasing residential population.

Allocation To General Plan Buildout: 100.00%

Reference Document:

Project Timing:

Based upon the rate of construction of residential units and thus collection of any imposed development Impact Fees.

PROPOSED EXPENDITURES	2011 - 12	2012 - 13	2013 - 14	2014 - 15	2015 - 16 through Build-out	Total all Years
1. Design / Engineering / Administratic	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
2. Land Acquisition / Right Of Way	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
3. Construction	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
4. Contingency	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
5. Equipment / Other	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	921,524.00	921,524.00
TOTAL COST:	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	921,524.00	921,524.00

City of Huntington Beach

Community Use Facilities

Huntington Beach
Master Facilities Plan
Community Use Facilities

		2011 - 12	2012 - 13	2013 - 14	2014 - 15	2015 - 16 Through Build Out	Project Build Out Total
CF -001	Central Park Senior Center	$0	$0	$0	$0	$22,000,000	$22,000,000
CF -002	Edison Community Center Gymnasium	$0	$0	$0	$0	$2,975,000	$2,975,000
CF -003	Murdy Community Center Gymnasium	$0	$0	$0	$0	$2,975,000	$2,975,000
CF -004	Oak View Recreation Center Expansion	$0	$0	$0	$0	$800,000	$800,000
	TOTALS	$0	$0	$0	$0	$28,750,000	$28,750,000

Notes:
1) If project timing is not a component of this effort, then all projects default to their "Thru Build Out" amount.

Huntington Beach

Master Facilities Plan Project Detail

Infrastructure: Community Use Facilities

Project Number/ Title CF 001 Central Park Senior Center

Submitting Departments: Community Services

Project Description:

Construct 45,000 square foot Senior Center in Central Park. The facility would have a large multi-purpose room, a number of smaller classrooms, a warming kitchen, fitness center, game room with pool tables, and ancillary offices. There would also be a garden patio with a water feature, turf and gardens. The facility would have parking for 250 vehicles.

Justification / Consequences of Avoidance:

The City currently has a de-facto standard of 0.620 square feet or general purpose community use facility space per resident based upon the City's 118,820 square feet of public use facilities available to the 190,377 residents. The City wishes to maintain, if not improve, this standard by construction. The 0.620 square foot per person is not the standard for senior only facilities, but for all community use facilities available to the entire residential population.

Relationship to General Plan Development:

The proposed land-use database indicates additional residential dwellings that would likely result in roughly 17,089 additional residents requiring at least 10,595 square feet of public use space in order to maintain the existing level of service (LOS)

Allocation To General Plan Buildout: 0.00%

Reference Document:

Project Timing:

The construction of the facility is on-hold pending litigation.

PROPOSED EXPENDITURES	2011 - 12	2012 - 13	2013 - 14	2014 - 15	2015 - 16 through Build-out	Total all Years
1. Design / Engineering / Administratic	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	2,200,000.00	2,200,000.00
2. Land Acquisition / Right Of Way	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
3. Construction	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	17,600,000.00	17,600,000.00
4. Contingency	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1,760,000.00	1,760,000.00
5. Equipment / Other	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	440,000.00	440,000.00
TOTAL COST:	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	22,000,000.00	22,000,000.00

Huntington Beach

Master Facilities Plan Project Detail

Infrastructure: Community Use Facilities

Project Number/ Title CF 002 Edison Community Center Gymnasium

Submitting Departments: Community Services

Project Description:

Construct a 7,000 square foot gymnasium contiguous to the Edison Community Center. The facility would be a basic "high school" design or grade with a single main basketball court that can be broken down into two smaller full-courts or four half-courts for practice sessions. The facility would also have locker rooms and restrooms.

Justification / Consequences of Avoidance:

Due to higher demands of their own, the local high school gymnasiums are no longer as available as they once were. As a result, the City is finding it more difficult to meet the City's youth indoor sports needs.

Relationship to General Plan Development:

The proposed land-use database indicates additional residential dwellings that would likely result in roughly 17,089 additional residents requiring at least 10,595 square feet of public use space in order to maintain the existing level of service (LOS).

Allocation To General Plan Buildout: 0.00%

Reference Document:

Project Timing:

The expansion is planned for construction between 2010 and 2020.

PROPOSED EXPENDITURES	2011 - 12	2012 - 13	2013 - 14	2014 - 15	2015 - 16 through Build-out	Total all Years
1. Design / Engineering / Administratic	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	357,000.00	357,000.00
2. Land Acquisition / Right Of Way	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
3. Construction	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	2,380,000.00	2,380,000.00
4. Contingency	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	238,000.00	238,000.00
5. Equipment / Other	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
TOTAL COST:	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	2,975,000.00	2,975,000.00

Huntington Beach

Master Facilities Plan Project Detail

Infrastructure: Community Use Facilities

Project Number:/ Title CF 003 Murdy Community Center Gymnasium

Submitting Departments: Community Services

Project Description:

Construct a 7,000 square foot gymnasium contiguous to the Murdy Community Center. The facility would be a basic "high school" design or grade with a single main basketball court that can be broken down into two smaller full-courts or four half-courts for practice sessions. The facility would also have locker rooms and restrooms.

Justification / Consequences of Avoidance:

Due to higher demands of their own, the local high school gymnasiums are no longer as available as they once were. As a result the City is finding it more difficult to meet the City's youth indoor sports needs. This problem will only increase with more residents.

Relationship to General Plan Development:

The proposed land-use database indicates additional residential dwellings that would likely result in roughly 17,089 additional residents requiring at least 10,595 square feet of public use space in order to maintain the existing level of service (LOS).

Allocation To General Plan Buildout: 0.00%

Reference Document:

Project Timing:

The expansion is planned for construction between 2010 and 2020.

PROPOSED EXPENDITURES	2011 - 12	2012 - 13	2013 - 14	2014 - 15	2015 - 16 through Build-out	Total all Years
1. Design / Engineering / Administratic	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	357,000.00	357,000.00
2. Land Acquisition / Right Of Way	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
3. Construction	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	2,380,000.00	2,380,000.00
4. Contingency	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	238,000.00	238,000.00
5. Equipment / Other	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
TOTAL COST:	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	2,975,000.00	2,975,000.00

Huntington Beach

Master Facilities Plan Project Detail

Infrastructure: Community Use Facilities

Project Number:/ Title CF 004 Oak View Recreation Center Expansion

Submitting Departments: Community Services

Project Description:

Construct a roughly 2,000 square foot expansion to the existing 10,000 square foot Oak View Recreation Community Center. The facility would consist of a game room, multi-purpose room and a restroom.

Justification / Consequences of Avoidance:

The facility is necessary (or planned) to maximize the fairly small facility.

Relationship to General Plan Development:

The proposed land-use database indicates additional residential dwellings that would likely result in roughly 17,089 additional residents requiring at least 10,595 square feet of public use space in order to maintain the existing level of service (LOS).

Allocation To General Plan Buildout: 0.00%

Reference Document:

Project Timing:

The expansion is planned for construction between 2010 and 2020.

PROPOSED EXPENDITURES	2011 - 12	2012 - 13	2013 - 14	2014 - 15	2015 - 16 through Build-out	Total all Years
1. Design / Engineering / Administratic	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	80,000.00	80,000.00
2. Land Acquisition / Right Of Way	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
3. Construction	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	640,000.00	640,000.00
4. Contingency	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	64,000.00	64,000.00
5. Equipment / Other	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	16,000.00	16,000.00
TOTAL COST:	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	800,000.00	800,000.00

City of Huntington Beach

Public Library Facilities and Collection

NOTE: "Allocation to General Plan" on all projects is listed as 0.00% because any or all of the projects will qualify for Quimby Act financing due to it's flexibility.

Huntington Beach
Master Facilities Plan
Park Land Acquisition And Park Facilities Development

		2011 - 12	2012 - 13	2013 - 14	2014 - 15	2015 - 16 Through Build Out	Project Build Out Total
PK -001	Bartlett Park Conceptual Plan And EIR	$400,000	$0	$0	$0	$5,000,000	$5,400,000
PK -002	Irby Park Phase II	$0	$0	$0	$0	$500,000	$500,000
PK -003	Edison Park Youth Sport Complex Plan & Phase I Improvements	$0	$0	$0	$1,250,000	$4,250,000	$5,500,000
PK -004	Central Park Former Gun Range EIR, RAP And Development	$325,000	$0	$0	$0	$4,000,000	$4,325,000
PK -005	Le Bard Park Expansion Master Plan And Development Plan	$250,000	$0	$0	$0	$1,200,000	$1,450,000
PK -006	Blufftop Park Permanent Beach Restrooms	$0	$0	$0	$0	$2,400,000	$2,400,000
PK -007	Blufftop Park Trail Improvements	$0	$0	$0	$0	$1,000,000	$1,000,000
PK -008	Edinger Dock Development	$0	$0	$0	$0	$700,000	$700,000
PK -009	Wardlow Field Reconfiguration Design/Construction	$120,000	$0	$0	$0	$880,000	$1,000,000
PK -010	Worthy Park Restroom	$0	$0	$0	$0	$130,000	$130,000
PK -011	Skate Park Facility & Restroom Design/Const.	$130,000	$0	$0	$0	$1,130,000	$1,260,000
PK -012	City-Wide Parks Master Plan	$0	$0	$0	$0	$350,000	$350,000
PK -013	Central Park Habitat Plan	$0	$0	$0	$0	$250,000	$250,000
PK -014	Central Park Acquisiton Of Encyclopedia Lots	$0	$0	$0	$0	$1,020,000	$1,020,000
PK -015	Central Park Development Of Remaining 86 Acres	$0	$0	$0	$0	$20,000,000	$20,000,000
PK -016	Central Park Rebuild Two Restaurant Facilities	$0	$0	$0	$0	$800,000	$800,000
PK -017	General Youth Sports Facilities Grants	$150,000	$150,000	$150,000	$150,000	$39,000,000	$39,600,000
PK -018	Sport Complex (8th Field)	$0	$0	$0	$0	$450,000	$450,000
PK -019	Murdy Youth Sports Complex Phase II	$0	$0	$0	$0	$2,500,000	$2,500,000
PK -020	Beach Playground	$0	$0	$0	$0	$350,000	$350,000
PK -021	Central Park Development Of Former Gun Range Area	$0	$0	$0	$0	$3,000,000	$3,000,000
PK -022	Warner Dock Renovation And Expansion	$0	$0	$0	$0	$800,000	$800,000

Huntington Beach
Master Facilities Plan
Park Land Acquisition And Park Facilities Development

		2011 - 12	2012 - 13	2013 - 14	2014 - 15	2015 - 16 Through Build Out	Project Build Out Total
PK -023	Lamb Park Design And Development	$0	$0	$0	$0	$1,100,000	$1,100,000
PK -024	Central Park Sports Complex Team Room	$0	$0	$0	$0	$100,000	$100,000
PK -025	Future Parks Acquisition (Possible Closed School Sites)	$0	$0	$0	$0	$14,748,000	$14,748,000
	TOTALS	$1,375,000	$150,000	$150,000	$1,400,000	$105658,000	$108733,000

Notes:
1) If project timing is not a component of this effort, then all projects default to their "Thru Build Out" amount.

Huntington Beach

Master Facilities Plan Project Detail

Infrastructure: Park Land Acquisition And Park Facilities Development

Project Number:/ Title PK 001 Bartlett Park Conceptual Plan And EIR

Submitting Departments: Community Services

Project Description:

The project consists of the environmental assessment and conceptual plan for the remaining 28 acre Bartlett Park, largely an Environmentally Sensitive Habitat Area (ESHA). The preliminary plans include a natural-passive use consisting of trails, trailhead kiosks, and limited, natural parking.

Justification / Consequences of Avoidance:

The park improvements are needed for protection of the currently open or vacant parcel. Roughly 90% of the park would remain untouched with improvements designed to protect that 90%.

Relationship to General Plan Development:

Little direct relationship, but the improvements are consistent with the City's General Plan Recreation Element and indirectly support the additional residents resulting from new development. The project is also capacity increasing.

Allocation To General Plan Buildout: 0.00%

Reference Document:

Project Timing:

The design and environment assessment component is planned for 2009 to 2010. The first construction component is planned for between 2010 and 2020.

PROPOSED EXPENDITURES	2011 - 12	2012 - 13	2013 - 14	2014 - 15	2015 - 16 through Build-out	Total all Years
1. Design / Engineering / Administratic	400,000.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	500,000.00	900,000.00
2. Land Acquisition / Right Of Way	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
3. Construction	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	4,000,000.00	4,000,000.00
4. Contingency	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	500,000.00	500,000.00
5. Equipment / Other	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
TOTAL COST:	400,000.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	5,000,000.00	5,400,000.00

Huntington Beach

Master Facilities Plan Project Detail

Infrastructure: Park Land Acquisition And Park Facilities Development

Project Number:/ Title PK 002 Irby Park Phase II

Submitting Departments: Community Services

Project Description:

The project consists of the development of the remaining eight acres. Construct bio-filter and water retention area. In addition, construct trails, passive pocket areas, interpretive signs and a small area of neighborhood park improvements (climbing apparatus, benches, picnic tables) adjacent to the neighborhood area. The more active portion would be designed in a fashion to protect the more natural areas.

Justification / Consequences of Avoidance:

The park needs a combination of passive/active improvements to create a balance of active uses with protection of the water retention needs. The water retention needs would receive appropriations from storm drainage sources, a State Public Works Grant.

Relationship to General Plan Development:

Little direct relationship, but the improvements are consistent with the City's General Plan Recreation Element and indirectly support the additional residents resulting from new development. The project is also capacity increasing.

Allocation To General Plan Buildout: 0.00%

Reference Document:

Project Timing:

Based upon receipt of State (Public Works) Grant. The project is in conjunction with a PW State Grant - matching funds.

PROPOSED EXPENDITURES	2011 - 12	2012 - 13	2013 - 14	2014 - 15	2015 - 16 through Build-out	Total all Years
1. Design / Engineering / Administratic	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	50,000.00	50,000.00
2. Land Acquisition / Right Of Way	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
3. Construction	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	400,000.00	400,000.00
4. Contingency	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	50,000.00	50,000.00
5. Equipment / Other	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
TOTAL COST:	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	500,000.00	500,000.00

Huntington Beach

Master Facilities Plan Project Detail

Infrastructure: Park Land Acquisition And Park Facilities Development

Project Number:/ Title PK 003 Central Park Former Gun Range EIR, RAP And Development

Submitting Departments: Community Services

Project Description:

The project consists of an Environmental Impact Review, Remedial Action Plan and ultimately a development plan. The gun range has been inactive for over ten years and the accumulated lead in the soil and use of creosote wood presents an environmental problem and must be remediated before re-use. Phase I consists of preparation of an Environmental Impact Report and Remedial Action Plan. Phase II ($2.0 million) is an estimate of the range remediation. Phase III (also $2.0 million) is the actual site improvements to turn it into an active park use, proposed at this time to be a skate park.

Justification / Consequences of Avoidance:

The roughly five acre gun range area is part of the City's major regional park and needs to be used to its maximum potential in a yet to be determined manner.

Relationship to General Plan Development:

Little direct relationship, but the improvements are consistent with the City's General Plan Recreation Element and indirectly support the additional residents resulting from new development. The project is also capacity increasing.

Allocation To General Plan Buildout: 0.00%

Reference Document:

Project Timing:

The study/report, site remediation and site improvements are planned for a period between 2010 and 2020.

PROPOSED EXPENDITURES	2011 - 12	2012 - 13	2013 - 14	2014 - 15	2015 - 16 through Build-out	Total all Years
1. Design / Engineering / Administratic	325,000.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	325,000.00
2. Land Acquisition / Right Of Way	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
3. Construction	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	4,000,000.00	4,000,000.00
4. Contingency	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
5. Equipment / Other	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
TOTAL COST:	325,000.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	4,000,000.00	4,325,000.00

Huntington Beach

Master Facilities Plan Project Detail

Infrastructure: Park Land Acquisition And Park Facilities Development

Project Number:/ Title PK 004 Le Bard Park Expansion Master Plan And Development Plan

Submitting Departments: Community Services

Project Description:

Undertake the Park Master Plan and construction documents necessary to expand the turf area and park amenities on the two remaining undeveloped acres. The improvements will be completed in a single phase. Improvements also include the elimination of drainage problems and construction of a ramp to the Santa Ana River Trail.

Justification / Consequences of Avoidance:

The park improvements are necessary to complete the park and maximize the roughly five acres available at this park.

Relationship to General Plan Development:

Little direct relationship, but the improvements are consistent with the City's General Plan Recreation Element and indirectly support the additional residents resulting from new development. The project is also capacity increasing.

Allocation To General Plan Buildout: 0.00%

Reference Document:

Project Timing:

As park-related revenues become available.

PROPOSED EXPENDITURES	2011 - 12	2012 - 13	2013 - 14	2014 - 15	2015 - 16 through Build-out	Total all Years
1. Design / Engineering / Administratic	250,000.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	250,000.00
2. Land Acquisition / Right Of Way	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
3. Construction	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1,200,000.00	1,200,000.00
4. Contingency	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
5. Equipment / Other	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
TOTAL COST:	250,000.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1,200,000.00	1,450,000.00

Huntington Beach

Master Facilities Plan Project Detail

Infrastructure: Park Land Acquisition And Park Facilities Development

Project Number:/ Title PK 005 Blufftop Park Trail Improvements

Submitting Departments: Community Services

Project Description:

Construct improvements to the existing two and a half-mile long asphalt trail, including a split trail system for pedestrian and wheeled traffic. The project includes 15% for citizen input, project design/engineering, soils and materials testing, project plan check and construction inspection. The project also includes a standard 10% for project contingency.

Justification / Consequences of Avoidance:

The project is necessary to reduce the rate of erosion of the very important blufftop area.

Relationship to General Plan Development:

None directly, the improvements are primarily necessary to maintain an existing asset.

Allocation To General Plan Buildout: 0.00%

Reference Document:

Project Timing:

As revenues permit.

PROPOSED EXPENDITURES	2011 - 12	2012 - 13	2013 - 14	2014 - 15	2015 - 16 through Build-out	Total all Years
1. Design / Engineering / Administratic	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	120,000.00	120,000.00
2. Land Acquisition / Right Of Way	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
3. Construction	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	800,000.00	800,000.00
4. Contingency	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	80,000.00	80,000.00
5. Equipment / Other	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
TOTAL COST:	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1,000,000.00	1,000,000.00

Huntington Beach

Master Facilities Plan Project Detail

Infrastructure: Park Land Acquisition And Park Facilities Development

Project Number:/ Title PK 006 Edinger Dock Development

Submitting Departments: Community Services

Project Description:
Construct a new dock and boat launch.

Justification / Consequences of Avoidance:
The improvements need to be made to meet the recreational boating needs of the community.

Relationship to General Plan Development:
Little direct relationship, but the improvements are consistent with the City's General Plan Recreation Element and indirectly support the additional residents resulting from new development.

Allocation To General Plan Buildout: 0.00%

Reference Document:

Project Timing:
Within priority and as Park Fund revenues become available.

PROPOSED EXPENDITURES	2011 - 12	2012 - 13	2013 - 14	2014 - 15	2015 - 16 through Build-out	Total all Years
1. Design / Engineering / Administratic	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	50,000.00	50,000.00
2. Land Acquisition / Right Of Way	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
3. Construction	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
4. Contingency	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	600,000.00	600,000.00
5. Equipment / Other	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	50,000.00	50,000.00
TOTAL COST:	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	700,000.00	700,000.00

Huntington Beach

Master Facilities Plan Project Detail

Infrastructure: Park Land Acquisition And Park Facilities Development

Project Number/ Title PK 007 Wardlow Field Reconfiguration Design/Construction

Submitting Departments: Community Services

Project Description:

Reconfigure the park to accommodate a youth sports field and plan for additional parking. Construction costs for the little league field and parking lot are included at $380,000.

Justification / Consequences of Avoidance:

The parks earlier configuration is inefficient in terms of space.

Relationship to General Plan Development:

Little direct relationship, but the improvements are consistent with the City's General Plan Recreation Element and indirectly support the additional residents resulting from new development.

Allocation To General Plan Buildout: 0.00%

Reference Document:

Project Timing:

2010.

PROPOSED EXPENDITURES	2011 - 12	2012 - 13	2013 - 14	2014 - 15	2015 - 16 through Build-out	Total all Years
1. Design / Engineering / Administratic	120,000.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	120,000.00
2. Land Acquisition / Right Of Way	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
3. Construction	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	800,000.00	800,000.00
4. Contingency	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	80,000.00	80,000.00
5. Equipment / Other	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
TOTAL COST:	120,000.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	880,000.00	1,000,000.00

Huntington Beach

Master Facilities Plan Project Detail

Infrastructure: Park Land Acquisition And Park Facilities Development

Project Number/ Title PK 008 City-Wide Parks Master Plan

Submitting Departments: Community Services

Project Description:
The project consists solely of the preparation of a Parks Master Plan.

Justification / Consequences of Avoidance:
A Master Plan of Parks is needed to insure the continued rational programmed development of the City parks system.

Relationship to General Plan Development:
A Park Master Plan for the continued development of the City's Park system is directly related to General Plan development.

Allocation To General Plan Buildout: 0.00%

Reference Document:

Project Timing:
The project is scheduled for the period of 2010 to 2020.

PROPOSED EXPENDITURES	2011 - 12	2012 - 13	2013 - 14	2014 - 15	2015 - 16 through Build-out	Total all Years
1. Design / Engineering / Administratic	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	350,000.00	350,000.00
2. Land Acquisition / Right Of Way	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
3. Construction	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
4. Contingency	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
5. Equipment / Other	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
TOTAL COST:	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	350,000.00	350,000.00

Huntington Beach

Master Facilities Plan Project Detail

Infrastructure: Park Land Acquisition And Park Facilities Development

Project Number:/ Title PK 009 Central Park Habitat Plan

Submitting Departments: Community Services

Project Description:

Complete an enhanced habitat plan for entire Central Park area. The plan is necessary for mitigating the raptor foraging area related to the areas slated for construction of the proposed Central Park Senior Center. The results may indicate the need for a one-to-one basis within the park. That is, all negative impacts must be fully mitigated.

Justification / Consequences of Avoidance:

The area proposed for the Senior Citizens Center has been vacant for a great deal of time and has become a raptor foraging area. The City needs to study the entire park area and determine if and how the impact of the proposed development of the Senior Center can be mitigated on a park-wide basis.

Relationship to General Plan Development:

Little direct relationship, but the improvements are consistent with the City's General Plan Recreation Element and indirectly support the additional residents resulting from new development.

Allocation To General Plan Buildout: 0.00%

Reference Document:

Project Timing:

As revenues permit.

PROPOSED EXPENDITURES	2011 - 12	2012 - 13	2013 - 14	2014 - 15	2015 - 16 through Build-out	Total all Years
1. Design / Engineering / Administratic	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	250,000.00	250,000.00
2. Land Acquisition / Right Of Way	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
3. Construction	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
4. Contingency	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
5. Equipment / Other	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
TOTAL COST:	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	250,000.00	250,000.00

Huntington Beach

Master Facilities Plan Project Detail

Infrastructure: Park Land Acquisition And Park Facilities Development

Project Number:/ Title PK 010 Central Park Acquisiton Of Encyclopedia Lots

Submitting Departments: Community Services

Project Description:

The expenditures allow for the acquisition of fifty-one privately owned lots located within park boundaries at approximately $20,000 per lot. The small, individual lots are located generally north of Ellis, south of Edwards and west of Golden West Avenues.

Justification / Consequences of Avoidance:

The acquisition of the small lots is necessary to allow for the complete development and thus maximization, of Central Park.

Relationship to General Plan Development:

Little direct relationship, but the improvements are consistent with the City's General Plan Recreation Element and indirectly support the additional residents resulting from new development. The project is also capacity increasing.

Allocation To General Plan Buildout: 0.00%

Reference Document:

Project Timing:

As Park Fund revenues permit.

PROPOSED EXPENDITURES	2011 - 12	2012 - 13	2013 - 14	2014 - 15	2015 - 16 through Build-out	Total all Years
1. Design / Engineering / Administratic	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
2. Land Acquisition / Right Of Way	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1,020,000.00	1,020,000.00
3. Construction	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
4. Contingency	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
5. Equipment / Other	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
TOTAL COST:	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1,020,000.00	1,020,000.00

Huntington Beach

Master Facilities Plan Project Detail

Infrastructure: Park Land Acquisition And Park Facilities Development

Project Number/ Title PK 011 Central Park Development Of Remaining 86 Acres

Submitting Departments: Community Services

Project Description:

Complete the mostly passive area of the park, near Ellis and Golden West Avenues, with trails, picnic areas, a restroom and additional parking per the Central Park Master Plan.

Justification / Consequences of Avoidance:

The improvements are necessary to maximize the use of this major park.

Relationship to General Plan Development:

Little direct relationship, but the improvements are consistent with the City's General Plan Recreation Element and indirectly support the additional residents resulting from new development. The project is also capacity increasing.

Allocation To General Plan Buildout: 0.00%

Reference Document:

Project Timing:

As park capital revenues permit.

PROPOSED EXPENDITURES	2011 - 12	2012 - 13	2013 - 14	2014 - 15	2015 - 16 through Build-out	Total all Years
1. Design / Engineering / Administratic	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
2. Land Acquisition / Right Of Way	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
3. Construction	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	20,000,000.00	20,000,000.00
4. Contingency	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
5. Equipment / Other	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
TOTAL COST:	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	20,000,000.00	20,000,000.00

Huntington Beach

Master Facilities Plan Project Detail

Infrastructure: Park Land Acquisition And Park Facilities Development

Project Number:/ Title PK 012 Central Park Rebuild Two Restaurant Facilities

Submitting Departments: Community Services

Project Description:
Rebuild the "Park Bench Cafe" and "Alice's Restaurant".

Justification / Consequences of Avoidance:
The facilities are nearly thirty years old and in need of replacement.

Relationship to General Plan Development:
These improvements are largely concession-based improvements and thus financed with long-term concession revenues.

Allocation To General Plan Buildout: 0.00%

Reference Document:

Project Timing:
As revenues permit and as negations are completed.

PROPOSED EXPENDITURES	2011 - 12	2012 - 13	2013 - 14	2014 - 15	2015 - 16 through Build-out	Total all Years
1. Design / Engineering / Administratic	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
2. Land Acquisition / Right Of Way	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
3. Construction	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	800,000.00	800,000.00
4. Contingency	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
5. Equipment / Other	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
TOTAL COST:	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	800,000.00	800,000.00

Huntington Beach

Master Facilities Plan Project Detail

Infrastructure: Park Land Acquisition And Park Facilities Development

Project Number:/ Title PK 013 General Youth Sports Facilities Grants

Submitting Departments: Community Services

Project Description:

The proposed expenditure acts as seed money for grants obtained by volunteer youth sports programs. The project consists of $150,000 per year in grant assistance.

Justification / Consequences of Avoidance:

The City has had a long-term policy of assisting local groups leverage City money for common park area improvements.

Relationship to General Plan Development:

Little direct relationship, but the improvements are consistent with the City's General Plan Recreation Element and indirectly support the additional residents resulting from new development.

Allocation To General Plan Buildout: 0.00%

Reference Document:

Project Timing:

As requested by local groups that have success in obtaining grants or other financial assistance.

PROPOSED EXPENDITURES	2011 - 12	2012 - 13	2013 - 14	2014 - 15	2015 - 16 through Build-out	Total all Years
1. Design / Engineering / Administratic	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
2. Land Acquisition / Right Of Way	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
3. Construction	150,000.00	150,000.00	150,000.00	150,000.00	39,000,000.00	39,600,000.00
4. Contingency	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
5. Equipment / Other	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
TOTAL COST:	150,000.00	150,000.00	150,000.00	150,000.00	39,000,000.00	39,600,000.00

Huntington Beach

Master Facilities Plan Project Detail

Infrastructure: Park Land Acquisition And Park Facilities Development

Project Number:/ Title PK 014 Murdy Youth Sports Complex Phase II

Submitting Departments: Community Services

Project Description:

Reconfigure the current park/school configuration to increase youth sports capabilities. The City and school district will amend the existing joint use agreement and the City will construct a sports field on school property. There will also be parking lot improvements with additional spaces and a turn -around.

Justification / Consequences of Avoidance:

The existing field configuration does not maximize the existing field space for use by youth sports associations and the re-design of the existing park and school parcels will address this shortcoming.

Relationship to General Plan Development:

The existing field configuration does not maximize the existing field space for use by youth sports associations and the re-design will address this.

Allocation To General Plan Buildout: 0.00%

Reference Document:

Project Timing:

As revenues permit.

PROPOSED EXPENDITURES	2011 - 12	2012 - 13	2013 - 14	2014 - 15	2015 - 16 through Build-out	Total all Years
1. Design / Engineering / Administratic	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
2. Land Acquisition / Right Of Way	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
3. Construction	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	2,500,000.00	2,500,000.00
4. Contingency	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
5. Equipment / Other	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
TOTAL COST:	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	2,500,000.00	2,500,000.00

Huntington Beach

Master Facilities Plan Project Detail

Infrastructure: Park Land Acquisition And Park Facilities Development

Project Number:/ Title PK 015 Beach Playground

Submitting Departments: Community Services

Project Description:

Construct a tot lot/youth playground with capability to serve the needs of two different age groups. The improvement would be located on the City beach north of the pier adjacent to Blufftop Park at 9th Street. The park would have asphalt access with a turnabout.

Justification / Consequences of Avoidance:

The improvements are intended to improve the beach day experience for youths.

Relationship to General Plan Development:

The existing field configuration does not maximize the existing field space for use by youth sports associations and the re-design will address this.

Allocation To General Plan Buildout: 0.00%

Reference Document:

Project Timing:

As revenues permit.

PROPOSED EXPENDITURES	2011 - 12	2012 - 13	2013 - 14	2014 - 15	2015 - 16 through Build-out	Total all Years
1. Design / Engineering / Administratic	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
2. Land Acquisition / Right Of Way	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
3. Construction	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	350,000.00	350,000.00
4. Contingency	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
5. Equipment / Other	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
TOTAL COST:	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	350,000.00	350,000.00

Huntington Beach

Master Facilities Plan Project Detail

Infrastructure: Park Land Acquisition And Park Facilities Development

Project Number/ Title PK 016 Central Park Development Of Former Gun Range Area

Submitting Departments: Community Services

Project Description:
The project consists of the removal of the existing gun range and designing/constructing a skate park facility.

Justification / Consequences of Avoidance:
The City currently has no facilities of its own for in-line skating and skateboarding in this area of the community and will need to offset the loss of the existing Huntington Beach High School skate facility.

Relationship to General Plan Development:
None directly, but the proposed skate facility is capacity increasing.

Allocation To General Plan Buildout: 0.00%

Reference Document:

Project Timing:
The project design is planned for 2010 and the construction between 2010 and 2020.

PROPOSED EXPENDITURES	2011 - 12	2012 - 13	2013 - 14	2014 - 15	2015 - 16 through Build-out	Total all Years
1. Design / Engineering / Administratic	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	360,000.00	360,000.00
2. Land Acquisition / Right Of Way	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
3. Construction	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	2,400,000.00	2,400,000.00
4. Contingency	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	240,000.00	240,000.00
5. Equipment / Other	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
TOTAL COST:	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	3,000,000.00	3,000,000.00

Huntington Beach

Master Facilities Plan Project Detail

Infrastructure: Park Land Acquisition And Park Facilities Development

Project Number:/ Title PK 017 Warner Dock Renovation And Expansion

Submitting Departments: Community Services

Project Description:

Improve the Edinger Dock area by dredging the area and adding four to six docks or slips. There would also be improements made to the public boat launch ramp.

Justification / Consequences of Avoidance:

The area serves the yacht club activities as well as casual boaters.

Relationship to General Plan Development:

Little direct relationship, but the improvements are consistent with the City's General Plan Recreation Element and indirectly support the additional residents resulting from new development. The project is also capacity increasing.

Allocation To General Plan Buildout: 0.00%

Reference Document:

Project Timing:

The project design is planned for 2010 and the construction between 2010 and 2020.

PROPOSED EXPENDITURES	2011 - 12	2012 - 13	2013 - 14	2014 - 15	2015 - 16 through Build-out	Total all Years
1. Design / Engineering / Administratic	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	96,000.00	96,000.00
2. Land Acquisition / Right Of Way	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
3. Construction	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
4. Contingency	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	640,000.00	640,000.00
5. Equipment / Other	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	64,000.00	64,000.00
TOTAL COST:	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	800,000.00	800,000.00

Huntington Beach

Master Facilities Plan Project Detail

Infrastructure: Park Land Acquisition And Park Facilities Development

Project Number:/ Title PK 018 Lamb Park Design And Development

Submitting Departments: Community Services

Project Description:

Design, engineer and construct park improvements on the 2.4 acre Lamb Park site. The improvements would include lighted sports facilities (ballfield and sportsfield) and other neighborhood fixtures such as benches, sidewalks, drinking fountains and a play apparatus on the parcel, a closed school site.

Justification / Consequences of Avoidance:

The park improvements, mostly sports oriented, are necessary to complete the park and maximize the roughly 2.4 acres available at this park.

Relationship to General Plan Development:

Little direct relationship, but the improvements are consistent with the City's General Plan Recreation Element and indirectly support the additional residents resulting from new development. The project is also capacity increasing.

Allocation To General Plan Buildout: 0.00%

Reference Document:

Project Timing:

The project design is planned for 2010 and the construction between 2010 and 2020.

PROPOSED EXPENDITURES	2011 - 12	2012 - 13	2013 - 14	2014 - 15	2015 - 16 through Build-out	Total all Years
1. Design / Engineering / Administratic	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	132,000.00	132,000.00
2. Land Acquisition / Right Of Way	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
3. Construction	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	880,000.00	880,000.00
4. Contingency	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	88,000.00	88,000.00
5. Equipment / Other	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
TOTAL COST:	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1,100,000.00	1,100,000.00

Huntington Beach

Master Facilities Plan Project Detail

Infrastructure: Park Land Acquisition And Park Facilities Development

Project Number:/ Title PK 019 Central Park Sports Complex Team Room

Submitting Departments: Community Services

Project Description:

Construct a team-room at the sports complex. The facility would be used by teams for during game breaks. The facility would have electrical service and possibly a drinking fountain but would not include shower/locker facilities.

Justification / Consequences of Avoidance:

The facility will provide sports teams with a location for team discussions, changing and personal effects security.

Relationship to General Plan Development:

Little direct relationship, but the improvements are consistent with the City's General Plan Recreation Element and indirectly support the additional residents resulting from new development. The project is also capacity increasing.

Allocation To General Plan Buildout: 0.00%

Reference Document:

Project Timing:

The project design is planned for 2010 and the construction between 2010 and 2020.

PROPOSED EXPENDITURES	2011 - 12	2012 - 13	2013 - 14	2014 - 15	2015 - 16 through Build-out	Total all Years
1. Design / Engineering / Administratic	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
2. Land Acquisition / Right Of Way	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
3. Construction	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	100,000.00	100,000.00
4. Contingency	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
5. Equipment / Other	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
TOTAL COST:	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	100,000.00	100,000.00

Huntington Beach

Master Facilities Plan Project Detail

Infrastructure: Park Land Acquisition And Park Facilities Development

Project Number:/ Title PK 020 Future Parks Acquisition (Possible Closed School Sites)

Submitting Departments: Community Services

Project Description:

Acquire approximately 28 acres of land suitable for development of active and passive parks such as including neighborhood, community and sports parks. Potential sites would include closed school sites. Land acquisition is estimated at $20.00 per square foot or $871,120 per acre.

Justification / Consequences of Avoidance:

The City needs to acquire approximately 100 acres in order to meet the General Plan target of 5.0 acres per 1,000 residents.

Relationship to General Plan Development:

The City's General Plan currently identifies a target of 5.0 acres of recreation opportunites per one thousand residents.

Allocation To General Plan Buildout: 0.00%

Reference Document:

Project Timing:

The project design is planned for 2010 and the construction between 2010 and 2020.

PROPOSED EXPENDITURES	2011 - 12	2012 - 13	2013 - 14	2014 - 15	2015 - 16 through Build-out	Total all Years
1. Design / Engineering / Administratic	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
2. Land Acquisition / Right Of Way	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	24,488,000.00	24,488,000.00
3. Construction	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
4. Contingency	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
5. Equipment / Other	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
TOTAL COST:	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	24,488,000.00	24,488,000.00

End of Plan