CITY OF MURRIETA

DEVELOPMENT IMPACT FEE STUDY UPDATE

ADMINISTRATIVE DRAFT

FEBRUARY 12, 2024

Oakland Office
66 Franklin Street
Suite 300
Oakland, CA 94607
Tel: (510) 832-0899

Corporate Office
27368 Via Industria
Suite 200
Temecula, CA 92590
Tel: (800) 755-6864
Fax: (888) 326-6864

Other Regional Offices
Aurora, CO
Orlando, FL
Phoenix, AZ
Plano, TX
Seattle, WA
Washington, DC

www.willdan.com

This page intentionally left blank.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Executive Summary

This report summarizes an analysis of development impact fees needed to support future development in The City of Murrieta through 2035. It is the City's intent that the costs representing future development's share of public facilities and capital improvements be imposed on that development in the form of a development impact fee, also known as a public facilities fee. The public facilities and improvements included in this analysis are divided into the fee categories listed below:

- Law Enforcement
- Fire Protection
- Streets, Minor Bridges & Culverts
- Traffic Signals
- Storm Drainage
- General Facilities
- Park Facilities
- Community Centers
- Public Library

Background and Study Objectives

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

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

All development impact fee-funded capital projects should be programmed through the City's five-year Capital Improvement Plan (CIP). Using a CIP can help the City identify and direct its fee revenue to public facilities projects that will accommodate future growth. By programming fee revenues to specific capital projects, the City can help ensure a reasonable relationship between new development and the use of fee revenues as required by the *Mitigation Fee Act*.

Facility Standards and Costs

There are three approaches typically used to calculate facilities standards and allocate the costs of planned facilities to accommodate growth in compliance with the *Mitigation Fee Act* requirements.

The **existing inventory** approach is based on a facility standard derived from the City's existing level of facilities and existing demand for services. This approach results in no facility deficiencies attributable to existing development. This approach is often used when a long-range plan for new facilities is not available. Only the initial facilities to be funded with fees are identified in the fee study. Future facilities to serve growth will be identified through the City's annual capital improvement plan and budget process and/or completion of a new facility master plan. This approach is to calculate the law enforcement, fire protection, parks, community center and general facilities fees in this report.

The **planned facilities** approach allocates costs based on the ratio of planned facilities that serve new development to the increase in demand associated with new development. This approach is appropriate when specific planned facilities that only benefit new development can be identified, or when the specific share of facilities benefiting new development can be identified. Examples include street improvements to avoid deficient levels of service or a sewer trunk line extension to

a previously undeveloped area. This approach is used for the streets, minor bridges & culverts, traffic signal, and storm drain facility fees.

The **system plan** approach is based on a master facility plan in situations where the needed facilities serve both existing and new development. This approach allocates existing and planned facilities across existing and new development to determine new development's fair share of facility needs. This approach is used when it is not possible to differentiate the benefits of new facilities between new and existing development. Often the system plan is based on increasing facility standards, so the City must find non-impact fee revenue sources to fund existing development's fair share of planned facilities. This approach is used for the public library facility fees in this report.

Use of Fee Revenues

The Mitigation Fee Act requires that this analysis "Identify the use to which the fee is to be put. If the use is financing public facilities, the facilities shall be identified. That identification may, but need not, be made by reference to a capital improvement plan as specified in Section 65403 or 66002, may be made in applicable general or specific plan requirements, or may be made in other public documents that identify the public facilities for which the fee is charged."[1] Each chapter in this report identifies the appropriate use of impact fee revenues for each particular impact fee category.

Impact fee revenue must be spent on new facilities or expansion of current facilities to serve new development. Facilities can be generally defined as capital acquisition items with a useful life greater than five years. Impact fee revenue can be spent on capital facilities to serve new development, including but not limited to land acquisition, construction of buildings, infrastructure, the acquisition of vehicles or equipment, information technology, software licenses and equipment.

Development Impact Fee Schedule Summary

Table E.1 summarizes the development impact fees that meet the City's identified needs and comply with the requirements of the *Mitigation Fee Act*.

1 *California Government Code* §66001 (a) (2).

Table E.1: Maximum Justified Impact Facilities Fee Summary

Land Use	Law Enforcement	Fire Protection	Streets, Minor Bridges & Culverts	Traffic Signals	Storm Drainage	General Facilities	Parkland Facilities	Community Centers	Public Library	Total
Residential - Fee per Square Foot										
Single Family	$ 0.40	$ 0.28	$ 2.38	$ 0.35	$ 0.15	$ 0.45	$ 4.89	$ 0.12	$ 0.17	**$ 9.19**
Multifamily	0.54	0.38	3.63	0.54	0.29	0.61	3.12	0.16	0.23	**9.50**
Nonresidential - Fee per Square Foot										
Commercial	$ 1.20	$ 1.85	$ 8.82	$ 1.30	$ 0.20	$ 0.21	$ -	$ -	$ -	**$ 13.58**
Office	1.93	2.98	7.69	1.13	0.10	0.34	-	-	-	**14.18**
Industrial	0.64	0.99	2.51	0.37	0.25	0.11	-	-	-	**4.87**

Sources: Tables 3.6, 4.6, 5.6, 6.4, 7.5, 8.6, 9.9, 10.6 and 11.7.

Other Funding Needed

Impact fees may only fund the share of public facilities related to new development in Murrieta. They may not be used to fund the share of facility needs generated by existing development or by development outside of the City. As shown in **Table E.2,** approximately $104.5 million in additional funding will be needed to complete the facility projects the City currently plans to develop. The "Additional Funding Required" column shows non-impact fee funding required to fund a share of the improvements partially funded by impact fees. Non-fee funding is needed because these facilities are needed partially to remedy existing deficiencies and partly to accommodate new development.

The City will need to develop alternative funding sources to fund existing development's share of the planned facilities. Potential sources of revenue include but are not limited to existing or new general fund revenues, existing or new taxes, special assessments, and grants.

Table E.2: Non-Impact Fee Funding Required

Fee Category	Total Project Cost	Projected Impact Fee Revenue	Additional Funding Required
Law Enforcement	$ 59,670,000	$ 59,670,000	$ -
Fire Protection	85,521,000	85,521,000	-
Streets, Minor Bridges & Culverts	355,740,973	286,035,438	69,705,535
Traffic Signals	67,872,382	41,977,526	25,894,856
Storm Drainage	12,983,598	7,850,999	5,132,599
General Facilities	18,131,000	18,131,000	-
Parkland Facilities	97,204,000	97,204,000	-
Community Centers	2,288,000	2,288,000	-
Public Library	7,100,000	3,325,104	3,774,896
Total	$ 706,510,953	$ 602,003,068	$ 104,507,886

Sources: Tables 3.5, 4.5, 5.4, 5.5, 6.2, 6.3, 7.3, 7.4, 8.5, 9.7, 10.5, 11.3 and 11.6.

1. Introduction

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

- Public Facilities Financing in California;
- Study Objectives;
- Fee Program Maintenance;
- Study Methodology; and,
- Organization of the Report.

Public Facilities Financing in California

The changing fiscal landscape in California during the past 45 years has steadily undercut the financial capacity of local governments to fund infrastructure. Four dominant trends stand out:

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

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

Study Objectives

The primary policy objective of a public facilities fee program is to ensure that new development pays the capital costs associated with growth. *Policy LU-1.7* of the City's General Plan states "Ensure necessary capital improvements are in place prior to new development or completed concurrently." *Policy LU-1.8* of the City's General Plan states "Ensure that fiscal impacts associated with growth and change are evaluated to ensure the City's ability to provide vital services is not compromised." The primary purpose of this report is to update the City's impact fees based on the most current available facility plans and growth projections. The proposed fees will enable the City to expand its inventory of public facilities as new development leads to increases in service demands. This report supports the General Plan policies stated above.

The City imposes public facilities fees under authority granted by the Mitigation Fee Act (the Act), contained in California Government Code Sections 66000 et seq. This report provides the necessary findings required by the Act for adoption of the fees presented in the fee schedules presented in this report.

Murrieta is forecast to significant growth through this study's planning horizon of 2035. This growth will create an increase in demand for public services and the facilities required to deliver them. Given the revenue challenges described above, Murrieta has decided to use a development impact fee program to ensure that new development funds the share of facility costs associated with growth. This report makes use of the most current available growth forecasts and the City's most recently adopted Capital Improvement Plan (CIP) to update the City's existing fee program to ensure that the fee program accurately represents the facility needs resulting from new development.

Fee Program Maintenance

Once a fee program has been adopted it must be properly maintained to ensure that the revenue collected adequately funds the facilities needed by new development. To avoid collecting inadequate revenue, the inventories of existing facilities and costs for planned facilities must be updated periodically for inflation, and the fees recalculated to reflect the higher costs. The use of established indices for each facility included in the inventories (land, buildings, and equipment), such as the *Engineering News-Record*, is necessary to accurately adjust the impact fees. For a list of recommended indices, see Chapter 13.

While fee updates using inflation indices are appropriate for annual or periodic updates to ensure that fee revenues keep up with increases in the costs of public facilities, it is recommended to conduct more extensive updates of the fee documentation and calculation (such as this study) when significant new data on growth forecasts and/or facility plans become available. For further detail on fee program implementation, see Chapter 13.

Study Methodology

Development impact fees are calculated to fund the cost of facilities required to accommodate growth. The six steps followed in this development impact fee study include:

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

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

Types of Facility Standards

There are three separate components of facility standards:

- *Demand standards* determine the amount of facilities required to accommodate growth, for example, park acres per thousand residents, square feet of library space per capita, or gallons of water per day. Demand standards may also reflect a level of service such as the vehicle volume-to-capacity (V/C) ratio used in traffic planning.
- *Design standards* determine how a facility should be designed to meet expected demand, for example, park improvement requirements and technology infrastructure for City office space. Design standards are typically not explicitly evaluated as part of an impact fee analysis but can have a significant impact on the cost of facilities. Our approach incorporates the cost of planned facilities built to satisfy the City's facility design standards.
- *Cost standards* are an alternate method for determining the amount of facilities required to accommodate growth based on facility costs per unit of demand. *Cost standards* are useful when demand standards were not explicitly developed for the facility planning process. *Cost standards* also enable different types of facilities to be analyzed based on a single measure (cost or value) and are useful when different facilities are funded by a single fee program. Examples include facility costs per capita, cost per vehicle trip, or cost per gallon of water per day.

New Development Facility Needs and Costs

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

There are three common methods for determining new development's fair share of planned facilities costs: the **existing inventory method**, the **planned facilities method,** and the **system plan** method. The formula used by each approach and the advantages and disadvantages of each method is summarized below:

Existing Inventory Method

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

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

Under this method new development will fund the expansion of facilities at the same standard currently serving existing development. By definition the existing inventory method results in no facility deficiencies attributable to existing development. This method is often used when a long-range plan for new facilities is not available. Only the initial facilities to be funded with fees are identified in the fee study. Future facilities to serve growth are identified through an annual capital improvement plan and budget process, possibly after completion of a new facility master plan. This approach is to calculate the law enforcement, fire protection, parks, community center and general facilities fees in this report.

Planned Facilities Method

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

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

This method is appropriate when planned facilities will entirely serve new development, or when a fair share allocation of planned facilities to new development can be estimated. An example of the former is a Wastewater trunk line extension to a previously undeveloped area. An example of the latter is a portion of a roadway that has been identified as necessary to mitigate the impact from new development through traffic modeling analysis. Under this method new development will fund the expansion of facilities at the standards used in the applicable planning documents. This approach is used for the streets, minor bridges & culverts, traffic signal, and storm drain facility fees.

System Plan Method

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

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

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

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

Organization of the Report

The determination of a public facilities fee begins with the selection of a planning horizon and development of growth projections for population and employment. These projections are used throughout the analysis of different facility categories and are summarized in Chapter 2.

Chapters 3 through 11 identify facility standards and planned facilities, allocate the cost of planned facilities between new development and other development, and identify the appropriate development impact fee for each of the following facility categories:

- Law Enforcement
- Fire Protection
- Streets, Minor Bridges & Culverts
- Traffic Signals
- Storm Drainage
- General Facilities
- Park Facilities
- Community Centers
- Public Library

Chapter 12 describes how this study complies with the requirements of AB 602.

Chapter 13 details the procedures that the City must follow when implementing a development impact fee program. Impact fee program adoption procedures are found in *California Government Code* Sections 66016 through 66018.

The five statutory findings required for adoption of the proposed public facilities fees in accordance with the Mitigation Fee Act are documented in Chapter 14.

2. Growth Forecasts

Growth projections are used as indicators of demand to determine facility needs and allocate those needs between existing and new development. This chapter explains the source for the growth projections used in this study based on a 2023 base year and a planning horizon of 2035.

Estimates of existing development and projections of future growth are critical assumptions used throughout this report. These estimates are used as follows:

- The estimate of existing development in 2023 is used as an indicator of existing facility demand and to determine existing facility standards.
- The estimate of total development at the 2035 planning horizon is used as an indicator of future demand to determine total facilities needed to accommodate growth and remedy existing facility deficiencies, if any.
- Estimates of growth from 2023 through 2035 are used to (1) allocate facility costs between new development and existing development, and (2) estimate total fee revenues.

The demand for public facilities is based on the service population, dwelling units or nonresidential development creating the need for the facilities.

Land Use Types

To ensure a reasonable relationship between each fee and the type of development paying the fee, growth projections distinguish between different land use types. The land use types that impact fees have been calculated for are defined below.

- **Residential:** All residential dwelling units. Fees charged per square foot of living space.
- **Commercial:** All commercial, retail, educational, and hotel/motel development.
- **Office:** All general, professional, and medical office development.
- **Industrial:** All manufacturing, warehousing, and other industrial development.

Some developments may include more than one land use type, such as a mixed-use development with both residential and commercial uses. Another similar situation would be a warehousing facility that contains office space. In those cases, the facilities fee would be calculated separately for each land use type included within the building.

The City has the discretion to determine which land use type best reflects a development project's characteristics for purposes of imposing an impact fee and may adjust fees for special or unique uses to reflect the impact characteristics of the use.

Existing and Future Development

Table 2.1 shows the estimated number of residents, dwelling units, employees, and building square feet in Murrieta, both in 2023 and in 2035. The base year estimates of residents and dwelling units comes from the California Department of Finance. The population projection for 2035 was calculated based on the total single family and multifamily units identified in Table 3-15 of the 2035 General Plan Land Use Element, multiplied by estimates of 3.25 residents per single family unit and 2.07 residents per multifamily unit calculated from the 2022 American Community Survey data for Murrieta.

Base year employees were estimated based on data obtained from the U.S. Census Bureau's OnTheMap Application. The projection of employees is based on the total building square feet identified in Table 3-15 of the 2035 General Plan Land Use Element, multiplied by employment densities from Table 2.2. Estimated building square feet in 2023 is based on existing building square feet in 2009 General Plan EIR, increased by new construction since 2009 as reported by CoStar. Building square feet at buildout identified in Table 3-15 of the 2035 General Plan Land Use Element.

Table 2.1: Demographic Assumptions

	2023	2035	Increase
Residents[1]	109,998	135,774	25,776
Dwelling Units[2]			
Single Family	28,817	30,872	2,055
Multifamily	8,388	17,121	8,733
Total	37,205	47,993	10,788
Employment[3]			
Commercial	11,561	38,383	26,822
Office	10,238	70,234	59,996
Industrial	4,441	2,663	(1,778)
Total	26,240	111,280	85,040
Building Square Feet (000s)[4]			
Commercial	6,443	19,887	13,444
Office	6,315	22,583	16,268
Industrial	3,425	2,585	(839)
Total	16,183	45,056	28,873

Note: Figures have been rounded to the hundreds.

[1] Current population from California Department of Finance (DOF). Projection for 2035 calculated based on total single family and multifamily units in 2035 identified in Table 3-15 of the 2035 General Plan Land Use Element, multiplied by estimates of 3.25 residents per single family unit and 2.07 residents per multifamily unit calculated from the 2022 American Community Survey data for Murrieta.

[2] Existing dwelling units in 2023 identified in CA DOF Table E-5. Total 2035 dwelling units identified in Table 3-15 of the 2035 General Plan Land Use Element

[3] Current estimates of primary jobs from the US Census' OnTheMap. Projection based on total building square feet identified in Table 3-15 of the 2035 General Plan Land Use Element, multiplied by employment densities from Table 2.2.

[4] Estimated building square feet in 2023 based on existing building square feet in 2009 EIR, increased by new construction since 2009 as reported by CoStar. Building square feet at buildout identified in Table 3-15 of the 2035 General Plan Land Use Element.

Sources: California Department of Finance (DOF), Table E-5, 2023; Murrieta General Plan EIR and Murrieta General Plan Update; US Census Bureau OnTheMap Application; CoStar; Willdan Financial Services.

Occupant Densities

All fees in this report are calculated based on dwelling units or building square feet. Occupant density assumptions ensure a reasonable relationship between the size of a development project, the increase in service population associated with the project, and the amount of the fee.

Occupant densities (residents per dwelling unit or workers per building square foot) are the most appropriate characteristics to use for most impact fees. The fee imposed should be based on the land use type that most closely represents the probable occupant density of the development.

The average occupant density factor used in this report is shown in **Table 2.2**. The residential density factors are based on data for Murrieta from the 2022 U.S. Census' American Community Survey (Tables B25024 and B25033)**.** Table B25024 provides total housing units by type of unit Table B25033 documents the total population residing in occupied housing by type of unit. Total residents are divided by total units to estimate average persons per dwelling unit Citywide by type of unit. The nonresidential occupancy factors are calculated based on data from the City's General Plan EIR.

Table 2.2: Occupant Density

Residential		
Single Family	3.25	Residents per dwelling unit
Multifamily	2.07	Residents per dwelling unit
Nonresidential		
Commercial	1.93	Employees per 1,000 square feet
Office	3.11	Employees per 1,000 square feet
Industrial	1.03	Employees per 1,000 square feet

Sources: U.S. Census Bureau, 2022 American Community Survey 1-Year Estimates, Tables B25024 and B25033; City of Murrieta General Plan Update and EIR; Willdan Financial Services.

3. Law Enforcement Facilities

The purpose of the law enforcement impact fee is to fund the law enforcement facilities needed to serve new development. Murrieta currently provides law enforcement services from a single law enforcement station. A maximum justified fee is presented based on the existing standard of law enforcement facilities per capita.

Service Population

Law enforcement facilities serve both residents and businesses. Therefore, demand for services and associated facilities are based on the City's service population including residents and workers.

Table 3.1 shows the existing and future projected service population for law enforcement facilities. To calculate the service population for law enforcement facilities, residents are weighted at 1.00. The use of a worker demand factor of 1.99 for workers in Murrieta is based on an analysis of police department call data, categorized by land use, in the City from 2022. Annual calls for service at residential land uses were divided by the residential population to yield an annual calls-per-capita factor. Dividing annual calls for service at nonresidential areas by annual employment in the City yielded a comparable per-capita factor. The ratio of the worker per capita factor to the resident per capita factor is the worker demand factor used in the analysis. See **Appendix Table A.1** for a detailed worker weighting analysis.

Table 3.1: Law Enforcement Facilities Service Population

	Residents	Workers	Service Population
Existing (2023)	109,998	26,240	162,200
New Development (2023-2035)	25,776	85,040	195,000
Total (2035)	135,774	111,280	357,200
Weighting factor[1]	1.00	1.99	

[1] Workers are weighted at 1.99 of residents based on an an analysis of calls for service within the City. Refer to Table A.1 for further detail.

Source: Tables 2.1 and A.1.

Existing Facility Inventory

This study uses the existing standard methodology to calculate fees for law enforcement facilities. Law enforcement services in the City of Murrieta are presently based out of one main facility. **Table 3.2** summarizes the City's current inventory of law enforcement land, buildings, and vehicles. The unit cost for the land value assumption of $510,200 per acre was based on an analysis of recent land sales comparisons as reported by Costar since 2021. Unit cost assumptions for the replacement cost of buildings were provided by City staff.

Table 3.2: Existing Law Enforcement Facilities Inventory

	Inventory	Unit Cost	Value
Land (acres)			
Police Station	5.95	$510,200	$ 3,035,700
Buildings (square feet)			
Police Headquarters	28,800	$ 950	$ 27,360,000
Storage Building	7,158	550	3,936,900
Subtotal			$ 31,296,900
Vehicles (See Appendix Table A.2)			$ 12,065,000
Equipment			
Telecommunications Equipment			$ 2,000,000
Police Headquarters Furniture and Equipment			950,000
Police Storage Furniture and Equipment			200,000
Subtotal			$ 3,150,000
Canines	4	$ 15,000	$ 60,000
Total Value of Existing Facilities			$ 49,607,600

Sources: City of Murrieta; Appendix Table A.2, Willdan Financial Services.

Planned Facilities

Table 3.3 summarizes the preliminary planned law enforcement facilities needed to serve the City through 2035. The City plans a expansion of its police station and a regional training center that will be share with the fire department. New facilities costs are estimated to total approximately $25.9 million, after accounting for the existing fund balance.

Table 3.3: Planned Law Enforcement Facilities

	Inventory	Unit Cost	Value
Buildings (square feet)			
Police Station Expansion	10,000	$ 1,500	$ 15,000,000
Regional Training Center (RTC)			12,500,000
Subtotal			$ 27,500,000
(Less: Existing Fund Balance)			(1,622,147)
Net Cost of Planned Facilities			$ 25,877,853

Sources: Capital Improvement Plan FY 2022-23 to FY 2026-27, City of Murrieta, California; Willdan Financial Services.

Cost Allocation

Table 3.4 expresses the City's current law enforcement facilities level of service in terms of an existing cost per capita, by dividing the replacement cost of the City's existing facilities by the existing service population. The resulting cost per capita drives the fee calculation. The cost per capita is multiplied by the worker weighting factor to determine the cost per worker.

Table 3.4: Existing Level of Service

Value of Existing Facilities	$	49,607,600
Existing Service Population		162,200
Cost per Capita	$	306
Facility Standard per Resident	$	306
Facility Standard per Worker[1]		609

[1] Based on a weighting factor of 1.99.

Sources: Tables 3.1 and 3.2; City of Murrieta; Willdan Financial Services.

Use of Fee Revenue

The City can use law enforcement facilities fee revenues for the construction or purchase of buildings, land, and equipment that are part of the system of law enforcement facilities serving new development. A list of preliminary planned facilities is included in Table 3.3.

Fee Revenue Projection

The City plans to use police facilities fee revenue to construct improvements and acquire capital facilities and equipment to add to the system of police facilities to serve new development. **Table 3.5** details a projection of fee revenue, based on the service population growth increment identified in **Table 3.1.** When setting fees to maintain the existing level of service, the resulting fee revenue will fully fund the identified planned facilities, and the City will need to identify additional facilities to maintain the level of service as new development adds demand for law enforcement services and facilities through the planning horizon.

Table 3.5: Revenue Projection - Existing Standard

Cost per Capita	$ 306
Growth in Service Population (2023 - 2035)	195,000
Fee Revenue	$ 59,670,000
Net Cost of Planned Facilities	25,877,853
Additional Facilities to be Identified	$ 33,792,147

Sources: Tables 3.1, 3.3 and 3.4.

Fee Schedule

Table 3.6 shows the maximum justified law enforcement facilities fee schedule. The cost per capita is converted to a fee per unit of new development based on dwelling unit and employment densities (persons per dwelling unit or employees per 1,000 square feet of nonresidential building space). The fee per average sized single family, and multifamily dwelling unit is converted into a fee per square foot by dividing the fee per dwelling unit by the assumed average square footage of each type of unit.

The total fee includes a two percent (2%) administrative charge to fund costs that include: a standard overhead charge applied to all City programs for legal, accounting, and other departmental and administrative support, and fee program administrative costs including revenue collection, revenue and cost accounting, mandated public reporting, and fee justification analyses.

In Willdan's experience with impact fee programs, two percent of the base fee adequately covers the cost of fee program administration. The administrative charge should be reviewed and adjusted during comprehensive impact fee updates to ensure that revenue generated from the charge sufficiently covers, but does not exceed, the administrative costs associated with the fee program.

Table 3.6: Law Enforcement Facilities Fee Schedule

Land Use	A Cost Per Capita	B Density	C = A x B Base Fee[1]	D = C x 0.02 Admin Charge[1, 2]	E = C + D Total Fee[1]	F = E / Average Fee per Sq. Ft.[3]
Residential						
Single Family	$ 306	3.25	$ 995	$ 20	$ 1,015	$ 0.40
Multifamily	306	2.07	633	13	646	0.54
Nonresidential						
Commercial	$ 609	1.93	$ 1,175	$ 24	$ 1,199	$ 1.20
Office	609	3.11	1,894	38	1,932	1.93
Industrial	609	1.03	627	13	640	0.64

[1] Fee per average sized dwelling unit, per 1,000 square feet of nonresidential.

[2] Administrative charge of 2.0 percent for (1) legal, accounting, and other administrative support and (2) impact fee program administrative costs including revenue collection, revenue and cost accounting, mandated public reporting, and fee justification analyses.

[3] Assumes 2,555 square feet per average sized single family unit, and 1,198 square feet per average sized multifamily unit in Murrieta based on an analysis of building permits issued between January 2022 and September 2023.

Sources: Tables 2.2 and 3.4; Willdan Financial Services.

4. Fire Protection Facilities

The purpose of the fire impact fee is to fund the fire facilities needed to serve new development. A maximum justified fee schedule is presented based on the system plan standard of fire facilities per capita.

Service Population

Fire facilities are used to provide services to both residents and businesses. The service population used to determine the demand for fire facilities includes both residents and workers. **Table 4.1** shows the current fire facilities service population and the estimated service population at the planning horizon of 2035.

To calculate the service population for fire protection facilities, residents are weighted at 1.00. The use of a worker demand factor of 4.31 for workers in Murrieta is based on an analysis of fire department call data, categorized by land use, in the City from 2022. Average annual incidents at residential land uses were divided by the residential population to yield an average annual incidents-per-capita factor. Dividing average annual incidents at nonresidential areas by average annual employment in the City yielded a comparable per-capita factor. The ratio of the worker per capita factor to the resident per capita factor is the worker demand factor used in the analysis. See **Appendix Table A.3** for a detailed worker weighting analysis.

Table 4.1: Fire Facilities Service Population

	Residents	Workers[1]	Service Population
Existing (2023)	109,998	26,240	223,100
New Development (2023-2035)	25,776	85,040	392,300
Total (2035)	135,774	111,280	615,400
Weighting factor[1]	1.00	4.31	

[1] Workers are weighted at 4.31 of residents based on an analysis of calls for service within the City. Refer to Table A.3 for further detail.

Source: Tables 2.1 and A.3.

Existing Facility Inventory

Table 4.2 summarizes the City's current inventory of land, apparatus and vehicles. Fire protection services are provided from seven stations located throughout the City. The unit cost for the land value assumption of $510,200 per acre was based on an analysis of recent land sales comparisons as reported by Costar since 2021, and consistent with other chapters in this report. Building valuations were provided by the City. A summary of the value of vehicles, fire protection equipment, and apparatuses can be found in **Appendix Table A.4**.

Table 4.2: Existing Fire Facilities Land and Building Inventory

	Inventory	Units	Unit Cost	Value[1]
Land (acres)				
Station 1 and Admin	1.89	acres	$510,200	$ 964,300
Station 2	1.76	acres	510,200	898,000
Station 3	2.30	acres	510,200	1,173,500
Station 4	3.99	acres	510,200	2,035,700
Station 5	1.45	acres	510,200	739,800
Subtotal	11.39	acres		$ 5,811,300
Buildings (square feet)[1,2]				
Fire Station 1	14,332	Sq. Ft.	$466	$ 6,678,200
Administration Building	7,970	Sq. Ft.	475	3,787,300
Shop Maintenance	6,110	Sq. Ft.	221	1,347,600
Training Building	2,266	Sq. Ft.	306	694,400
Shelter	1,160	Sq. Ft.	35	40,500
Exercise Room	660	Sq. Ft.	194	127,800
Fire Station 2	10,200	Sq. Ft.	439	4,477,100
Fire Station 3	7,572	Sq. Ft.	474	3,586,200
Fire Station 4	9,500	Sq. Ft.	765	7,263,000
Fire Station 5 - Building 1 (Temp)[3]	1,400	Sq. Ft.	-	-
Fire Station 5 - Building 2 (Temp)[3]	2,000	Sq. Ft.	-	-
Subtotal				$ 28,002,100
Vehicles and Apparatus (See Appendix Table A.4)				$ 14,772,600
Total Value of Existing Facilities				$48,586,000

[1] Unit costs were evaluated using replacement values supplied by the Murrieta Fire & Rescue 2020 FAIRA insurance valuation as the base. 14% escalation added per year to achieve 2023 structural values.
[2] Value includes building cost and contents (furnishings and equipment) specific to each building.
[3] No value shown for these facilities because they will be replaced by planned Station #5.

Sources: 2020 FAIRA Insurance Renewal Valuation for the Murrieta Fire & Rescue; Willdan Financial Services.

Planned Facilities

Table 4.3 summarizes the planned facilities needed to serve the City through 2035, as identified by the City. The City plans to build a two new fire stations and purchase several engines and apparatus, in addition to a new Regional Training Center that will be shared with the police department. In total $30.1 million worth of new facilities has been identified.

Table 4.3: Planned Fire Facilities

Facility / Asset	Inventory	Unit Cost	Value
New Fire Stations and Facilities (square feet)			
Regional Training Center (RTC)			$12,500,000
Replace Fire Station 5 (S5) on Vineyard Parkway[1]	12,680	$ 670	8,500,000
New Fire Station 6 (S6) and garage bay[2]	12,680	670	8,500,000
Subtotal			$29,500,000
New Apparatus[3]			
S6 Pierce Type 1 Engine. Upfitting included			$ 1,470,000
S6 Rescue Truck for Medic Patrol. Upfitting included			485,000
S6 All-Terrain Polaris. Upfitting included			48,000
S6 Pierce Type 3 Brush Truck. Upfitting included			675,000
Subtotal			$ 2,678,000
Total Cost - Planned Facilities			$32,178,000
Less: Existing Fund Balance			2,078,791
Net Cost of Planned Facilities			$30,099,209

[1] Replace S5 temporary modular building at the current location with a 2-story building, install a carport, low-maintenance landscaping. Existing garage bay will remain.
[2] New S6 includes station building approximately 12,500/sf with Police substation, separate garage bay 3-door tandem with bi-fold doors, carport for BC vehicles, community and training room, patio space, greenbelt and landscaping, solar system, data infrastructure, station alerting system, PPE extractors, deionized water treatment system.
[3] S6 topography will need the following fleet: 1) Type 3-Brush Engine that has a pumper unit. 2) Type 1 Engine. 3) Rescue Truck. 4) All-Terrain Polaris

Sources: Capital Improvement Plan FY24, City of Murrieta, Murrieta Fire & Rescue.

Cost Allocation

Table 4.4 expresses the City's current fire protection facilities level of service in terms of an existing cost per capita, by dividing the replacement cost of the City's existing facilities by the existing service population. The resulting cost per capita drives the fee calculation. The cost per capita is multiplied by the worker weighting factor to determine the cost per worker.

Table 4.4: Existing Level of Service

Value of Existing Facilities	$	48,586,000
Existing Service Population		223,100
Cost per Capita	$	218
Facility Standard per Resident	$	218
Facility Standard per Worker[1]		940

[1] Based on a weighting factor of 4.31

Sources: Tables 4.1 and 4.2; City of Murrieta; Willdan Financial Services.

Fee Revenue Projection

The City plans to use fire protection facilities fee revenue to construct improvements and acquire capital facilities and equipment to add to the system of fire protection facilities to serve new development. **Table 4.5** details a projection of fee revenue, based on the service population growth increment identified in **Table 4.1.** When setting fees to maintain the existing level of service, the resulting fee revenue will fully fund the identified planned facilities, and the City will need to identify additional facilities to maintain the level of service as new development adds demand for fire protection services and facilities through the planning horizon.

Table 4.5: Revenue Projection - Existing Standard

Cost per Capita	$	218
Growth in Service Population (2023 - 2035)		392,300
Fee Revenue	$	85,521,000
Net Cost of Planned Facilities		30,099,209
Value of Facilities To Be Identified	$	55,421,791

Sources: Tables 4.1, 4.3 and 4.4.

Fee Schedule

Table 4.6 shows the maximum justified fire protection facilities fee schedule. The cost per capita is converted to a fee per unit of new development based on dwelling unit and employment densities (persons per dwelling unit or employees per 1,000 square feet of nonresidential building space). The fee per average sized single family, and multifamily dwelling unit is converted into a fee per square foot by dividing the fee per dwelling unit by the assumed average square footage of each type of unit.

The total fee includes a two percent (2%) administrative charge to fund costs that include: a standard overhead charge applied to all City programs for legal, accounting, and other departmental and administrative support, and fee program administrative costs including revenue

collection, revenue and cost accounting, mandated public reporting, and fee justification analyses.

In Willdan's experience with impact fee programs, two percent of the base fee adequately covers the cost of fee program administration. The administrative charge should be reviewed and adjusted during comprehensive impact fee updates to ensure that revenue generated from the charge sufficiently covers, but does not exceed, the administrative costs associated with the fee program.

Table 4.6: Fire Protection Facilities Fee Schedule

	A	*B*	*C = A x B*	*D = C x 0.02*	*E = C + D*	*F = E / Average*
Land Use	**Cost Per Capita**	**Density**	**Base Fee[1]**	**Admin Charge[1, 2]**	**Total Fee[1]**	**Fee per Sq. Ft.**
Residential						
Single Family	$ 218	3.25	$ 709	$ 14	$ 723	$ 0.28
Multifamily	218	2.07	451	9	460	0.38
Nonresidential						
Commercial	$ 940	1.93	$ 1,814	$ 36	$ 1,850	$ 1.85
Office	940	3.11	2,923	58	2,981	2.98
Industrial	940	1.03	968	19	987	0.99

[1] Fee per average sized dwelling unit, per 1,000 square feet of nonresidential.

[2] Administrative charge of 2.0 percent for (1) legal, accounting, and other administrative support and (2) impact fee program administrative costs including revenue collection, revenue and cost accounting, mandated public reporting, and fee justification analyses.

[3] Assumes 2,555 square feet per average sized single family unit, and 1,198 square feet per average sized multifamily unit in Murrieta based on an analysis of building permits issued between January 2022 and September 2023.

Sources: Tables 2.2 and 4.4; Willdan Financial Services.

5. Streets, Minor Bridges & Culverts

This chapter summarizes an analysis of the need for streets, minor bridges, and culverts, to accommodate new development. The chapter documents a reasonable relationship between new development and the impact fee for funding of these facilities.

Trip Demand

The need for street improvements is based on the trip demand placed on the system by development. A reasonable measure of demand is the number of average daily vehicle trips, adjusted for the type of trip. Vehicle trip generation rates are a reasonable measure of demand on the City's system of street improvements across all modes because alternate modes (transit, bicycle, pedestrian) often substitute for vehicle trips.

The two types of trips adjustments made to trip generation rates to calculate trip demand are described below:

- Pass-by trips are deducted from the trip generation rate. Pass-by trips are intermediates stops between an origin and a final destination that require no diversion from the route, such as stopping to get gas on the way to work.
- The trip generation rate is adjusted by the average length of trips for a specific land use category compared to the average length of all trips on the street system.

Table 5.1 shows the calculation of trip demand factors by land use category based on the adjustments described above. Data is based on extensive and detailed trip surveys conducted in the San Diego region by the San Diego Association of Governments. The surveys provide one of the most comprehensive databases available of trip generation rates, pass-by trips factors, and average trip length for a wide range of land uses. Though urban development patterns differ between San Diego and the City of Murrieta, the use of this data is appropriate as a means of allocating trips across multiple land use categories. It should be noted that the projections of current and future trip generation in this report are based on data specific to the City of Murrieta.

Table 5.1: Trip Rate Adjustment Factors

	Primary Trips[1]	Diverted Trips[1]	Total Excluding Pass-by[1]	Average Trip Length[2]	Adjust-ment Factor[3]	ITE Category	Average Daily Trips[4]	Trip Demand Factor[5]
	A	*B*	*C = A + B*	D	*E = C x D / 6.9*		*F*	*G = E x F*
Residential								
Single Family	86%	11%	97%	7.9	1.11	Single Family Housing (210)	9.43	10.47
Multifamily	86%	11%	97%	7.9	1.11	Apartment (220)	6.74	7.48
Nonresidential								
Commercial	47%	31%	78%	3.6	0.41	Shopping Center (820)	37.01	15.17
Office	77%	19%	96%	8.8	1.22	General Office Building (710)	10.84	13.22
Industrial	79%	19%	98%	9.0	1.28	Industrial Park (130)	3.37	4.31

[1] Percent of total trips. Primary trips are trips with no midway stops, or "links". Diverted trips are linked trips whose distance adds at least one mile to the primary trip. Pass-by trips are links that do not add more than one mile to the total trip.

[2] In miles.

[3] The trip adjustment factor equals the percent of non-pass-by trips multiplied by the average trip length and divided by the systemwide average trip length of 6.9 miles.

[4] Trips per dwelling unit or per employee.

[5] The trip demand factor is the product of the trip adjustment factor and the average daily trips.

[6] Assumes 2.26 average daily trips per resident, multiplied by residents per dwelling unit assumptions from Table 2.2.

Sources: San Diego Association of Governments, Brief Guide of Vehicular Traffic Generation Rates for the San Diego Region, July 1998; Institute of Traffic Engineers, Trip Generation, 11th Edition; Willdan Financial Services.

Trip Growth

The planning horizon for this analysis is 2035. **Table 5.2** lists the 2023 and 2035 land use assumptions used in this study. The trip demand factors calculated in Table 5.1 are multiplied by the existing and future dwelling units and building square feet from Table 2.1 to determine the increase in trip demand associated with new development.

Table 5.2: Land Use Scenario and Total Trips

		2023		Growth 2023 to 2035		Total - 2035	
Land Use	Trip Demand Factor	Units / 1,000 SF	Trips	Units / 1,000 SF	Trips	Units / 1,000 SF	Trips
Residential							
Single Family	10.47	28,817	301,714	2,055	21,516	30,872	323,230
Multifamily	7.48	8,388	62,742	8,733	65,323	17,121	128,065
Subtotal		37,205	364,456	10,788	86,839	47,993	451,295
Nonresidential							
Commercial	15.17	6,443	97,744	13,444	203,949	19,887	301,693
Office	13.22	6,315	83,484	16,268	215,067	22,583	298,551
Industrial	4.31	3,425	14,760	(839)	(3,617)	2,585	11,143
Subtotal		16,183	195,988	28,873	415,399	45,056	611,387
Total			560,444		502,238		1,062,682
			52.7%		47.3%		100%

Sources: Tables 2.1 and 5.1; Willdan Financial Services

Level of Service

This impact fee study is an update to the City's 2016 development impact fee update study. The streets, minor bridges, and culverts fee in that analysis was based on the circulation element policy of maintaining an average daily traffic (ADT) Level of Service (LOS) "C" or better for all roadway segments. This update relies on the same transportation modeling that was used in the 2016 study. Segments that have been completed have been removed from the project list. The remaining segments are needed to ensure that new development does not degrade the LOS to unacceptable levels. In some cases, even with mitigation the LOS cannot be fully mitigated back to an acceptable LOS.

Projects that were allocated 100% to new development in the prior study are still allocated 100% to the impact fee. Projects that are needed to serve both existing demand and future demand are allocated to the impact fee based on new development's share of total trips at the planning horizon (47.3%) identified in **Table 5.2**.

Table 5.3: Existing and Future Roadway Segment Level of Service

		Existing Conditions (2013)					Future Conditions (2035)					
Project	Roadway	Classification	No. of Lanes	Existing V/C	Existing LOS	Bike Lane	Future	No. of Lanes	Future V/C	Future LOS	Bike Lane	Allocation To New Development
ST-07 - A-B	Jefferson Avenue	Secondary	2	0.86	D	Class II	Arterial	6	1.01	F	Class II	100%
ST-07 - C	Jefferson Avenue	Arterial	3	0.86	D	Class II	Arterial	6	1.01	F	Class II	100%
ST-08 - A	Jefferson Avenue	Arterial	2	0.22	A	Class II	Arterial	6	0.40	A	Class II	100%
ST-08 - B-C	Jefferson Avenue	Arterial	2	0.22	A	-	Arterial	6	0.50	A	Class II	100%
ST-15 - G	Washington Avenue	---	4	0.55	A	-	Secondary	4	0.56	A	Class II	100%
ST-15 - L	Washington Avenue	---	-	-	-	-	Collector	2	0.11	A	MP Trail	47.3%
ST-16 - A	Washington Avenue	Industrial Collector	2	0.05	A	-	Industrial Collector	2	0.25	A	MP Trail	100%
ST 17/18 - A	Guava Street	---	2	0.02	A	-	Major	4	0.46	A	Class II	100%
ST 17/18 - E	Guava Street	---	2	0.09	A	-	Collector	2	0.49	A	Class II	100%
ST-19 - A- B	Adams Avenue		2	0.18	A	-	Secondary	4	0.13	A	-	100%
ST-20 - B	Ivy Street		2	0.33	A	-	Major	4	0.26	A	Class II	100%
ST-26 - A	Kalmia Street	Collector	2	1.18	F	-	Collector	2	0.63	B	Class II / MP Trail	47.3%
ST-27/28 - A	Kalmia Street	Major	3	0.99	E	-	Arterial	6	0.91	E	Class II	100%
ST-27/28 - B	Kalmia Street	Major	3	1.26	F	-	Major	4	0.83	D	Class II	47.3%
ST-29 - A	Lemon Street	Secondary	2	0.32	A	-	Secondary	4	0.16	A	Class II	100%
ST-30 - A	Nutmeg Street	Secondary	2	0.44	A	-	Secondary	4	0.77	C	Class II	100%
ST-31 - A-B	Nutmeg Street	Secondary	2	0.45	A	-	Secondary	4	0.49	A	Class II	100%
ST-33 - B	Monroe Avenue	Major	-	-	-	-	Major	4	0.67	B	Class II	100%
ST-35 - A	Jackson Avenue	Collector	3	0.51	A	-	Secondary	4	0.39	A	Class II	100%
ST-36 - A	Whitewood Road	Major	-	-	-	-	Major	4	0.62	B	MP Trail	100%
ST-37 - B	Vineyard Parkway	Collector	-	-	-	-	Collector	2	0.21	A	Class II	100%
ST-40/41 - A	McElwain Road	Secondary	2			-	Secondary	4	-	-	Class II	47%
ST-40/41 - B	McElwain Road	Secondary	3			-	Secondary	4	0.77	C	Class II	47%
ST-42 - A	Linnel Lane	Secondary	2			-	Secondary	4	0.93	E	Class II	47%
ST-46 - B	Whitewood Road	Major	3	0.24	A	Class II	Major	4	0.79	C	MP Trail	100%

Source: Kimley Horn and Associates.

Table 5.3: Existing and Future Roadway Segment LOS (Continued)

		Existing Conditions (2013)					Future Conditions (2035)					Allocation
Project	Roadway	Existing Classification	No. of Lanes	Existing V/C	Existing LOS	Bike Lane	Future Classification	No. of Lanes	Future V/C	Future LOS	Bike Lane	To New Development
ST-46/47 - A	New Antelope Road	---	-	-	-	-	Major	4	1.06	F	Class II	100%
ST-49 - A	I-215 & Keller Road Interchange	---	-	-	-	-	Interchange	-	-	-	-	47.3%
ST-50 - A	Elm Street	Major	2	0.19	A	-	Major	4	0.53	A	Class II	100%
ST-51 - A	Madison Avenue	Major	2	0.26	A	-	Major	4	0.11	A	Class II	100%
ST-51 - B	Madison Avenue	---	-	-	-	-			0.14	A	Class II	100%
ST-51 - C	Madison Avenue	Major	2	0.26	A	-			0.53	A	Class II	47.3%
ST-52 - A	Monroe Avenue	---	-	-	-	-	Major	4	0.06	A	Class II	100%
ST-54 - A	Murrieta Hot Springs Road	Arterial	4	0.59	A	-	Urban Arterial	6	0.86	D	Class II	100%
ST-57 - A	Hayes Avenue	Collector	2	0.05	A	-	Collector	2	0.59	A	MP Trail	100%
ST-59 - A	Fig Street	---	-	-	-	-	Industrial Collector	2	0.34	A	-	100%
ST-60 - A	Larchmont Lane	---	-	-	-	-	Industrial Collector	2	0.50	A	-	100%
ST-64 - A	Porth Road	---	-	-	-	-	Collector	2			-	47.3%
ST-65 - A	Liberty Road	---	-	-	-	-	Collector	2	0.30	A	-	100%
ST-66 - A	Antelope	Industrial Collector	2			-	Industrial Collector	2	0.41	A	-	47.3%
ST-67 - A	Keller Road	Arterial	3			Class II	Arterial	6	0.79	C	Class II, MP Trail	47.3%
ST-68 - A	Mitchell Road	---	-	-	-	-	Secondary	4	0.47	A	-	100%
ST-70 - A	Adams Avenue	Collector	2	0.52	A	Class II	Collector	2	1.01	F	Class II	100%
ST-71 - A	Hawthorne	---	-	-	-	-	Collector	2	0.12	A	Class II	100%
ST-72 - A	Ivy Street	Collector	2	0.58	A	Class II	Collector	2	0.06	A	Class II	100%
ST-73 - A	Adams Avenue	Collector	2	0.15	A	-	Secondary	4	0.45	A	Class II	100%
ST-75 - A	Lemon Street	Secondary	2	0.52	A	-	Secondary	4	0.47	A	Class II	100%
ST-76 - A	Vista Murrieta	---	-	-	-	-	Collector	2	0.12	A	-	100%
ST-78 - A	Fig Street	Industrial Collector	2	0.19	A	-	Industrial Collector	2	0.06	A	-	100%
ST-81 - A	Los Alamos	Collector	2	0.36	A	-	Collector	2	0.28	A	Class II	100%
ST-82 - A	Lincoln	Collector	2	0.3	A	-	Collector	2	0.22	A	Class III	100%

Source: Kimley Horn and Associates.

Project Costs

Cost estimates and the allocated to new development are summarized in **Table 5.4**. The project costs from the 2016 study were prepared in 2013. Those costs were adjusted for inflation to 2024 using the Engineering News Record's Construction Cost Index. The table also shows the allocation to new development. The majority of the projects included in the fee program were not deficient at the time the fee program was created. For projects that were not deficient as of the last analysis, the full cost of the improvements is needed to remedy unacceptable level of service decreases caused by the increase in trips from new development. For projects that were deficient at that time, an the mitigation does not allow the LOS to degrade further, the full cost of the improvement is allocated to new development. For projects that the only improvement that could be made increases the LOS, a proportional share of responsibility is allocated to new development and to existing development.

Table 5.4: Roadway Segment Facilities Costs and Allocation to New Development

Project	Roadway	Description	Lane Feet	Signal	Total Cost (2023)	Allocation To New Development	Cost Allocated To New Development
ST-07 - A-B	Jefferson Avenue	Widen 2200 LF on the west side Lemon to N/O Kalmia (A). Widen 1000 LF on the east side N/O Kalmia to Centerpointe (B). Construct additional 23 LF, 4 lane span bridge to cross canal at $575,000.	2,200		$ 6,085,185	100%	$ 6,085,185
ST-07 - C[1]	Jefferson Avenue	Widen 350 LF on the east side Kalmia to canal	350	Intersection #44 at Kalmia in intersection estimates	942,681	100%	942,681
ST-08 - A	Jefferson Avenue	Widen 900 LF on the east side Gateway to City Limits	900		2,656,896	100%	2,656,896
ST-08 - B-C	Jefferson Avenue	Widen 500 LF on the eas side S/O Gateway (B) and 1100 LF on the west side S/O Gateway (C).	1,100		3,247,317	100%	3,247,317
ST-15 - G	Washington Avenue	Widen 700 LF on the east side S/O Calle de Oso Oro. Add two bike lanes and a sidewalk.	700		852,124	100%	852,124
ST-15 - L	Washington Avenue	Reconstruct a new 2 lane collector.	2,620		5,711,987	47.3%	2,701,770
ST-16 - A	Washington Avenue	Construct between Elm and Guava at 5280 LF	5,280		11,339,482	100.0%	11,339,482
ST 17/18 - A	Guava Street	1320 LF widening on north side and 820 LF widening on south side Jefferson to Monroe	2,280		5,615,450	100%	5,615,450
ST 17/18 - E	Guava Street	Widen 5400 LF Washington to W/O John Wayne	5,400		9,406,022	100%	9,406,022
ST-19 - A- B	Adams Avenue	Widen 1300 LF on the west side Brown to Guava (A) and widen 2800 LF on the east side Guava to Hawthorn (B).	2,800		7,228,702	100%	7,228,702
ST-20 - B[1]	Ivy Street	Widen 1320 LF on the north side Adams to Washington	1,320		1,448,229	100%	1,448,229
ST-26 - A	Kalmia Street	Widen/Construct 2640 LF W. City Limits to Washington	2,640		5,061,336	47.3%	2,394,012
ST-27/28 - A[1]	Kalmia Street	Widen 690 LF on the north side Village Walk to Jefferson which includes narrowing travel lanes, relocating the median, and constructing a through lane and SW.	690	Intersection #44 at Jefferson in intersection estimates	1,575,517	100%	1,575,517
ST-27/28 - B	Kalmia Street	Widen 2200 LF on the northside W/O Jefferson to Washington	2,200	Intersection #44 at Jefferson in intersection estimates	4,251,995	47.3%	2,011,194

Notes:
-Streetlight and dry utility costs are included in cost/LF. Streetlights are estimated at one streetlight every 250' at $16,000 each, dry utilities are estimated as $40,000 every 2500'.
-The costs for a one lane bridge span is estimated at $6,250/LF.
[1] Cost estimated by the City of Murrieta. Contingencies were added to the initial estimates.

Sources: City of Murrieta; Kimley Horn and Associates.

Table 5.4: Roadway Segment Facilities Costs and Allocation to New Development Continued

Project	Roadway	Description	Lane Feet	Signal[2]	Total Cost (2023)	Allocation To New Development	Cost Allocated To New Development
ST-29 - A	Lemon Street	Widen 2000 LF on the north side of Washington to E/O Hayes.	2,000	Relocate existing signal/streetlight at Washington on the west leg. In intersection estimate	$ 3,888,071	100%	$ 3,888,071
ST-30 - A	Nutmeg Street	Widen appx 480 LF along bridge on Calle de Oso Oro. Construct additional two lane span bridge at $6M.	480		9,416,202	100%	9,416,202
ST-31 - A-B	Nutmeg Street	Widen 1700 LF on the south side Washington to Adams (A) and widen 700 LF on the north side W/O Adams to Washington (B).	1,700		3,304,861	100%	3,304,861
ST-33 - B	Monroe Avenue	Construct 3800 LF Los Almos to Murrieta Hot Springs.	3,800	Intersection at los alamos rd intersection #27	$ 11,604,833	100%	$ 11,604,833
ST-35 - A	Jackson Avenue	Widen 1300 LF on the east side Nutmeg St to S/O Robards	1,300		1,775,505	100%	1,775,505
ST-36 - A	Whitewood Road	Construct 4600 LF Jackson to Murrieta Hot Springs	4,600	Intersection #57 at Murrieta Hot Springs Rd in intersection estimates	10,106,723	100%	10,106,723
ST-37 - B	Vineyard Parkway	Construct 2500 LF S/O Calle Del Oso Oro to future Calle Rambla Orienta	2,500		5,450,369	100%	5,450,369
ST-40/41 - A	McElwain Road	Widen/Construct 3000 LF Linnel Ln to N. City Limit	3,000		7,363,300	47.3%	3,482,841
ST-40/41 - B	McElwain Road	Construct 650 LF S/O Linnel Ln on west side	650		887,753	47.3%	419,907
ST-42 - A	Linnel Lane	Widen 1100 LF on the north side W/O I-215	1,100		2,138,439	47.3%	1,011,482
ST-46 - B	Whitewood Road	Widen 4800 LF on the east side Hunter to Clinton Keith	4,800		9,277,080	100%	9,277,080
ST-46/47 - A	Warm Springs Parkway	Construct appx 14800 LF of New Antelope Rd Clinton Keith to Scott. Construct new signal at Clinton Keith (Intersection #21). Signal & 1200 LF Built	13,600	Intersection #21 at clinton keith in intersection estimates. *Completed*	37,283,070	100%	37,283,070
ST-49 - A	215 & Keller Road Interchang	Construct interchange		-	47,000,000	47.3%	22,231,000
ST-50 - A	Elm Street	Jefferson Avenue to Monroe Avenue	2,100		5,172,125	100%	5,172,125

Notes:
-Streetlight and dry utility costs are included in cost/LF. Streetlights are estimated at one streetlight every 250' at $16,000 each, dry utilities are estimated as $40,000 every 2500'.
-The costs for a one lane bridge span is estimated at $6,250/LF.
[1] Cost estimated by the City of Murrieta. Contingencies were added to the initial estimates.

Sources: City of Murrieta; Kimley Horn and Associates.

Table 5.4: Roadway Segment Facilities Costs and Allocation to New Development Continued

Project	Roadway	Description	Lane Feet	Signal[2]	Total Cost (2023)	Allocation To New Development	Cost Allocated To New Development
ST-51 - A	Madison Avenue	Nick Ln to Date St	1,290		$ 3,177,162	100%	$ 3,177,162
ST-51 - B	Madison Avenue	Golden Gate Cir to Nick Ln	700		2,137,732	100%	2,137,732
ST-51 - C	Madison Avenue	Murrieta Hot Springs Rd to Golden Gate Cir	5,830		17,804,256	47.3%	8,421,413
ST-52 - A	Monroe Avenue	Guava St to Larchmont	4,000		12,215,613	100%	12,215,613
ST-54 - A	Murrieta Hot Springs Road	Madison Ave to Jefferson Ave	1,320		1,935,326	100%	1,935,326
ST-55 - A	Murrieta Hot Springs Road	Jefferson Ave to Adams Ave	1,320		4,975,487	100%	4,975,487
ST-57 - A	Hayes Avenue	Kalmia St to Guava St	8,000		13,934,848	100%	13,934,848
ST-59 - A	Fig Street	Jefferson Ave to Monroe Avenue	2,400		6,715,194	100%	6,715,194
ST-60 - A	Larchmont Lane	Jefferson Ave to Monroe	2,100		5,875,795	100%	5,875,795
ST-64 - A	Porth Road	Liberty Rd to Clinton Keith	2,700		5,886,399	47.3%	2,784,267
ST-65 - A	Liberty Road	Porth Rd to City Limit	1,320		2,877,795	100%	2,877,795
ST-66 - A	Antelope	Stepp Rd to Brians Way	7,000		12,192,992	47.3%	5,767,285
ST-67 - A	Keller Road	I-215 to Menifee Rd	1,700		3,331,300	47.3%	1,575,705
ST-68 - A	Mitchell Road	McElwain to Clinton Keith	2,300		5,937,863	100%	5,937,863
ST-70 - A	Adams Avenue	Lemon to Kalmia	2,640		4,598,500	100%	4,598,500
ST-71 - A	Hawthorne	Adams to Washington	1,320		2,877,795	100%	2,877,795
ST-72 - A	Ivy Street	Washington to Hayes	1,900		3,309,526	100%	3,309,526
ST-73 - A	Adams Avenue	Guava St to Cherry	9,300		9,598,588	100%	9,598,588
ST-75 - A	Lemon Street	Washington to Jefferson	2,640		5,132,254	100%	5,132,254
ST-76 - A	Vista Murrieta	Los Alamos to Monroe	2,900		6,322,428	100%	6,322,428
ST-78 - A	Fig Street	Adams to Jefferson	700		1,503,340	100%	1,503,340
ST-81 - A	Los Alamos	Via Santee to Ruth Ellen	900		1,567,670	100%	1,567,670
ST-82 - A	Lincoln	Juniper to Los Alamos	1,000		1,741,856	100%	1,741,856
Total					$355,740,973		$ 296,912,091

Notes:
Streetlight and dry utility costs are included in cost/LF. Streetlights are estimated at one streetlight every 250' at $16,000 each, dry utilities are estimated as $40,000 every 2500'.
The costs for a one lane bridge span is estimated at $6,250/LF.
[1] Cost estimated by the City of Murrieta. Contingencies were added to the initial estimates.

Sources: City of Murrieta; Kimley Horn and Associates.

Fee per Trip Demand Unit

Every impact fee consists of a dollar amount, or the cost of projects that can be funded by a fee, divided by a measure of development. In this case, all fees are first calculated as a cost per trip demand unit. Then these amounts are translated into housing unit (cost per dwelling unit) and employment space (cost per 1,000 building square feet) by multiplying the cost per trip by the trip generation rate for each land use category. These amounts become the fee schedule.

Table 5.5 calculates the cost the cost per trip demand unit by dividing the project costs attributable to new development, net of existing fund balances, from Table 5.4, by the total growth in trips calculated in Table 5.2.

Table 5.5: Cost per Trip to Accommodate Growth

	Project Costs
Fee Program Share of Planned Facilities Costs	$ 296,912,091
Less Existing Fund Balance	(10,876,653)
Net Costs	$ 286,035,438
Growth in Daily Trips	502,238
Cost per Trip	$ 570

Sources: Tables 5.2 and 5.4; Willdan Financial Services.

Fee Schedule

Table 5.6 shows the maximum justified arterial streets fee schedule. The maximum justified fees are based on the costs per trip shown in Table 5.5. The cost per trip is multiplied by the trip demand factors in Table 5.1 to determine a fee per unit of new development. The fee per average sized single family, and multifamily dwelling unit is converted into a fee per square foot by dividing the fee per dwelling unit by the assumed average square footage of each type of unit.

The total fee includes a two percent (2%) administrative charge to fund costs that include: a standard overhead charge applied to all City programs for legal, accounting, and other departmental and administrative support, and fee program administrative costs including revenue collection, revenue and cost accounting, mandated public reporting, and fee justification analyses.

In Willdan's experience with impact fee programs, two percent of the base fee adequately covers the cost of fee program administration. The administrative charge should be reviewed and adjusted during comprehensive impact fee updates to ensure that revenue generated from the charge sufficiently covers, but does not exceed, the administrative costs associated with the fee program.

Table 5.6: Streets, Minor Bridges & Culverts Impact Fee

Land Use	A Cost Per Trip	B Trip Demand Factor	C = A x B Base Fee[1]	D = C x 0.02 Admin Charge[1, 2]	E = C + D Total Fee[1]	F = E / Average Fee per Sq. Ft.
Residential						
Single Family	$ 570	10.47	$ 5,968	$ 119	$ 6,087	$ 2.38
Multifamily	570	7.48	4,264	85	4,349	3.63
Nonresidential						
Commercial	$ 570	15.17	$ 8,647	$ 173	$ 8,820	$ 8.82
Office	570	13.22	7,535	151	7,686	7.69
Industrial	570	4.31	2,457	49	2,506	2.51

[1] Fee per average sized dwelling unit, per 1,000 square feet of nonresidential.

[2] Administrative charge of 2.0 percent for (1) legal, accounting, and other administrative support and (2) impact fee program administrative costs including revenue collection, revenue and cost accounting, mandated public reporting, and fee justification analyses.

[3] Assumes 2,555 square feet per average sized single family unit, and 1,198 square feet per average sized multifamily unit in Murrieta based on an analysis of building permits issued between January 2022 and September 2023.

Sources: Tables 5.1 and 5.5; Willdan Financial Services.

6. Traffic Signals

This chapter summarizes an analysis of the need for traffic signals to accommodate new development. The chapter documents a reasonable relationship between new development and the impact fee for funding of these facilities. Note that the trip demand factors calculated in Table 5.1, and the trip growth projections calculated in Table 5.2 will also be used in this chapter.

Project Costs and Cost Allocation

Intersection locations needed to serve new development are summarized in **Table 6.1**. The table also shows the allocation to new development. None of the intersections included in the fee program were deficient at the time the fee program was created. For projects that were not deficient as of the last analysis, the full cost of the improvements is needed to remedy LOS decreases caused by the increase in trips from new development. For projects where the only improvement that could be made increases the LOS, a proportional share of responsibility is allocated to new development and to existing development.

Project costs are summarized in **Table 6.2.** The project costs from the 2016 study were prepared in 2013. Those costs were adjusted for inflation to 2024 using the Engineering News Record's Construction Cost Index. The allocation to new development from Table 6.1 is multiplied by the cost estimate to determine the costs allocated to new development.

Table 6.1: Traffic Signal and Intersection Level of Service (LOS)

		Existing Conditions				2035 No Improvement				2035 + Recommended Improvement					Allocation
GP Int No.	Intersections	Control	AM Peak Hour Delay (s/veh)	LOS	PM Peak Hour Delay (s/veh)	LOS	AM Peak Hour Delay (s/veh)	LOS	PM Peak Hour Delay (s/veh)	LOS	Control	AM Peak Hour Delay (s/veh)	LOS	PM Peak Hour Delay (s/veh)	LOS	to New Development
9	New Antelope Rd / Baxter Rd	Signal	-	-	-	-	25.2	C	89.2	F	Signal	-	-	-	-	100%
14	New Antelope Rd / Linnel Lane	TWSC	-	-	-	-	22.1	C	28.5	C	Signal	21.4	C	23.4	C	100%
27	Monroe Ave / Los Alamos Rd	Signal	15	B	12.4	B	24.5	C	27.5	C	Signal	-	-	-	-	100%
28	Jefferson Ave / Murrieta Hot Springs Rd	Signal	21.2	C	20.7	C	133.3	F	206.4	F	Signal	56.1	E	115.8	F	100%
39	Washington Ave / Calle Del Oso Oro - Nutmeg St	Signal	29.2	C	26.8	C	27.6	C	27.5	C	Signal	-	-	-	-	100%
42	Jefferson Ave / Magnolia St	AWSC	18.2	C	21.2	C	10.7	B	9.4	A	Signal	-	-	-	-	47%
44	Jefferson Ave / Kalmia St	Signal	26.2	C	26.7	C	59.3	E	159.9	F	Signal	60.3	E	158.5	F	100%
49	Monroe Ave / Murrieta Hot Springs Rd	TWSC	15.8	C	23.8	C	8.0	A	16.2	B	Signal	-	-	-	-	47%
57	Whitewood Rd / Murrieta Hot Springs Rd	Signal	12.6	B	9.7	A	28.3	C	88.7	F	Signal	28.4	C	51.6	D	100%
58	Adams Ave / Guava St	AWSC	8.6	A	9.3	A	12.2	B	143.0	B	Signal	-	-	-	-	100%
	Washington Ave / Lemon St	Signal	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	Signal	-	-	-	-	47%
	Jackson Ave / Nutmeg St	Signal	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	Signal	-	-	-	-	47%
	Adams St / Ivy St	AWSC	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	Signal	-	-	-	-	47%
	Jefferson Ave / Elm St	Signal	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	Signal	-	-	-	-	47%
	Hayes Ave / De Luz Rd - Guava St	TWSC	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	Signal	-	-	-	-	47%
	Madison Ave / Elm St	AWSC	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	Signal	-	-	-	-	47%
	Linnel Ln / McElwain Rd	AWSC	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	Signal	-	-	-	-	47%
	Jefferson Ave / Fig St	Signal	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	Signal	-	-	-	-	47%
	Madison Ave / Fig St	AWSC	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	Signal	-	-	-	-	47%
	Jefferson Ave / Centerpointe Ct	Signal	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	Signal	-	-	-	-	47%

DNE - Indicates intersections that do not exist.

Source: Kimley Horn and Associates.

Table 6.2: Traffic Signal Costs and Allocation to New Development

GP Int No.	Intersection	Estimated Construction Costs (2013)	Estimated Construction Costs (2023)	Project Specifications and Engineering (PS+E) for Design (15%)	Traffic Control (5%)	Stormwater Management (5%)	Contingencies (15%)	Grand Total	Allocation to New Development	Total Cost Allocated to New Development
9	New Antelope Rd / Baxter Rd[1]	$ 689,063	$ 974,227	$ 103,359	$ 34,453	$ 34,453	$ 103,359	$ 1,938,915	100%	$ 1,938,915
14	New Antelope Rd / Linnel Lane	3,612,500	5,107,512	541,875	180,625	180,625	541,875	10,165,012	100%	10,165,012
27	Monroe Ave / Los Alamos Rd[1]	364,063	514,728	54,609	18,203	18,203	54,609	1,024,416	100%	1,024,416
28	Jefferson Ave / Murrieta Hot Springs Rd[1]	827,313	1,169,691	124,097	41,366	41,366	124,097	2,327,929	100%	2,327,929
39	Washington Ave / Calle Del Oso Oro - Nutmeg St	750,000	1,060,383	112,500	37,500	37,500	112,500	2,110,383	100%	2,110,383
42	Jefferson Ave / Magnolia St	1,601,000	2,263,564	240,150	80,050	80,050	240,150	4,504,964	47.3%	2,130,848
44	Jefferson Ave / Kalmia St	750,000	1,060,383	112,500	37,500	37,500	112,500	2,110,383	100%	2,110,383
49	Monroe Ave / Murrieta Hot Springs Rd	2,058,000	2,909,691	308,700	102,900	102,900	308,700	5,790,891	47.3%	2,739,091
57	Whitewood Rd / Murrieta Hot Springs Rd	751,750	1,062,857	112,763	37,588	37,588	112,763	2,115,307	100%	2,115,307
58	Adams Ave / Guava St	1,170,000	1,654,198	175,500	58,500	58,500	175,500	3,292,198	100%	3,292,198
	Washington Ave / Lemon St	1,000,000	1,413,844	150,000	50,000	50,000	150,000	2,813,844	47.3%	1,330,948
	Jackson Ave / Nutmeg St	500,000	706,922	75,000	25,000	25,000	75,000	1,406,922	47.3%	665,474
	Adams St / Ivy St	750,000	1,060,383	112,500	37,500	37,500	112,500	2,110,383	47.3%	998,211
	Jefferson Ave / Elm St[1]	275,000	388,807	41,250	13,750	13,750	41,250	773,807	47.3%	366,011
	Hayes Ave / De Luz Rd - Guava St	1,472,750	2,082,239	220,913	73,638	73,638	220,913	4,144,089	47.3%	1,960,154
	Madison Ave / Elm St	2,357,000	3,332,431	353,550	117,850	117,850	353,550	6,632,231	47.3%	3,137,045
	Linnel Ln / McElwain Rd	2,132,750	3,015,376	319,913	106,638	106,638	319,913	6,001,226	47.3%	2,838,580
	Jefferson Ave / Fig St[1]	290,250	410,368	43,538	14,513	14,513	43,538	816,718	47.3%	386,308
	Madison Ave / Fig St	2,594,000	3,667,512	389,100	129,700	129,700	389,100	7,299,112	47.3%	3,452,480
	Jefferson Ave / Centerpointe Ct[1]	175,438	248,041	26,316	8,772	8,772	26,316	493,654	47.3%	233,498
Total		$24,120,875	$34,103,157	$ 3,618,131	$ 1,206,044	$ 1,206,044	$ 3,618,131	$ 67,872,382		$ 45,323,190

Notes: 2013 costs adjusted to 2023 using the Engineering News Record's Construction Cost Index.

[1] Costs assumed three legs of signal completed.

Source: Kimley Horn Associates.

Fee per Trip Demand Unit

Every impact fee consists of a dollar amount, or the cost of projects that can be funded by a fee, divided by a measure of development. In this case, all fees are first calculated as a cost per trip demand unit. Then these amounts are translated into housing unit (cost per dwelling unit) and employment space (cost per 1,000 building square feet) by multiplying the cost per trip by the trip generation rate for each land use category. These amounts become the fee schedule.

Table 6.3 calculates the cost the cost per trip demand unit by dividing the total project costs attributable to new development summarized in Table 6.2, net of the existing fund balance, by the total growth in trips calculated in Table 5.2.

Table 6.3: Cost per Trip to Accommodate Growth

Fee Program Share of Planned Facilities Costs	$ 45,323,190
Less Existing Fund Balance	(3,345,664)
Net Costs	$ 41,977,526
Growth in Daily Trips	502,238
Cost per Trip	$ 84

Sources: Tables 5.2 and 6.2; Willdan Financial Services.

Fee Schedule

Table 6.4 shows the maximum justified traffic signals facilities fee schedule. The maximum justified fees are based on the costs per trip shown in Table 6.3. The cost per trip is multiplied by the trip demand factors in Table 5.1 to determine a fee per unit of new development. The fee per average sized single family, and multifamily dwelling unit is converted into a fee per square foot by dividing the fee per dwelling unit by the assumed average square footage of each type of unit.

The total fee includes a two percent (2%) administrative charge to fund costs that include: a standard overhead charge applied to all City programs for legal, accounting, and other departmental and administrative support, and fee program administrative costs including revenue collection, revenue and cost accounting, mandated public reporting, and fee justification analyses.

In Willdan's experience with impact fee programs, two percent of the base fee adequately covers the cost of fee program administration. The administrative charge should be reviewed and adjusted during comprehensive impact fee updates to ensure that revenue generated from the charge sufficiently covers, but does not exceed, the administrative costs associated with the fee program.

Table 6.4: Traffic Signals Impact Fee

Land Use	A Cost Per Trip	B Trip Demand Factor	C = A x B Base Fee[1]	D = C x 0.02 Admin Charge[1, 2]	E = C + D Total Fee[1]	F = E / Average Fee per Sq. Ft.
Residential						
Single Family	$ 84	10.47	$ 879	$ 18	$ 897	$ 0.35
Multifamily	84	7.48	628	13	641	0.54
Nonresidential						
Commercial	$ 84	15.17	$ 1,274	$ 25	$ 1,299	$ 1.30
Office	84	13.22	1,110	22	1,132	1.13
Industrial	84	4.31	362	7	369	0.37

[1] Fee per average sized dwelling unit, per 1,000 square feet of nonresidential.

[2] Administrative charge of 2.0 percent for (1) legal, accounting, and other administrative support and (2) impact fee program administrative costs including revenue collection, revenue and cost accounting, mandated public reporting, and fee justification analyses.

[3] Assumes 2,555 square feet per average sized single family unit, and 1,198 square feet per average sized multifamily unit in Murrieta based on an analysis of building permits issued between January 2022 and September 2023.

Sources: Tables 5.1 and 6.3; Willdan Financial Services.

7. Storm Drain Facilities

This chapter summarizes an analysis of the need for storm drain facilities to accommodate growth within the City of Pomona. This projects and associated costs in this chapter were identified it the City's prior impact fee study. This chapter documents a reasonable relationship between new development and a storm drain fee to fund storm drain facilities that serve new development.

Storm Drain Demand

Most new development generates storm water runoff that must be controlled through storm drain facilities by increasing the amount of land that is impervious to precipitation. **Table 7.1** shows the calculation of equivalent dwelling unit (EDU) demand factors based on impervious surface coefficient by land use category. The average impervious surface assumptions are consistent with the City's prior impact fee study. EDU factors relate demand for storm drain facilities in terms of the demand created by a single-family dwelling unit.

Table 7.1: Storm Drain Facilities Equivalent Dwelling Units

	DU or KSF per acre[1]	Average Percent Impervious	Impervious Square Feet per Unit	Equivalent Dwelling Unit (EDU)[2]
Residential				
Single Family	5.00	40%	3,485	1.00
Multifamily	10.00	73%	3,158	0.91
Nonresidential				
Commercial	21.78	90%	1,800	0.52
Office	41.38	90%	947	0.27
Industrial	17.42	90%	2,250	0.65

[1] Dwelling units for residential and thousand building square feet for non-residential. Density based on estimated development and acreage for each land use type in the *General Plan* . Nonresidential densities are based on floor-area-ratios of 0.5 for commercial, 0.95 for office, and 0.40 for industrial, derived from the ranges in Table 3-18 of the *General Plan Land Use Element.*

[2] EDUs per dwelling unit for residential development and per thousand square feet for nonresidential development.

Sources: *Murrieta General Plan Land Use Element,* Table 3-18. Willdan Financial Services.

EDU Generation by New Development

Table 7.2 shows the estimated EDU generation from new development through 2040. New development will generate approximately 20,839 new EDUs, representing 32.3 percent of total storm drain demand in 2035.

Table 7.2: Storm Drain Facilities Equivalent Dwelling Units

	EDU Factor[1]	Existing (DU/KSF)	Projected Growth (DU/KSF)	Total (DU/KSF)	Existing EDUs	Growth in EDUs	Total
Residential							
Single Family	1.00	28,817	2,055	30,872	28,817	2,055	30,872
Multifamily	0.91	8,388	8,733	17,121	7,633	7,947	15,580
Subtotal		37,205	10,788	47,993	36,450	10,002	46,452
Nonresidential							
Commercial	0.52	6,443	13,444	19,887	3,350	6,991	10,341
Office	0.27	6,315	16,268	22,583	1,705	4,392	6,097
Industrial	0.65	3,425	(839)	2,585	2,226	(546)	1,680
Subtotal		16,183	28,873	45,056	7,282	10,837	18,119
Total					43,732	20,839	64,571
Share					67.7%	32.3%	

[1] Per dwelling unit (residential) or thousand building square feet (nonresidential).

Sources: Table 2.1 and 7.1; Willdan Financial Services

Planned Facilities

Table 7.3 identifies the planned storm drain facilities to be funded by the fee. The new storm drain facilities were all identified in the City's prior impact fee study. Projects that have been completed since that study was published were removed from the project list. The project costs from that study were estimated in 2013 and are adjusted here for inflation to 2023 dollars using the Engineering News record's Construction Cost Index. Since drainage projects will benefit both existing development and new development, capacity expanding projects are allocated to new development based on new development's share of storm drain demand at the planning horizon.

Table 7.3: Storm Drain Capital Improvements

Project Number	Description	Total Cost (2013)[1]	Total Cost (2023)[1]	Allocation to New Development	Costs Allocated to New Development
SD-01	Construct Storm Drainage Line D	$ 6,998,454	$ 9,413,545	32.27%	$ 3,038,034
SD-11	Construct Storm Drainage Line L	2,436,171	3,276,867	32.27%	1,057,543
SD-12	Construct Storm Drainage Line L-1	201,784	271,417	32.27%	87,594
SD-13	Construct Storm Drainage Line M	592,227	796,599	32.27%	257,086
SD-14	Construct Storm Drainage Line M-1	319,901	430,296	32.27%	138,869
SD-15	Construct Storm Drainage Line N	1,737,310	2,336,836	32.27%	754,167
SD-16	Construct Storm Drainage N/O Larchmont, Jefferson to Murrieta Creek	1,171,331	1,575,544	32.27%	508,475
SD-17	Construct Storm Drainage N/O Fuex Wa, Jefferson to Murrieta Creek	592,227	796,599	32.27%	257,086
SD-19	Construct Storm Drainage Line, Kalmia Street, Historic Murrieta Area	185,703	249,788	32.27%	80,614
SD-20	Construct Storm Drainage Line, "B" Street, Historic Murrieta area	146,498	197,053	32.27%	63,595
SD-21	Construct Storm Drainage Line, Juniper Street, Historic Murrieta area	-	-	32.27%	-
SD-22	Construct Storm Drainage Line, Jefferson Street, Historic Murrieta area	108,602	146,080	32.27%	47,144
SD-23	Construct Storm Drainage Line, Adams Street, Historic Murrieta area	203,424	273,624	32.27%	88,307
SD-25	Construct Storm Drainage Line, Ivy Street, Historic Murrieta area	-	-	32.27%	-
SD-26	Construct Storm Drainage Line, New Clay Street, Historic Murrieta area	188,824	253,985	32.27%	81,969
SD-27	Storm Drainage Master Plan	500,000	672,545	32.27%	217,050
8059	Guava: Jefferson to Murrieta Creek Road	208,398	280,314	32.27%	90,466
8157	Line D and D1-Madison to Jefferson	30,246	40,684	32.27%	13,130
8202	Line E Storm Drain	74,725	100,512	32.27%	32,438
8345	Murrieta Creek Design	268,461	361,104	32.27%	116,539
10016	Development Impact Fee Nexus Study	4,900	6,591	32.27%	2,127
N/A	Line F at Murrieta Creek	1,940,000	2,609,473	32.27%	842,155
N/A	Construct Line G - Adams to Murrieta Creek	2,000,000	2,690,178	32.27%	868,201
SD-18	Construct Murrieta Creek Flood Control Channel	10,000,000	13,450,892	32.27%	4,341,007
Total		$ 29,909,187	$ 40,230,526		$ 12,983,598
(Less Existing Fund Balances)					$ (5,132,599)
Net Cost of Planned Facilities (Including Murrieta Creek)					$ 7,850,999

[1] Project costs from 2016 impact fee study have been adjusted for inflation to 2023 using the Engineering News Record's Construction Cost Index.

Sources: City of Murrieta; Engineering News Record; Willdan Financial Services.

Cost per Equivalent Dwelling Unit

This chapter uses the planned facilities approach to calculate the storm drain facilities cost standard. The net cost of planned facilities allocated to new development is divided by the growth in EDUs to determine a cost standard per EDU. **Table 7.4** shows the facility cost standard for storm drain facilities.

Table 7.4: Cost per Equivalent Dwelling Unit

Net Cost of Planned Facilities for New Development	$	7,850,999
Growth in EDUs		20,839
Cost per EDU	$	377

Sources: Tables 7.2 and 7.3; Willdan Financial Services.

Fee Schedule

The maximum justified fee for storm drain facilities is shown in **Table 7.5**. The City can adopt any fee up to this amount. The cost per EDU from Table 7.4 is converted to a fee per unit of new development based on the EDU factors shown in Table 7.1. The fee per average sized single

family, and multifamily dwelling unit is converted into a fee per square foot by dividing the fee per dwelling unit by the assumed average square footage of each type of unit.

The total fee includes a two percent (2.0%) administrative charge to fund costs that include: a standard overhead charge applied to all City programs for legal, accounting, and other departmental and administrative support, and fee program administrative costs including revenue collection, revenue and cost accounting and mandated public reporting.

In Willdan's experience with impact fee programs, two percent of the base fee adequately covers the cost of fee program administration. The administrative charge should be reviewed and adjusted during comprehensive impact fee updates to ensure that revenue generated from the charge sufficiently covers, but does not exceed, the administrative costs associated with the fee program.

Table 7.5: Storm Drain Facilities Impact Fee Schedule

	A	*B*	*C = A x B*	*D = C x 0.02*	*E = C + D*	*F = E / Average*
	Cost Per EDU	**EDU Factor**	**Base Fee[1]**	**Admin Charge[1, 2]**	**Total Fee[1]**	**Fee per Sq. Ft.**
Residential						
Single Family	$ 377	1.00	$ 377	$ 8	$ 384	$ 0.15
Multifamily	377	0.91	343	7	350	0.29
Nonresidential						
Commercial	$ 377	0.52	$ 196	$ 4	$ 200	$ 0.20
Office	377	0.27	102	2	104	0.10
Industrial	377	0.65	245	5	250	0.25

[1] Fee per average sized dwelling unit, per 1,000 square feet of nonresidential.

[2] Administrative charge of 2.0 percent for (1) legal, accounting, and other administrative support and (2) impact fee program administrative costs including revenue collection, revenue and cost accounting, mandated public reporting, and fee justification analyses.

[3] Assumes 2,555 square feet per average sized single family unit, and 1,198 square feet per average sized multifamily unit in Murrieta based on an analysis of building permits issued between January 2022 and September 2023.

Sources: Tables 7.1 and 7.4; Willdan Financial Services.

8. General Facilities

The purpose of the fee is to ensure that new development funds its fair share of general facilities. A fee schedule is presented based on the existing facilities standard of general facilities in the City of Murrieta to ensure that new development provides adequate funding to meet its needs.

Service Population

General facilities serve both residents and businesses. Therefore, demand for services and associated facilities are based on the City's service population including residents and workers.

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

Table 8.1: General Facilities Service Population

	Residents	Workers	Service Population
Existing (2023)	109,998	26,240	118,100
New Development (2023-2035)	25,776	85,040	52,100
Total (2035)	135,774	111,280	170,200
Weighting factor	1.00	0.31	

Source: Table 2.1; Willdan Financial Services.

Existing Facility Inventory

This study uses the existing standard methodology to calculate fees for general facilities. The general facilities inventory is comprised of several properties: new city hall, the Murrieta Innovation Center (MIC), Los Alamos Hills office and the City Maintenance Yard. Additionally, the City owns vehicles and equipment. The unit cost for the land value assumption of $510,200 per acre was based on an analysis of recent land sales comparisons as reported by Costar since 2021. City staff provided the replacement costs for the owned buildings, vehicles and equipment. In total, the City owns approximately $41.1 million worth of general facilities.

Table 8.2: General Facilities Inventory

	Inventory	Unit Cost[1]	Value
Land (acres)			
New City Hall	4.04	$ 510,200	$ 2,061,200
MIC (Old City Hall)	0.95	510,200	484,700
Los Alamos Hills Office	19.13	510,200	9,760,100
Maintenance Yard	6.90	510,200	3,520,400
Subtotal	31.02		$ 15,826,400
Buildings (square feet)			
New City Hall	35,000	$ 285	$ 9,975,000
MIC (Old City Hall)	14,815	198	2,808,630
Public Works Modular Office	1,440	150	216,000
Shop Bldg	4,284	91	390,000
Storage Shed # 1	640	23	15,000
Storage Shed # 2	640	23	15,000
Equipment Shelter #1	2,520	36	90,000
Equipment Shelter #2	2,520	36	90,000
Equipment Shelter #3	2,520	36	90,000
Equipment Shelter #4	2,520	36	90,000
Subtotal	66,899		$ 13,779,630
Vehicles (Appendix Table A.5)			$ 1,542,850
Equipment (Appendix Table A.6)			$ 7,070,425
Building Contents			
Old City Hall	n/a	n/a	$ 700,000
Public Works Modular Office	n/a	n/a	40,000
Shop Bldg	n/a	n/a	65,000
Storage Shed # 1	n/a	n/a	10,000
Storage Shed # 2	n/a	n/a	10,000
Equipment Shelter #1	n/a	n/a	25,000
Equipment Shelter #2	n/a	n/a	25,000
Equipment Shelter #3	n/a	n/a	25,000
Equipment Shelter #4	n/a	n/a	25,000
New City Hall	n/a	n/a	2,000,000
Subtotal	-		$ 2,925,000
Total Value of Existing Facilities			$ 41,144,305

[1] Unit costs are replacement valuations supplied by the City of Murrieta.

Sources: City of Murrieta; Appendix Tables A.1 and A.2, Willdan Financial Services.

Planned Facilities

Table 8.3 displays the preliminary planned facilities. The City plans to acquire land to expand the maintenance yard and to construct an additional maintenance yard building. The City also plans

to pursue a North Murrieta Technology Corridor Master Plan to further identify additional general facilities to maintain its existing level of service.

Table 8.3: Planned Facilities

	Amount	Units	Unit Cost	Total
Maintenance Yard	13	Acres	$ 510,200	$ 6,632,600
Public Works Maintenance Building	10,000	Sq. Ft.	$ 500	5,000,000
North Murrieta Technology Corridor Master Plan			n/a	150,000
Subtotal				$ 11,782,600
(Less Existing Fund Balance)				(119,709)
Net Cost of Planned Facilities				$ 11,662,891

Sources: City of Murrieta; Willdan Financial Services.

Cost Allocation

Table 8.4 shows the calculation of the existing cost per capita facility standard by dividing the value of the existing facilities inventory by the existing service population. The resulting cost per capita is the basis of the impact fee. Funding facilities at this level will ensure that as development occurs, new development will contribute to general facilities at the same standard that existing development has contributed thus far. Using the existing standard methodology does not result in existing deficiencies.

Table 8.4: General Facilities Existing Standard

Value of Existing Facilities	$	41,144,305
Existing Service Population		118,100
Cost per Capita	$	348
Facility Standard per Resident	$	348
Facility Standard per Worker[1]		108

[1] Based on a weighting factor of 0.31.

Sources: Tables 8.1 and 8.2.

Fee Revenue Projection

The City plans to use general facilities fee revenue to construct improvements to add to the system of general and administrative facilities to serve new development. **Table 8.5** details a projection of fee revenue, based on the service population growth increment identified in Table 8.1. The City will have to identify and additional $6.5 million worth of general facilities beyond the preliminary list of planned facilities in Table 8.3 to ensure that the existing standard is maintained through the planning horizon as new development increases demand for general facilities.

Table 8.5: Revenue Projection - Existing Standard

Cost per Capita	$ 348
Growth in Service Population (2023 - 2035)	52,100
Fee Revenue	$ 18,131,000
Net Cost of Planned Facilities	11,662,891
Facilities To Be Identified	$ 6,468,109

Sources: Tables 8.1, 8.3 and 8.4.

Fee Schedule

Table 8.6 shows the maximum justified general facilities fee schedule. The cost per capita is converted to a fee per unit of new development based on dwelling unit and employment densities (persons per dwelling unit or employees per 1,000 square feet of nonresidential building space). The fee per average sized single family, and multifamily dwelling unit is converted into a fee per square foot by dividing the fee per dwelling unit by the assumed average square footage of each type of unit.

The total fee includes a two percent (2%) administrative charge to fund costs that include: a standard overhead charge applied to City programs for legal, accounting, and other departmental and administrative support, and fee program administrative costs including revenue collection, revenue and cost accounting, mandated public reporting, and fee justification analyses.

In Willdan's experience with impact fee programs, two percent of the base fee adequately covers the cost of fee program administration. The administrative charge should be reviewed and adjusted during comprehensive impact fee updates to ensure that revenue generated from the charge sufficiently covers, but does not exceed, the administrative costs associated with the fee program.

Table 8.6: General Facilities Fee Schedule

Land Use	*A* Cost Per Capita	*B* Density	*C = A x B* Base Fee[1]	*D = C x 0.02* Admin Charge[1, 2]	*E = C + D* Total Fee[1]	*F = E / Average* Fee per Sq. Ft.
Residential						
Single Family	$ 348	3.25	$ 1,131	$ 23	$ 1,154	$ 0.45
Multifamily	348	2.07	720	14	734	0.61
Nonresidential						
Commercial	$ 108	1.93	$ 208	$ 4	$ 212	$ 0.21
Office	108	3.11	336	7	343	0.34
Industrial	108	1.03	111	2	113	0.11

[1] Fee per average sized dwelling unit, per 1,000 square feet of nonresidential.

[2] Administrative charge of 2.0 percent for (1) legal, accounting, and other administrative support and (2) impact fee program administrative costs including revenue collection, revenue and cost accounting, mandated public reporting, and fee justification analyses.

[3] Assumes 2,555 square feet per average sized single family unit, and 1,198 square feet per average sized multifamily unit in Murrieta based on an analysis of building permits issued between January 2022 and September 2023.

Sources: Tables 2.2 and 8.4; Willdan Financial Services

9. Park Facilities

The purpose of the park facilities impact fee is to fund the acquisition and improvement of park facilities needed to serve new development. The maximum justified impact fee is presented based on maintaining a 5.0-acre standard of park land per 1,000 residents and maintaining the existing standard of park improvements facilities per resident.

Service Population

Park facilities in Murrieta primarily serve residents. Therefore, demand for services and associated facilities is based on the City's residential population. **Table 9.1** shows the existing and future projected residential population for park facilities.

Table 9.1: Park Facilities Service Population

	Residents
Existing (2023)	109,998
New Development (2023-2035)	25,776
Total (2035)	135,774

Source: Table 2.1.

Existing Park Facilities Inventory

The City of Murrieta maintains several park and recreation facilities throughout the city. **Table 9.2** summarizes the City's existing park land inventory in 2023. All facilities are owned by the City. The inventory also includes undeveloped raw land and distinguishes the acreage accordingly. Parks are divided into several categories depending on common characteristics. In total, the inventory includes a total of 506.19 acres of City-owned park land.

Table 9.2: Park Land Inventory

	Developed Acreage	Undeveloped Acreage
Neighborhood Parks		
Barratt Park	8.30	-
Firefighters Park	3.21	-
Grizzly Ridge Park	0.50	-
Mapleton Park	9.30	-
Mountain Pride Park	9.64	-
Murrieta Elementary School	4.26	-
Northstar Park	3.08	-
Rancho Acacia Park	10.11	-
Second Avenue Park	0.75	5.35
Shady Maple Park	4.79	-
Valley Vista Park	6.50	-
Vintage Reserve Park	3.83	-
Subtotal	64.27	5.35
Neighborhood Play Areas		
Antelope Hills Park - Active	5.31	-
Antigua Park	2.26	-
Blackmore Ranch Park	1.14	-
Calle Cipres Park	1.80	-
Calle Estancia Park	2.83	-
Carson Park	0.69	-
Century Park	3.90	-
Creekside Village Green	4.00	-
Crystal Aire Park	1.11	-
Eastgate Park	1.50	-
Echo Canyon Park	3.07	-
Golden Cities/Alderwood	8.00	
Meadowridge Park	4.29	-
Montafino Park	0.76	-
Monte Vista Park	1.06	-
Oak Terrace Park	0.20	-
Oak Tree Park	0.32	-
Palomar Park	1.75	-
Rosewood Park	0.41	-
Springbrook Park	0.29	-
Sycamore Park	2.66	-
Whitewood Park	1.84	-
Subtotal	49.19	

Source: City of Murrieta.

Table 9.2: Park Land Inventory - Continued

	Developed Acreage	Undeveloped Acreage
Citywide Parks		
Los Alamos Hills Sports Park	45.00	40.00
Community Parks		
Alta Murrieta Sports Park	9.76	-
B Street Station	0.30	-
California Oaks Sports Park	19.99	-
Copper Canyon Park	20.94	-
Glen Arbor Park	18.92	-
Hunt Field/Community Center	4.72	-
Mira Mosa Park	8.10	-
Pond Park	14.59	-
Torrey Pines Park	8.00	-
Subtotal	105.32	-
Special Use Parks		
Equestrian Park	21.27	-
Sykes Ranch Park	9.03	-
Town Square Park	4.22	-
Subtotal	34.52	
Nature Parks		
Bear Valley Park 1	20.14	-
Bear Valley Park 2	3.97	-
Cole Canyon Park	140.00	-
Falcon's View Park	14.00	-
Oak Mesa P ark	5.98	-
Warm Springs Park	23.80	-
Subtotal	207.89	-
Total - Existing Parkland	506.19	45.35

Source: City of Murrieta.

Table 9.3 summarizes the City's inventory of park buildings, equipment and special facilities. The total value of these facilities is divided by the total developed park acres to determine the value of existing park buildings, equipment and special facilities per acre. Estimated replacement costs were provided by City staff for use in this analysis.

Table 9.3: Park Facility Inventory

	Quantity	Estimated Cost per Unit	Total Replacement Cost
Playground Equipment			
Small	14	$ 100,000	$ 1,400,000
Medium	11	200,000	2,200,000
Large	12	300,000	3,600,000
California Oaks Sports Park Pool Building			
Building 1: Admin Office & Irrigation/Lighting Room	1	100,000	100,000
Building 2: Lifeguard Office	1	50,000	50,000
Building 3: Pump Room, Storage, Restrooms, etc.	1	1,200,000	1,200,000
Copper Canyon Park Little Ones Buidling	1	500,000	500,000
Picnic Shelters	31	150,000	4,650,000
Trash Enclosures	16	50,000	800,000
Stand Alone Restrooms[1]	7	650,000	4,550,000
Restroom/Snack Bars[2]	5	750,000	3,750,000
Exercise Equipment	11	9,000	99,000
Dressing Room[3]	1	500,000	500,000
Storage[3]	1	500,000	500,000
Mechanical Enclosure (LAHSP)	1	100,000	100,000
Park Maintenance Office	0	-	-
House & Garage	1	900,000	900,000
Barn	1	180,000	180,000
Pump Station (LAHSP)	1	250,000	250,000
Total			$ 25,329,000
Acres of Parkland			506.19
Cost per Acre			$ 50,039

[1] 13 restrooms total, but accounting for COSP restroom separately

[2] Snack bars are joined with restrooms/other buildings and go beyond solely replacing the snack bar in the instance of replacement

[3] Additional rooms within the Town Square Park Amphitheatre building

Source: City of Murrieta.

Park Facilities Unit Costs

Table 9.4 displays the unit costs necessary to acquire and improve park land in Murrieta. The buildings, equipment and special facilities cost per acre from Table 9.3 is added to the cost of an acre of standard park improvements to determine the total improvement cost per acre. The cost per acre of standard park improvements from the City's prior impact fee study was adjusted for inflation into current dollars using the Engineering News Record's Construction Cost Index. The unit cost for the land value assumption of $510,200 per acre was based on an analysis of recent land sales comparisons as reported by Costar since 2021. In total, this analysis assumes that it costs $775,439 to acquire and develop an acre of park land in Murrieta.

Table 9.4: Park Facilities Unit Costs

	Cost Per Acre	Share
Land Acquisition	$ 510,200	66%
Park Improvements		
Standard Park Improvements	$ 215,200	
Special Use Facilities	50,039	
Improvements Cost per Acre	$ 265,239	34%
Total Cost per Acre	$ 775,439	66%

Sources: Tables 9.2 and 9.3.

Preliminary Planned Park Improvements

Table 9.5 lists the City's preliminarily planned park improvements. Costs were provided by City staff. Note that the City will need to identify additional improvements and land acquisition to maintain the existing facility standards through the planning horizon.

Table 9.5: Preliminary Planned Park Improvements

Facility	Total Cost
NorthStar Park Tot Lot (new)	$ 256,740
Mira Mosa Park Tot Lot (new)	151,468
Pioneer Park Phase 2 (Infrastructure, Design, etc.)	450,000
Pioneer Park Phase 3 (Pump Track, etc.) ~37,500 sq. ft.	2,500,000
Equestrian Park (implementing master plan)	10,000,000
Total	$ 13,358,208

Source: City of Murrieta.

Park Facility Standards

Park facility standards establish a reasonable relationship between new development and the need for expanded park land and park facilities. Information regarding the City's existing inventory of existing parks facilities was obtained from City staff.

The most common measure in calculating new development's demand for parks is the ratio of park acres per resident. In general, facility standards may be based on the Mitigation Fee Act (using a city's existing inventory of park land and park facilities), or an adopted policy standard contained in a master facility plan or general plan. Facility standards may also be based on a land

dedication standard established by the Quimby Act.[2] In this case, the City will use the Mitigation Fee Act to impose park impact fees for development within the City.

Mitigation Fee Act

The Mitigation Fee Act does not dictate use of a particular type or level of facility standard for public facilities fees. To comply with the findings required under the law, facility standards must not burden new development with any cost associated with facility deficiencies attributable to existing development.[3] In this case, the fees will be set at a 5.0 acre per 1,000 resident standard for park land acquisition, consistent with the City's General Plan. The park improvements component of the fees will be set at the existing improved park land standard.

City of Murrieta Park Facilities Standards

Table 9.6 shows the existing standards of park land and park improvements per 1,000 residents. In total the City has an existing park land standard of 5.01 acres per 1,000 residents of land, and 4.60 acres per 1,000 residents of park improvements. The fees will be set at a 5.0 acre per 1,000 resident standard for park land acquisition, consistent with the City's General Plan. The park improvements component of the fees will be set at the existing improved park land standard.

Table 9.6: Existing Park Standards

	Land	Improvements
Park Acreage	551.54	506.19
Service Population (2023)	109,998	109,998
Existing Standard (Acres per 1,000 Residents)	5.01	4.60

Sources: Tables 9.1, 9.2 and 9.5.

Facilities Needed to Accommodate New Development

Table 9.7 shows the park land acquisition needed to accommodate new development at the 5.0 acre per 1,000 resident standard, and park improvements needed to maintain the existing improvement standard through the planning horizon. To achieve these standards by the planning horizon, new residential development must fund the purchase of 128.88 acres, and improvement of 11.857 park land acres, at a total cost of $97.2 million.

[2] *California Government Code* §66477.

[3] See the *Benefit* and *Burden* findings in *Background Report*.

Table 9.7: Park Facilities to Accommodate New Development

	Calculation	
Parkland		
Facility Standard (acres/1,000 residents)	*A*	5.00
Growth in Service Population (2023 - 2035)	*B*	25,776
Facility Needs (acres)	*C = (B / 1,000) x A*	128.88
Average Unit Cost (per acre)	*D*	$ 510,200
Total Cost of Parkland To Serve New Development	*E = C x D*	$ 65,754,600
Improvements		
Facility Standard (acres/1,000 residents)	*A*	4.60
Growth in Service Population (2023 - 2035)	*B*	25,776
Facility Needs (acres)	*C = (B / 1,000) x A*	118.57
Average Unit Cost (per acre)	*H*	$ 265,239
Total Cost of Park Improvements To Serve New Development	*I = C x H*	$ 31,449,400
Total Cost of Land and Improvements	***J = G + I***	**$ 97,204,000**

Sources: Tables 9.1, 9.4, and 9.6; City of Murrieta.

Parks Cost per Capita

Table 9.8 shows the cost per capita of providing new park land and park facilities at the 5.0 acres land acquisition standard and the existing park improvement facility standard. The cost per capita is shown separately for land and improvements. The cost per capita is shown separately for land and improvements.

Table 9.8: Cost per Capita - Existing Level of Service

	Calculation		
Parkland			
Parkland Investment (per acre)	*A*	$	510,200
Facility Standard (acres per 1,000 residents)	*B*		5.00
Total Cost Per 1,000 capita	*C = A x B*	$	2,551,000
Cost Per Resident	*D = C / 1,000*	$	2,551
Improvements			
Parkland Investment (per acre)	*E*	$	265,239
Facility Standard (acres per 1,000 residents)	*B*		4.60
Total Cost Per 1,000 capita	*F = E x B*	$	1,220,000
Cost Per Resident	*G = F / 1,000)*	$	1,220

Sources: Tables 9.3, 9.4 and 9.7; Willdan Financial Services.

Use of Fee Revenue

The City plans to use park facilities fee revenue to purchase park land or construct improvements to add to the system of park facilities that serves new development. The City may only use impact fee revenue to provide facilities and intensify usage of existing facilities needed to serve new development.

Fee Schedule

To calculate fees by land use type, the investment in park facilities is determined on a per capita basis for both land acquisition and improvement. These cost factors (shown in Table 9.8) are cost per capita based on the unit cost estimates and facility standards. The fee per average sized single family, and multifamily dwelling unit is converted into a fee per square foot by dividing the fee per dwelling unit by the assumed average square footage of each type of unit.

Table 9.9 shows the maximum justified park facilities fee schedule based on the analysis described above. The total fee includes an administrative charge to fund costs that include: (1) legal, accounting, and other administrative support and (2) impact fee program administrative costs including revenue collection, revenue and cost accounting, mandated public reporting, and fee justification analyses.

Table 9.9: Park Facilities Fee Schedule

Land Use	A Cost Per Capita	B Density	C = A x B Base Fee[1]	D = C x 0.02 Admin Charge[1, 2]	E = C + D Total Fee[1]	F = E / Average Fee per Sq. Ft.[3]
Single Family						
Parkland	$ 2,551	3.25	$ 8,291	$ 166	$ 8,457	$ 3.31
Improvements	1,220	3.25	3,965	79	4,044	1.58
Total					$ 12,501	$ 4.89
Multifamily						
Parkland	$ 2,551	2.07	$ 5,281	$ 106	$ 5,387	$ 2.11
Improvements	1,220	2.07	2,525	51	2,576	1.01
Total					$ 7,963	$ 3.12

[1] Fee per average sized dwelling unit.

[2] Administrative charge of 2.0 percent for (1) legal, accounting, and other administrative support and (2) impact fee program administrative costs including revenue collection, revenue and cost accounting, mandated public reporting, and fee justification analyses.

[3] Assumes 2,555 square feet per average sized single family unit, and 1,198 square feet per average sized multifamily unit in Murrieta based on an analysis of building permits issued between January 2022 and September 2023.

Sources: Tables 2.2 and 9.8; Willdan Financial Services.

10. Community Center Facilities

The following chapter documents the nexus analysis, demonstrating the need for new community center facilities demanded by new development.

Service Population

Park facilities in Murrieta primarily serve residents. Therefore, demand for services and associated facilities is based on the City's residential population. **Table 10.1** shows the existing and future projected service population for community center facilities.

Table 10.1: Community Center Facilities Service Population

	Residents
Existing (2023)	109,998
New Development (2023-2035)	25,776
Total (2035)	135,774

Source: Table 2.1.

Existing Facility Inventory

The City of Murrieta maintains several recreation and community center facilities. **Table 10.2** summarizes the City's existing recreation and community center facilities inventory. All facilities are located within the City limits. In total, the City owns approximately $9.8 million in recreation and community center facilities.

Table 10.2: Existing Community Centers

	Inventory	Units	Unit Cost[1]	Value
Land				
Community Center	4.72	acres	$ 510,200	$ 2,408,100
Teen Center	3.09	acres	510,200	1,576,500
Senior Center	2.14	acres	510,200	1,091,800
Subtotal	9.95	acres		$ 5,076,400
Buildings				
Community Center	8,866	sq. ft.	$ 192	$ 1,700,000
Classrooms	842	sq. ft.	154	130,000
Community Ctr Modular Office	1,440	sq. ft.	110	158,200
Senior Center	9,000	sq. ft.	222	2,000,000
Hay barn, maintenance garage	3,200	sq. ft.	100	320,000
Equestrian Center Building	1,621	sq. ft.	100	162,100
Equestrian Center Building	1,430	sq. ft.	100	143,000
Equestrian Center Building	754	sq. ft.	100	75,400
Subtotal				$ 4,688,700
Total Value - Existing Community Centers				$ 9,765,100

Sources: City of Murrieta; Willdan Financial Services.

Planned Facilities

The City has planned several recreation and community center facilities to serve new development. Included in the plans are both expansions to existing facilities and the new construction of facilities. The City has identified $69.4 million of recreation and community center facilities to serve existing and new development net of existing fund balances. **Table 10.3** details the City's planned recreation and community center facilities.

Table 10.3: Planned Recreation Facilities

	Amount	Units	Unit Cost	Total
Community Room Addition	9,000	Sq. Ft.	$ 748	$ 6,733,351
Youth Center Expansion	6,500	Sq. Ft.	748	4,862,976
Community Center	30,000	Sq. Ft.	748	22,444,504
Aquatic Center (Los Alamos)	25,000	Sq. Ft.	748	18,703,753
Aquatic Center (Cal Oaks)	18,000	Sq. Ft.	748	13,466,702
Equestrian Park (implementing master plan)				5,000,000
Subtotal				$ 71,211,286
(Less Existing Fund Balance)				(1,807,685)
Net Cost of Planned Facilities				$ 69,403,601

Source: City of Murrieta.

Cost Allocation

Table 10.4 expresses the City's current recreation facilities level of service in terms of an existing cost per capita, by dividing the replacement cost of the City's existing facilities by the existing service population. The resulting cost per capita drives the fee calculation.

Table 10.4: Existing Level of Service

Value of Existing Facilities	$	9,765,100
Existing Service Population		109,998
Facility Standard per Resident	$	89

Sources: Tables 10.1 and 10.2; Willdan Financial Services.

Fee Revenue Projection

The City plans to use recreation and community center facilities fee revenue to construct improvements to add to the system of recreation and community center facilities that serves existing and new development. The list of facilities to be funded by the fee is detailed above in Table 10.3. **Table 10.5** details a projection of fee revenue, based on the service population growth increment identified in Table 10.1. The projected fee revenue will not fully fund the identified planned facilities. However, so long as the fee revenue is spent of capacity expanding facilities that serve new development, then the fee revenue will have been spent appropriately. The City plans to update its parks and recreation facilities master plan in the sort term, at which point it should consider revising this impact fee to accommodate the facility plans identified in that document.

Table 10.5: Revenue Projection - Existing Standard

Cost per Capita	$	89
Growth in Service Population (2023 - 2035)		25,776
Fee Revenue	$	2,288,000

Sources: Tables 10.1 and 10.4.

Fee Schedule

Table 10.6 shows the maximum justified recreation facilities fee schedule. The cost per capita is converted to a fee per unit of new development based on dwelling unit densities (residents per dwelling unit). The fee per average sized single family, and multifamily dwelling unit is converted into a fee per square foot by dividing the fee per dwelling unit by the assumed average square footage of each type of unit.

The total fee includes a two-percent (2%) administrative charge to fund costs that include: a standard overhead charge applied to City programs for legal, accounting, and other departmental and administrative support, and fee program administrative costs including revenue collection, revenue and cost accounting, mandated public reporting, and fee justification analyses.

In Willdan's experience with impact fee programs, two percent of the base fee adequately covers the cost of fee program administration. The administrative charge should be reviewed and adjusted during comprehensive impact fee updates to ensure that revenue generated from the charge sufficiently covers, but does not exceed, the administrative costs associated with the fee program.

Table 10.6: Community Center Facilities Fee - Existing Standard

	A	*B*	*C = A x B*	*D = C x 0.02*	*E = C + D*	*F = E / Average*
Land Use	**Cost Per Capita**	**Density**	**Base Fee[1]**	**Admin Charge[1, 2]**	**Total Fee**	**Fee per Sq. Ft.[3]**
Residential						
Single Family	$ 89	3.25	$ 289	$ 6	$ 295	$ 0.12
Multifamily	89	2.07	184	4	188	0.16

[1] Fee per average sized dwelling unit.

[2] Administrative charge of 2.0 percent for (1) legal, accounting, and other administrative support and (2) impact fee program administrative costs including revenue collection, revenue and cost accounting, mandated public reporting, and fee justification analyses.

[3] Assumes 2,555 square feet per average sized single family unit, and 1,198 square feet per average sized multifamily unit in Murrieta based on an analysis of building permits issued between January 2022 and September 2023.

Sources: Tables 2.2 and 10.4.

11. Library Facilities

The following chapter documents the nexus analysis based on a system plan standard approach, demonstrating the need for new library facilities to serve by new development.

Service Population

Library facilities in Murrieta primarily serve residents. Therefore, demand for services and associated facilities are based on the City's residential population. **Table 11.1** shows the existing and future projected service population for library facilities.

Table 11.1: Library Facilities Service Population

	Residents
Existing (2023)	109,998
New Development (2023-2035)	25,776
Total (2035)	135,774

Source:Table 2.1; Willdan Financial Services.

Existing Facility Inventory

Table 11.2 summarizes the City's existing library facility inventory. Only facilities owned by the City are included in the inventory. The unit cost for the land value assumption of $510,200 per acre was based on an analysis of recent land sales comparisons as reported by Costar since 2021. Unit cost assumptions for the replacement cost of buildings, and the estimated replacement cost of collections were provided by City staff.

Table 11.2: Existing Library Facilities

	Inventory	Units	Unit Cost[1]	Value
Existing Library				
Land (acres)	2.64	acres	$ 510,200	$ 1,346,900
Building	23,375	square feet	325	7,600,000
Library HVAC building	1,581	square feet	117	185,000
Collection	na	items		3,900,000
Total Value - Existing Library Facilities				$ 13,031,900

[1] Unit costs based on actual construction costs for existing library. Cost per item based on data from similar jurisdictions.

[2] Planned increases in collection based on maintaining ratio of building space to items.

Sources: City of Murrieta; Willdan Financial Services.

Planned Facilities

Table 11.3 summarizes the planned library facility needed to serve the City through 2035. The City plans to construct an expansion to the library building, new book lockers and a new mobile library. In all, the projects are estimated to cost approximately $4.5 million, net of existing fund balances and identified grant funding.

Table 11.3: Planned Library Facilities

	Value
Building - Children's Library Expansion	$ 6,000,000
Book Lockers	1,000,000
Mobile Library	100,000
Cost of Planned Facilities	$ 7,100,000
Less Existing Fund Balance	(1,055,113)
Less Grant Funding	(1,500,000)
Net Cost of Planned Facilities	$ 4,544,887

Sources: City of Murrieta; Willdan Financial Services.

Cost Allocation

Existing Level of Service

Per the new nexus study requirements that went into effect of January 1, 2022, a nexus study "shall identify the existing level of service for each public facility, identify the proposed new level of service, and include an explanation of why the new level of service is appropriate." **Table 11.4** expresses the City's current law enforcement facilities level of service in terms of an existing cost per capita. This cost per capita is not used in the fee calculation, rather it is shown here for informational purposes to comply with AB 602.

Table 11.4: Existing Facilities Standard

Value of Existing Facilities	$	13,031,900
Existing Service Population		109,998
Facility Standard per Resident	$	118

Sources: Tables 11.1 and 11.2.

Future Level of Service

Table 11.5 shows new development's projected per capita investment in library facilities at the planning horizon. This value is calculated by dividing the cost of existing and planned facilities by the service population at the planning horizon.

Table 11.5: Library Facilities System Standard

Value of Existing Facilities	$	13,031,900
Cost of Planned Facilities		4,544,887
Total System Value (2035)	$	17,576,787
Future Service Population (2035)		135,774
Cost Allocation per Capita	$	129

Sources: Tables 11.1, 11.2 and 11.3.

Use of Fee Revenue

The City can use library facilities fee revenues for the construction or purchase of buildings, land, vehicles and collections that are part of the system of library facilities serving new development. A list of planned facilities is included in Table 11.3.

Fee Revenue Projection

The City plans to use library facilities fee revenue to construct improvements to add to the system of library facilities that serves new development. The list of facilities to be funded by the fee is detailed above in Table 11.3. **Table 11.6** details a projection of fee revenue, based on the service population growth increment identified in Table 11.1. The cost of the planned facilities not funded by fee revenue represents existing development's share of the facilities and can be funded by any revenue source other than impact fees.

Table 11.6: Library Impact Fee Revenue Projection

Cost per Resident	$	129
Growth in Service Population		25,776
Projected Impact Fee Revenue	$	3,325,104
Total Cost of Planned Facilities	$	4,544,887
Funding Required From Other Sources	$	1,219,783

Sources: Tables 11.1, 11.4 and 11.5.

Fee Schedule

Table 11.7 shows the maximum justified library facilities fee schedule. The cost per capita is converted to a fee per unit of new development based on dwelling unit densities (persons per dwelling). The fee per average sized single family, and multifamily dwelling unit is converted into

a fee per square foot by dividing the fee per dwelling unit by the assumed average square footage of each type of unit.

The total fee includes a two-percent (2%) administrative charge to fund costs that include: a standard overhead charge applied to City programs for legal, accounting, and other departmental and administrative support, and fee program administrative costs including revenue collection, revenue and cost accounting, mandated public reporting, and fee justification analyses.

In Willdan's experience with impact fee programs, two percent of the base fee adequately covers the cost of fee program administration. The administrative charge should be reviewed and adjusted during comprehensive impact fee updates to ensure that revenue generated from the charge sufficiently covers, but does not exceed, the administrative costs associated with the fee program.

Table 11.7: Library Facilities Fee Schedule

Land Use	*A* Cost Per Capita	*B* Density	*C = A x B* Base Fee[1]	*D = C x 0.02* Admin Charge[1, 2]	*E = C + D* Total Fee	*F = E / Average* Fee per Sq. Ft.[3]
Residential						
Single Family	$ 129	3.25	$ 419	$ 8	$ 427	$ 0.17
Multifamily	129	2.07	267	5	272	0.23

[1] Fee per average sized dwelling unit.

[2] Administrative charge of 2.0 percent for (1) legal, accounting, and other administrative support and (2) impact fee program administrative costs including revenue collection, revenue and cost accounting, mandated public reporting, and fee justification analyses.

[3] Assumes 2,555 square feet per average sized single family unit, and 1,198 square feet per average sized multifamily unit in Murrieta based on an analysis of building permits issued between January 2022 and September 2023.

Sources: Tables 2.2 and 11.5.

12. AB 602 Requirements

On January 1, 2022, new requirements went into effect for California jurisdictions implementing impact fees. Among other changes, AB 602 added Section 66016.5 to the Government Code, which set guidelines for impact fee nexus studies. Three key requirements from that section which concern the nexus study are reproduced here:

66016.5. (a) (2) When applicable, the nexus study shall identify the existing level of service for each public facility, identify the proposed new level of service, and include an explanation of why the new level of service is appropriate.

66016.5. (a) (4) If a nexus study supports the increase of an existing fee, the local agency shall review the assumptions of the nexus study supporting the original fee and evaluate the amount of fees collected under the original fee.

66016.5. (a) (6) Large jurisdictions shall adopt a capital improvement plan as a part of the nexus study.

Compliance with AB 602

The following sections describe this study's compliance with the new requirements of AB 602.

66016.5. (a) (2) - Level of Service

1. For fees calculated under the existing standard methodology, the fees are calculated such that new development funds facilities at the existing level of service. These fee categories are: law enforcement, fire protection, parks, community centers and general facilities. The existing level service in terms of the existing facility investment per capita is shown in each corresponding chapter.
2. For fees calculated under the planned facilities methodology, the fees are calculated to ensure that the level of service does not fall to unacceptable levels. The fees calculated under this approach are the streets, minor bridges and culverts fee, the traffic signals fee, and the storm drain facilities fees. Impact fees charged under this program will serve to ensure that the level of service will not fall to unacceptable levels.
3. For the fees calculated under the system standard methodology, the maximum justified fees represent an increase in the facility level of service. The fees calculated under this methodology are the library facilities fees. The increased level of service is required to fund new development's fair share of facilities identified and by City. New development will not fund the entirety of the increase in level of service, rather, it will fund a share of the increased level of service represented by the planned facilities. The City will have to fund existing development's share of the increase level of service through any other funding source. The library facilities fee chapter includes tables that show the existing level of service and future level of service in terms of facility investment per capita.

66016.5. (a) (4) – Review of Original Fee Assumptions

Table 13.1 reviews the assumptions from the 2016 study in terms of the resulting fee revenue generated by each impact fee and compares the projected fee revenue to this study.

Table 12.1: Review of 2016 Study

Facility Category	2016 Study Costs Allocated to New Development	2024 Study Costs Allocated to New Development
Law Enforcement	$ 8,567,000	$ 59,670,000
Fire Protection	16,701,426	85,521,000
Streets, Minor Bridges & Culverts	315,035,646	286,035,438
Traffic Signals	60,137,717	41,977,526
Storm Drainage	6,758,778	7,850,999
General Facilities	3,443,582	18,131,000
Parkland Facilities	19,891,200	97,204,000
Community Centers	3,482,000	2,288,000
Public Library	1,764,900	3,325,104
Total	$ 435,782,250	$ 602,003,068

Sources: City of Murrieta; Table E.2, Willdan Financial Services.

Table 13.2 presents an accounting of impact fee revenue collected since FY2015, and displays the average annual amount collected, by impact fee fund during this time period.

Table 12.2: Annual Collected Fee Revenue

	FY 2015	FY 2016	FY 2017	FY 2018	FY 2019	FY 2020	FY 2021	FY 2022	Average
Law Enforcement	$ 196,171	$ 130,274	$ 133,704	$ 155,365	$ 167,703	$ 115,446	$ 119,479	$ 164,312	$ 147,807
Fire Protection	620,634	338,656	255,794	173,149	232,445	137,219	152,318	253,660	270,484
Streets, Minor Bridges & Culverts	465,471	1,012,146	845,722	1,371,320	2,476,905	851,036	807,714	804,234	1,079,318
Traffic Signals	79,486	203,762	159,303	262,964	512,204	226,716	284,674	746,755	309,483
Storm Drainage	449,152	559,545	204,997	89,919	145,089	90,568	156,643	156,164	231,510
General Facilities	142,729	83,015	82,302	61,725	75,852	47,342	51,401	72,062	77,053
Parkland Facilities	1,431,025	857,986	1,149,368	1,096,247	1,134,393	792,765	796,988	963,069	1,027,730
Community Centers	79,396	48,954	137,327	191,684	198,567	138,744	143,981	198,838	142,186
Public Library	84,190	48,951	84,236	97,512	100,786	70,404	72,999	85,296	80,547

City of Murrieta.

66016.5. (a) (6) – Capital Improvement Plan

The Capital Improvement Plan for this nexus study is comprised of the identified planned facilities within each facility fee chapter. Planned facilities identified in this document are sourced from the City's current adopted CIP and other City documents. Adoption of this nexus study would approve the planned facilities identified herein as the Capital Improvement Plan for this nexus study.

13. Implementation

Impact Fee Program Adoption Process

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

Inflation Adjustment

The City can keep its impact fee program up to date by periodically adjusting the fees for inflation. Such adjustments should be completed regularly to ensure that new development will fully fund its share of needed facilities. We recommend that the California Construction Cost Index (CCCI) be used for adjusting fees for inflation.

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

Reporting Requirements

The City will comply with the annual and five-year reporting requirements of the *Mitigation Fee Act*. For facilities to be funded by a combination of public fees and other revenues, identification of the source and amount of these non-fee revenues is essential. Identification of the timing of receipt of other revenues to fund the facilities is also important.

Programming Revenues and Projects with the CIP

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

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

Reimbursements

For some facility categories, particularly park facilities, developers occasionally dedicate park land and construct facilities in lieu of paying the development impact fee. If a developer builds park land that exceeds the development's share of needed facilities, that developer should be reimbursed for the amount of facilities created above and beyond that development's impact. However, we recommend that the City' reimburse the difference based on a) the costs identified in the most recent CIP, and b) at the time that the City would be building the improvement had the

development not occurred. By following these guidelines, the City will not be unfairly burdened with unanticipated costs.

14. Mitigation Fee Act Findings

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

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

Purpose of Fee

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

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

Use of Fee Revenues

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

Fees proposed in this report, if enacted by the City, would be used to fund expanded facilities to serve new development. Facilities funded by these fees are designated to be located within the City's sphere of influence. Fees addressed in this report have been identified by the City to be restricted to funding the following facility categories: streets, minor bridges & culverts, traffic signals, fire protection facilities, law enforcement facilities, parks, library facilities, recreation facilities, general facilities, corporation yard facilities, and storm drainage facilities.

Benefit Relationship

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

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

Burden Relationship

- *Determine the reasonable relationship between the need for the public facilities and*

the types of development on which the fees are imposed (§66001(a)(4) of the Act).

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

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

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

Proportionality

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

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

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

Appendix

Appendix Table A.1: Police Facilities Worker Weighting Factor

Category	Calls for Service	Population or Employees	Calls per Capita
Residential	34,058	109,998	0.31
Nonresidential	16,183	26,240	0.62
Other	2,087		
Worker Weighting Factor[1]			1.99

[1] Nonresidential calls per capita / residential calls per capita.

Sources: Murrieta Police Department; Willdan Financial Services.

Appendix Table A.2: Police Vehicle Inventory

Description	Average Unit Cost	Units	Total Value
1996 Toyota Camry	$ 36,000	1	$ 36,000
1997 Ford F350 Van	55,000	1	55,000
2001 Ford F-150	45,000	1	45,000
2002 Jeep Liberty	36,000	1	36,000
2003 Ford Expedition	61,000	1	61,000
2005 Ford Expedition	61,000	1	61,000
2005 Freightliner Motorhome	500,000	1	500,000
2006 Dodge Durango	58,000	1	58,000
2006 F-350 4X4	65,000	1	65,000
2006 Ford Expedition	61,000	1	61,000
2006 Ford F-150	45,000	2	90,000
2006 Ford F-450	70,000	2	140,000
2007 Ford Crown Victoria	56,000	1	56,000
2007 Ford Ranger P/U 4X4	66,000	2	132,000
2008 Dodge Charger	51,000	3	153,000
2008 Dodge Durango	58,000	1	58,000
2008 Ford Ranger P/U	56,000	2	112,000
2009 BMW R 1200 RT	37,000	2	74,000
2010 Honda Accord	32,000	1	32,000
2010 Honda Odyssey	42,000	1	42,000
2011 Chevy Tahoe	57,000	1	57,000
2011 Dodge Charger	71,000	4	284,000
2011 Ford Crown Victoria	56,000	1	56,000
2012 Chevy Tahoe	72,000	3	216,000
2012 Chevy Tahoe	57,000	2	114,000
2012 Ford F250	55,000	1	55,000
2013 Chevy Tahoe	57,000	1	57,000
2013 Chevy Tahoe	72,000	2	144,000
2014 Dodge Charger	71,000	3	213,000
2014 Ford Explorer	56,000	4	224,000
2015 BMW R 1200 RT	37,000	1	37,000
2015 Dodge Durango	58,000	1	58,000
2015 Ford Explorer	58,000	3	174,000
2015 Ford Explorer	95,000	6	570,000
2015 Ford Taurus	36,000	2	72,000
2016 BMW R 1200 RT	37,000	2	74,000
2016 Ford Explorer	95,000	10	950,000
2016 Ford F-550 BearCat	350,000	1	350,000
2016 Nissan Frontier P/U	35,000	2	70,000
2017 BMW R1200 RT	37,000	1	37,000
2017 Dodge Durango	58,000	1	58,000
2017 Ford Explorer	95,000	5	475,000
2017 Ford Explorer K9	98,000	2	196,000
2017 Ford T350 Van	55,000	1	55,000
2017 Honda Accord	30,000	1	30,000
2017 Nissan Frontier P/U	35,000	1	35,000
2018 Ford Explorer	95,000	4	380,000
2019 BMW R1200 RT	37,000	2	74,000
2019 Dodge Charger	82,000	7	574,000
2019 Dodge Durango	58,000	4	232,000
2019 Ford Explorer	95,000	5	475,000
2019 Ford F-150	45,000	1	45,000
2019 KTM Off-Road M/C	14,000	2	28,000
2020 BMW R1200 RT	37,000	2	37,000
2020 Dodge Durango	58,000	3	174,000
2020 Ford Explorer	95,000	5	475,000
2021 BMWR1250RT	37,000	2	74,000
2021 Cheverlot Tahoe	72,000	2	144,000
2021 Ford Explorer	95,000	6	570,000
2021 Jeep Grand Cherokee	53,000	1	53,000
2022 Dodge Durango	58,000	2	116,000
2022 Ford Explorer	58,000	2	116,000
2022 Ford Explorer	95,000	10	950,000
2022 Ford Ranger	66,000	2	132,000
2023 Ford Explorer	95,000	6	570,000
2023 Ford Explorer K9	98,000	2	196,000
2023 Ford Ranger	66,000	1	66,000
Total Existing Value			$ 12,065,000

Source: City of Murrieta.

Appendix Table A.3: Fire Facilities Worker Weighting Factor

Category	Calls for Service	Population or Employees	Calls per Capita
Residential	2,943	109,998	0.03
Nonresidential	3,028	26,240	0.12
Other	5,223		
Worker Weighting Factor[1]			4.31

[1] Nonresidential calls per capita / residential calls per capita.

Sources: Murrieta Fire Department; Willdan Financial Services.

Appendix Table A.4: Existing Fire Apparatus Inventory CY 2023

Inventory ID	Unit Name	Model Year	Replacement Value
Existing Inventory - Heavy Apparatus - Location			
41-001	International/Bean Pumper (training vehicle) S1	1941	$ 1,200
23-028	Seagraves (parade vehicle) Shop Garage	1923	8,500
01-037	Freightliner/Weststates - used to deploy swift water rescue trailer unit. S1	2001	260,000
03-043	E-One Quint (T-1) S1	2003	1,380,000
05-049	E-One Pumper (E-3) Shop Garage	2005	1,055,600
05-050	E-One Pumper (E-4) S4	2005	1,055,600
05-051	International/E-1 (B-5). S5	2005	550,000
08-063	Pierce Pumper (E-2) S1	2006	1,055,600
07-059	International/Pierce (B-1) S1	2007	650,000
07-058	E-One Pumper (E-5) Shop Garage	2007	1,055,600
15-078	Pierce Quint Ladder Truck. S2	2015	1,400,000
15-095	2015 International 4X4 OES 6311 Type 3. S1	2015	675,000
18-082	2018 Pierce Pumper E5. S5	2018	1,055,600
18-083	2018 Pierce Pumper E4. S4	2018	1,055,600
20-089	2020 Pierce Pumper E3. S3	2020	1,055,600
20-092	2021 BMS Water Tender. S1	2021	435,000
20-093	2020 Ford F-550 OES Type 1. S3	2020	175,000
20-090	2020 Dodge 5500 - MP 2. S2	2020	188,000
20-091	2020 Dodge 5500 - MP 3. S3	2020	188,000
Subtotal			**$ 13,299,900**
Existing Inventory - Light Duty Vehicles			
06-052	Ford F-350 (Repair-1) Shop Truck	2006	$ 97,000
08-060	Ford F-350 (MP Unit Reserve)	2008	55,500
08-061	Ford F-250 (BC-6306) S. Kean. S4	2008	98,500
14-073	Polaris Ranger XP (Ranger 5) S5	2014	38,000
15-076	Ford F-250 4X4 (Batt- 6305). M. Ramos. S4	2015	98,500
15-077	Ford F-250 4X4 (Batt-6301) D. Perez. S4	2015	98,500
16-079	2016 Ford F-150 4X4 Training Captain S1	2016	94,000
16-080	2016 Ford F-150 Deputy Fire Marshal S1	2016	77,000
16-081	2016 Ford Transit Van - Admin	2016	62,000
16-082	2016 Ford Focus Sedan - FP-4	2016	32,000
16-083	2016 Ford Focus Sedan - Admin	2016	32,000
17-084	2017 Ford Explorer SUV - EMS Antonucci S1	2017	44,000
18-084	2018 Ford Explorer Fire Marshal S1	2018	44,000
18-085	2018 Ford Explorer Pool Fire Admin S1	2018	44,000
20-086	2020 Ford F-150 FP 3 - S1	2020	77,000
20-087	2020 Ford F-150 FP 2 - S1	2020	77,000
20-088	2020 Ford F-150 FP 1 - S1	2020	77,000
22-096	2022 Chevrolet Tahoe 4X4 Deputy Chief Lopez S1	2022	70,500
22-097	2022 Chevrolet Tahoe 4X4 Fire Chief Molloy S1	2022	70,500
Subtotal			**$ 1,287,000**

Sources: 1) Murrieta Fire & Rescue Vehicle Replacement Schedule 2023 (Municipal Fleet Consultants). 2) Murrieta Fire & Rescue Vehicle Inventory April 2023 3) www.kbb.com. 4) Johnson Controls Equipment costs. 5) www.firetruckmall. 6) www.ford.com. 7) www.chevrolet.com

Appendix Table A.4: Existing Fire Apparatus Inventory Continued

Inventory ID	Unit Name	Model Year	Replacement Value
Existing Inventory - Trailers			
02-041	Wells 2 Axel Trailer S2 (TRU-1) Heavy Rescue	2002	$ 11,100
07-053	Az-Tex 2 Axel Trailer (Explorers) S1	2007	9,500
12-070	2012 Haul Mark Trailer (Mass/Care 1) S1	2012	13,200
12-071	2012 Haul Mark Trailer (Mass/Care 2) S1	2012	13,200
07-056	Wells 2 Axel Trailer (Cert-S3)	2007	9,500
07-057	Scott/Liberty Light Air (LA/S1)	2007	40,000
08-072	Wells 2 Axel Trailer (Cert-1) S1	2008	9,500
08-066	Wells 2 Axel Trailer (Cert-2) S2	2008	9,500
08-068	Wells 2 Axel Trailer (Cert-4) S4	2008	9,500
10-067	Wells 2 Axel Trailer (Cert-5) S5	2009	9,500
14-074	Powerlite Trailer (EMSTRL-1) S5	2014	38,000
22-094	2022 Continental Trailer - EOC	2022	13,200
Subtotal			**$ 185,700**
Total Value - Existing Inventory			**$ 14,772,600**

Sources: 1) Murrieta Fire & Rescue Vehicle Replacement Schedule (Municipal Fleet Consultants). 2) Murrieta Fire & Rescue Vehicle Inventory April 2023.

Appendix Table A.5: General Government Vehicle Inventory

Description	Department	Replacement Value
2002 Ford F-750 Dump Truck	PW	$ 125,000
2003 Ford F-150	CSD	57,800
2003 Ford F-150	PW	57,800
2003 Ford F-150	PW	57,800
2003 Ford F-150	PW	57,800
2005 Dodge 2500	PW	57,800
2005 Global Electric Motor	CSD	15,250
2005 Global Electric Motor	CSD	15,250
2005 Global Electric Motor	IS	15,250
2006 Ford Ranger	CH Pool	38,000
2007 Ford F-150	PW	57,800
2007 Ford F-750 Dump Truck	PW	125,000
2008 Ford F-150	PW	57,800
2009 Ford F-750 Dump Truck	PW	125,000
2016 Ford F-250	PW	75,000
2016 Ford F-250	PW	75,000
2016 Ford F-250	PW	75,000
2016 Ford F-250	PW	75,000
2016 Ford F-250	PW	75,000
2017 Chevrolet Volt	CH Pool	28,000
2017 Chevrolet Volt	CH Pool	28,000
2017 Chevrolet Silverado	CSD	57,800
2018 Ford F-150	PW	57,800
2018 Ford F-150	CH Pool	57,800
2018 Ford F-150	CH Pool	57,800
2019 Club Car	CH Pool	17,300
Total		$ 1,542,850

PW = Public Works
CH POOL = City Hall Pool
DSD = Development Services
CSD = Community Services District.
ECON = Economic Development
Source: City of Murrieta.

Appendix Table A.6: Equipment Inventory

	Total Cost
Router Enclosure	$ 6,553
ESRI GIS Software	4,899
Blade Enclosure	53,243
HP SAN/EVA4400	26,821
GEOXT 512 W/ Terrasync Pro	6,368
HP BL20PG2 XEON- Server	18,288
SAN Array 100	13,712
ArcSDE 9.0 Software	10,783
HP Server BLadeProliant BL20	6,552
Precision Workstation 670	5,528
Xplore PC Tablet	5,143
Dell Precision Workstation 670	13,520
NEO 2000 Tabe Backup	11,191
Data Repository	29,582
HP ProLiant DL585 Server	54,802
MSA 1000 SAN Starter Kit	14,038
Xplore PC Tablet	6,574
ArcInfo Software	11,176
HP DeskJet Z6100 42" Plotter	9,805
Production Line Tool Set Soft	5,395
Nexan SATABoy Disk Backup	15,427
Backup Software	7,290
1995 Vibration Roller Trailer	14,169
1995 Extend a Hoe Backhoe	60,746
1995 Motor Grader	122,754
Compressor Trailer	9,000
Thermal Imager	13,389
Audio Log Digital Recorder 911	29,318
Computer Aided Dispatch System	206,741
Dispatch Radio Console Pos.	121,258
Pass Thru Evidence Storage	21,681
Movable Shelving Unit	63,528
Electric Door Access System	48,000
CCTV Surveillance Cam Sys	68,330
Tack Trailer	8,000
Auto Extraction Unit+	15,000
Layton H500B Paver	22,095
Auto Extraction Power Unit	6,500
18KVA UPS Battery Backup	25,000
2005 Single Axle Trailer	9,765
Forensic Recovery of Evidence Device	6,614
Movable Shelving Unit	11,586
DSM Lockers Pass Thru	21,682
2005 Backhoe Loader	59,801
Transmit Combiner	11,818

Source: City of Murrieta.

Appendix Table A.6: Equipment Inventory (Continued)

	Total Cost
Astro-Trac Receiver	$ 22,500
Astro-Trac Reciever	34,254
Netclock GPS Master Clock	8,457
Channel 2 Repeater	10,000
Spectra-Tac Comprato	30,000
Channel 3 Digitac Comparator	16,556
Channel 1 Quantar Repeater	54,000
Channel 3 Quantar Repeater	34,402
Emergency Generator 3456DITA	97,680
Central Electronics Bank Gold	29,924
Central Electronics CardCages	6,765
Gold Series Windows NT Server	5,204
MDB System Message Switch	5,625
MDB Client	28,350
Automatic Vehicle Location	8,985
Looking Glass Dispatch	20,000
Looking Glass Mobile Map	25,970
Looking Glass Crimes	10,000
Cotton Velour Traveler Curtain	5,841
Multi Media-Digital Scanner	12,221
Forensic Computer	6,149
Tactical Blanket	9,300
Auto Extraction Unit DPU3100	17,000
Auto Extraction Unit Engine 3	17,000
Auto Extraction Unit PPU1202	17,000
Tactical Throw Telephone	10,506
CAD Primary	40,000
Light Air Unit	78,000
Waxie 20" 1500 RPM Burnisher	5,390
Grand Piano	15,000
Video Conference Center	106,928
34 Mobile Data Bases	426,514
Dyna Vac Jet N Vac Pumper	44,995
ADT Alarm System	86,881
Alert AM Satelite Radio	111,621
2008 John Deere 310SJ Loader	84,495
Xplore PC Tablet W ArcPad	6,662
Autopulse Platform Resuscitati	92,217
Autopulse Platform Resuscitati	13,435
Portable Co-Oximeter Masimo	38,758
Hydro Tek Pressur Washer	9,013
Portable Computers	35,265
DUI Checkpoint Trailer	30,000
Tic Evolution 5200	8,297

Source: City of Murrieta.

Appendix Table A.6: Equipment Inventory (Continued)

	Total Cost
Road Force Trailer 8x16	$ 6,910
Station 2 Heating & Air Units	16,524
Property & Evidence Shelving	5,175
Dispatch Console #5	5,630
False Alarm Tracking Software	4,849
Falcon's View Park Fencing	23,152
Photo ID Machine/Camera	6,006
Con-Space CSI-2000 Rescue 1	6,419
Uninteruptable Power Supply	24,342
CCTV System-40600 Cal Oaks	13,921
Thermal Imaging Camera 5000	25,860
Fujitsu Scanner	6,331
Universal Fit Test System	10,956
Fire Alarm Sprinkler System	8,375
City Hall Card Access System	9,513
Training Room Epson Projector	5,261
Air Cleaning System Fire Stn	110,449
IP Communications System	871,548
Entry Gate System	8,587
Frequency 858.23750/813.23750	25,000
HP Proliant DL380 Server	17,154
Eagle Pincher Forklift	11,853
Fujitsu M4097D Duplex Scanner	4,854
EVO 500 Thermal Imaging Camera	8,775
CFAB Capital Budget Software	7,500
Xplore Tablet XPL 01-10830	11,067
Panasonic Tuffbook Dual XP	11,974
Fire Station #4 Radio Equip	14,552
Liberty Software	91,590
File Tracking Software	43,737
Fire Station #4 Phone System	13,570
System Expansion Hard Drives	5,926
Media Manager Software	11,881
HP Proliant DL380 - Fire	6,517
Security Gate @ Station 2	29,707
Security Gate @ Station 1	11,307
HP Designjet 820 MFP	19,298
Brake Lathe with Bench	5,398
Pool Cover & Reels	5,142
Closed Circuit TV	37,603
HP Designjet 820 MFP	19,298
TeleStaff Software	12,122
IBM i5 Model 9406-520 CAD	20,144
CAD Software	10,721
Vehicle Exhaust System	9,323
CAD 400 Redundancy	16,971
Smartnet Phone System	16,315
KR Nida Satellite Phone	14,552
Uninteruptable Power System	11,164
Tuffstuff AP4500 4 Station Gym	15,142
3M Detection System Model 8802	23,612
3M RefID Handheld Tracker	6,633
3M Selfcheck System 8410	19,689
3M Selfcheck System 8410	49,473

Source: City of Murrieta.

Appendix Table A.6: Equipment Inventory (Continued)

	Total Cost
Radar Speed Display Trailer	$ 16,031
1520 DC Speed Display Unit	12,133
Optical Library System	18,664
HP DL 380G5 Server	9,107
Team Budget Software	8,700
2007 Wells Cargo Road Force	6,620
Commercial Range	9,198
Tile Concrete Spray Turtle	7,524
IBMx3650 Series Server	11,206
TIC Evolution 5200	8,189
DVR for CCTV	10,909
Fujitsu B&W/Color Scanner	6,460
Holmatro PPU15 Personal Power	20,994
Holmatro DPU31 Pump	8,388
Holmatro 4050 NCT Cutter Core	31,918
Holmatro 4242 Spreader	28,979
Holmatro PPU15 Personal Power	5,249
Holmatro 4242 Spreader	5,737
LaserFiche Standard Server Sin	10,042
Fujitsu 5750C VRS Scanner	7,650
16 Channel DVR Flat Panel Moni	8,494
Cisco 2811 ISR Router	6,127
Midland Tech III Base Station	10,364
Midland Base Tech III Repeater	10,364
EZ6 Jeter Mobile System	95,622
Uninteruptable Power Source	95,898
Tangent Voting System	9,676
Voting Software	28,425
Fiber Optic Connect	65,934
Router & Phone System Station5	18,040
Budget Custom Reports Upgrade	5,175
Portable Aquatic Lift	6,997
Learning Express Software	5,379
Laserfiche Advanced Audit	11,982
Team Budget Planning Report	5,400
Wells Cargo 16x8 Road Force	7,224
Video Investigator 4.0	6,934
Heavy Truck Wheel Lift	40,000
Automotive Car/Truck Lift	8,000
Auto Extraction unit	7,500
Electric Auto Extraction Unit	16,700
HP Scanner Plotter	19,298
Wells 2 Axel Trailer	5,578
2007 Az Tex 2 Axel Trailer	6,620
DUI Trailer-Mighty Mover Tralr	11,000
Solar Speed Limit Sign	14,198

Source: City of Murrieta.

Appendix Table A.6: Equipment Inventory (Continued)

	Total Cost
Fire Supression System	$ 88,985
Centracom Elite Series Console	20,431
Vision Communication Console	27,187
Electric Hydraulic Expander	7,358
Security Cameras-Labor & Matls	12,968
Ingersoll-Rand Asphalt Compact	29,654
Zieman Carrier-Trailer	5,724
Dispatcher Wall Monitor	4,199
Audiolog, Max-Pro 3000	35,840
Library Automatic Doors	7,621
Audio/Visual Equipment FS# 4 Training	9,483
Traffic Management Audio/Video	79,476
Traffic Mgmt Video Server	11,744
IFAS Financial Software	570,054
Intelligent Return plus Library Sorter	256,701
2010 Wells Cargo RF8162	6,888
Auto Scrubber	5,981
Midland VHF Radio	21,161
Dispatch Console #6	47,454
23952.67 - Police Dept AMLP System	23,953
33142.32 - LP15 - Monitor/Defibrillator/Modem	364,566
Upgrade to GeoBlade Platform	10,332
Tactical Camera System	16,598
Network Storage Equipt	15,210
A/C Unit-City Hall's Video Rm	10,500
Remote surveillance unit	5,400
AC Units - Comm Center	32,180
SWAT handheld Unit	8,845
	$ 7,070,425

Source: City of Murrieta.