

CITY OF GLENDALE

PUBLIC FACILITIES FEE STUDY



JUNE 26, 2007

Final Draft



Oakland Office

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

Anaheim, CA
Industry, CA
Jacksonville, FL
Lancaster, CA
Oakland, CA

Phoenix, AZ
Washington, DC
Seattle, WA
Temecula, CA

www.muni.com

TABLE OF CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY.....	1
Background and Study Objectives	1
Demographic Assumptions	1
Facility Standards and Costs of Growth	2
Fee Schedule Summary	3
1. INTRODUCTION	5
Background and Study Objectives	5
Public Facilities Financing In California	5
Public Facilities Planning and Financing In Glendale	6
Organization of the report	7
Public Facility Standards	7
2. DEMOGRAPHIC ASSUMPTIONS	11
Service Population, Equivalent Dwelling Units, and Trips	11
Land Use Types	11
Occupant Densities	12
Demographic Assumptions for City of Glendale	13
3. LIBRARY FACILITIES	14
Service Population	14
Facility Inventories, Plans and Standards	14
Facility Needs and Costs	16
Fee Schedule	16
4. PARKS & PARKLAND DEDICATION	18
Service Population	18
Facility Standards	19
Facility Needs and Costs	23
Fee Schedule	27
5. OPEN SPACE	29
Service Population	29
Facility Inventories, Plans & Standards	29
Facility Needs and Costs	30
Fee Schedule	31
6. IMPLEMENTATION.....	32
Adopt Ordinance and Resolution	32
Inflation Adjustment	32

Reporting Requirements	33
Programming Revenues and Projects with the CIP	33
7. MITIGATION FEE ACT FINDINGS	34
Purpose of Fee	34
Use of Fee Revenues	34
Benefit Relationship	35
Burden Relationship	35
Proportionality	36
APPENDIX A.....	A-1
APPENDIX B: WORKER DEMAND SURVEY	B-1
Library Survey	B-1
Park Survey	B-5

This page intentionally left blank.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This report summarizes an analysis of the need for public facilities and capital improvements to support future development within the City of Glendale through 2030. It is the City's intent that the costs representing future development's share of these facilities and improvements be imposed on that development in the form of a development impact fee, also known as a public facilities fee. The public facilities and improvements included in this analysis of the City's public facilities fee program are divided into the fee categories listed below.

- ♦ Library
- ♦ Parks and Parkland Dedication
- ♦ Open Space

It is important to note that the Parks and Parkland Dedication fee includes community centers and special use recreational facilities.

BACKGROUND AND STUDY OBJECTIVES

The primary policy objective of a public facilities fee program is to ensure that new development pays the capital costs associated with growth. The primary purpose of this report is to complete a comprehensive fee study and determine the maximum justified public facilities fee levels to impose on new development to maintain the City's facilities standard. The City should review and update this report and the calculated fees once every five years to incorporate the best available information.

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

Park fees for developments requiring subdivision have also been calculated using the standards allowed under the Quimby Act (*California Government Code* Section 66477).

DEMOGRAPHIC ASSUMPTIONS

To estimate facility needs, this study uses residential and household population data provided by the California Department of Finance, the U.S. Census, and the City of Glendale. The population projection for 2030, an expected increase of approximately 14,300 residents, is taken from data used in Glendale's Downtown Specific Plan.¹ Current employment figures were based on data provided by the State of California Employment Development Department (EDD) and the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG). The Downtown Specific Plan also provided employment for 2030. The occupant

¹ Adopted on November 7, 2006. Downtown Specific Plan projections are within 98.8% of SCAG projections.

density assumptions in this report are shown in **Table E.1**. The development projections used in this analysis are summarized in **Table E.2**.

Table E.1: Occupant Density Assumptions (2006)

<u>Residential</u>		
Single Family	2.98	Residents per dwelling unit
Multi-family	2.56	Residents per dwelling unit
<u>Nonresidential</u>		
Commercial	2.01	Employees per 1,000 square feet
Office	2.45	Employees per 1,000 square feet
Industrial	1.00	Employees per 1,000 square feet

Sources: United States Census Bureau 2000 Census, Tables H31-H33; California Department of Finance (DOF) Table E-5, 2006; Natelson 2001 Employment Density Study prepared for Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) Los Angeles County data; MuniFinancial.

Table E.2: Demographic Assumptions

	2006	2030	Increase
Residents ¹	208,200	224,000	15,800
Employment ¹	82,800	108,000	25,200

¹ Includes estimate of service population associated with development anticipated to already be under construction before fees are implemented. See Appendix Table A.1.

Sources: California Department of Finance (DOF), Table E-5, 2006; Quarterly Census of Employment and Wages (QCEW) Program, June 2005 Employment/Wages for the City of Glendale, March 2006, California Employment Development Department (EDD); Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) 2004 Projections; City of Glendale; Table A.1; MuniFinancial.

FACILITY STANDARDS AND COSTS OF GROWTH

This fee analysis uses the City's existing facilities standards to determine the costs to accommodate growth. Under this approach new development funds the expansion of facilities at the same standard currently serving existing development. By definition the existing inventory method results in no facility deficiencies attributable to existing development. This method is often used when a long-range plan for new facilities is not available. The only exception to this method are the standards used for parkland that are calculated under the authority of the Quimby Act for which use planned facilities approach is used. The Quimby Act allows a city to require developers of certain qualifying projects to dedicate at least three acres and up to five acres per 1,000 residents. Future facilities to serve growth will be identified through an annual capital improvement plan and budget process.

This study distinguishes between the share of planned facilities needed to accommodate growth and the share that serves existing residents and businesses. New development can only fund its fair share of facilities. To ensure compliance with the law, this study ensures that there is a reasonable relationship between new development, the amount of the fee, and facilities funded by the fee.

FEE SCHEDULE SUMMARY

Table E.3 summarizes the schedule of maximum justified public facilities fees based on the analysis contained in this report. A development project would pay either the park fee (Mitigation Fee Act) or the parkland in-lieu fee (Quimby Act) but not both. The City may adopt any fee up to those shown in the table. If the City adopts a lower fee then it should consider reducing the fee for each land use by the same percentage. This approach would ensure that each new development project would fund the same proportionate share of public facilities costs. This table summarizes the highest possible fee level analyzed in this report assuming the Quimby Act standard for parkland.

Table E.3: Proposed Public Facilities Fee Summary

Land Use	Libraries		Open Space		Park Fee (Mitigation Fee Act)		Or	Parkland In-Lieu Fee (Quimby Act) ¹		Total With Mitigation Fee Act Park Fees		Total With Quimby Act Parkland Fees ²	
	Per DU	Per Sq. Ft. ³	Per DU	Per Sq. Ft. ³	Per DU	Per Sq. Ft. ³		Per DU	Per Sq. Ft. ³	Per DU	Per Sq. Ft. ³	Per DU	Per Sq. Ft. ³
<u>Residential</u>													
Single Family	\$ 1,623	\$ 0.63	\$ 5,352	\$ 2.08	\$ 16,590	\$ 6.45		\$ 14,894	\$ 5.79	\$ 23,565	\$ 9.16	\$ 21,869	\$ 8.50
Multi-family	1,394	0.77	4,598	2.55	14,251	7.91		12,795	7.10	20,243	11.23	18,787	10.42
<u>Nonresidential</u> ⁴													
Commercial		\$ 0.38		\$ 0.87		\$ 5.04			na	\$ 6.29		na	
Office		0.47		1.06		6.14			na	7.67		na	
Industrial		0.19		0.43		2.51			na	3.13		na	

¹ Applicable to new residential development subdivisions only and subject to constraints described in *California Government Code* Section 66477. All other new residential development will pay Mitigation Fee Act park and open space fees.

² Represents the highest possible fee charged to new development using the Quimby Standard for park fees that is applied only to qualifying subdivisions. (See note 1.)

³ Average size of a single family home is 2,571 and the average size of a multi-family home is 1,802 in the City of Glendale based on new home building permits obtained from City Department of Building and Safety records.

⁴ While Quimby fees are not charged to non-residential development, library and open space and park fees can still be charged under the Mitigation Fee Act.

Sources: Tables 3.4, 4.8 and 5.4, MuniFinancial.

1. INTRODUCTION

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

- ◆ Background and study objectives;
- ◆ Public facilities financing in California;
- ◆ Public facilities planning and financing in Glendale;
- ◆ Organization of the report; and
- ◆ Facility standards approach.

BACKGROUND AND STUDY OBJECTIVES

The primary policy objective of a public facilities fee program is to ensure that new development pays the capital costs associated with growth. The primary purpose of this report is to complete a comprehensive fee study and determine the maximum justified public facilities fee levels to impose on new development to maintain the City's facilities standard. The City should review and update this report and the calculated fees at minimum - once every five years to incorporate the best available information.

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

Parkland fees for developments requiring subdivision have additionally been calculated using the standards allowed under the Quimby Act (*California Government Code* Section 66477).

PUBLIC FACILITIES FINANCING IN CALIFORNIA

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

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

Faced with these trends, many cities and counties have adopted a policy of "growth pays its own way". This policy shifts the burden of funding infrastructure expansion from existing rate and taxpayers onto new development. This funding shift has been accomplished primarily through the imposition of assessments, special taxes, and development impact fees

also known as public facilities fees. Assessments and special taxes require approval of property owners and are appropriate when the funded facilities are directly related to the developing property. Development fees, on the other hand, are an appropriate funding source for facilities that benefit all development jurisdiction-wide. Development fees need only a majority vote of the legislative body for adoption.

PUBLIC FACILITIES PLANNING AND FINANCING IN GLENDALE

The City of Glendale has a number of library, parks and open space needs to meet the demands of community growth. Glendale is almost completely built out. As the region develops, Glendale will see an intensification of land use, as low-density land uses, such as single-family homes, are replaced with high-density land uses, such as condominiums. As the density of development increases, the City will face a shortage of facilities that it has historically provided for its residents. The City would like to implement impact fees in order to provide facilities to new development at the same standard that existing development has funded thus far.

Preliminary ideas on facility needs are described in the “Facility Needs and Costs” section of each chapter. Specifically, the City anticipates the construction of new branch libraries, the addition and development of new parks, and the acquisition of additional open space. Despite having preliminary ideas on facility needs, there are facility issues that should be addressed through master planning efforts. A suggested use of fee revenues would be to fund master planning to more specifically identify capital facilities necessary to serve new development. Fee revenues can fund that portion of master plan costs associated with facilities to serve growth. Upon completion of the master planning effort and the identification of capital facilities needed to accommodate growth, the City should update its public facilities fee program to include these new projects and any financing costs that may be required to construct facilities when needed.

Through the process of preparing master plans, the City may choose to raise its facilities standards above the existing levels. These increased facility standards would then be documented in the fee update. In this situation, new development would pay a fee based on this higher standard. However, using a facility standard that is higher than the existing inventory standard creates a deficiency for existing development. The City would have to secure non-fee funding for that portion of planned facilities required to correct the deficiency caused by this higher standard.

By nature, public facilities fee programs are constrained by rates of growth and the timing of revenue collection. Since public facilities fees represent a pay-as-you-go system, cities may confront the problem of only being able to partially fund large projects with fee revenues at the time of project implementation. Therefore, facilities needs may require alternative financing options in order to implement projects in a timelier manner. The cost of financing (e.g. interest payments) can legitimately be included into the public facilities fee. At this point, the City has not identified a need for financing; the cost of financing is not included in this fee study.

By using fee revenues to fund a master planning effort and updating the fee to reflect the identified projects and possible financing costs, the City will maximize its ability to maintain

its facilities standard and fund the capital facilities necessary to serve new development as density intensification continues.

Finally, all fee-funded capital projects should be programmed through the City's 5-year Capital Improvement Plan (CIP). Using a CIP can help the City of Glendale 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 of Glendale identifies the use for fee revenues as expressly required by the Mitigation Fee Act.

ORGANIZATION OF THE REPORT

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

1. **Growth projections:** Develop growth projections that represent the increased demand for public facilities;
2. **Facility standards:** Identify facility standards to measure the impact of new development on the need for expanded facilities;
3. **Facility needs and costs:** Determine the amount and cost of facilities required to accommodate new development based on facility standards and growth projections;
4. **Cost allocation and fee schedule:** Allocate costs per unit of new development to calculate the public facilities fee schedule.

The determination of a public facilities fee begins with the selection of a planning horizon and development of projections for population and employment (step #1, above). These projections are used throughout the analysis of different facility categories, and are summarized in Chapter 2.

Chapters 3 through 5 document the maximum justified public facilities fee based on the remaining three steps listed above applied to each of the following three facility categories:

- ♦ Library
- ♦ Open Space
- ♦ Parks and Parkland Dedication²

Chapter 6 details the procedures that the City must follow when implementing a public facilities fee program. Fee program adoption procedures are found in *California Government Code* Section 66016.

The five statutory findings required for adoption of the proposed public facilities fees in accordance with the *Mitigation Fee Act* are summarized in Chapter 7.

PUBLIC FACILITY STANDARDS

The key public policy issue in public facility fee studies is the identification of facility standards (step #2, above) for each category of facilities in a fee program. A facility standard

² Parks and Parkland Dedication fee includes community centers and special use recreational facilities.

is a public policy that states the amount of facilities required per unit of new development to accommodate the increased service demand. Examples of facility standards include park acres per capita and wastewater generation per equivalent dwelling unit. Standards also may be expressed in monetary terms such as the total cost of facility investments per capita.

The facility standard assists in documenting statutory findings required for adoption of a public facilities fee. First, the standard documents a reasonable relationship between the type of new development and the total need for new facilities. Where applicable, the same facility standard is applied to both existing and new development to ensure that new development does not fund deficiencies associated with existing development. Second, the facility standard is often used to allocate facility costs to each development project, documenting a reasonable relationship between the amount of the fee and the cost of facilities allocated to each development project.

Types of facility standards and their application in specific situations are discussed below. This section concludes with a description of how facility standards are used in the current study.

TYPES OF FACILITY STANDARDS

The types of standards that may be used in a public facility fee study include:

- ♦ *Demand standards* determine the amount of facilities required to accommodate growth, for example park acres per thousand residents, traffic level of service, or gallons of water per day per dwelling unit. These standards are the most common method for discussing policy options with regards to public facility fees.
- ♦ *Design standards* determine how a facility should be designed to meet expected demand, for example park improvement requirements, street intersection design, and water storage needs. These standards are typically not evaluated as part of a fee analysis, but they can have a significant impact on the cost of facilities.
- ♦ *Cost standards* determine the cost per unit of demand based on the estimated cost of facilities, for example cost per capita, cost per vehicle trip, or cost per gallon of water per day.

APPLYING FACILITY STANDARDS

Demand and design standards may or may not play an explicit role in the documentation of a specific public facility fee, while cost standards always play a role. Often the approach depends on the degree to which the community has engaged in comprehensive facility master planning to identify facility needs.

- ♦ For some fees explicit *demand* and *design* standards are used to determine total facility needs and costs, and then a cost standard is used to allocate costs to new development. For example, the fee study may document how a park standard of three acres per 1,000 residents determines park needs for new development. Next, a *cost* standard is calculated based on total park needs allocated per unit of new development to calculate the fee schedule.

- ♦ For other fees the total cost of needed facilities is documented outside of the fee study. The fee study may base future facility needs on a community's existing inventory of facilities, a detailed facility master plan, or simply the judgment of a community's elected leaders regarding facility needs. Though *demand* and *design* standards may have been used the fee study itself does not explicitly use these factors in the fee calculation. Instead the study proceeds directly to the calculation of a *cost* standard to allocate costs per unit of development and calculate the fee schedule. For example, a separate wastewater facilities master plan may have already documented the facilities needs requiring the fee study to simply allocate those total costs per unit of new development.

Demand and *design* standards tend to be grounded in engineering analysis performed outside of the fee study if not simply a statement of public policy. *Cost* standards, on the other hand, tend to be an integral part of all fee studies. There are three approaches used to calculate a cost standard, described below.

- ♦ The **existing inventory method** calculates the facility standard and allocates costs based on the ratio of existing facilities to the existing service population. Under this approach new development funds the expansion of facilities at the same standard currently serving existing development. By definition the existing inventory method results in no facility deficiencies attributable to existing development. This method is often used when a long-range plan for new facilities is not available. Only the initial facilities to be funded with fees are identified in the fee study. Future facilities to serve growth are identified through an annual capital improvement plan and budget process.
- ♦ The **planned facilities method** calculates the facility standard and allocates costs based on the ratio of planned facilities to the increase in demand associated with new development. This method is appropriate when planned facilities only benefit new development, such as a sewer trunk line extension to a previously undeveloped area. This method also may be used when there is excess capacity in existing facilities that can accommodate new development. In that case new development can fund facilities at a standard lower than the existing inventory standard and still provide an acceptable level of facilities. Alternatively, this method may be used when improvements would benefit both existing and new development. In this case, new development only pays its fair share of facilities costs.
- ♦ The **system plan method** calculates the facility standard and allocates costs based on the ratio of existing plus planned facilities to total future demand (existing and new development). This method is used when (1) the local agency anticipates increasing its facility standard above the existing inventory standard discussed above, and (2) planned facilities are part of a system that benefit both existing and new development. Using a facility standard that is higher than the existing inventory standard creates a deficiency for existing development. The jurisdiction must secure non-fee funding for that portion of planned facilities required to correct the deficiency.

THE TYPES AND APPROACHES USED IN THIS STUDY

The type of facility standard calculated in this study is primarily the cost standard. The exception to the use of a cost standard in this study is the planned facilities standard used to calculate parkland facilities fees under the authority of the Quimby Act. The Quimby Act will only be applicable to some projected new development. It allows cities to require subdivisions to dedicate parkland or pay a fee in lieu of dedication as a condition of approval of a tentative or parcel map, at a standard of three acres per 1,000 regardless of the existing standard. A city can require developers to dedicate more than three acres and up to five acres per 1,000 residents only if the city's existing park standard as of the last Census justifies the higher level and if that standard is codified in a general plan or a specific plan.

This study uses the existing inventory approach to determine facility standards for public facilities with the exception of parkland in-lieu fees (Quimby Act), which use a planned facilities standard. Under the existing inventory approach, new development would contribute to the cost of improvements in proportion to the level of investment made to date by existing development.

2. DEMOGRAPHIC ASSUMPTIONS

To assist in determining the appropriate fee structure, existing development estimates and new development growth projections are used. Projected new development is estimated using the existing service population in 2006 as a base year with a planning horizon through the year 2030.

SERVICE POPULATION, EQUIVALENT DWELLING UNITS, AND TRIPS

Different types of new development use public facilities at different rates in relation to each other, depending on the services provided. In Chapters 3 through 5, a specific service population is identified for each facility category to reflect total demand. The service population weights residential land use types against nonresidential land uses based on the relative demand for services between residents and workers.

Workers create a significant amount of demand for libraries, parks and open space in the city of Glendale. In order to investigate the amount of demand by workers on these facilities, the City conducted an intercept user survey at various parks and libraries through out the City on both weekdays and weekends. The results of the survey, when weighted for the relative sample size and population size of residents versus workers, indicates that worker demand for library services is 0.35 that of a resident, and is 0.45 that of a resident for park services. Worker demand on open space is assumed to be 0.24 that of a resident. The 0.24-weighting factor for worker demand on open space is based on a 40-hour workweek divided by the total number of hours in a week (168). This weighting factor is appropriate because open space benefits both residents and workers equally; it reflects the amount of time that workers are in the City and can receive benefit from open space. A detailed explanation of survey and the methodology used to determine the worker weighting factors can be found in **Appendix B**.

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 classifications. The land use types used in this analysis are defined below.

- ◆ **Single family:** Attached and detached one-family dwelling units
- ◆ **Multi-family:** All attached multi-family dwellings such as duplexes and condominiums, plus mobile homes, apartments, and dormitories.
- ◆ **Commercial:** All commercial, retail, educational, and hotel/motel development.
- ◆ **Office:** All general, professional, and medical office development.
- ◆ **Industrial:** All manufacturing and warehouse development.

Some developments may include more than one land use type, such as an industrial warehouse with living quarters (a live-work designation) or a planned unit development with

both single and multi-family uses. In these cases the public facilities fee would be calculated separately for each land use type.

The City should have the discretion to impose the public facilities fee based on the specific aspects of a proposed development regardless of the zoning designation where the project will be located. Should the project be located in an area that is not zoned as any of the above stated land use types, the guideline to use is the probable occupant density of the development, either residents per dwelling unit or workers per building square foot, to determine which fee will be charged. The fee imposed should be based on the land use type that most closely represents the probable occupant density of the development.

OCCUPANT DENSITIES

Occupant densities ensure a reasonable relationship between the increase in service population and amount of the fee. To do this, they must vary by the estimated service population generated by a particular development project. Developers pay the fee based on the number of additional housing units or building square feet of nonresidential development, so the fee schedule must convert service population estimates to these measures of project size. This conversion is done with average occupant density factors by land use type, shown in **Table 2.1**.

The residential occupant density factors are derived from the 2000 U.S. Census Bureau's Tables H-31 through H-33. Table H-31 provides vacant housing units data, while Table H-32 provides information relating to occupied housing. Table H-33 documents the total 2000 population residing in occupied housing. The US Census numbers are adjusted by using the California Department of Finance (DOF) estimates for January 1, 2006, and the most recent State of California data available. The nonresidential density factors are based on *Employment Density Study Summary Report*, prepared for the Southern California Association of Governments, October 2001 by The Natelson Company. For example, the industrial density factor represents an average for light industrial, heavy industrial, and warehouse uses likely to occur in the City.

Table 2.1: Occupant Density Assumptions (2006)

<u>Residential</u>		
Single Family	2.98	Residents per dwelling unit
Multi-family	2.56	Residents per dwelling unit
<u>Nonresidential</u>		
Commercial	2.01	Employees per 1,000 square feet
Office	2.45	Employees per 1,000 square feet
Industrial	1.00	Employees per 1,000 square feet

Sources: United States Census Bureau 2000 Census, Tables H31-H33; California Department of Finance (DOF) Table E-5, 2006; Natelson 2001 Employment Density Study prepared for Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) Los Angeles County data; MuniFinancial.

DEMOGRAPHIC ASSUMPTIONS FOR CITY OF GLENDALE

Table 2.2 summarizes the demographic assumptions used in this analysis. The base year for this study is the year 2006. The existing facilities in 2006 will make up the existing facilities standard in our study.

The base year residential estimate is calculated using the California Department of Finance (DOF) January 1, 2006 estimates. Base year employment estimates are based on data from the State of California Employment Development Department (EDD). Future population and dwelling unit estimates come from data used in the City's Downtown Specific Plan. 2006 estimates for both residential and non-residential land uses have been adjusted to include expected population from already entitled and other development that may occur before impact fee implementation. This projected development and the associated expected population are listed in **Appendix Table A.1**. The Downtown Specific Plan data also provided employment projections for 2030.

Table 2.2: Demographic Assumptions

	2006	2030	Increase
Residents ¹	208,200	224,000	15,800
Employment ¹	82,800	108,000	25,200

¹ Includes estimate of service population associated with development anticipated to already be under construction before fees are implemented. See Appendix Table A.1.

Sources: California Department of Finance (DOF), Table E-5, 2006; Quarterly Census of Employment and Wages (QCEW) Program, June 2005 Employment/Wages for the City of Glendale, March 2006, California Employment Development Department (EDD); Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) 2004 Projections; City of Glendale; Table A.1; MuniFinancial.

3. LIBRARY FACILITIES

This chapter provides the documentation to enable the City to impose a public facilities fee to fund library facilities. The City would use fee revenues to help fund expanded library facilities to serve new development.

SERVICE POPULATION

Residents and workers employed in Glendale are both significant users of libraries in the City of Glendale. Therefore, demand for libraries and associated facilities are based on the City's combined resident-worker service population, weighted for each group's relative demand. The worker weighting of 0.35 relative to residents is based on a survey of library use conducted by the City of Glendale in 2006. (See Appendix B.)

Estimates of the existing service population and projected growth are shown in **Table 3.1**.

Table 3.1: Library Facilities Service Population

	2006	2030	Growth
Residents (A)	208,200	224,000	15,800
Employees (B)	82,800	108,000	25,200
Weighted Employees @ 0.35 (C = B x 0.35) ¹	29,000	37,800	8,800
Total (D = A + C)	237,200	261,800	24,600

Note: Totals may not add due to rounding.

¹ Workers are weighted at 0.35 of residents based on a City of Glendale library survey data (2006). See Appendix B.

Sources: Table 2.2; MuniFinancial.

FACILITY INVENTORIES, PLANS AND STANDARDS

The Glendale Library provides services through various library branches located through out the city. The City intends to add library facilities to maintain the existing standard as new development occurs in Glendale. Specifically, the City is currently considering the addition of at least one new branch library.

Table 3.2 shows the City's existing inventory of library facilities, including land, buildings and collections and the existing library facility standard. Land costs are significant in Glendale. The cost of \$3.5 million per acre is based on recent City of Glendale land purchases of land suitable for a library site. The construction cost estimate of \$450 per square foot is based on a recent architectural bid developed for the potential new branch library being considered. This cost estimate is inclusive of all site development costs as well

as architecture and engineering costs, project management, furniture, equipment and all building systems commissioning.

Library collections comprise an important component of a library system's facilities as well constituting a significant investment. Collections may include books, online databases, audio-visual materials, periodical subscriptions, and government documents. The City owns over \$22.3 million worth of these materials.

Table 3.2: Library Facilities - Existing Inventory Standard

	Inventory	Unit Cost ¹	Value
Land (acres)			
Brand Library ²	0.60	\$ 3,500,000	\$ 2,100,000
Chevy Chase Library	0.46	3,500,000	1,610,000
Central Library	7.65	3,500,000	26,775,000
Casa Verdugo Library	0.29	3,500,000	1,015,000
Montrose/Cresenta Library	0.63	3,500,000	2,205,000
Grandview Library	0.36	3,500,000	1,260,000
Edison Pacific Park ²	0.31	3,500,000	1,085,000
Subtotal - Land	10.30		\$ 36,050,000
Buildings (square feet)			
Brand Library	19,000	\$ 450	\$ 8,550,000
Chevy Chase Library	6,452	450	2,903,400
Central Library	92,000	450	41,400,000
Casa Verdugo Library	4,923	450	2,215,350
Montrose/Cresenta Library	10,520	450	4,734,000
Grandview Library	5,267	450	2,370,150
Edison Pacific Park	13,510	450	6,079,500
Subtotal - Buildings	151,672		\$ 68,252,400
Library Collections	770,000	\$ 29	\$ 22,330,000
Total Value Existing Library Facilities			\$ 126,632,400
Existing Service Population (2006)			237,200
Cost per Capita			\$ 534
Facility Standard per Resident			\$ 534
Facility Standard per Worker ³			187

¹ Unit cost of land based on current market value of neighborhood land recently acquired by the City of Glendale. Unit costs for construction based on recent cost estimates and includes costs for: entitlement clearances, project managements, A&E, off-site development, site development, construction, furniture, equipment, and building systems commissioning.

² Branch libraries located in parks. Building footprint is included here, remainder included in park land inventory.

³ Workers are weighted at 0.35 of residents based on a city of Glendale library survey data (2006). See Appendix B.

Sources: Tables 3.1; City of Glendale; West Edge Architects; MuniFinancial

FACILITY NEEDS AND COSTS

Table 3.3 presents the cost of new library facilities needed to maintain the existing facility standard as growth occurs. The costs generated by new development also represent the total revenue that the library facilities fee would generate. These revenues should be annually programmed to capital improvement projects and be integrated into a 5-year Capital Improvement Plan (CIP). Expected library capital infrastructure projects include the addition of branch libraries in the northwest, northeast and southeast areas of the city to accommodate increased demand from future development.

Table 3.3: Library Facilities to Accommodate New Development

	Residential	Nonresidential	Total
Facility Standard Per Capita	\$ 534	\$ 187	
New Development Service Population (2006-2030)	15,800	25,200	
Costs Generated by New Development	\$ 8,437,000	\$ 4,712,000	\$ 13,149,000

Sources: Tables 3.1 and 3.2; MuniFinancial.

FEE SCHEDULE

Table 3.4 presents the library facilities fee schedule based on the existing standard. The cost per capita is converted to a fee per unit of new development based on dwelling unit densities. Fees are also calculated per square foot. The total fee includes an administrative charge to fund costs that include: a standard overhead charge applied to all City programs for legal, accounting, and other departmental and citywide administrative support, and impact fee program administrative costs including revenue collection, revenue and cost accounting, mandated public reporting, and fee justification analyses.

Table 3.4: Library Facilities Fee

Land Use	A	B	C = A x B		D=C x 0.02		E = C + D	
	Costs per Capita	Density ¹	Cost per Unit ²		Admin ^{2,3}		Total Fee ²	Fee / Sq. Ft. ⁴
<i><u>Residential</u></i>								
Single Family	\$ 534	2.98	\$ 1,591	\$	32		\$ 1,623	\$ 0.63
Multi-family	534	2.56	1,367		27		1,394	0.77
<i><u>Nonresidential</u></i>								
Commercial	\$ 187	2.01	\$ 376	\$	8		\$ 384	\$ 0.38
Office	187	2.45	458		9		467	0.47
Industrial	187	1.00	187		4		191	0.19

¹ Persons per dwelling unit or 1,000 square feet of nonresidential.

² Fee per residential dwelling unit or per 1,000 square feet of nonresidential development.

³ Administrative charge of 2.0 percent.

⁴ Average size of a single family home is 2,571 and the average size of a multi-family home is 1,802 in the City of Glendale based on new home building permits obtained from City Department of Building and Safety records.

Sources: Tables 2.1 and 3.2; City of Glendale Department of Building and Safety; MuniFinancial.

4. PARKS & PARKLAND DEDICATION

The purpose of the fee is to ensure that new development funds its fair share of park facilities. The City would use fee revenues to expand park facilities to serve new development. The community centers and special use recreational facilities are included in this chapter as park facilities for the purposes of calculating a facilities standard. This analysis documents two separate fees based on the Quimby Act and the Mitigation Fee Act. The City could collect the fee based on a standard of 3.0 acres of parkland per 1,000 residents if the development was subject to the Quimby Act land dedication requirement. However the City has chosen to calculate the Quimby fee based on a more conservative standard. For all other development, the City would collect based on the existing standard through the Mitigation Fee Act. The City would only collect one of the two fees depending on which was applicable.

SERVICE POPULATION

Facility standards for parks are typically expressed as a ratio of park facilities per 1,000 residents. Similar to library facilities, both residents and workers are considered to be users of parks in the City of Glendale. Demand for parks and associated facilities are based on the City's combined resident-worker service population. Workers have been weighted as having 0.45 of the impact of a resident, based on a City of Glendale Park user survey conducted in 2006. (See Appendix B.)

Table 4.1 provides estimates of the current service population with a projection for the year 2030. The 2000 Census resident population is also shown because provisions of the Quimby Act stipulate that calculations reference the resident population of the latest available United States Census.

Table 4.1: Park Facilities Service Population

	2000	2006	2030	Growth
Residents (Census 2000)	194,973			
Residents (A)		208,200	224,000	15,800
Employees (B)		82,800	108,000	25,200
Weighted Employees @ 0.45 (C = B x 0.45) ¹		37,300	48,600	11,300
Total (D = A + C)		245,500	272,600	27,100

Note: Totals may not add due to rounding

¹ Workers are weighted at 0.45 of residents based on a City of Glendale park survey data (2006). See Appendix B.

Sources: Census 2000; Table 2.2; MuniFinancial.

FACILITY STANDARDS

This section describes the City's facility standards used to determine new development's impact on the need for park facilities. Park facility standards establish a reasonable relationship between new development and the need for expanded 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 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 as long as it is supported by adopted general plan or specific plan policies.³

EXISTING INVENTORY

The City owns and operates all of its various park facilities. The City's inventory of parks and open space facilities includes a total of 275.96 acres summarized in **Table 4.2**. The inventory differentiates between properties that were owned by the city in 2000 (as of the last Census) and properties currently owned by the city. This differentiation is necessary to determine if the city chooses to charge fees under the Quimby Act for eligible development projects. This inventory also distinguishes between developed and undeveloped parkland acreage. Undeveloped acreage is converted into an equivalent amount of developed acreage for purposes of calculating the existing inventory facilities standard.

³ California Government Code §66477.

Table 4.2: Existing Parkland Inventory and Standards

Facility	2000 (acres)	Improved	2006 (acres)	Total
	Total		Unimproved ¹	
<u>Mini Parks</u>				
Adams Square	-	0.29	-	0.29
Cedar Mini Park	-	-	0.50	0.50
Chess Park	-	0.08	-	0.08
Elk Mini Park	0.30	0.30	-	0.30
Harvard Mini Park	-	0.30	-	0.30
Maryland Mini Park	-	-	0.48	0.48
Milford Mini Park	0.30	0.30	-	0.30
Oakmont View Park	0.50	0.50	-	0.50
Piedmont Park	0.25	0.25	-	0.25
Wilson Mini Park	0.30	0.30	-	0.30
Windsor Mini Park	-	0.30	-	0.30
Subtotal - Mini Parks	1.65	2.62	0.98	3.60
<u>Neighborhood Parks</u>				
Babe Herman Little League	1.80	1.80	-	1.80
Carr Park	3.20	3.20	-	3.20
Cerritos School Park ²	0.75	-	1.02	1.02
Dunsmore Park	9.80	9.80	-	9.80
Edison Pacific Park	5.56	5.56	-	5.56
Emerald Isle Park	6.40	6.40	-	6.40
Franklin School Park ²	-	-	-	-
Fremont Park	7.90	7.90	-	7.90
Fremont School Park ²	-	-	-	-
Glenoaks Park	2.20	2.20	-	2.20
Glorietta Park	8.00	8.00	-	8.00
Griffith Manor Park	2.90	2.90	-	2.90
Maple Park	3.80	3.80	-	3.80
Mayors Bicentennial Park	3.20	3.20	-	3.20
New York Park	1.90	1.90	-	1.90
Nibley Park	2.40	2.40	-	2.40
Palmer Park	2.80	2.80	-	2.80
Pelanconi Park	3.20	3.20	-	3.20
Scholl Canyon Athletic Fields	9.00	9.00	-	9.00
Scholl (Lower) Canyon Park	6.20	6.20	-	6.20
Stengel Field	3.50	3.50	-	3.50
Subtotal - Neighborhood Parks	84.51	83.76	1.02	84.78
<u>Community Parks</u>				
Brand Park	30.40	30.40	-	30.40
Deukmejian Wilderness Park	10.00	10.00	-	10.00
Glendale Sports Complex	25.60	25.60	-	25.60
Montrose Community Park	14.50	14.50	-	14.50
Verdugo Park	38.68	38.68	-	38.68
Subtotal - Community Parks	119.18	119.18	-	119.18
<u>Special Use Facilities</u>				
Adult Recreation Center	3.20	3.20	-	3.20
Casa Adobe De San Rafael	1.60	1.60	-	1.60
Civic Auditorium	4.80	4.80	-	4.80
Scholl Canyon Golf & Tennis Facility	57.00	57.00	-	57.00
Sparr Heights Community Center	0.50	0.50	-	0.50
Verdugo Adobe Park	1.30	1.30	-	1.30
Subtotal - Special Use Facilities	68.40	68.40	-	68.40
Total - All Park Facilities	273.74	273.96	2.00	275.96
Service Population³	194,973	245,500		245,500
Parkland per 1,000 Service Population	1.40	1.12		1.12

¹ Unimproved parkland is land that the city has acquired for recreational purposes that has no recreational improvements yet.

² Includes only city owned land portion of parks located immediately adjacent to and also used by schools.

³ Service population in 2000 is comprised only of residents. Service population in 2006 is calculated using both residents and weighted workers.

Sources: City of Glendale; Table 4.1; MuniFinancial.

MITIGATION FEE ACT FACILITY STANDARD

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.⁴ A simple and clearly defensible approach to calculating a facility standard is to use the city's existing ratio of park acreage per 1,000 residents. Under this approach, new development is required to fund new park facilities at the same level as existing residents have provided those same types of facilities to date.

QUIMBY ACT FACILITY STANDARD

The Quimby Act does specify facility standards to use for parkland dedication. The Act only includes dedication of parkland and does not require construction of park improvements. The Act specifies that the dedication requirement allows for a minimum of 3.0 acres and a maximum of 5.0 acres per 1,000 residents if that standard is supported by an adopted standard in either a general or specific plan. Funds collected through the Quimby ordinance can only be used for purchasing land to create neighborhood and community parks, not open space. The city can require residential developers to dedicate above the 3.0 acres per 1,000 residents minimum if the city's existing park standard as of the last Census justifies the higher level (up to 5.0 acres per 1,000 residents).

The Quimby Act only applies to land subdivisions. A city cannot apply the Quimby Act to development on land subdivided prior to adoption of a Quimby ordinance, such as development on infill lots. The Quimby Act also would not apply to residential development on future approved projects on single parcels, such as many types of multi-family development.

The Quimby Act allows payment of a fee in lieu of land dedication. The fee is calculated to fund acquisition of the same amount of land that would have been dedicated. The fee does not include the cost of park improvements because the land dedication requirement does not include improvements.

The Quimby Act allows use of in-lieu fee revenue for a number of park or recreation facility purposes. Allowable uses of revenue include land acquisition, park improvements including recreation facilities, and rehabilitation of existing park and recreation facilities.

CITY OF GLENDALE PARK FACILITIES STANDARDS

To calculate new development's need for new parks, municipalities commonly use a ratio expressed in terms of developed park acres per 1,000 residents. In order to incorporate the City's existing inventory of undeveloped parkland in the facility standard the undeveloped acreage has been converted into an 'improved parkland' equivalent. This conversion is based on the cost of unimproved parkland per acre relative to the investment in an improved parkland acre. **Table 4.3** shows the calculation that was used to convert the two (2.0) acres of unimproved parkland into an equivalent amount of improved park acres.

⁴ See the *benefit* and *burden* findings in *Chapter 7, Mitigation Fee Act Findings*.

Table 4.3 Unimproved - Improved Parkland Equivalent

	Cost per Acre	Acres
Unimproved Parkland Acres		2.00
Improved Parkland	\$ 4,872,800	
Unimproved Parkland	<u>3,500,000</u>	
Unimproved Land Costs		
Percentage of Improved Parkland Costs		<u>71.8%</u>
Equivalent Improved Acres		1.44

Sources: Tables 3.2, 4.2 and 4.5; City of Glendale; MuniFinancial.

Table 4.4 shows the calculated and allowable standards under the Mitigation Fee and Quimby Acts. The table shows the existing standard of 1.12 acres of improved park acreage per 1,000 service population (residents and weighted employees). It also documents the City's existing standard of 1.40 acres per 1,000 residents as of the last Census for the Quimby Act calculations. Because the City of Glendale General Plan standard is 6.0 acres per 1,000 capita, under the Quimby Act the City can require applicable subdivisions to dedicate land or pay an in lieu fee at any standard up to 5.0 acres per 1,000 capita. To be conservative, the City has opted to use a standard of 1.40 acres per thousand residents, the standard as of Census 2000, to determine the Quimby fee.

Table 4.4: Park Facility Existing Standard

	Mitigation Fee Act Parkland Fee Standard (2006 Data)	Quimby Act Parkland In-Lieu Fee Standard (2000 Data)
Existing Improved Park Acreage	273.96	<u>N/A</u>
Unimproved Acreage (Equivalent)	<u>1.44</u>	<u>N/A</u>
Total Equivalent Improved Acreage	275.40	273.74
Service Population	<u>245,500</u>	<u>194,973</u>
Park Facility Standards¹	1.12	1.40
Calculated Allowable Standard²	1.12	3.00

¹ Acres per 1,000 residents. Quimby calculations only based on residential population as of 2000 US Census, per Quimby Act specifications.

² Quimby Act allows a three acre standard even if existing standard is less than three acres.

Sources: Tables 4.1, 4.2 and 4.3.

FACILITY NEEDS AND COSTS

This section presents the costs of parkland and improvements in the City of Glendale.

UNIT COSTS FOR LAND ACQUISITION AND IMPROVEMENT

The unit costs used to estimate the total investment in parkland facilities are shown in **Table 4.5**. All costs are expressed in 2006 dollars. Land acquisition costs and improvement costs are based on the City's experience with park development and information from a recent market analysis of land values in Glendale provided by the City. Using unit costs to determine a facility standard ensures that the cost of facilities to serve new development is not artificially increased, and new development unfairly burdened, compared to existing development.

The cost of land is very expensive in Glendale. Unit costs of \$3.5 million per acre are used based on recent City experience and consistent with the value used in the Library chapter of this report. The costs of standard park improvements (e.g. turf and irrigation installation, parking, outdoor restroom facilities, picnic tables, etc.) are estimated to be approximately \$1.2 million per acre. These cost estimates are based on specific park development project data provided by the City.

The cost of certain special use facilities is based on specific information provided by the City (e.g. tennis courts). The cost of community centers and other special use facilities is estimated here at \$350 per square foot of building space, again based on sample project cost data provided by the City of Glendale. The total cost of all non-standard park improvements is summed, and then divided by all improved parkland acres to determine the recreational facilities cost of \$157,800 per acre. The all-inclusive improved parkland cost per acre is nearly \$4.9 million.

Table 4.5: Park Facilities Improvements Unit Costs (2006)

	Sq. Ft. and Cost/Sq. Ft.	Subtotals	Cost Per Acre	Share
Park Improvements				
<u>Recreation Facilities¹</u>				
<i>Community Centers/Public Meeting Spaces</i>				
Babe Herman Dad's Club	1,472			
Brand Park Doctor's House	2,109			
Griffith Manor Building	2,348			
Maple Park Community Building	6,928			
Sparr Heights Community Center	6,488			
Glenoaks Park Community Building	4,834			
Dunsmore Park Clubhouse	4,424			
Brand Park Tea House	1,133			
Subtotal Building Sq. Ft.	29,736			
Cost per Sq. Ft. ²	\$ 350			
Subtotal Community Centers		\$ 10,407,600		
<i>Special Use Facilities</i>				
Casa Adobe de San Rafael	2,119			
Civic Auditorium	54,380			
Adult Recreation Center	14,293			
Sports Complex Building	4,622			
Verdugo Adobe	1,400			
Subtotal Building Sq. Ft.	76,814			
Cost per Sq. Ft. ²	\$ 350			
Subtotal Buildings		\$ 26,884,900		
Scholl Canyon Golf & Tennis Facility (Courts)	10			
Cost per Court ³	\$ 280,000			
Subtotal Courts		2,800,000		
Brand Studios				
Subtotal Building Sq. Ft.	7,000			
Cost per Sq. Ft. ⁴	\$ 450			
Subtotal Brand Studios		3,150,000		
Subtotal Special Use Facilities		32,834,900		
Total Recreation Facilities		\$ 43,242,500		
Improved Park Acres		273.96		
Recreational Facilities Cost per Improved Acre			\$ 157,800	
Average Cost For Park or Site Improvements ⁵			1,215,000	
Park Improvements Subtotal			1,372,800	28.2%
Land Acquisition ⁶			\$ 3,500,000	71.8%
Total Land & Improvements			\$ 4,872,800	100%

¹ Recreation facilities only include special use facilities that are not part of standard park improvements such as recreation centers, meeting rooms, indoor restroom facilities, concession stands, gymnasiums and pools.

² Cost per square foot for community centers and special use facilities based on cost estimate for a new park facility (gymnasium) by Flewelling and Moody architects, March 2006.

³ Per City of Glendale Parks, Recreation and Community Services Department.

⁴ Brand studios price per square foot based on library cost per square foot estimates (see Table 3.2).

⁵ Standard park improvement costs are conservatively estimated at approximately \$1,215,000 per acre for basic park and field amenities such as basketball courts, parking, outdoor restrooms, tot lots, irrigation, turf, open green space, pedestrian paths, and picnic tables. Includes demolition costs, A&E, and approximately 45% contingency based on Budgetary Park Development Cost Evaluation prepared for the City of Glendale by Jacobus and Yuang, Inc., 2006. For recreational facilities these costs represent site improvement costs separate from the building per square foot costs used to estimate building values.

⁶ Land acquisition values are estimated at \$3,500,000 per acre based on recent City land purchases, and are consistent with values used in the library section of this study.

Sources: Tables 3.2 and 4.2; City of Glendale; Flewelling and Moody, Architects; MuniFinancial.

TOTAL NEEDS AND COSTS

The total investment in park facilities to serve growth is calculated by multiplying the facility standards developed in Table 4.4 by the growth in residents. The total value of the needs for park facilities is based on the average unit costs for land acquisition and improvements shown in Table 4.5. To accommodate the increase in service population through 2030 at the existing standard new development would need to fund facilities estimated to cost approximately \$148 million as shown in **Table 4.6**. To accommodate the increase in residential population through 2030 at the standard of 1.40 acres per thousand residents as prescribed by the Quimby Act new development would need to fund facilities estimated to cost approximately \$77.4 million. It is unknown how much of the projected growth will be subject to the Quimby fees. A development project can only be charged the Mitigation Fee Act Fee or the Quimby Fee, not both. Only residential development occurring in subdivisions can be charged the Quimby Fee. All other development is charged the Mitigation Fee Act Fee. The revenue generated by the fees will range between the amount generated by the Mitigation Fee Act and the amount generated by the Quimby Act, shown in the bottom line of Table 4.6, depending on the amount of growth that will be subject to the Quimby fees.

If the City cannot acquire all of the approximately 30.36 acres calculated in Table 4.6 under the Mitigation Fee Act because of land constraints, the City may apply the same funds to rehabilitating, renovating, or rebuilding facilities in existing parks. The \$148 million in facilities improvements must be used for enhancing, upgrading, adding to, or expanding new park facilities. Renovating and intensifying development of existing parks is another reasonable method for accommodating growth that could be used in conjunction with expanding improved park acreage. The use of fee revenues would be identified through planned acquisition and improvement projects described in the most recently adopted version of annual capital improvement budget.

Table 4.6: Park Facilities to Serve Growth

	Quimby Act	Mitigation Fee Act (Residential)	Mitigation Fee Act (Nonresidential)
<u>Parkland (Quimby Act)</u>			
Facility Standard (acres/1,000 residents)	1.40		
Residential Growth (2006-2030)	<u>15,800</u>		
Facility Needs (acres)	22.12		
Average Unit Cost (per acre)	<u>\$ 3,500,000</u>		
Subtotal - Parkland	\$ 77,420,000	N/A	N/A
OR			
<u>Parkland (Mitigation Fee Act)</u>			
Facility Standard (acres/1,000 residents)		1.12	1.12
Service Population Growth (2006-2030)		<u>15,800</u>	<u>11,300</u>
Facility Needs (acres)		17.70	12.66
Average Unit Cost (per acre)		<u>\$ 3,500,000</u>	<u>\$ 3,500,000</u>
Subtotal - Parkland	N/A	\$ 61,950,000	\$ 44,310,000
AND			
<u>Improvements (Mitigation Fee Act)</u>			
Facility Standard		1.12	1.12
Service Population Growth (2006-2030)		<u>15,800</u>	<u>11,300</u>
Facility Needs (acres)		17.70	12.66
Average Unit Cost (per acre)		<u>\$ 1,372,800</u>	<u>\$ 1,372,800</u>
Subtotal - Improvements	N/A	\$ 24,299,000	\$ 17,380,000
Total, per Land Use	<u>\$ 77,420,000</u>	<u>\$ 86,249,000</u>	<u>\$ 61,690,000</u>
Total Facilities Costs Range ¹	\$ 77,420,000	to \$ 147,939,000	

¹ \$150,375,00 represents the combined fee revenues from both residential and nonresidential development.

Sources: Tables 3.2, 4.1, 4.4 and 4.5; City of Glendale; MuniFinancial

The City anticipates that the park fees would be the primary revenue source to fund new development's investment in park facilities. Expected parks capital infrastructure projects include the expansion of current playground facilities and the acquisition of additional park facilities to serve increased demand by new development. **Table 4.7** shows the share of costs that could be levied on a per capita basis for both land acquisition and improvement.

Table 4.7: Park Facilities Costs Per Capita

	Park Fee	Parkland In-Lieu Fee
Parkland Investment (per acre)	\$ 4,872,800	\$ 3,500,000
Facility Standard (acres per 1,000 residents)	1.12	1.40
Total Investment per 1,000 capita	\$ 5,458,000	\$ 4,900,000
Cost per Capita	\$ 5,458	\$ 4,900
Cost per Worker	2,456	na

¹ Workers weighted at 0.45 compared to a resident based on park survey, 2006.

Sources: Tables 4.4, 4.5 and B.2.a; MuniFinancial.

FEE SCHEDULE

In order to calculate fees by land use type, the investment in park facilities is determined on a per resident basis for both land acquisition and improvement. These investment factors (shown in Table 4.7) are investment per capita based on the unit cost estimates and facility standards.

The City anticipates that the park fees would be the primary revenue source to fund new development's investment in park facilities. **Tables 4.8a and 4.8b** show the park facilities fee based on the Quimby standard and the existing standard, respectively. The City would collect the fee based on only one of the two approaches as appropriate. Each fee includes a component for park improvements based on the City's existing standard. The investment per capita is converted to a fee per dwelling unit and a fee per square foot. The total fee includes an administrative charge to fund costs that include: a standard overhead charge applied to all City programs for legal, accounting, and other departmental and citywide administrative support, and impact fee program administrative costs including revenue collection, revenue and cost accounting, mandated public reporting, and fee justification analyses.

Table 4.8a: Parkland In-Lieu (Quimby Act) Fee Schedule

Land Use	A Cost Per Capita	B Density ¹	C=AxB Base Fee ²	D Admin Charge ^{2,3}	E=C+D Total Fee	Fee/ Sq. Ft. ⁴
<u>Residential</u>						
Single Family	\$ 4,900	2.98	\$ 14,602	\$ 292	\$ 14,894	\$ 5.79
Multi-family	4,900	2.56	12,544	251	12,795	7.10

¹ Persons per dwelling unit.

² Fee per residential dwelling unit.

³ Administrative charge of 2.0 percent

⁴ Average size of a single family home is 2,571 and the average size of a multi-family home is 1,802 in the City of Glendale based on new home building permits obtained from City Department of Building and Safety records.

Sources: Tables 2.1 and 4.7; Glendale Unified School District; MuniFinancial.

Table 4.8b: Parkland (Mitigation Fee Act) Fee Schedule

	A	B	C=AxB		D	E=C+D	
	Cost Per			Admin			Fee/
Land Use	Capita	Density ¹	Base Fee ²	Charge ^{2, 3}		Total Fee ²	Sq. Ft. ⁴
<u>Residential</u>							
Single Family	\$	5,458	2.98	\$	16,265	\$	325
Multi-family		5,458	2.56		13,972		279
<u>Nonresidential</u>							
Commercial	\$	2,456	2.01	\$	4,937	\$	99
Office		2,456	2.45		6,017		120
Industrial		2,456	1.00		2,456		49

¹ Persons per dwelling unit or 1,000 square feet of nonresidential.

² Fee per residential dwelling unit or per 1,000 square feet of nonresidential development.

³ Administrative charge of 2.0 percent

⁴ Average size of a single family home is 2,571 and the average size of a multi-family home is 1,802 in the City of Glendale based on new home building permits obtained from City Department of Building and Safety records.

Sources: Tables 2.1 and 4.7; Glendale Unified School District; MuniFinancial.

5. OPEN SPACE

The purpose of the fee is to ensure that new development funds its fair share of open space. The City will use fee revenues to purchase open space to accommodate new development. A fee schedule is presented based on the cost of acquiring open space to ensure that new development provides adequate funding to meet its needs.

SERVICE POPULATION

Open space serves both residents and businesses. Therefore, demand for open space is based on the City's service population including residents and workers.

Table 5.1 shows the estimated service population in 2006 and 2030. In calculating the service population, workers are weighted less than residents to reflect a lower per capita service demand. Nonresidential buildings are typically occupied less intensively than dwelling units, so it is reasonable to assume that average per-worker demand for services is less than average per-resident demand. The 0.24-weighting factor for workers is based on a 40-hour workweek divided by the total number of hours in a week (168). The 0.24-weighting factor is appropriate because open space benefits both residents and workers equally; the weighting reflects the average amount of time that workers get to enjoy the open space.

Table 5.1: Open Space Service Population

	2006	2030	Growth
Residents (A)	208,200	224,000	15,800
Employees (B)	82,800	108,000	25,200
Weighted Employees @ 0.24 (C = B x 0.24)	19,900	25,900	6,000
Total (D = A + C)	228,100	249,900	21,800

Note: Totals may not add due to rounding

Sources: Table 2.2; MuniFinancial.

FACILITY INVENTORIES, PLANS & STANDARDS

Open space in Glendale includes all city-owned property that will never be developed due to topographical constraints. Open space serves as an aesthetic barrier to break the monotony of the urban landscape. As noted above, the study uses the existing standard method to calculate fee schedules. In order to calculate the existing standard the total investment in existing open space is divided by the current service population to determine an open space cost per capita.

Table 5.2 presents the existing facility inventory and standard. The resulting facility standard for open space is \$1,761 per resident and \$423 per worker.

Table 5.2: Open Space Existing Standard

	Inventory	Unit Cost ¹	Value
Land (acres)			
Various, Unnamed Open Space Properties	4,112.05	\$ 80,000	\$ 328,964,000
Idlewood	32.85	80,000	2,628,000
Polygon	293.00	80,000	23,440,000
Geronimo	11.75	80,000	940,000
New Polygon (College Hills)	28.78	80,000	2,302,400
Bachman	7.92	80,000	633,600
Deerpass	21.29	80,000	1,703,200
Deadhorse Canyon	36.45	80,000	2,916,000
Oakmont V	244.00	80,000	19,520,000
Murchison Property	150.36	80,000	12,028,800
Trammell Property	10.30	80,000	824,000
Flint Canyon Property	71.25	80,000	5,700,000
Total - Open Space²	5,020.00		\$ 401,600,000
Existing Service Population			228,100
Cost per Capita			\$ 1,761
Facility Standard per Resident			\$ 1,761
Facility Standard per Worker			423

¹ Unit cost of land based on current market value of open space most recently acquired by the City of Glendale (Flint Canyon).

² Total open space acreage owned by City verified by George Balteria, City of Glendale CIP administrator.

Sources: Tables 5.1; City of Glendale; MuniFinancial

FACILITY NEEDS AND COSTS

Table 5.3 presents the cost of new open space needed to maintain the existing facility standard as growth occurs. The costs generated by new development also represent the total revenue that the open space fee would generate. These revenues should be annually programmed to capital improvement projects and be integrated into a 5-year Capital Improvement Plan (CIP). Expected open space projects that will be funded by impact fees include the purchase of open space that will be of benefit to the entire city. Some special assessment districts may be formed in the future to purchase open space that is only of benefit to specific geographically isolated communities within Glendale.

Table 5.3: Open Space to Accommodate New Development

	Residential	Nonresidential	Total
Facility Standard Per Capita	\$ 1,761	423	
New Development Service Population (2006-2030)	15,800	25,200	
Costs Generated by New Development	\$ 27,817,975	\$ 10,648,298	\$ 38,466,000

Sources: Tables 5.1 and 5.2; MuniFinancial.

FEE SCHEDULE

Table 5.4 shows the open space fee schedule based on maintaining new development's share of the existing standard. The cost per capita is converted to a fee per unit of new development based on dwelling unit and building space densities (persons per dwelling unit (DU) for residential development and workers per 1,000 square feet of building space for nonresidential development). The fee per square foot of residential development has also been calculated and is shown in Table 5.4. The total fee includes an administrative charge to fund costs that include: a standard overhead charge applied to all City programs for legal, accounting, and other departmental and citywide administrative support, and impact fee program administrative costs including revenue collection, revenue and cost accounting, mandated public reporting, and fee justification analyses.

Table 5.4: Open Space Fee

Land Use	A Costs per Capita	B Density ¹	C = A x B Cost per Unit ²	D=C x 0.02 Admin ^{2,3}	E = C + D Total Fee ²	Fee / Ft. ⁴	Sq.
<u>Residential</u>							
Single Family	\$ 1,761	2.98	\$ 5,247	\$ 105	\$ 5,352	\$ 2.08	
Multi-family	1,761	2.56	4,508	90	4,598	2.55	
<u>Nonresidential</u>							
Commercial	\$ 423	2.01	\$ 850	\$ 17	\$ 867	\$ 0.87	
Office	423	2.45	1,036	21	1,057	1.06	
Industrial	423	1.00	423	8	431	0.43	

¹ Persons per dwelling unit or 1,000 square feet of nonresidential.² Fee per residential dwelling unit or per 1,000 square feet of nonresidential development.³ Administrative charge of 2.0 percent.⁴ Average size of a single family home is 2,571 and the average size of a multi-family home is 1,802 in the City of Glendale based on new home building permits obtained from City Department of Building and Safety records.

Sources: Tables 2.1 and 5.2; Glendale Unified School District; MuniFinancial.

6. IMPLEMENTATION

The City should implement the following in establishing a public facilities fee program:

ADOPT ORDINANCE AND RESOLUTION

The City Council should adopt an ordinance and resolution to implement the fees subject to the advice of legal counsel. The ordinance would authorize the City to impose and collect public facilities fees, impose, and make the statutory findings required by the Mitigation Fee Act.

The fee resolution could reference the ordinance, set the amount of the fee, and reference this report to justify the amount of the fee. Setting the fee by resolution could make it easier administratively to update the fee annually for inflation (see further discussion below).

Specifically, the City must also adhere to the requirements of *California Government Code* Sections 66016 through 66018 pertaining to fee adoption including:

- ◆ Send a notice of public hearing at least 14 days prior to the hearing to any party that has submitted a written request for such a notice. Have this report and all supporting documentation (such as updated facility master plans) available for review by the public at least 10 days prior to the hearing;
- ◆ Hold the public hearing to consider adoption of the fee schedule;
- ◆ Adopt an implementing ordinance to establish the City's authority to impose the proposed fee and adjust the fee annually for inflation, and adopt a resolution to set the fee based on the proposed fee schedule;
- ◆ Begin collecting the fee no sooner than 60 days following adoption of the ordinance and resolution.

A separate ordinance will be required for adoption and implementation to require parkland dedication or in lieu fees for parkland through the Quimby Act legislation (codified in *California Government Code* Section 66477.) The adoption of Quimby Act parkland dedication or in lieu fees has a slightly different process than Mitigation Fee Act including that the ordinance must only be in effect for 30 days before fees can be collected.

INFLATION ADJUSTMENT

Appropriate inflation indexes should be identified in a fee ordinance including an automatic adjustment to the fee annually. Separate indexes for land and construction costs should be used. Calculating the land cost index may require the periodic use of a property appraiser. The construction cost index can be based on the City's recent capital project experience or can be taken from any reputable source, such as the *Engineering News-Record*. To calculate prospective fee increases, each index should be weighed against its share of total planned facility costs represented by land or construction, as appropriate. Each update requires adoption by the City Council.

REPORTING REQUIREMENTS

The City should comply with the annual and five-year reporting requirements of the Act (*California Government Code* 66001 (d) (1) through (4)). 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 should consider adopting a Capital Improvements Program (CIP) to adequately plan for future infrastructure needs. The CIP should also identify fee revenue with specific projects. The use of the CIP in this manner documents a reasonable relationship between new development and the use of those revenues. Fee revenues can legitimately be used to fund master planning to further identify needed facilities.

With or without a CIP, 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.

For the five-year planning period of the fee program, the City should consider allocating existing fund balances and projected fee revenue to specific projects. The City can hold funds in a project account for longer than five years if necessary to collect sufficient monies to complete a project.

7. MITIGATION FEE ACT FINDINGS

Fees are assessed and typically paid when a building permit is issued and imposed on new development projects by local agencies responsible for regulating land use (cities and counties). To guide the imposition of facilities fees, the California State Legislature adopted the Mitigation Fee Act with Assembly Bill 1600 in 1987 and subsequent amendments. This chapter does not apply to the parkland dedication fees, which are imposed under the Quimby Act. The Mitigation Fee Act, contained in *California Government Code* §§66000 – 66025, establishes requirements on local agencies for the imposition and administration of fees. The Act requires local agencies to document five statutory findings when adopting fees.

The five findings in the Act required for adoption of the maximum justified fees documented in this report are: 1) Purpose of fee, 2) Use of fee Revenues, 3) Benefit Relationship, 4) Burden Relationship, and 5) Proportionality. They are each discussed below and are supported throughout the rest of this report.

PURPOSE OF FEE

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

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

USE OF FEE REVENUES

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

Fees proposed in this report, if enacted by the City, would be available to fund expanded facilities to serve new development. Facilities funded by these fees are designated to be located within the City. Fees addressed in this report have been identified by the City to be restricted to funding the following facility categories: library facilities, park facilities (including community centers and other special use recreational facilities) and open space.

Summary descriptions of the existing facilities such as size and cost estimates were provided by the City and are included in Chapters 3 through 5 of this report. The fees should be updated if there are significant changes in facility planning or costs that could result in changes to the fair share cost allocated to new development.

BENEFIT RELATIONSHIP

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

We expect that the 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. The fees calculated in this report will fund the following facility categories: libraries, parks and open space. 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 nonresidential 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. Facilities demand is determined as follows:

- ◆ The service population for library facilities is established on the number of residents and a weighted number of workers (0.35 the demand of a resident), as worker demand on these facilities is substantially less than that of a resident;
- ◆ The service population for park facilities is established on the number of residents and a weighted number of workers (0.45 the demand of a resident), as worker demand on these facilities is substantially less than that of a resident; and
- ◆ The service population for open space facilities is established on the number of residents and a weighted number of workers (0.24 the demand of a resident), as worker demand on these facilities is substantially less than that of a resident.

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. 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 nonresidential development.

Chapter 2, Demographic Assumptions provides a description of how service population and growth projections are calculated. Facility standards are described in the *Facility Inventories, Plans & Standards* sections of in each facility category chapter.

PROPORTIONALITY

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

The reasonable relationship between each facilities fee for a specific new development project and the cost of the facilities attributable to that project is based on the estimated new development growth the project will accommodate. Fees for a specific project are based on the project's size or increases in service population. 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 can ensure a reasonable relationship between a specific new development project and the cost of the facilities attributable to that project.

See *Chapter 2, Demographic Assumptions*, or the *Service Population, Equivalent Dwelling Unit or Trip Rate Adjustment Factor* sections in each facility category chapter for a description of how service population is determined for different types of land uses. See the *Fee Schedule* section of each facility category chapter for a presentation of the proposed facilities fees.

APPENDIX A

Table A.1: Proposed Development That May Occur Before Impact Fees Are Implemented

Location	Description	Units/ Building SF	Type	Equivalent Population
1. 800 N. Central at Burchett	12 story, 272-room Embassy Suites Hotel	272	Hotel Rooms	544
2. 200 W. Burchett	188,000 s.f., 8 story commercial office	188,000	Commercial	378
3. 300 W. Central	72 unit condo, 4,000 sf retail (proposal)	72	Multi-Family	185
		4,000	Commercial	8
4. Americana at Brand	475,000 sf retail, 230 apartments and 100 condos, 4,500 restaurant	475,000	Commercial	955
		230	Multi-Family	590
		4,500	Commercial	9
		100	Multi-Family	256
5. 214-220 E. Broadway	38 unit condo project with ground floor retail	38	Multi-Family	97
6. 416 E. Colorado	118 unit condo, 9,000 sf commercial	118	Multi-Family	303
		9,000	Commercial	18
7. 435 West Los Feliz		165	Multi-Family	423
		2,200	Commercial	4
8. 1200 N. Pacific		5,010	Commercial	10
9. 375 West Arden		23	Multi-Family	59
10. 812-28 South Brand	Auto Showroom	81,200	Commercial	163
11. 3600 North Verdugo		22,000	Office	54
		8,000	Commercial	16
Equivalent Residents				1,900
Equivalent Workers				2,200

Sources: City of Glendale; MuniFinancial.

APPENDIX B: WORKER DEMAND SURVEY

The worker demand weightings for library and park facilities were developed during various user intercept surveys carried out by City of Glendale staff and volunteers in April 2006. The following appendix describes the methodology used to arrive at the worker demand weighting factors.

LIBRARY SURVEY

The library user intercept survey was administered to all willing patrons at three locations over a combination of weekends and weekdays. A total of 2,134 individuals were surveyed. The following questions were asked:

- ◆ Is this library closest to:
 - Your workplace?
 - Your school?
 - Your home?
- ◆ Is your visit to the library today mainly for:
 - Business or job related needs?
 - School related needs?
 - Other needs?

After our analysis of the raw survey data results we determined that nonresidential developments impact on library facilities was best estimated based on the location responses. The positive responses to proximity of workplace for all library patronage purposes were tabulated. Totals were adjusted for hours of operation over hours surveyed for all three branches.

Next the total number of adjusted workplace proximity associated library visits were divided by the estimated number of employees working in the city of Glendale in 2006 to derive library visits per employee. (Projected employees associated with entitled but incomplete development projects were excluded.) The remaining library visits were assumed to be resident driven and were divided by the estimated number of residents in Glendale in 2006. (Projected residents associated with entitled but not yet completed residential projects were excluded.) The relative weight of employee trips to resident trips was calculated resulting in a weighting factor of 0.35 for employees.

Table B.1.a. shows the calculations of the relative worker demand on library facilities. The underlying data collected in the survey is shown in **Table B.1.b.**

Table B.1.a: Library Survey Results and Relative Demand Calculations

Brand Library				Central Library			
Reason for Visit	Library Near Work	Library Near Home or School	Total Visits	Reason for Visit	Library Near Work	Library Near Home or School	Total Visits
Business or Job	23	47	70	Business or Job	55	196	251
Other	32	198	230	Other	130	1,274	1,404
Total Visits			300	Total Visits			1,655
<u>Weighted Results</u>				<u>Weighted Results</u>			
Hours of Branch Operation	29			Hours of Branch Operation	64		
Hours Surveyed	16			Hours Surveyed	41		
	1.81				1.56		
Business or Job	41.63	85.07	127	Business or Job	85.80	305.76	392
Other	57.92	358.38	416	Other	202.80	1,987.44	2,190
			543				2,582
<u>Weighted Percent</u>				<u>Weighted Percent</u>			
Business or Job	8%	16%	23%	Business or Job	3%	12%	15%
Other	11%	66%	77%	Other	8%	77%	85%
			100%				100%

Sources: City of Glendale Library Survey 2006; MuniFinancial.

Montrose Library				All Surveyed Libraries			
Library Branch/Reason for Visit	Library Near Work	Library Near Home or School	Total Visits	Reason for Visit	Library Near Work	Library Near Home or School	Total Visits
Business or Job	4	19	23				
Other	12	142	154				
Total Visits			177				
<u>Weighted Results</u>				<u>Weighted Results</u>			
Hours of Branch Operation	31						
Hours Surveyed	13						
	2.38						
Business or Job	9.52	45.22	55	Business or Job	137	436	573
Other	28.56	337.96	367	Other	289	2,684	2,973
			421		426	3,120	3,546
<u>Weighted Percent</u>				<u>Weighted Percent</u>			
Business or Job	2%	11%	13%	Business or Job	4%	12%	16%
Other	7%	80%	87%	Other	8%	76%	84%
			100%				100%
				<u>Service Population</u>			
				Employees	80,600		
				Residents	206,300		
				Work visits/employ.	5.29		
				Other visits/res.	15.12		
					35%		

Sources: City of Glendale Library Survey 2006; MuniFinancial.

Table B.1.b: City of Glendale Survey of Library Users April 2006 - Raw Data

Brand

Location/Date	Location/Time	1a. Library Near Workplace				1b. Library Near School				1c. Library Near Home				
		Work	School	Other		Work	School	Other		Work	School	Other		
Weekday Brand														
04/18/06 Tuesday	1:00 - 3:00 p.m.	7	1	3		1	0	0		9	5	20		
	3:00 - 6:00 p.m.	0	1	2		0	2	1		9	8	24		
	Total1	7	2	5	14	1	2	1	4	18	13	44	75	
04/20/06 Thursday	3:00 - 6:00 p.m.	7	0	5		1	2	3		6	5	12		
	6:00 - 9:00 p.m.	0	0	0		0	2	1		2	3	14		
	Total2	7	0	5	12	1	4	4	9	8	8	26	42	
	Total1	14	2	10	26	2	6	5	13	26	21	70	117	
		Weekday Brand				Weekday Brand				Weekday Brand				156
Saturday Brand														
4/22/2006	1:00 - 3:00 p.m.	4	4	6	14	0	4	2	6	14	9	35	58	
	3:00 - 6:00 p.m.	5	1	9	15	0	0	2	2	5	8	36	49	
	Ttotal2	9	5	15	29	0	4	4	8	19	17	71	107	
		Saturday Brand				Saturday Brand				Saturday Brand				144
	Total1	14	2	10		2	6	5		26	21	70		
	Total2	9	5	15		0	4	4		19	17	71		
	Total	23	7	25		2	10	9		45	38	141		
		42%	13%	45%		10%	48%	43%		20%	17%	63%		
		1a. Library Near Work Place				1b. Library Near School				1c. Library Near Home				300
			55	55			21	21			224	224		

City of Glendale Survey of Library Users

Montrose

Location/Date	Location/Time	1a. Library Near Workplace				1b. Library Near School				1c. Library Near Home					
		Work	School	Other		Work	School	Other		Work	School	Other			
Weekday Montrose															
04/17/06	3:00 - 7:00 p.m.	0	3	4		3	5	4		3	20	20			
Monday	Total1	0	3	4	7	3	5	4	12	3	20	20	43		
04/18/06	1:00 - 6:00 p.m.	3	1	4		2	6	6		5	18	20			
Wednesday	Total2	3	1	4	8	2	6	6	14	5	18	20	43		
	Total1	3	4	8		5	11	10		8	38	40			
		Weekday Montrose			15	Weekday Montrose			26	Weekday Montrose			86		
Saturday Montrose	1:00 - 5:00 p.m.	1	0	0	1	0	1	2	3	6	6	34	46		
4/22/2006	Total2	1	0	0		0	1	2		6	6	34			
		Saturday Montrose			1	Saturday Montrose			3	Saturday Montrose			46		
	Total1	3	4	8		5	11	10		8	38	40			
	Total2	1	0	0		0	1	2		6	6	34			
	Total	4	4	8		5	12	12		14	44	74			
		25%	25%	50%		17%	41%	41%		11%	33%	56%			
		1a. Library Near Work Place			16	16	1b. Library Near School		29	29	1c. Library Near Home		132	132	
															177

Table B.1.b: City of Glendale Survey of Library Users April 2006 - Raw Data (Continued)**City of Glendale Survey of Library Users****Central**

Location/Date	Location/Time	1a. Library Near Workplace				1b. Library Near School				1c. Library Near Home				
		Work	School	Other		Work	School	Other		Work	School	Other		
Weekday Central														
04/19/06	10:00 - 3:00 p.m.	9	4	11		2	8	6		23	32	83		
Wednesday	3:00 - 6:00 p.m.	6	7	8		1	38	17		11	62	75		
	6:00 - 9:00 p.m.	6	5	1		2	21	3		17	58	69		
	Stotal1	21	16	20	57	5	67	26	98	51	152	227	430	585
04/20/06	10:00 - 3:00 p.m.	8	4	12		3	7	1		28	51	102		
Thursday	3:00 - 6:00 p.m.	3	2	3		1	10	5		16	39	57		
	6:00 - 9:00 p.m.	3	1	4		1	5	7		7	11	20		
	Stotal2	14	7	19	40	5	22	13	40	51	101	179	331	411
04/26/06	10:00 - 3:00 p.m.	7	3	24		1	11	1		33	43	114		
Monday	3:00 - 6:00 p.m.	3	8	8		1	8	6		12	35	42		
	6:00 - 9:00 p.m.	1	3	6		0	16	2		10	26	30		
	Stotal3	11	14	38	63	2	35	9	46	55	104	186	345	454
	Total1	46	37	77		12	124	48		157	357	592		
					Weekday Central 160				Weekday Central 184				Weekday Central 1106	1450
Saturday Central														
4/22/2006	10:00 - 3:00 p.m.	9	1	9	19	1	6	3	10	16	27	54	97	
	3:00 - 6:00 p.m.	0	1	5	6	0	0	3	3	10	20	40	70	
	Ttotal2	9	2	14		1	6	6		26	47	94		
					Saturday Central 25				Saturday Central 13				Saturday Central 167	205
	Total1	46	37	77		12	124	48		157	357	592		
	Total2	9	2	14		1	6	6		26	47	94		
	Total	55	39	91		13	130	54		183	404	686		
		30%	21%	49%		7%	66%	27%		14%	32%	54%		
		1a. Library Near Work Place			185 185	1b. Library Near School			197 197	1c. Library Near Home			1273 1273	1655

PARK SURVEY

The parks intercept survey was administered to all willing park-goers at ten park locations through out the City of Glendale on Wednesday April 19th, and Saturday April 22nd 2006. Park users were asked if they came to the park that day because of proximity to work, home, both, or other?

Results were initially tabulated by the City of Glendale. Weekday (Wednesday April 19th) survey results were calculated by five to represent the five weekdays. Results from the weekend survey (Saturday April 22nd) were multiplied by two to estimate total visits for both weekend days.

MuniFinancial made the adjustment of allocating 50 percent of responses to “both” to “work” responses and 50 percent of responses to “both” to home responses. All “other” responses were allocated to residential use. As with the library survey, the resulting estimate of total proximity to work responses were then divided by the current estimate of employees working within the city of Glendale (excluding projected employment from pending entitled development projects) to derive park visits per employee. The remaining responses were divided by the estimated current resident population (excluding projected employment from pending entitled residential development projects) to derive estimated park visits per resident. The relative weight of employee park visits to resident park visits resulting in a weighting factor of 0.45 for employees.

Table B.2.a shows the relative demand calculations and **Table B.2.b** displays the initial park survey data results from the City of Glendale.

Table B.2.a: Park Survey Relative Demand Calculations

	Visits	Service Population	Visits per Worker or per Resident
Employment Related Park Visits	666	80,600	0.008263
Home or Resident Related Park Visits	<u>3,799</u>	206,300	0.018415
Total	4,465		
Relative Demand (Worker to Resident)			0.45

Sources: City of Glendale Park Survey 2006; MuniFinancial.

Table B.2.b: City of Glendale Park Survey - Raw Data

CITY OF GLENDALE SURVEY OF PARK USERS - CONDUCTED APRIL 19TH & 22ND OF 2006

WEDNESDAY APRIL 19TH, 2006							
Survey Date	Survey Time	Park Name	Patron Came to Park because: (Tally Total)				Misc. Patron Comments/ Senarios
			Work?	Home?	Both?	Other?	
4/19/06	11:30 a.m. to 1:30 p.m.	Brand Park	32	105	7	26	
4/19/06	11:30 a.m. to 1:30 p.m.	Casa Adobe	11	9	0	0	
4/19/06	11:30 a.m. to 1:30 p.m.	Maple Park	7	83	0	8	
4/19/06	11:30 a.m. to 1:30 p.m.	Montrose Park	7	22	7	17	Come to park because it's clean, games for kids, bathrooms, it's safe.
4/19/06	11:30 a.m. to 1:30 p.m.	Nibley Park	10	47	10	2	It's a nice park, drove from Arcadia
4/19/06	11:30 a.m. to 1:30 p.m.	Pacific Park	10	18	0	27	Come to park because it is close to school, good place to relax, nice restrooms, safe for kids.
4/19/06	11:30 a.m. to 1:30 p.m.	Palmer Park	0	10	0	0	
4/19/06	11:30 a.m. to 1:30 p.m.	Scholl Canyon	2	6	0	1	Nice, clean and beautiful park
4/19/06	11:30 a.m. to 1:30 p.m.	Verdugo Park	9	34	1	2	
4/19/06	11:30 a.m. to 1:30 p.m.	Wilson MiniPark	15	36	14	6	Many comments about suggested improvements to park.
WEDNESDAY SURVEY RESULTS			Patron Came to Park because: (Tally Total)				TOTAL SURVEYED
			Work?	Home?	Both?	Other?	
TOTAL PARK USERS:			71	265	32	63	
PERCENTAGES:			16%	61%	7%	15%	

SATURDAY APRIL 22ND, 2006							
Survey Date	Survey Time	Park Name	Patron Came to Park because: (Tally Total)				Misc. Patron Comments/
			Work?	Home?	Both?	Other?	Senarios
4/22/06	11:30 a.m. to 1:30 p.m.	Brand Park	1	47	0	49	Baseball game, playground, wedding, love the park
4/22/06	11:30 a.m. to 1:30 p.m.	Casa Adobe	5	3	0	0	
4/22/06	11:30 a.m. to 1:30 p.m.	Maple Park	3	27	4	0	
4/22/06	11:30 a.m. to 1:30 p.m.	Montrose Park	1	33	3	74	Baseball game, B-day Party, equipment is new, play tennis.
4/22/06	11:30 a.m. to 1:30 p.m.	Nibley Park	0	63	0	12	Nice B-day, Love Park
4/22/06	11:30 a.m. to 1:30 p.m.	Pacific Park	11	53	13	61	Library, B-ball, Baseball for fun, to walk the dogs, love the park.
4/22/06	11:30 a.m. to 1:30 p.m.	Scholl Canyon	0	23	6	72	B-Day Party, Came for Baseball game, softball practice.
4/22/06	11:30 a.m. to 1:30 p.m.	Sports Complex	34	57	33	92	No Complaints, Baseball Practice is here, to work out, to play soccer.
4/22/06	11:30 a.m. to 1:30 p.m.	Verdugo Park	11	72	0	207	To go to a party, CV baseball, Relax, Earth Day, Armenian Genocide, to exercise, to go to the skate park, to go to a party, it's near my school, to go to the skate park.
4/22/06	11:30 a.m. to 1:30 p.m.	Wilson Mini Park	20	60	0	5	Many comments about suggested improvements to park.
SATURDAY SURVEY RESULTS			Patron Came to Park because: (Tally Total)				TOTAL SURVEYED
			Work?	Home?	Both?	Other?	
TOTAL PARK USERS:			86	438	59	572	
PERCENTAGES:			7%	38%	5%	50%	

Table B.2.b: City of Glendale Park Survey - Raw Data (Continued)

STATISTICAL COMPARISON OF AVERAGE WEEKLY PARK USE

SURVEY RESULTS SUMMARY BY DAY					
	Patron Came to Park because: (Tally Total)				TOTAL SURVEYED
	Work?	Home?	Both?	Other?	
TOTAL WEDNESDAY PARK USERS:	71	265	32	63	431
PERCENTAGES:	16%	61%	7%	15%	
TOTAL SATURDAY PARK USERS:	86	438	59	572	1155
PERCENTAGES:	7%	38%	5%	50%	
SURVEY RESULTS RATIO					
	Patron Came to Park because: (Tally Total)				TOTAL SURVEYED
	Work?	Home?	Both?	Other?	
TOTAL WEDNESDAY PARK USERS MULTIPLIED BY FIVE (TO CREATE A RATIO OF SIMILAR WORKDAYS PER WEEK):	355	1325	160	315	2155
TOTAL SATURDAY PARK USERS MULTIPLIED BY TWO (TO CREATE A RATIO OF SIMILAR WEEKEND DAYS PER WEEK):	172	876	118	1144	2310
TOTAL AVERAGE WEEKLY PARK USERS (CALCULATED USING ABOVE RATIOS OF SIMILAR DAYS PER WEEK):	527	2201	278	1459	4465
TOTAL AVERAGE WEEKLY PARK USER PERCENTAGES:	12%	49%	6%	33%	



KEYSER MARSTON ASSOCIATES
ADVISORS IN PUBLIC/PRIVATE REAL ESTATE DEVELOPMENT

MEMORANDUM

ADVISORS IN:
REAL ESTATE

REDEVELOPMENT
AFFORDABLE HOUSING
ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

SAN FRANCISCO

A. JERRY KEYSER
TIMOTHY C. KELLY
KATE EARLE FUNK
DEBBIE M. KERN
REED T. KAWAHARA
DAVID DOEZEMA

LOS ANGELES

KATHLEEN H. HEAD
JAMES A. RABE
GREGORY D. SOO-HOO
KEVIN E. ENGSTROM
JULIE L. ROMÉY

SAN DIEGO

GERALD M. TRIMBLE
PAUL C. MARRA

To: Gillian van Muyden, Chief Assistant City Attorney
City of Glendale

From: James Rabe, CRE

Date: January 7, 2014

Subject: Update - Development Impact Fees

At your request, Keyser Marston Associates, Inc. (KMA) has reviewed the City of Glendale's (City) Development Impact Fees (Fees). The City enacted the Fees through its Public Use Facilities Development Impact Fee Ordinance (Ordinance) in 2007. The Fees were based upon a Nexus Study prepared for the City by MuniFinancial in June, 2007. The Ordinance states that the Fees shall be reviewed no less than once every two years. The Ordinance also states that as part of its review, the City may consider the change in the Engineering News Record Construction Cost Index (Index) for the calendar year as of December 1st.

ANALYSIS

The Ordinance created development fees for Libraries, Parks and Recreation and Quimby fees. The Fees were based upon the Nexus analysis prepared by MuniFinancial. The initial fees from the Nexus Study are shown in Table 1. Separate impact fees were developed for single-family and multi-family residential projects and for commercial, office and industrial projects. For example, the Library Fees were \$1,623 for a single-family dwelling and \$1,394 per unit for a multi-family project. The fees for non-residential uses were calculated on a per square foot basis.

The annual Index stood at 7,966 for 2007 and increased to 9,547 for 2013 based on the indices dated December 1, 2013. The change in the index from 2007 through 2013 is 19.85%. This is equal to an average annual increase of 3.06%.

To: Gillian van Muyden, Chief Assistant City Attorney
Subject: Update - Development Impact Fees

January 7, 2014

Page 2

KMA prepared a list of updated Fees based on the change in the Index. These updated Fees are shown in the right hand column of Table 1. All Fees are increased by 19.85%. For example, the Library Fee for a single-family home increases from the initial \$1,623 per unit to \$1,945 per unit. The Library Fee for Commercial space increases from \$0.38 per square foot to \$0.46 per square foot.

The table provides the adjustments for the individual components based on the change in the Index. Total fees are shown in the lower portion of the table. We hope that this provides sufficient information to assist the City in its review of the Fees.

TABLE 1

**ADJUSTED DEVELOPMENT IMPACT FEES
PUBLIC FACILITY FEE ORDINANCE
GLENDALE, CALIFORNIA**

	<u>2007 Fee¹</u>	<u>Change in Index²</u>	<u>Updated Fee</u>
Library			
Single Family	\$1,623	19.85%	\$1,945
Multi-family	\$1,394	19.85%	\$1,671
Commercial	\$0.38	19.85%	\$0.46
Office	\$0.47	19.85%	\$0.56
Industrial	\$0.19	19.85%	\$0.23
Park Fee			
Single Family	\$16,590	19.85%	\$19,883
Multi-family	\$14,251	19.85%	\$17,080
Commercial	\$5.04	19.85%	\$6.04
Office	\$6.14	19.85%	\$7.36
Industrial	\$2.51	19.85%	\$3.01
Parkland In-lieu Fee (Quimby Fee)			
Single Family	\$14,894	19.85%	\$17,850
Multi-family	\$12,795	19.85%	\$15,335
Total Library and Park Fee			
Single Family	\$18,213		\$21,828
Multi-family	\$15,645		\$18,751
Commercial	\$5.42		\$6.50
Office	\$6.61		\$7.92
Industrial	\$2.70		\$3.24
Total Library and Quimby Fee			
Single Family	\$16,517		\$19,796
Multi-family	\$14,189		\$17,006

1 City of Glendale, Public Facilities Fee Study, MuniFinancial, June 2007

2 Engineering News Record, Construction Cost Index change from 2007 through 2013.