STANISLAUS COUNTY

COMPREHENSIVE PUBLIC FACILITIES IMPACT FEE UPDATE STUDY

FINAL

REVISED JULY 30, 2020

Oakland Office
1939 Harrison Street
Suite 430
Oakland, CA 94612
Tel: (510) 832-0899

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

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

www.willdan.com

This page intentionally left blank.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Executive Summary

This report summarizes an analysis of the need for public facilities and capital improvements to support future development within Stanislaus County through 2045. It is the County's intent that the costs representing future development's share of these facilities and improvements be imposed on that development in the form of a development impact fee, also known as a public facilities fee.

Background and Study Objectives

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

This 2020 revision to the PFF includes two primary changes compared to the February 19, 2019 Public Facilities Fee Update Study:

1. The regional transportation impact fee (RTIF) is comprehensively updated in Chapter 13.
2. New fees are calculated for the Crows Landing Industrial Business Park (CLIBP) Specific Plan Area in Chapter 16.

Chapters 2 through 12 and Chapter 14 remain unchanged from the February 19, 2019 report.

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

Fee Categories

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

- Animal Services
- Behavioral Health
- Criminal Justice
- Detention
- Emergency Services
- Health
- Libraries
- Other County Facilities
- Parks
- Sheriff
- Regional Transportation
- Countywide Information Technology
- Crows Landing Industrial Business Park Area Fees (Includes: Transportation, Water, Wastewater and Storm Drain Facilities Fees)

Use of Fee Revenues

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

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

Methodologies Used in This Study

For all categories *except* for the regional transportation impact fee (RTIF) and Crows Landing Industrial Business Park (CLIBP) fees, this study uses the existing inventory method to calculate a cost standard that ensures that new development contributes to facilities at the same rate that existing development has contributed to date. This methodology is not based on a master plan for facilities. Rather, this methodology uses the County's existing inventory of facilities as of 2016 to calculate the existing facility standard serving existing development. A cost standard is used to combine disparate types of facilities, such as land, buildings, and vehicles, funded by the same public facility fee. By definition this methodology results in no facility deficiencies attributable to existing development.

The RTIF and CLIBP Fees are calculated using the planned facilities approach. The cost of facilities and improvements needed to serve new development was identified though traffic modeling and various engineering studies and is allocated to the increase in demand from new development. Refer to Chapter 16 for a full description of the RTIF methodology and Chapter 14 for a description of the CLIBP fee methodologies.

Fee Schedules

Tables E.1, E.2 and E.3 summarizes the schedules of maximum justified public facilities fees, including recommended RTIF, based on the analysis contained in this report.

Table E.4 summarizes the maximum justified fees for backbone infrastructure at the Crows Landing Industrial Business Park. These fees are only charged in the Crow's Landing Specific Plan Area and are charged in addition to the unincorporated area fees summarized in Table E.1.

Table E.1: Stanislaus County Public Faciltiies Fee Summary - Unincorporated

Land Use	Animal Services	Behavioral Health	Criminal Justice	Detention	Emergency Services	Health	Library	Other County Facilities	Regional Parks	Neighbor-hood Parks [1]	Sheriff [1]	County-wide IT	Recommended RTIF	Admin Charge	Total Fee
Residential (Per Dwelling Unit)															
Single Family / Duplex	$ 118	$ 92	$ 134	$ 1,091	$ 16	$ 353	$ 350	$ 2,121	$ 346	$ 671	$ 1,078	$ 10	$ 3,592	$ 199	$ 10,171
Multifamily / Mobile Home Park	77	60	87	710	10	230	228	1,381	225	437	702	6	2,404	131	6,688
Accessory Dwelling Unit	37	29	42	343	5	111	110	667	109	211	339	3	995	60	3,061
Nonresidential (Per Thousand Square Feet)															
Office	N/A	$ 26	$ 37	$ 304	$ 6	$ 98	N/A	$ 594	N/A	N/A	$ 301	$ 3	$ 4,237	$ 112	$ 5,718
Industrial [2]															
Industrial (Small)	N/A	$ 6	$ 8	$ 68	$ 1	$ 22	N/A	$ 132	N/A	N/A	$ 67	$ 1	$ 1,932	$ 45	$ 2,282
Industrial (Large)															
Manufacturing	N/A	8	12	98	2	31	N/A	190	N/A	N/A	97	1	2,034	49	2,522
Distribution	N/A	3	5	39	1	13	N/A	77	N/A	N/A	39	-	1,326	30	1,533
Warehouse	N/A	2	2	19	0.40	6	N/A	37	N/A	N/A	19	-	774	17	876
Commercial															
Small Retail	N/A	$ 22	$ 31	$ 255	$ 5	$ 82	N/A	$ 499	N/A	N/A	$ 253	$ 2	$ 2,407	$ 71	$ 3,627
Medium Retail	N/A	22	31	255	5	82	N/A	499	N/A	N/A	253	2	3,594	95	4,838
Shopping Center	N/A	22	31	255	5	82	N/A	499	N/A	N/A	253	2	3,323	89	4,561
Shopping Mall	N/A	22	31	255	5	82	N/A	499	N/A	N/A	253	2	2,034	64	3,247
Church	N/A	$ 22	$ 31	$ 255	$ 5	$ 82	N/A	$ 499	N/A	N/A	$ 253	$ 2	$ 780	$ 39	$ 1,968
Hospital	N/A	22	31	255	5	82	N/A	499	N/A	N/A	253	2	1,390	51	2,590
Nursing Home	N/A	22	31	255	5	82	N/A	499	N/A	N/A	253	2	509	33	1,691
Special Cases [3]															
Drive Through (per lane)	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	$ 8,538	$ 171	$ 8,709
Gas Station (per pump)	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	8,238	165	8,403
Motel/Hotel (per room)	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	847	17	864
Golf Course (per acre)	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	635	13	648

[1] Charged only in unincorporated areas.

[2] Commercial dairies charged under small industrial if less that 20,000 square feet, or under the large industrial manufacturing land use if greater than 20,000 square feet.

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

Table E.2: Stanislaus County Public Faciltiies Fee Summary - Cities of Ceres, Hughson, Modesto, Patterson and Waterford

Land Use	Animal Services	Behavioral Health	Criminal Justice	Detention	Emergency Services	Health	Library	Other County Facilities	Regional Parks	Neighbor-hood Parks [1]	Sheriff [1]	County-wide IT	Recommended RTIF	Admin Charge	Total Fee
Residential (Per Dwelling Unit)															
Single Family / Duplex	$ 118	$ 92	$ 134	$ 1,091	$ 16	$ 353	$ 350	$ 1,065	$ 346	N/A	N/A	$ 10	$ 3,592	$ 143	$ 7,310
Multifamily / Mobile Home Park	77	60	87	710	10	230	228	693	225	N/A	N/A	6	2,404	95	4,825
Accessory Dwelling Unit	37	29	42	343	5	111	110	335	109	N/A	N/A	3	995	42	2,161
Nonresidential (Per Thousand Square Feet)															
Office	N/A	$ 26	$ 37	$ 304	$ 6	$ 98	N/A	$ 298	N/A	N/A	N/A	$ 3	$ 4,237	$ 100	$ 5,109
Industrial [2]															
Industrial (Small)	N/A	$ 6	$ 8	$ 68	$ 1	$ 22	N/A	$ 67	N/A	N/A	N/A	$ 1	$ 1,932	$ 42	$ 2,147
Industrial (Large)															
Manufacturing	N/A	8	12	98	2	31	N/A	96	N/A	N/A	N/A	1	2,034	46	2,328
Distribution	N/A	3	5	39	1	13	N/A	38	N/A	N/A	N/A	-	1,326	29	1,454
Warehouse	N/A	2	2	19	0.40	6	N/A	19	N/A	N/A	N/A	-	774	16	838
Commercial															
Small Retail	N/A	$ 22	$ 31	$ 255	$ 5	$ 82	N/A	$ 251	N/A	N/A	N/A	$ 2	$ 2,407	$ 61	$ 3,116
Medium Retail	N/A	22	31	255	5	82	N/A	251	N/A	N/A	N/A	2	3,594	85	4,327
Shopping Center	N/A	22	31	255	5	82	N/A	251	N/A	N/A	N/A	2	3,323	79	4,050
Shopping Mall	N/A	22	31	255	5	82	N/A	251	N/A	N/A	N/A	2	2,034	54	2,736
Church	N/A	$ 22	$ 31	$ 255	$ 5	$ 82	N/A	$ 251	N/A	N/A	N/A	$ 2	$ 780	$ 29	$ 1,457
Hospital	N/A	22	31	255	5	82	N/A	251	N/A	N/A	N/A	2	1,390	41	2,079
Nursing Home	N/A	22	31	255	5	82	N/A	251	N/A	N/A	N/A	2	509	23	1,180
Special Cases [3]															
Drive Through (per lane)	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	$ 8,538	$ 171	$ 8,709
Gas Station (per pump)	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	8,238	165	8,403
Motel/Hotel (per room)	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	847	17	864
Golf Course (per acre)	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	635	13	648

[1] Charged only in unincorporated areas.

[2] Commercial dairies charged under small industrial if less that 20,000 square feet, or under the large industrial manufacturing land use if greater than 20,000 square feet.

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

Table E.3: Stanislaus County Public Faciltiies Fee Summary - Cities of Turlock, Oakdale, Newman and Riverbank

Land Use	Animal Services	Behavioral Health	Criminal Justice	Detention	Emergency Services	Health	Library	Other County Facilities	Regional Parks	Neighbor-hood Parks [1]	Sheriff [1]	County-wide IT	Recommended RTIF	Admin Charge	Total Fee
Residential (Per Dwelling Unit)															
Single Family / Duplex	N/A	$ 92	$ 134	$ 1,091	$ 16	$ 353	$ 350	$ 1,065	$ 346	N/A	N/A	$ 10	$ 3,592	$ 141	$ 7,190
Multifamily / Mobile Home Park	N/A	60	87	710	10	230	228	693	225	N/A	N/A	6	2,404	93	4,746
Accessory Dwelling Unit	N/A	29	42	343	5	111	110	335	109	N/A	N/A	3	995	42	2,124
Nonresidential (Per Thousand Square Feet)															
Office	N/A	$ 26	$ 37	$ 304	$ 6	$ 98	N/A	$ 298	N/A	N/A	N/A	$ 3	$ 4,237	$ 100	$ 5,109
Industrial [2]															
Industrial (Small)	N/A	$ 6	$ 8	$ 68	$ 1	$ 22	N/A	$ 67	N/A	N/A	N/A	$ 1	$ 1,932	$ 42	$ 2,147
Industrial (Large)															
Manufacturing	N/A	8	12	98	2	31	N/A	96	N/A	N/A	N/A	1	2,034	46	2,328
Distribution	N/A	3	5	39	1	13	N/A	38	N/A	N/A	N/A	-	1,326	29	1,454
Warehouse	N/A	2	2	19	0.40	6	N/A	19	N/A	N/A	N/A	-	774	16	838
Commercial	N/A	$ 22	$ 31	$ 255	$ 5	$ 82	N/A	$ 251	N/A	N/A	N/A	$ 2	$ -	$ -	
Small Retail	N/A	$ 22	$ 31	$ 255	$ 5	$ 82	N/A	$ 251	N/A	N/A	N/A	$ 2	$ 2,407	$ 61	$ 3,116
Medium Retail	N/A	22	31	255	5	82	N/A	251	N/A	N/A	N/A	2	3,594	85	4,327
Shopping Center	N/A	22	31	255	5	82	N/A	251	N/A	N/A	N/A	2	3,323	79	4,050
Shopping Mall	N/A	22	31	255	5	82	N/A	251	N/A	N/A	N/A	2	2,034	54	2,736
Church	N/A	$ 22	$ 31	$ 255	$ 5	$ 82	N/A	$ 251	N/A	N/A	N/A	$ 2	$ 780	$ 29	$ 1,457
Hospital	N/A	22	31	255	5	82	N/A	251	N/A	N/A	N/A	2	1,390	41	2,079
Nursing Home	N/A	22	31	255	5	82	N/A	251	N/A	N/A	N/A	2	509	23	1,180
Special Cases [3]															
Drive Through (per lane)	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	$ 8,538	$ 171	$ 8,709
Gas Station (per pump)	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	8,238	165	8,403
Motel/Hotel (per room)	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	847	17	864
Golf Course (per acre)	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	635	13	648

[1] Charged only in unincorporated areas.

[2] Commercial dairies charged under small industrial if less that 20,000 square feet, or under the large industrial manufacturing land use if greater than 20,000 square feet.

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

Table E.4: Crows Landing Industrial Business Park - Maximum Justified Impact Fee Schedule

	Traffic Facilities	Water Facilities	Wastewater Facilities	Strom Drain Facilities	Total Fees per 1,000 Sq. Ft.[1]	Fee per Sq. Ft.[1]
Fee per KSF						
Logistics/Distribution	$ 756	$ 3,638	$ 4,240	$ 708	$ 9,342	$ 9.34
Light Industrial	3,920	3,543	4,129	690	12,282	12.28
Business Park	5,951	3,638	4,240	603	14,432	14.43
Airport	2,598	62	182	655	3,497	3.50

[1] Includes 2% administration fee for (1) legal, accounting, and other administrative support and (2) impact fee program administrative costs including revenue collection, revenue and cost accounting, mandated public reporting, and fee justification analyses.

Sources: Tables 16.9, 16.14, 16.19, 16.24.

1. Introduction

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

- Public Facilities Financing in California;
- Study Objectives;
- Stanislaus County Public Facilities Fee Program;
- Study Methodology;
- Fee Program Maintenance; and
- Organization of the report.

Public Facilities Financing in California

The changing fiscal landscape in California during the past 40 years has steadily undercut the financial capacity of local governments to fund infrastructure. Three dominant trends stand out:

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

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

Study Objectives

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

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

The County of Stanislaus is forecast to experience substantial growth in both incorporated cities and unincorporated areas through this study's planning horizon of 2045. This growth will create an increase in demand for public services and the County facilities required to deliver them. Given the revenue challenges described above that are common to most cities and counties in

California; the County has decided to use a development impact fee program to ensure that new development funds the share of facility costs associated with growth. This report makes use of the most current available growth forecasts, facility plans, and engineering studies to ensure that the County's fee program is representative of the facility needs resulting from new development.

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

Stanislaus County Public Facilities Fee Program

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

PFF Program Overview

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

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

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

The multi-jurisdictional strategy of the PFF program was unique at the time of initial adoption in 1990 and has served as a model for other counties throughout the State. The County's nine cities have agreements with the County to adopt, impose, collect and transfer to the County impact fees to fund facilities that are the responsibility of the County. These facilities include, for example, jails, libraries, regional parks, and regional roads. The County's PFF was the first impact fee program in California in which cities partnered with their county to fund the impact of new development on countywide public facilities. Since Stanislaus County pioneered this public facility funding strategy a number of counties have adopted or are currently considering this type of multi-jurisdictional fee program.[1]

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

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

1990 – Initial Adoption

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

1992 – Recession Adjustment

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

2003 – Comprehensive Update

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

- Revising the facility inventory and service demand data to reflect existing facility standards as of 2003;
- Updating unit costs for public facilities to 2003;
- Adding a new public facility fee category for animal control, dividing the parks fee into regional parks and neighborhood parks categories, and re-programming the unincorporated area only fire fee to cover all emergency services countywide;
- In the fee schedules, disaggregating the Large Industrial land use type into more detailed land uses to more accurately reflect the lower employment densities of this type of development; and
- Adopting an automatic annual inflation adjustment to the fee schedules to reflect capital project cost inflation.

2005 – Inflation Update

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

2010 – Comprehensive Update

In two separate efforts, the County comprehensive update of the PFF program, and the Regional Transportation Impact Fee (RTIF) by:

- Revising the facility inventory and service demand data to reflect existing facility standards as of 2008;
- Updating unit costs for public facilities to November, 2009;
- Updating RTIF project lists; and,
- Adding a new facility fee category for information technology.

2014 – Inflation Update

The 2014 inflation update revised the 2010 PFF program fee schedules to 2014 reappraised land values and separate inflation indices for buildings and equipment.

2018 – Comprehensive Update

The study provided a comprehensive update of the PFF program, excluding RTIF by:

- Revising the facility inventory and service demand data to reflect existing facility standards as of 2016;
- Updating unit costs for public facilities to 2016; and,
- Revising administrative guidelines as necessary.

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

2019 – Addition of Accessory Dwelling Unit Land Use Category

This revision added the accessory dwelling unit land use category to the PFF program based on an assumption of 1.0 persons per dwelling unit. The fees for all existing land uses remain consistent with the 2018 Comprehensive PFF Update.

2020 - RTIF Update, Addition of Crows Landing Industrial Business Park Specific Plan Impact Fees

The 2020 revisions to the PFF program include the update of the RTIF in Chapter 13 of this report and the addition of fees to fund backbone infrastructure at the CLIBP in Chapter 16 of this report. ***Note that Chapters 2 through 12 and Chapter 14 are not being updated at this time and have not changed since the 2019 PFF report.***

Table 1.1: PFF Program Revisions

1990	2003	2005	2008	2010	2014	2018	2020
			Countywide Facilities Fees				
Public/Mental Health[1]	Behavioral Health	Behavioral Health	Behavioral Health	Behavioral Health	Behavioral Health	Behavioral Health	Behavioral Health
Criminal Justice	Criminal Justice	Criminal Justice	Criminal Justice	Criminal Justice	Criminal Justice	Criminal Justice	Criminal Justice
Jails[1]	Detention	Detention	Detention	Detention	Detention	Detention	Detention
Out Patient Care[1]	Health	Health	Health	Health	Health	Health	Health
Libraries	Libraries	Libraries	Libraries	Libraries	Libraries	Libraries	Libraries
Other County	Other County	Other County	Other County	Other County	Other County	Other County	Other County
Parks	Regional Parks[2]	Regional Parks	Regional Parks	Regional Parks	Regional Parks	Regional Parks	Regional Parks
Roads Inter-City	Roads Inter-City	Roads Inter-City	Regional Transportation Impact Fee (RTIF)[1,3]	Regional Transportation Impact Fee (RTIF)[1]	Regional Transportation Impact Fee (RTIF)[1]	Regional Transportation Impact Fee (RTIF)[1]	Regional Transportation Impact Fee (RTIF)[1]
Roads City/County	Roads City/County	Roads City/County	Roads City/County[3]				
	Animal Services	Animal Services	Animal Services[4]	Animal Services[4]	Animal Services[4]	Animal Services[4]	Animal Services[4]
	Emergency Services[5]	Emergency Services	Emergency Services	Emergency Services	Emergency Services	Emergency Services	Emergency Services
			Countywide Information Technology	Countywide Information Technology	Countywide Information Technology	Countywide Information Technology	Countywide Information Technology
			Unincorporated Only Facilities Fees				
Sheriff	Sheriff	Sheriff	Sheriff	Sheriff	Sheriff	Sheriff	Sheriff
Fire	NA[5]	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
NA	Neighborhood Parks[2]	Neighborhood Parks	Neighborhood Parks	Neighborhood Parks	Neighborhood Parks	Neighborhood Parks	Neighborhood Parks
			Crows Landing Industrial Plan Specific Plan Area Fees				
							Transportation, Water, Wastewater, Storm Drain

[1] Facility fee category renamed.
[2] Parks fee category re-programmed to include regional and neighborhood parks categories.
[3] Roads related fees are not being updated at this time.
[4] Facility fee category does not apply to all parts of the County because some cities provide their own animal services facilities.
[5] Fire facilities fee re-programmed to the countywide emergency services facilities fee in 2003.

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

Fee Program Maintenance

Once a fee program has been adopted it must be properly maintained to ensure that the revenue collected adequately funds the facilities needed by new development. Impact fee levels must be adjusted frequently to account for inflation. Should the cost of facilities rise more quickly than the fee amounts collected, the facilities needed to serve new development will be underfunded. To avoid collecting inadequate revenue, the inventories of existing facilities and costs for planned facilities must be updated periodically for inflation, and the fees recalculated to reflect the higher costs. The use of established indices for each facility included in the inventories (land, buildings, and equipment), such as the Engineering News Record, is necessary to accurately adjust the impact fees. For a list of recommended indices, and step-by-step instructions for adjusting fees for inflation, see Chapter 17.

While fee updates using inflation indices are appropriate for periodic updates to ensure that fee revenues keep up with increases in the costs of public facilities, it is recommended to conduct more extensive updates of the fee documentation and calculation (such as this study) when significant new data on growth forecasts and/or facility plans become available. For further detail on fee program implementation, see Chapter 17.

Study Methodology

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

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

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

Types of Facility Standards

There are three separate components of facility standards:

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

Our approach incorporates current facility design standards into the fee program to reflect the increasing construction cost of public facilities.

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

New Development Facility Needs and Costs

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

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

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

Existing Inventory Method

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

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

Under this method, new development funds the expansion of facilities at the same standard currently serving existing development. By definition the existing inventory method results in no facility deficiencies attributable to existing development. This method is often used when a long-range plan for new facilities is not available. Only the initial facilities to be funded with fees are identified in the fee study. Future facilities to serve growth are identified through an annual capital improvement plan and budget process, possibly after completion of a new facility master plan. This method is used for all facility categories in this report, with the exception of the regional transportation fee. All inventories included in this report are current as of 2016.

Planned Facilities Method

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

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

This method is appropriate when specific planned facilities can be identified that only benefit new development. Examples include street improvements to avoid deficient levels of service or a sewer trunk line extension to a previously undeveloped area. This method is appropriate when planned facilities would not serve existing development. Under this method, new development funds the expansion of facilities at the standards used for the master facility plan. This method is used to calculate the RTIF and CLIBP fees in Chapters 13 and 16, respectively.

System Plan Method

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

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

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

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

Organization of the Report

This report is organized as follows:

- **Chapter 1**, **Introduction (this chapter):** summarizes facilities financing in California, the history of the PFF in Stanislaus County, and the general approach;
- **Chapter 2**, **Growth Forecasts and Unit Cost Estimates:** describes the growth forecasts used to estimate future demand and the unit costs used to estimate total facility costs;
- **Chapter 3**, **Animal Control:** Charged countywide to residential development, except in the cities of Turlock, Oakdale, Newman and Riverbank.
- **Chapter 4, Behavioral Health:** Charged countywide. Includes all behavioral health facilities in the County, including the teen center, prenatal programs and adult programs.
- **Chapter 5, Criminal Justice:** Charged countywide. Includes criminal justice training center, public defender, and district attorney office space.
- **Chapter 6, Detention:** Charged countywide. Includes juvenile and adult detention facilities. Fee revenue funded the men's jail and juvenile hall expansion.
- **Chapter 7, Emergency Services:** Charged countywide. Includes emergency operations center, and dispatch.
- **Chapter 8, Health:** Charged countywide. Includes health related administrative offices, clinic space and workshop space.
- **Chapter 9, Libraries:** Charged countywide to residential development. Includes all libraries, collections and related equipment in the County.
- **Chapter 10, Other County Facilities:** Charged countywide. Includes all public facilities that do not fit into any other facility categories including facilities housing the Assessor, Auditor-Controller, Board of Supervisors, Central Services, Chief Executive Officer, Child Support Services, Clerk-Recorder, Community Services Agency, County Counsel, Fleet Services, General Services Agency, Planning, Public Works, Strategic Business Technology, and the Treasurer-Tax Collector.
- **Chapter 11, Parks:** Charged countywide to residential development. Fee will fund neighborhood parks in the unincorporated areas and regional parks countywide.
- **Chapter 12, Sheriff Patrol and Investigation:** Only charged in unincorporated areas. Fee funds sheriff facilities, vehicles, and equipment.

- **Chapter 13, Regional Transportation Impact Fee (RTIF):** Charged countywide to fund transportation facilities of regional significance.
- **Chapter 14, Countywide Information Technology:** Charged countywide. Fee revenue will fund major information technology purchases.
- **Chapter 15, PFF Administrative Fee:** Charged countywide to fund costs associated with the administration of the impact fee program.
- **Chapter 16, Crows Landing Industrial Business Park Impact Fees:** Charged only within the Crows Landing Industrial Business Park (CLIBP) Specific Plan area to fund backbone transportation, water, wastewater and storm drain infrastructure.
- **Chapter 17, Implementation:** Provides guidelines for the implementation and ongoing maintenance of the public facilities fee program.
- **Chapter 18, *Mitigation Fee Act* Findings:** summarizes the five statutory findings required for adoption of the proposed public facilities fees in accordance with the *Mitigation Fee Act* (codified in *California Government Code* Sections 66000 through 66025).

2. Growth Forecasts and Unit Cost Estimates

Growth forecasts assist in estimating facility needs based on additional service demand. New development is estimated using a base year of 2016 and a planning horizon of 2045. The growth forecast is used throughout this study.

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

Use of Growth Forecasts for Impact Fees

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

- Estimates of existing development in 2016 are used to determine the existing facility standards in the County.
- Estimates of total development at the 2045 planning horizon are used:
  - To determine the total amount of public facilities required to accommodate growth based on the existing facility standards (see Chapter 1), and
  - To estimate total fee revenues.

To measure existing service population and future growth, residential and worker population data are used for all facility categories with the exception of the parks and library fees, which only use population data. These measures are used because the amount of residents and workers is a reasonable indicator of the level of demand for public facilities. The County builds public facilities primarily to serve these populations and, typically, the greater the population the larger the facility required to provide a given level of service.

Service Population

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

A service population is a measure of all residents and workers that rely on a given set of services. The service population weights residential land use types against nonresidential land uses based on the relative demand for services between residents and workers.

Land Use Types

To ensure a reasonable relationship between each fee and the type of development paying the fee, growth forecasts distinguish between different land use types. Where ambiguity exists, the California Building Code may be used as a reference document to identify the proper use category. The land use types used in this analysis are defined below.

- **Single family:** Detached home, or duplex on an individual lot.
- **Multi-family:** All attached multi-family dwellings including triplexes, high and low rise apartments, condominiums, and residential planned unit developments (excluding single family units). This category also applies to mobile home parks.

- **Accessory Dwelling Unit:** Includes attached and detached accessory dwelling units to existing single family residences. Units less than 750 square feet are exempt from impact fees. The units can be a maximum of 1,200 square feet in size. No more than one accessory dwelling unit is allowed per single family lot. The County will comply with state law as requirements for implementing impact fees for accessory dwelling units evolve.
- **Commercial:** All commercial and retail, development, including but not limited to: supermarkets, drug stores, department stores, general merchandise, building materials or lumber stores, specialty retail stores, discount stores, hardware/paint stores, video arcades, new and used car sales as well as auto repair shops, fast-food restaurants, sit-down restaurants, banks and Credit Unions, educational or vocational facilities, day care facilities, and gas stations.
- **Office:** Professional offices including, but not limited to, business parks, corporate headquarters, insurance sales and research centers.
- **Industrial:** The manufacture, fabrication, reduction or destruction or processing of any article, substance or commodity or any other treatment thereof in such a manner as to change the form or character thereof. Uses include, but are not limited to, heavy and light industrial, warehousing, and industrial parks.
  - Industrial (small): less than or equal to 20,000 square feet;
  - Industrial (large): greater than 20,000 square feet, further defined in three subcategories:
    - Manufacturing: The conversion of raw materials, components or parts into finished goods that meet a customer's expectations or specifications. Uses which are considered large industrial include, but are not limited to:
      - Bottling plant
      - Cabinet shop
      - Electronics assembly, paper products
      - Food processor, brewery, bakery
      - Machine shop
      - Printing plant
      - Manufacture, fabrication, processing, packaging and treatment of explosives, oil and great products, chemicals and chemical products
      - Metal fabricator
      - Pulp and paper mill
      - Reduction, processing and storage of offal, dead animals, bones or similar materials
      - Rock crushing
      - Sheet-metal shop
      - Welding shop
    - Distribution: Entry, receiving, stocking, and shipping products on their way from supplier to customer. Uses which are considered distribution/ mixed use include but are not limited to:
      - Equipment rental yard
      - Freight
      - Junk handling, processing and storage
      - Landfill – waste products disposal or transfer station
      - Recycling facility
      - Septic tank, cesspool services
      - Wholesale nurseries
      - Distribution center (such as Longs, Wal-Mart, Coca-Cola)

- Warehouse: Facility where the primary activity is the storage of materials. Uses which are considered warehouse include, but are not limited to:
    - Bulk fee storage
    - Corporation yard, freight yard
    - Warehousing, Mini-warehouse
    - Moving and storage service

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

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

Growth Forecasts for Stanislaus County

The base year for this study is the year 2016. Base year population estimates are from California Department of Finance (DOF) January 1, 2016 data. Base year countywide employment estimates are based on data from the Stanislaus County Forecast Summary, July 7, 2016, prepared by the Eberhardt School of Business at the University of the Pacific.

Willdan and the County examined several population projections before selecting a future 2045 population projection from the Center for Rural Entrepreneurship (CRE). Other growth projections examined included projections from the California Department of Finance and the Eberhardt School of Business. Willdan and the County felt that the DOF and Eberhardt projections were too conservative, and represented too great a divergence from the growth projections from the StanCOG traffic model, used in prior PFF updates.

The CRE evaluated the potential effects of the Altamont Corridor Express (ACE) train extension to Stanislaus County. The analysis examined two scenarios: one where full investment in the ACE train system allows for full utilization of the system's capacity, spurring considerable development in Stanislaus County, and a second where a lower level of investment in the system yields lower growth. This PFF update uses the midpoint between those two scenarios to estimate the 2045 residential population in the County. Population is then allocated to each City, based on each city's current proportion of population relative to the Countywide population.

Local government employment is excluded from all current and future employment estimates presented here because local government facilities are typically added to serve new development. Government facilities, therefore, are more likely to result from increased demand for public facilities than to cause that increased demand. Whereas non-government development creates an increased demand for public facilities, development of government facilities occurs to meet that demand. The residents and workers that comprise the service populations outlined in this report constitute only those individuals that create demand for public facilities.

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

Table 2.1: Population and Employment Estimates and Projections

	2016	2045	Net Growth 2016 - 2045
Population[1]			
Ceres	46,800	76,500	29,700
Hughson	7,100	11,600	4,500
Modesto	209,000	341,500	132,500
Newman	10,800	17,600	6,800
Oakdale	22,200	36,300	14,100
Patterson	22,600	36,900	14,300
Riverbank	23,700	38,700	15,000
Turlock	70,700	115,500	44,800
Waterford	8,800	14,400	5,600
Unincorporated	112,100	183,200	71,100
Total	533,800	872,300	338,400
Employment[2]			
Ceres	11,400	15,400	4,000
Hughson	1,300	1,700	400
Modesto	81,300	110,600	29,300
Newman	1,400	1,800	400
Oakdale	6,600	8,500	1,900
Patterson	3,600	4,500	900
Riverbank	3,400	4,400	1,000
Turlock	26,300	34,700	8,400
Waterford	900	1,200	300
Unincorporated	45,600	57,900	12,300
Total	181,800	240,700	58,900
Unincorporated			
Population	112,100	183,200	71,100
Employees	45,600	57,900	12,300
Incorporated			
Population	421,700	689,000	267,300
Employees	136,200	182,800	46,600

Note: Figures rounded to the nearest 100.

[1] Household population only. Excludes people living in group quarters. Population forecast based on Center for Rural Entrepreneurship's ACE Train Population "Mid" Scenario.

[2] Base year adjusted to 2016 using implied compound annual growth rate for each jurisdiction from 2015 to 2045 from the County Forecast. 2045 Projection from County Forecast.

Sources: California Department of Finance, Table E-5, 2016 (base year population and dwelling unit estimates); Center for Rural Entrepreneurship, Scenario Adjustment Factors (planning horizon population estimates); Forecast Summary, July 7, 2016, Eberhardt School of Business (employment estimates and projections); Willdan Financial Services.

Occupant Densities

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

Table 2.2: Occupancy Density Assumptions

Residential:		
Single Family Unit	3.18	Persons per dwelling unit
Multi-family Unit	2.07	Persons per dwelling unit
Accessory Dwelling Unit	1.00	Persons per dwelling unit
Nonresidential:		
Commercial (Retail)	2.41	Employees per 1,000 sq. ft.
Office	2.87	Employees per 1,000 sq. ft.
Industrial (Small)	0.64	Employees per 1,000 sq. ft.
Industrial (Large)		
Manufacturing	0.92	Employees per 1,000 sq. ft.
Distribution	0.37	Employees per 1,000 sq. ft.
Warehouse	0.18	Employees per 1,000 sq. ft.

Sources: Tables B25033 and B25024 from the U.S. Census Bureau, 2015 American Community Survey 1-Year Estimates; Stanislaus Business Development and Workforce Alliance; Willdan Financial Services.

The residential occupant density factors for both the various types of dwelling units were calculated using the most recently available data from US Census' American Community Survey specific to Stanislaus County. Table B25033 identifies the estimated population, by type of dwelling unit. Table B25024 identifies the total amount of dwelling units, by type. The occupant densities resulting from dividing the population by the corresponding dwelling unit type are shown in Table 2.2.

The non-residential density factors were developed based on data compiled by the Stanislaus Business Development and Workforce Alliance (now, Opportunity Stanislaus) and the County.

Unit Costs

This study makes use of unit costs for land values and building construction. These costs are used to estimate the replacement value of existing facilities, as well as the construction or acquisition costs for planned facilities. Building costs are typically expressed in terms of cost per square foot while land costs are expressed in terms of cost per acre.

Table 2.3 lists the land and building values used in this study. Land values are listed in terms of cost per acre. The land values listed here were developed in 2016 by a licensed real estate appraisal firm in Modesto, Cogdill & Giomi Inc., specifically for use in this public facilities fee study. Building values are listed per square foot and were informed by recent appraisals and projects in the County, and by County staff. Some public facilities, such as jails and landfills, are

more likely to be located on land with limited development potential. Therefore, this study uses a lower land value for less-desirable land.

Table 2.3: Unit Costs

Location / Facility Type		Current Value
Land - Value per acre[1]		
Modesto Commercial Land Value	$	653,400
Suburban Commercial Land Value		522,720
Transitional Land Value		50,000
Business Park		50,000
Neighborhood Park		70,000
Regional Parks / Open Space		4,000
Landfill - Dry Ground		2,500
Landfill - Orchard Value		28,000
Buildings - Existing value per square foot[2]		
Jail / Detention Facilities	$	370
Clinic		351
Animal Services Shelter		234
Animal Services Shelter Expansion		474
All other (including office)		206
Park Improvements[2]		
Regional Park Improvements	$	18,000
Neighborhood Park Improvements		235,000

[1] Values for land in 2016 based on independent appraisal by Cogdill & Giomi.

[2] Values for buildings in 2017 based 2014 value, adjusted by changes in the Engineering New Record's Construction Cost Index for San Francisco.

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

3. Animal Control Facilities

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

Service Population

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

Table 3.1 shows the estimated service population in 2016 and 2045. The demand for countywide animal control facilities is primarily related to the demands that residents place on those facilities.

Table 3.1: Animal Services Service Population

	Residents
Existing (2016)[1]	406,400
New Development (2016-2045)[1]	257,800
Total - (2045)[1]	664,200

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

Sources: Table 2.1; Willdan Financial Services.

Facility Standards and Planned Facilities

This study uses the existing inventory method to calculate fee schedules for animal services facilities (see *Introduction* for further information). **Table 4.2** presents an inventory of animal services facilities in Stanislaus County along with an estimated current replacement value. An inventory of vehicles and equipment can be found in **Appendix Table A.1**. An inventory of technological assets can be found in **Appendix Table A.11**. The total value of existing animal services facilities is approximately $15.1 million.

Table 3.2: Animal Services Facilities Existing Facility Inventory

	Inventory	Unit Cost[1]	Value
Land (acres)			
Animal Services Shelter - 3647 Cornucopia Way	4.53	$ 50,000	$ 227,000
Buildings (square feet)			
Animal Services Shelter - New Portion	25,000	$ 474	$ 11,850,000
Animal Services Shelter - Old Portion	9,800	234	2,293,000
Subtotal - Buildings	34,800		$ 14,143,000
Vehicles & Equipment (*from Table A.1*)			$ 341,661
Technology *(from Table A.11)*			$ 49,505
Existing Fund Balance			$ 330,500
Total Value Existing Facilities			$ 15,091,666

[1] Unit costs based on market value.

Sources: Tables 2.3, A.1 and A.11; Stanislaus County; Willdan Financial Services.

Table 3.3 shows the existing per capita investment in animal control facilities in 2016. These values were calculated by dividing the value of existing animal control facilities by the existing service population. The resulting cost per capita is $37.

Table 3.3: Animal Services Facilities Existing Standard

Existing Animal Services Facilities	$	15,091,666
Existing Service Population		406,400
Facility Standard per Capita	$	37
Cost per Resident	$	37

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

Sources: Tables 3.1 and 3.2.

Use of Fee Revenues

The County can use animal control facilities fee revenues for the construction or purchase of new buildings and land that expands the capacity of the existing system to serve new development. The inclusion of technology in the facilities inventory allows fee revenue to be spent on technological needs related to animal control services. **Table 3.4** displays projected fee revenue through 2045.

Table 3.4: Projected Revenue

Facility Standard (Value) per Capita	$ 37
Service Population Growth Within County (2016-2045)	257,800
Projected Fee Revenues	$ 9,538,600

Sources: Tables 3.1 and 3.3.

Fee Schedule

Table 3.5 shows the animal control facilities fee schedule. The cost per capita is converted to a fee per unit of new development based on dwelling unit densities from Table 2.2.

Table 3.5: Animal Services Facilities Impact Fee - Existing Facilities Standard

Land Use	*A* Cost Per Capita	*B* Density	*C=AxB* Fee[1]
Residential			
Single Family	$ 37	3.18	$ 118
Multifamily	37	2.07	77
Accessory Dwelling Unit	37	1.00	37

[1] Fee per dwelling unit.

Sources: Tables 2.2 and 3.3.

4. Behavioral Health

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

Service Population

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

Table 4.1 shows the estimated service population in 2016 and 2045. The demand for countywide behavioral health facilities is primarily related to the demands that residents and businesses place on those facilities. While specific data is not available to estimate the actual ratio of demand per resident to demand by businesses (per worker) for this service, it is reasonable to assume that demand for these services is less for one employee compared to one resident, because nonresidential buildings are typically occupied less intensively than dwelling units. The 0.31-weighting factor for workers is based on a 40-hour workweek divided by the total number of non-work hours in a week (128) and reflects the degree to which nonresidential development yields a lesser demand for countywide behavioral health facilities.

Table 4.1: Behavioral Health Facilities Service Population

	Residents	Workers	Service Population
Existing (2016)	533,800	181,800	590,200
New Development (2016-2045)	338,400	58,900	356,700
Total (2045)	872,200	240,700	946,900
Weighting factor[1]	1.00	0.31	

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

Sources: Table 2.1, Willdan Financial Services.

Facility Standards

This study uses the existing inventory method to calculate fee schedules for behavioral health facilities (see *Introduction* for further information). **Table 4.2** presents an inventory of behavioral health facilities in Stanislaus County along with an estimated current replacement value. An inventory of vehicles and equipment can be found in **Appendix Table A.2**. An inventory of technological assets can be found in **Appendix Table A.11**. The total value of existing behavioral health facilities is approximately $17.3 million.

Table 4.2: Behavioral Health Facilities Existing Inventory

	Inventory	Units	Unit Cost[1]	Value
Land (acres)				
800 Scenic Drive, Modesto	1.85	Acres	$ 653,400	$ 1,209,000
1905 Memorial Drive, Ceres	15.37	Acres	50,000	769,000
				$ 1,978,000
Buildings (square feet)				
800 Scenic, Modesto				
Behavioral Health Share	26,414	Sq. Ft.	351	$ 9,271,000
2215 Blue Gum, Modesto				
Juvenile Justice	1,440	Sq. Ft.	351	505,000
Juvenile Justice	2,150	Sq. Ft.	351	755,000
CSA Bldg.-Hackett Rd.	2,600	Sq. Ft.	351	913,000
Total Building Square Feet	32,604	Sq. Ft.		$ 11,444,000
Vehicles *(from Table A.2)*				$ 1,539,060
Technology *(from Table A.11)*				$ 1,424,125
Existing PFF Fund Balance[2]				$ 911,300
Total Value Existing Facilities				$ 17,296,484

[1] Unit costs based on market value.
[2] Current as of December 31, 2016. Rounded to the hundreds.

Sources: Tables 2.3, A.2 and A.11; Stanislaus County; Willdan Financial Services

Table 4.3 shows the current per capita investment in behavioral health facilities. This value was calculated by dividing the existing investment in behavioral health facilities by the current service population. The cost per resident is $29, and the cost per worker is $9.

Table 4.3: Behavioral Health Facilities Existing Standard

Existing Behavioral Health Facilities	$	17,296,484
Existing Service Population		590,200
Facility Standard per Capita	$	29
Cost per Resident	$	29
Cost per Worker[1]		9

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

Sources: Tables 4.1 and 4.2.

Use of Fee Revenues

The County can use behavioral health facilities fee revenues for the construction or purchase of new buildings, land, vehicles, or equipment that expand the capacity of the existing system to serve new development. Fee revenues may not be used for replacement of aging facilities or equipment or to otherwise correct existing deficiencies unrelated to new development. The inclusion of technological assets in the facility inventory will allow fee revenue to be spent on technology related to behavioral health services. **Table 4.4** displays projected fee revenue through 2045.

Table 4.4: Projected Revenue - Existing Standard

Facility Standard per Capita	$ 29
Service Population Growth Within County (2016-2045)	356,700
New Development Contribution to Planned Facilities	$ 10,344,300

Sources: Tables 4.1 and 4.3.

Fee Schedule

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

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

Land Use	*A* Cost Per Capita	*B* Density	*C=AxB* Fee[1]	*D = C / 1,000* Fee per Sq. Ft.
Residential				
Single Family	$ 29	3.18	$ 92	
Multifamily	29	2.07	60	
Accessory Dwelling Unit	29	1.00	29	
Nonresidential				
Commercial	$ 9	2.41	$ 22	$ 0.022
Office	9	2.87	26	0.026
Industrial (Small)	9	0.64	6	0.006
Industrial (Large)				
Manufacturing	9	0.92	8	0.008
Distribution	9	0.37	3	0.003
Warehouse	9	0.18	2	0.002

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

Sources: Tables 2.2 and 4.3.

5. Criminal Justice

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

Service Population

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

Table 5.1 shows the estimated service population in 2016 and 2045. The demand for countywide criminal justice facilities is primarily related to the demands that residents and businesses place on those facilities. While specific data is not available to estimate the actual ratio of demand per resident to demand by businesses (per worker) for this service, it is reasonable to assume that demand for these services is less for one employee compared to one resident, because nonresidential buildings are typically occupied less intensively than dwelling units. The 0.31-weighting factor for workers is based on a 40-hour workweek divided by the total number of non-work hours in a week (128) and reflects the degree to which nonresidential development yields a lesser demand for criminal justice facilities.

Table 5.1: Criminal Justice Service Population

	Residents	Workers	Service Population
Existing - Countywide (2016)	533,800	181,800	590,200
New Development - Countywide (2016-2045)	338,400	58,900	356,700
Total - Countywide (2045)	872,200	240,700	946,900
Weighting factor[1]	1.00	0.31	

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

Sources: Table 2.1, Willdan Financial Services.

Facility Standards

This study uses the existing inventory method to calculate fee schedules for criminal justice facilities (see *Introduction* for further information). **Table 5.2** presents an inventory of criminal justice facilities in Stanislaus County along with each facility's estimated replacement value. An inventory of vehicles can be found in **Appendix Table A.3**. An inventory of technological assets can be found in **Appendix Table A.11**. The total value of criminal justice facilities is estimated at approximately $25 million.

Table 5.2: Criminal Justice Existing Facilities

Facility	Inventory		Unit Cost[1]	Total Value
Land				
Former Bank of America Building, 1021 I Street, Modesto	0.28	acres	$ 653,400	$ 183,000
Ray Simon Reg Criminal Justice Training Ctr, Modesto	26.83	acres	50,000	1,341,500
Former City Hall Building, 801 11th Street, Modesto[2]	0.22	acres	653,400	143,700
832 12th Street Office Building	0.20	acres	653,400	130,680
Subtotal - Land	27.53	acres		$ 1,798,880
Buildings				
Ray Simon Regional Criminal Justice Training Center	22,530	sq. ft.	$ 206	$ 4,641,200
801 11th Street, Modesto - Probation	16,761	sq. ft.	206	3,452,800
12th Street Office Building - District Attorney	43,800	sq. ft.	206	9,022,800
1021 I Street (former Bank of America) I Street - Public D	14,177	sq. ft.	206	2,920,500
Subtotal - Buildings	97,268	sq. ft.		$ 20,037,300
Vehicles *(from Table A.3)*				$ 1,835,251
Technology *(from Table A.11)*				$ 1,106,194
Existing PFF Fund Balance[3]				$ 236,700
Total Existing Facilities				$ 25,014,325

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

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

[3] Current as of December 31, 2016. Rounded to the hundreds.

Source: Stanislaus County.

Table 5.3 shows current per capita investment in criminal justice facilities. This value was calculated by dividing the existing investment in criminal justice facilities by the current service population. The cost per resident is $42, and the cost per worker is $13.

Table 5.3: Criminal Justice Facilities - Existing Standard

Total Value Existing Facilities	$ 25,014,325
2016 Service Population	590,200
Cost Per Capita	$ 42
Cost Per Resident	$ 42
Cost Per Worker[1]	13

[1] Workers weighted at 0.31 of residents.

Sources: Tables 5.1 and 5.2; Willdan Financial Services.

Use of Fee Revenues

The County can use criminal justice facilities fee revenues for the construction or purchase of new buildings, land, vehicles, or equipment that expand the capacity of the existing system to serve new development. Fee revenues may not be used for replacement of aging facilities. The inclusion of technological assets in the facility inventory will allow fee revenue to be spent on technology related to criminal justice services. **Table 5.4** displays projected fee revenue through 2045.

Table 5.4: Projected Criminal Justice Facility Fee Revenue - Existing Standard

Facility System Cost Per Capita	$	42
New Development Service Population (2016-2045)		356,700
New Development Contribution to Planned Facilities	$	14,981,400

Sources: Tables 5.1 and 5.3.

Fee Schedule

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

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

Land Use	*A* Cost Per Capita	*B* Density	*C=AxB* Fee[1]	*D = C / 1,000* Fee per Sq. Ft.
Residential				
Single Family Unit	$ 42	3.18	$ 134	
Multi-family Unit	42	2.07	87	
Accessory Dwelling Unit	42	1.00	42	
Nonresidential				
Commercial	$ 13	2.41	$ 31	$ 0.031
Office	13	2.87	37	0.037
Industrial (Small)	13	0.64	8	0.008
Industrial (Large)				
Manufacturing	13	0.92	12	0.012
Distribution	13	0.37	5	0.005
Warehouse	13	0.18	2	0.002

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

Sources: Tables 2.2 and 5.3.

6. Detention

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

Service Population

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

Table 6.1 shows the estimated service population in 2016 and 2045. The demand for countywide detention facilities is primarily related to the demands that residents and businesses place on the County's judicial system. While specific data is not available to estimate the actual ratio of demand per resident to demand by businesses (per worker) for this service, it is reasonable to assume that demand for these services is less for one employee compared to one resident, because nonresidential buildings are typically occupied less intensively than dwelling units. The 0.31-weighting factor for workers is based on a 40-hour workweek divided by the total number of non-work hours in a week (128) and reflects the degree to which nonresidential development yields a lesser demand for countywide detention facilities.

Table 6.1: Detention Facilities Service Population

	Residents	Workers	Service Population
Existing - Countywide (2016)	533,800	181,800	590,200
New Development - Countywide (2016-2045)	338,400	58,900	356,700
Total - Countywide (2045)	872,200	240,700	946,900
Weighting factor[1]	1.00	0.31	

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

Sources: Table 2.1, Willdan Financial Services.

Facility Standards

As noted in the *Introduction*, this study uses the existing inventory method to calculate facilities standards for countywide detention facilities. **Table 6.2** presents an inventory of detention facilities in Stanislaus County. An inventory of vehicles and equipment can be found in **Appendix Table A.4**. An inventory of technological assets can be found in **Appendix Table A.11**. Total value for all existing facilities is approximately $202.6 million.

Table 6.2: Detention Facilities Existing Facilities

Facility	Inventory	Unit Cost[1]	Total Value
Land			
Juvenile Justice Center, 2215 Blue Gum Road, Modesto	34.36 acres	$ 50,000	$ 1,718,000
Downtown Jail, Modesto	0.86 acres	653,400	561,900
Public Safety Center 200-442 Hackett Road, Modesto	97.31 acres	50,000	4,865,500
Subtotal - Land	132.53 acres		$ 7,145,400
Buildings			
Juvenile Commitment Center, 2215 Blue Gum Avenue, Modesto	47,207 sq. ft.	$ 206	$ 9,724,600
Juvenile Justice Center, 2215 Blue Gum Avenue, Modesto	78,908 sq. ft.	206	16,255,000
Juvenile Justice Center Human Resources Office, 2215 Blue Gum Ave.	2,160 sq. ft.	206	445,000
Juvenile Justice Center Training Building A, 2215 Blue Gum Ave.	2,160 sq. ft.	206	445,000
Jail Immediate Action Plan -- Units A-G	148,220 sq. ft.	370	54,841,400
Unit One (Minimum Security Housing)	34,350 sq. ft.	370	12,709,500
Jail Unit Two	28,753 sq. ft.	370	10,638,600
Downtown Men's Jail	53,206 sq. ft.	370	19,686,200
Re-Entry and Enhanced Alterntives to Custody Training (REACT)	56,102 sq. ft.	206	11,557,000
Public Safety Center Jail Expansion-Max Sec-Med/MH Hsng	137,276 sq. ft.	370	50,792,100
Public Safety Center Intake/Release/Transportation	33,645 sq. ft.	206	6,930,900
Subtotal - Buildings	621,987 sq. ft.		$ 194,025,300
Vehicles and Equipment (from Table A.4)			$ 276,202
Technology (from Table A.11)			$ 43,606
Existing PFF Fund Balance[2]			$ 1,120,600
Total Existing Facilities			$ 202,611,107

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

[2] Current as of December 31, 2016. Rounded to the hundreds.

Sources: Stanislaus County; Tables 2.3, A.4 and A.11, Willdan Financial Services.

Table 6.3 shows current per capita investment in detention facilities. This value was calculated by dividing the existing investment in detention facilities by the current service population. The cost per resident is $343, and the cost per worker is $106.

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

Total Value Existing Facilities	$ 202,611,107
2016 Service Population	590,200
Cost Per Capita	$ 343
Cost Per Resident	$ 343
Cost Per Worker[1]	106

[1] Workers weighted at 0.31 of residents.

Sources: Tables 6.1 and 6.2.

Use of Fee Revenues

The County can use detention facilities fee revenues for the construction or purchase of new buildings, land, vehicles, or equipment that expand the capacity of the existing system to serve new development. Fee revenues may not be used for replacement of aging facilities. Projects currently being evaluated that would be eligible for funding include expansion of the Public Safety Center and/or expansion of the Juvenile Justice Detention facilities. The inclusion of technological assets in the facility inventory will allow fee revenue to be spent on technology related to detention facilities. **Table 6.4** displays projected fee revenue through 2045.

Table 6.4: Projected Detention Facilities Fee Revenue - Existing Standard

Facility System Cost Per Capita	$ 343
Service Population Growth Within County (2016-2045)	356,700
New Development Contribution to Planned Facilities	$ 122,348,100

Sources: Tables 6.1 and 6.3.

Fee Schedule

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

Table 6.5: Detention Facilities Impact Fees - Existing Inventory Standard

Land Use	*A* Cost Per Capita	*B* Density	*C = A x B* Fee[1]	*D = C / 1,000* Fee per Sq. Ft.
Residential				
Single Family Unit	$ 343	3.18	$ 1,091	
Multi-family Unit	343	2.07	710	
Accessory Dwelling Unit	343	1.00	343	
Nonresidential				
Commercial	$ 106	2.41	$ 255	$ 0.26
Office	106	2.87	304	0.30
Industrial (Small)	106	0.64	68	0.07
Industrial (Large)				
Manufacturing	106	0.92	98	0.10
Distribution	106	0.37	39	0.04
Warehouse	106	0.18	19	0.02

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

Sources: Tables 2.2 and 6.3.

7. Emergency Services

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

Service Population

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

Table 7.1 shows the estimated service population in 2016 and 2045. The demand for emergency facilities is related to the demands that both residents and businesses place on the County's emergency response system. While specific data is not available to estimate the actual ratio of demand per resident to demand by businesses (per worker) for this service, it is reasonable to assume that demand for these services is less for one employee compared to one resident, because nonresidential buildings are typically occupied less intensively than dwelling units. The 0.31-weighting factor for workers is based on a 40-hour workweek divided by the total number of non-work hours in a week (128) and reflects the degree to which nonresidential development yields a lesser demand for emergency services facilities.

Table 7.1: Emergency Services Facilities Service Population

	Residents	Workers	Service Population
Existing (2016)	533,800	181,800	590,200
New Development (2016-2045)	338,400	58,900	356,700
Total (2045)	872,200	240,700	946,900
Weighting factor[1]	1.00	0.31	

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

Sources: Table 2.1, Willdan Financial Services.

Facility Standards

This study uses the existing inventory standard to calculate fees for emergency services facilities. **Table 7.2** shows the existing inventory of emergency services facilities, including land, building, vehicles, equipment and technological assets. An inventory of vehicles and equipment can be found in **Appendix Table A.5**. An inventory of technological assets can be found in **Appendix Table A.11**. The total value of all existing emergency services facilities is approximately $2.9 million.

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

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

Operational costs for Regional 911 are based on a population model that assigns 64 percent of costs to the City of Modesto and 36 percent of costs to the County (which represents the County and its contract cities of Hughson, Patterson, Riverbank, Waterford, and Newman).

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

Table 7.2: Emergency Services Facilities Existing Inventory

	Amount	Units	Unit Cost[1]	Value
Land (acres)				
3705 Oakdale Road	0.84	acres	$522,720	$ 439,000
Subtotal - Land	0.84	acres		$ 439,000
Buildings (square feet)				
Office of Emergency Services	4,000	sq. f.t	$ 206	$ 824,000
County Share of Emergency Dispatch (36%)	2,880	sq. f.t	206	593,280
Subtotal - Buildings	6,880	sq. f.t		$ 1,417,280
Vehicles & Equipment *(from Table A.5)*				$ 862,245
Technology *(from Table A.11)*				$ 134,341
Existing PFF Fund Balance[2]				$ 82,400
Total Existing Facilities				$ 2,935,266

[1] Unit costs based on market value.

[2] Current as of December 31, 2016. Rounded to the hundreds.

Sources: Stanislaus County; Tables 2.3, A.5 and A.11, Willdan Financial Services.

Table 7.3 shows current per capita investment in emergency services facilities. This value was calculated by dividing the existing investment in emergency services facilities by the current service population. The cost per capita is $5.

Table 7.3: Emergency Services Facilities - Existing Standard

Existing Emergency Services Facilities	$ 2,935,266
Existing Service Population	590,200
Facility Standard per Capita	$ 5
Cost per Resident	$ 5
Cost per Worker[1]	2

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

Sources: Tables 7.1 and 7.2.

Use of Fee Revenues

The County can use emergency services facilities fee revenues for the construction or purchase of new buildings, land, vehicles, or equipment that expand the capacity of the existing system to serve new development. Fee revenues may not be used for replacement of aging facilities. The inclusion of technological assets in the facility inventory will allow fee revenue to be spent on technology related to emergency services. **Table 7.4** displays projected fee revenue through 2045.

Table 7.4: Projected Fee Revenue - Emergency Services Facilities

Facility Standard per Capita	$ 5
Service Population Growth Within County (2016-2045)	356,700
New Development Fair Share of Planned Facilities	$ 1,783,500

Sources: Tables 7.1 and 7.3; Willdan Financial Services.

Fee Schedule

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

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

Land Use	*A* Cost Per Capita	*B* Density	*C = A x B* Fee[1]	*D = C / 1,000* Fee per Sq. Ft.
Residential				
Single Family	$ 5	3.18	$ 16	
Multifamily	5	2.07	10	
Accessory Dwelling Unit	5	1.00	5	
Nonresidential				
Commercial	$ 2	2.41	$ 5	$ 0.005
Office	2	2.87	6	0.006
Industrial (Small)	2	0.64	1	0.001
Industrial (Large)				
Manufacturing	2	0.92	2	0.002
Distribution	2	0.37	1	0.001
Warehouse	2	0.18	0.40	0.000

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

Sources: Tables 2.2 and 7.3; Willdan Financial Services.

8. Health Facilities

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

Service Population

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

Table 8.1 shows the estimated service population in 2016 and 2045. The demand for health facilities is related to the demands that both residents and businesses place on the County's healthcare system. While specific data is not available to estimate the actual ratio of demand per resident to demand by businesses (per worker) for this service, it is reasonable to assume that demand for these services is less for one employee compared to one resident, because nonresidential buildings are typically occupied less intensively than dwelling units. The 0.31-weighting factor for workers is based on a 40-hour workweek divided by the total number of non-work hours in a week (128) and reflects the degree to which nonresidential development yields a lesser demand for health facilities.

Table 8.1: Health Facilities Service Population

	Residents	Workers	Service Population
Existing (2016)	533,800	181,800	590,200
New Development (2016-2045)	338,400	58,900	356,700
Total (2045)	872,200	240,700	946,900
Weighting factor[1]	1.00	0.31	

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

Sources: Table 2.1, Willdan Financial Services.

Facility Standards

This study uses the existing inventory method to calculate impact fees for health facilities (see *Introduction* for further information). **Table 8.2** shows the existing inventory of health facilities owned by Stanislaus County. An inventory of vehicles and equipment can be found in **Appendix Table A.6**. An inventory of technological assets can be found in **Appendix Table A.11**. The total value of existing health facilities is approximately $65.3 million.

Table 8.2: Health Facilities Existing Inventory

	Amount	Units	Unit Cost[1]	Value
Land (acres)				
County Center II, 700-1020 Scenic Dr	14.10	acres	$ 653,400	$ 9,213,000
County Center III - Health Services Agency	2.84	acres	522,720	1,485,000
Subtotal - Land	16.94	acres		$ 10,698,000
Buildings (square feet)				
County Center II				
Administration Offices	35,570	sq. ft.	$ 206	$ 7,327,000
Clinic/Medical Offices	148,187	sq. ft.	206	30,527,000
Shop/Warehouse	17,320	sq. ft.	206	3,568,000
Subtotal - Buildings	201,077	sq. ft.		$ 41,422,000
County Center III	17,266	sq. ft.	$ 206	$ 3,557,000
Vehicles & Equipment *(from Table A.6)*				$ 477,853
Technology *(from Table A.11)*				$ 4,612,921
Existing PFF Fund Balance[2]				$ 4,512,500
Total Value - Existing Facilities				$ 65,280,274

[1] Unit costs based on market value.

[2] Current as of December 31, 2016. Rounded to the hundreds.

Sources: Stanislaus County; Table 2.3, A.6, A.11, Willdan Financial Services.

Table 8.3 shows current per capita investment in health facilities. This value was calculated by dividing the existing investment in emergency services facilities by the current service population. The cost per capita is $111.

Table 8.3: Health Facilities - Existing Standard

Existing Health Facilities	$	65,280,274
Existing Service Population		590,200
Facility Standard per Capita	$	111
Cost per Resident	$	111
Cost per Worker[1]		34

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

Sources: Tables 8.1 and 8.2.

Use of Fee Revenues

The County can use health facilities fee revenue for the construction or purchase of new buildings, land, vehicles, or equipment that expand the capacity of the existing system to serve new development. Fee revenues may not be used for replacement of aging facilities or equipment or to otherwise correct existing deficiencies unrelated to new development. The inclusion of technological assets in the facility inventory will allow fee revenue to be spent on technology related to health services. **Table 8.4** shows an estimate of health impact fee revenue through 2045.

Table 8.4: Projected Health Facilities Fee Revenue - Existing Standard

Facility Standard per Capita	$	111
Service Population Growth Within County (2016-2045)		356,700
New Development Fair Share of Planned Facilities	$	39,593,700

Sources: Tables 8.1 and 8.3; Willdan Financial Services.

Fee Schedule

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

Table 8.5: Health Facilities Impact Fee - Existing Facilities Standard

Land Use	*A* Cost Per Capita	*B* Density	*C = A x B* Fee[1]	*D = C / 1,000* Fee per Sq. Ft.
Residential				
Single Family	$ 111	3.18	$ 353	
Multifamily	111	2.07	230	
Accessory Dwelling Unit	111	1.00	111	
Nonresidential				
Commercial	$ 34	2.41	$ 82	$ 0.082
Office	34	2.87	98	0.098
Industrial (Small)	34	0.64	22	0.022
Industrial (Large)				
Manufacturing	34	0.92	31	0.031
Distribution	34	0.37	13	0.013
Warehouse	34	0.18	6	0.006

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

Sources: Tables 2.2 and 8.3.

9. Library Facilities

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

Service Population

Residents are the primary users of libraries. Therefore, demand for library facilities is based on the County's residential population and excludes workers. Stanislaus County provides library services countywide. Therefore, the fee is charged to new residential development countywide. **Table 9.1** shows the service population for library facilities for both 2016 and 2045.

Table 9.1: Library Facilities Service Population

	Residents
Existing (2016)	533,800
New Development (2016-2045)	338,500
Total - Countywide (2045)	872,300

Source: Table 2.1, Willdan Financial Services.

Facility Standards

This study uses the existing inventory method to calculate fee schedules for library facilities (see *Introduction* for further information). **Table 9.2** presents an inventory of existing library facilities, including land, buildings, vehicles, equipment and collections, in Stanislaus County. An inventory of collections can be found in **Appendix Table A.7.** An inventory of vehicles can be found in **Appendix Table A.8**. An inventory of technological assets can be found in **Appendix Table A.11**. The total existing value of library facilities is approximately $58.5 million.

Table 9.2: Existing Library Facilities

Existing Facilities	Amount	Units	Unit Cost[1]	Total Value
Land				
1305 Kern Street, Newman Branch Library	0.29	acres	$ 50,000	$ 14,500
1500 I Street, Modesto Main Library	1.69	acres	653,400	1,104,200
151 South 1st Street, Oakdale Branch Library	0.23	acres	522,720	120,200
324 E Street, Waterford Branch Library	0.14	acres	50,000	7,000
3442 Santa Fe Avenue, Riverbank Branch Library	0.22	acres	522,720	115,000
46-48 West Salida, Patterson Branch Library	0.14	acres	50,000	7,000
4835 Sisk Road, Nick W. Blom Salida Regional Library	4.95	acres	653,400	3,234,300
550 Minaret Avenue, Turlock Branch Library	1.46	acres	522,720	763,200
18 South Abie Street, Empire Community Center	0.96	acres	50,000	48,000
Subtotal	10.08	acres		$ 5,413,400
Buildings				
Empire Branch Library, 18 South Abie Street, Empire	4,300	sq. ft.	206	885,800
Keyes Branch Library, 5506 Jennie, Keyes	7,400	sq. ft.	206	1,524,400
Modesto Main Library, 1500 I Street, Modesto	62,000	sq. ft.	206	12,772,000
Newman Branch Library, 1305 Kern Street, Newman	2,613	sq. ft.	206	538,300
Oakdale Branch Library, 151 South 1st Street, Oakdale	6,500	sq. ft.	206	1,339,000
Patterson Branch Library, 46-48 West Salida, Patterson	6,800	sq. ft.	206	1,400,800
Riverbank Branch Library, 3442 Santa Fe Avenue, Riverbank	3,594	sq. ft.	206	740,400
Salida Branch Library, 4835 Sisk Road, Salida	61,000	sq. ft.	206	12,566,000
Turlock Branch Library, 550 Minaret Avenue, Turlock	10,000	sq. ft.	206	2,060,000
Waterford Branch Library, 324 E Street, Waterford	3,000	sq. ft.	206	618,000
Subtotal	167,207	sq. ft.		$ 34,444,700
Collections *(from Table A.7)*				$ 16,676,120
Computer Equipment *(from Table A.11)*				$ 922,199
Vehicles *(from Table A.8)*				$ 80,236
Existing Library Impact Fee (PFF) Fund Balance[2]				$ 968,400
Total Value Existing Facilities				$ 58,505,055

[1] Unit costs based on market value.
[2] Current as of December 31, 2016. Rounded to the hundreds.

Sources: Stanislaus County; Tables 2.3, A.7, A.8 and A.11, Willdan Financial Services.

Table 9.3 shows current per capita investment in library facilities. This value was calculated by dividing the existing investment in library facilities by the current service population. The cost per capita is $110.

Table 9.3: Library Facilities - Existing Standard

Existing Library Facilities	$	58,505,055
Existing Service Population		533,800
Facility Standard per Capita	$	110
Cost per Resident	$	110

Sources: Tables 9.1 and 9.2.

Use of Fee Revenues

The County can use library facilities fee revenues for the construction or purchase of new buildings, land, vehicles, volumes, or equipment that expand the capacity of the existing system to serve new development. Fee revenues may not be used for replacement of aging facilities or equipment or to otherwise correct existing deficiencies unrelated to new development. The inclusion of technological assets in the facility inventory will allow fee revenue to be spent on technology related to library services. **Table 9.4** shows an estimate of library impact fee revenue through 2045.

Table 9.4: Projected Library Facility Fee Revenue - Existing Standard

Facility Standard per Capita	$	110
Service Population Growth Within County (2016-2045)		338,500
New Development Fair Share of Planned Facilities	$	37,235,000

Sources: Tables 9.1 and 9.3.

Fee Schedule

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

Table 9.5: Library Facilities Impact Fee - Existing Facilities Standard

Land Use	*A* Cost Per Capita	*B* Density	*C = A x B* Fee[1]
Residential			
Single Family	$ 110	3.18	$ 350
Multifamily	110	2.07	228
Accessory Dwelling Unit	110	1.00	110

[1] Fee per dwelling unit.

Sources: Tables 2.2 and 9.3.

10. Other County Facilities

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

Service Population

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

Table 10.1: Other County Facilities Service Population

	Residents	Workers	Service Population
Countywide			
Existing (2016)	533,800	181,800	590,200
New Development (2016-2045)	338,400	58,900	356,700
Total (2045) - Countywide	872,200	240,700	946,900
Unincorporated			
Existing (2016)	112,100	45,600	126,200
New Development (2016-2045)	71,100	12,300	74,900
Total (2045) - Unincorporated	183,200	57,900	201,100
Weighting factor[1]	1.00	0.31	

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

Sources: Table 2.1, Willdan Financial Services.

Facility Inventories

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

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

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

Table 10.4 summarizes the allocation of other county facilities to countywide and unincorporated service populations.

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

Table 10.2a: Other County Facilities Existing Inventory - Land

	Amount	Units	Unit Cost[1]	Value
Land				
Tenth Street Place, 1010 10th Street	0.08	acres	$ 653,400	$ 52,000
Tenth Street Place, 1010 10th Street	0.56	acres	653,400	366,000
Tenth Street Place, 1010 10th Street	0.73	acres	653,400	477,000
County Center II - Community Services Agency	0.07	acres	653,400	46,000
County Center II - General Services Agency - Print Shop	0.47	acres	653,400	307,000
Agricultural Center 3800 Cornucopia Way, Modesto	15.58	acres	50,000	779,000
Burbank-Paradise Hall, 1325 Beverly Drive	0.11	acres	70,000	8,000
Morgan Road - Public Works Yard, 1716 Morgan Road	14.96	acres	50,000	748,000
Public Works Yard, 301 South First Str	1.29	acres	50,000	65,000
Landfill, 400 Fink Road (Dry Land)	122.56	acres	2,500	306,000
Landfill, 400 Fink Road (Buffer/Orchard)	345.00	acres	28,000	9,660,000
Former City Hall Building - 801 11th Street, Modesto	0.11	acres	653,400	72,000
Fleet Services Facility, 448 East Hackett Road	10.00	acres	50,000	500,000
Public Works Yard, 551 South Center Str	2.00	acres	50,000	100,000
Geer Road Landfill, 751 Geer Road (Dry Land)	85.19	acres	2,500	213,000
Geer Road Landfill, 751 Geer Road (Buffer/Orchard)	345.00	acres	28,000	9,660,000
Community Services Facility 3800 Cornucopia Way, Modesto	26.45	acres	50,000	1,323,000
Vacant/future Development - 3800 Cornucopia Way, Modesto	27.33	acres	50,000	1,367,000
12th Street Parking Garage, 820 12th Street	0.89	acres	653,400	582,000
1021 I Street, Modesto	0.41	acres	653,400	268,000
County Center III - Other County Facilities Share (CEO, Clerk, GSA, COE)	8.47	acres	522,720	4,427,000
12th Street Office Building, 832 12th Street	0.07	acres	653,400	46,000
Subtotal - Land	1,007.33			$ 31,372,000

[1] Unit costs based on market value.

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

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

	Amount	Units	Unit Cost[1]	Value
Buildings				
Agricultural Center Enclosed Warehouse and Shop - 3800 Cornucopia	10,854	sq. ft.	$ 206	$ 2,236,000
Agricultural Center Open Warehouse - 3800 Cornucopia	3,810	sq. ft.	206	785,000
Agricultural Center Stanislaus Building (Building A) - 3800 Cornucopia	56,315	sq. ft.	206	11,601,000
Agricultural Center Harvest Hall (Building B) - 3800 Cornucopia	12,544	sq. ft.	206	2,584,000
Agricultural Center Corporation Yard - 3800 Cornucopia	10,496	sq. ft.	206	2,162,000
Agricultural Center Warehouse (Building D) - 3800 Cornucopia	7,200	sq. ft.	206	1,483,000
Area Agency on Aging/Vets, 718 Tuolumne, Modesto - Mancini Hall	6,000	sq. ft.	206	1,236,000
Assessor, 1010 10th Street, Modesto	18,861	sq. ft.	206	3,885,000
Auditor-Controller, 1010 10th Street, Modesto	14,158	sq. ft.	206	2,916,000
Board of Supervisors, 1010 10th Street, Modesto	10,899	sq. ft.	206	2,245,000
Central Services, 1018 Scenic Drive, Modesto - Central Services	7,752	sq. ft.	206	1,597,000
Central Services, 909 Oakdale Road, Modesto - Training Center	23,544	sq. ft.	206	4,850,000
Central Services, 909 Oakdale Road, Modesto - Warehouse #1	14,400	sq. ft.	206	2,966,000
Central Services, 909 Oakdale Road, Modesto - Warehouse #2	13,600	sq. ft.	206	2,802,000
Chief Executive Office, 1010 10th Street, Modesto	22,225	sq. ft.	206	4,578,000
County Center III - Other County Facilities Share (CEO, Clerk, GSA, COE)	51,544	sq. ft.	206	10,618,000
Child Support Services, 251 E Hackett Road, Ceres	53,693	sq. ft.	206	11,061,000
Child Support Services, 801 11th Street, Modesto (former City Hall)	1,267	sq. ft.	206	261,000
Guardian Ad Litem, 801 11th Street, Modesto (former City Hall)	373	sq. ft.	206	77,000
Clerk of the Board, 1010 10th Street, Modesto	2,127	sq. ft.	206	438,000
Clerk-Recorder, 1021 I Street (former Bank of America) I Street	21,516	sq. ft.	206	4,432,000
Community Services Agency, 251 E Hackett Road, Ceres	144,970	sq. ft.	206	29,864,000
Community Services Agency, County Center II	1,000	sq. ft.	206	206,000
Cooperative Extension, 3800 Cornucopia Way	30,470	sq. ft.	206	6,277,000
County Counsel, 1010 10th Street, Modesto	9,053	sq. ft.	206	1,865,000
District Attorney, 832 12th Street	44,691	sq. ft.	206	9,206,000
Employment & Training, 251 E Hackett Road, Ceres	53,693	sq. ft.	206	11,061,000
Environmental Resources, 3800 Cornucopia Way	40,626	sq. ft.	206	8,369,000
Fleet Services, 442 E Hackett Road - Fleet Services Office/Shop	9,374	sq. ft.	206	1,931,000
Fleet Services, 442 E Hackett Road - Fleet Services Office/Shop	9,374	sq. ft.	206	1,931,000
General Services Agency Print Shop - County Center II	6,752	sq. ft.	206	1,391,000
Initial Access and Outreach Center, 825 12th Street	2,100	sq. ft.	206	433,000
Planning/Com. Dev., 1010 10th Street, Modesto	9,614	sq. ft.	206	1,980,000
Public Works, 1716 Morgan Rd. Bridge Shop	4,000	sq. ft.	206	824,000
Public Works, 1716 Morgan Rd. Carpenter/Paint Shop	2,740	sq. ft.	206	564,000
Public Works, 1716 Morgan Rd. Equipment Storage Shop	10,000	sq. ft.	206	2,060,000
Public Works, 1716 Morgan Rd. DER Office	180	sq. ft.	206	37,000
Public Works, 1716 Morgan Rd. Heavy Equipment Maintenance Shop	12,000	sq. ft.	206	2,472,000
Public Works, 1716 Morgan Rd. Household Hazardous Waste Facility	1,547	sq. ft.	206	319,000
Public Works, 1716 Morgan Rd. Public Works Office	9,504	sq. ft.	206	1,958,000
Public Works, 1716 Morgan Rd. Material Storage	5,850	sq. ft.	206	1,205,000
Public Works, 1716 Morgan Rd. Parks Pesticide Storage Facility	5,600	sq. ft.	206	1,154,000
Public Works, 1716 Morgan Rd. Pesticide Storage Facility	90	sq. ft.	206	19,000
Public Works, 1716 Morgan Rd. Sign Shop	2,500	sq. ft.	206	515,000
Public Works, 1716 Morgan Rd. Storage Building	4,836	sq. ft.	206	996,000
Public Works, 1716 Morgan Rd. Public Works Storage Building I	7,040	sq. ft.	206	1,450,000
Public Works, 1716 Morgan Rd. Combustable Liquid Storage Facility	440	sq. ft.	206	91,000
Public Works, 1716 Morgan Rd. Storage Building	64	sq. ft.	206	13,000
Public Works, 1716 Morgan Rd. Warehouse	624	sq. ft.	206	129,000
Environmental Resources, 400 Fink Road	500	sq. ft.	206	103,000
Environmental Resources, 400 Fink Road	2,500	sq. ft.	206	515,000
Environmental Resources, 400 Fink Road	800	sq. ft.	206	165,000
Environmental Resources, 400 Fink Road	1,600	sq. ft.	206	330,000
Environmental Resources, 751 Geer Road	2,500	sq. ft.	206	515,000
Public Works, 551 South Center - Public Works Office	1,600	sq. ft.	206	330,000
Public Works, 551 South Center - Public Works Shop	8,000	sq. ft.	206	1,648,000
Public Works, 551 South Center - Public Works Shop	3,000	sq. ft.	206	618,000
Public Works, 301 South First Street - Roads Modular Unit	800	sq. ft.	206	165,000
Public Works, 1010 10th Street, Modesto	14,646	sq. ft.	206	3,017,000
Strategic Business Technology, 801 11th Street	5,068	sq. ft.	206	1,044,000
Strategic Business Technology, 1021 I Street (former Bank of America)	400	sq. ft.	206	82,000
Treasurer-Tax Collector, 1010 10th Street, Modesto	16,995	sq. ft.	206	3,501,000
Subtotal - Buildings	850,317			$175,166,000

[1] Unit costs based on market value.

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

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

	Total Value	% County-wide[1]	Countywide Allocation	% Uninc. Only[1]	Uninc. Allocation
Land					
Tenth Street Place, 1010 10th Street	$ 52,000	100%	$ 52,000	0%	$ -
Tenth Street Place, 1010 10th Street	366,000	100%	366,000	0%	-
Tenth Street Place, 1010 10th Street	477,000	100%	477,000	0%	-
County Center II - Community Services Agency	46,000	100%	46,000	0%	-
County Center II - General Services Agency - Print Shop	307,000	100%	307,000	0%	-
Agricultural Center 3800 Cornucopia Way, Modesto	779,000	75%	584,250	25%	194,750
Burbank-Paradise Hall, 1325 Beverly Drive	8,000	100%	8,000	0%	-
Morgan Road - Public Works Yard, 1716 Morgan Road	748,000	0%	-	100%	748,000
Public Works Yard, 301 South First Str	65,000	0%	-	100%	65,000
Landfill, 400 Fink Road	9,966,000	100%	9,966,000	0%	-
Former City Hall Building - 801 11th Street, Modesto	72,000	100%	72,000	0%	-
Fleet Services Facility, 448 East Hackett Road	500,000	80%	400,000	20%	100,000
Public Works Yard, 551 South Center Str	100,000	0%	-	100%	100,000
Geer Road Landfill, 751 Geer Road	9,873,000	100%	9,873,000	0%	-
Community Services Facility 3800 Cornucopia Way, Modesto	1,323,000	100%	1,323,000	0%	-
Vacant/future Development - 3800 Cornucopia Way, Modesto	1,367,000	100%	1,367,000	0%	-
12th Street Parking Garage, 820 12th Street	582,000	100%	582,000	0%	-
1021 I Street, Modesto	268,000	100%	268,000	0%	-
1022 I Street, Modesto	4,427,000	100%	4,427,000	0%	-
12th Street Office Building, 832 12th Street	46,000	100%	46,000	0%	-
Subtotal - Land	$ 31,372,000		$ 30,164,250		$ 1,207,750

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

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

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

	Total Value	% County-wide[1]	Countywide Allocation	% Uninc. Only[1]	Uninc. Allocation
Buildings					
Agricultural Center Enclosed Warehouse and Shop - 3800 Cornucopia	$ 2,236,000	100%	$ 2,236,000	0%	$ -
Agricultural Center Open Warehouse - 3800 Cornucopia	785,000	100%	785,000	0%	-
Agricultural Center Stanislaus Building (Building A) - 3800 Cornucopia	11,601,000	100%	11,601,000	0%	-
Agricultural Center Harvest Hall (Building B) - 3800 Cornucopia	2,584,000	100%	2,584,000	0%	-
Agricultural Center Corporation Yard - 3800 Cornucopia	2,162,000	100%	2,162,000	0%	-
Agricultural Center Warehouse (Building D) - 3800 Cornucopia	1,483,000	100%	1,483,000	0%	-
Area Agency on Aging/Vets, 718 Tuolumne, Modesto - Mancini Hall	1,236,000	100%	1,236,000	0%	-
Assessor, 1010 10th Street, Modesto	3,885,000	100%	3,885,000	0%	-
Auditor-Controller, 1010 10th Street, Modesto	2,916,000	100%	2,916,000	0%	-
Board of Supervisors, 1010 10th Street, Modesto	2,245,000	100%	2,245,000	0%	-
Central Services, 1018 Scenic Drive, Modesto	1,597,000	80%	1,277,600	20%	319,400
Central Services, 909 Oakdale Road, Modesto - Training Center	4,850,000	80%	3,880,000	20%	970,000
Central Services, 909 Oakdale Road, Modesto - Warehouse #1	2,966,000	80%	2,372,800	20%	593,200
Central Services, 909 Oakdale Road, Modesto - Warehouse #2	2,802,000	80%	2,241,600	20%	560,400
Chief Executive Office, 1010 10th Street, Modesto	4,578,000	75%	3,433,500	25%	1,144,500
County Center III - Other County Facilities Share (CEO, Clerk, GSA, COE)	10,618,000	75%	7,963,500	25%	2,654,500
Capital Projects Office, 825 12th Street	433,000	75%	324,750	25%	108,250
Child Support Services, 251 E Hackett Road, Ceres	11,061,000	100%	11,061,000	0%	-
Child Support Services, 801 11th Street, Modesto (former City Hall)	261,000	100%	261,000	0%	-
Guardian Ad Litem, 801 11th Street, Modesto (former City Hall)	77,000	100%	77,000	0%	-
Clerk of the Board, 1010 10th Street, Modesto	438,000	100%	438,000	0%	-
Clerk-Recorder, 1021 I Street (former Bank of America) I Street	4,432,000	100%	4,432,000	0%	-
Community Services Agency, 251 E Hackett Road, Ceres	29,864,000	100%	29,864,000	0%	-
Community Services Agency, County Center II	206,000	100%	206,000	0%	-
Cooperative Extension, 3800 Cornucopia Way	6,277,000	100%	6,277,000	0%	-
County Counsel, 1010 10th Street, Modesto	1,865,000	75%	1,398,750	25%	466,250
District Attorney, 832 12th Street	9,206,000	100%	9,206,000	0%	-
Employment & Training, 251 E Hackett Road, Ceres	11,061,000	100%	11,061,000	0%	-
Environmental Resources, 3800 Cornucopia Way	8,369,000	100%	8,369,000	0%	-
Fleet Services, 442 E Hackett Road - Fleet Services Office/Shop	1,931,000	100%	1,931,000	0%	-
Fleet Services, 442 E Hackett Road - Fleet Services Office/Shop	1,931,000	100%	1,931,000	0%	-
General Services Agency Print Shop - County Center II	1,391,000	100%	1,391,000	0%	-
Planning/Com. Dev., 1010 10th Street, Modesto	1,980,000	0%	-	100%	1,980,000
Public Works, 1716 Morgan Rd. Bridge Shop	824,000	0%	-	100%	824,000
Public Works, 1716 Morgan Rd. Carpenter/Paint Shop	564,000	0%	-	100%	564,000
Public Works, 1716 Morgan Rd. Equipment Storage Shop	2,060,000	0%	-	100%	2,060,000
Public Works, 1716 Morgan Rd. DER Office	37,000	0%	-	100%	37,000
Public Works, 1716 Morgan Rd. Heavy Equipment Maintenance Shop	2,472,000	0%	-	100%	2,472,000
Public Works, 1716 Morgan Rd. Household Hazardous Waste Facility	319,000	0%	-	100%	319,000
Public Works, 1716 Morgan Rd. Public Works Office	1,958,000	0%	-	100%	1,958,000
Public Works, 1716 Morgan Rd. Material Storage	1,205,000	0%	-	100%	1,205,000
Public Works, 1716 Morgan Rd. Parks Pesticide Storage Facility	1,154,000	0%	-	100%	1,154,000
Public Works, 1716 Morgan Rd. Pesticide Storage Facility	19,000	0%	-	100%	19,000
Public Works, 1716 Morgan Rd. Sign Shop	515,000	0%	-	100%	515,000
Public Works, 1716 Morgan Rd. Storage Building	996,000	0%	-	100%	996,000
Public Works, 1716 Morgan Rd. Public Works Storage Building I	1,450,000	0%	-	100%	1,450,000
Public Works, 1716 Morgan Rd. Combustable Liquid Storage Facility	91,000	0%	-	100%	91,000
Public Works, 1716 Morgan Rd. Storage Building	13,000	0%	-	100%	13,000
Public Works, 1716 Morgan Rd. Warehouse	129,000	0%	-	100%	129,000
Environmental Resources, 400 Fink Road	103,000	40%	41,200	60%	61,800
Environmental Resources, 400 Fink Road	515,000	40%	206,000	60%	309,000
Environmental Resources, 400 Fink Road	165,000	40%	66,000	60%	99,000
Environmental Resources, 400 Fink Road	330,000	40%	132,000	60%	198,000
Environmental Resources, 751 Geer Road	515,000	40%	206,000	60%	309,000
Public Works, 551 South Center - Public Works Office	330,000	0%	-	100%	330,000
Public Works, 551 South Center - Public Works Shop	1,648,000	0%	-	100%	1,648,000
Public Works, 551 South Center - Public Works Shop	618,000	0%	-	100%	618,000
Public Works, 301 South First Street - Roads Modular Unit	165,000	0%	-	100%	165,000
Public Works, 1010 10th Street, Modesto	3,017,000	0%	-	100%	3,017,000
Strategic Business Technology, 801 11th Street	1,044,000	80%	835,200	20%	208,800
Strategic Business Technology, 1021 I Street (former Bank of America)	82,000	80%	65,600	20%	16,400
Treasurer-Tax Collector, 1010 10th Street, Modesto	3,501,000	100%	3,501,000	0%	-
Subtotal - Buildings	$175,166,000		$145,583,500		$29,582,500

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

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

Table 10.4: Summary of Allocation of Other County Facilities Between Countywide and Unincorporated Service Populations

	Countywide Allocation	Unincorporated Allocation
Land (from Table 10.3a)	$ 30,164,250	$ 1,207,750
Buildings (from Table 10.3b)	145,583,500	29,582,500
Vehicles & Equipment (from Table A.9)	6,690,097	1,304,044
Public Works Vehicles and Equipment (from Table A.10)	6,489,200	9,733,800
Technological Assets (from Table A.11)	8,409,026	-
Existing PFF Fund Balance[1]	332,000	68,100
Total Existing Investment in Other County Facilities	$ 197,668,073	$ 41,896,194

[1] Current as of December 31, 2016. Rounded to the hundreds.

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

Facility Standard

The County's projected growth in service population will create a need for additional other county facilities. The County must expand its facilities to maintain existing facility standards as new development occurs in the County. **Table 10.5** shows the calculation of the existing value per capita standard for both unincorporated and incorporated areas of the County. The value per capita in the unincorporated areas is equal to the sum of the countywide and the unincorporated only value per capita.

Table 10.5: Other County Facilities Existing Standard

Unincorporated Only		
Existing Other County Facilities	$	41,896,194
Existing Service Population		126,200
Facility Standard per Capita	$	332
Cost per Resident	$	332
Cost per Worker[1]		103
Countywide		
Existing Other County Facilities	$	197,668,073
Existing Service Population		590,200
Facility Standard per Capita	$	335
Cost per Resident	$	335
Cost per Worker[1]		104

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

Sources: Tables 10.1 and 10.4; Willdan Financial Services.

Use of Fee Revenues

The County can use other county facilities fee revenue for the construction or purchase of new buildings, land, vehicles, or equipment that expand the capacity of the existing system to serve new development. Fee revenue may not be used for replacement of aging facilities or equipment or to otherwise correct existing deficiencies unrelated to new development. The inclusion of technological assets in the facility inventory will allow fee revenue to be spent on technology related to other county services. **Table 10.6** shows the projection of countywide and unincorporated-only County fee revenue to new development based on the existing standards and the resulting cost per capita.

Table 10.6: Projected Other County Facilities Fee Revenue

Unincorporated		
Facility Standard per Capita	$	332
Service Population Growth in Unincorporated (2016-2045)		74,900
New Development Fair Share of Planned Facilities	$	24,866,800
Countywide		
Facility Standard per Capita	$	335
Service Population Growth Within County (2016-2045)		356,700
New Development Fair Share of Planned Facilities	$	119,494,500

Sources: Tables 10.1 and 10.5.

Fee Schedule

Table 10.7 displays the other county facilities fee schedule. The cost per capita is converted to a fee per unit of new development based on dwelling unit and employment densities (persons per dwelling unit or employees per 1,000 square feet of nonresidential building space).

Table 10.7: Other County Facilities Impact Fee - Existing Facilities Standard

Land Use	A Cost Per Capita	B Density	C = A x B Fee[1]	D = C / 1,000 Fee per Sq. Ft.
Countywide				
Residential				
Single Family	$ 335	3.18	$ 1,065	
Multifamily	335	2.07	693	
Accessory Dwelling Unit	335	1.00	335	
Nonresidential				
Commercial	$ 104	2.41	$ 251	$ 0.25
Office	104	2.87	298	0.30
Industrial (Small)	104	0.64	67	0.07
Industrial (Large)				
Manufacturing	104	0.92	96	0.10
Distribution	104	0.37	38	0.04
Warehouse	104	0.18	19	0.02
Unincorporated Only				
Residential				
Single Family	$ 332	3.18	$ 1,056	
Multifamily	332	2.07	687	
Accessory Dwelling Unit	332	1.00	332	
Nonresidential				
Commercial	$ 103	2.41	$ 248	$ 0.25
Office	103	2.87	296	0.30
Industrial (Small)	103	0.64	66	0.07
Industrial (Large)				
Manufacturing	103	0.92	95	0.10
Distribution	103	0.37	38	0.04
Warehouse	103	0.18	19	0.02
Unincorporated Total				
Residential				
Single Family	$ 667	3.18	$ 2,121	
Multifamily	667	2.07	1,381	
Accessory Dwelling Unit	667	1.00	667	
Nonresidential				
Commercial	$ 207	2.41	$ 499	$ 0.50
Office	207	2.87	594	0.59
Industrial (Small)	207	0.64	132	0.13
Industrial (Large)				
Manufacturing	207	0.92	190	0.19
Distribution	207	0.37	77	0.08
Warehouse	207	0.18	37	0.04

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

Sources: Tables 2.2 and 10.5, Willdan Financial Services.

11. Park Facilities

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

Service Population

Residents are the primary users of parks and open space facilities. Therefore, demand for parks and associated facilities are based on the County's residential population and exclude workers. **Table 11.1** provides estimates of the current resident population and a forecast for the year 2045. Because some neighborhood parks exclusively serve the unincorporated area, the countywide and unincorporated-only service populations are both shown in Table 11.1.

Table 11.1: Parks Service Population

	Residents
Existing - Countywide (2016)	533,800
New Development - Countywide (2016-2045)	338,400
Projected Total - Countywide (2045)	872,200
Existing - Unincorporated (2016)	112,100
New Development - Unincorporated (2016-2045)	71,100
Projected Total - Unincorporated (2045)	183,200

Source: Table 2.1, Willdan Financial Services.

Facility Standards

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

Table 11.2: Existing Parkland Inventory

Park Category	Location	Improved Acres	Unimproved Acres
Neighborhood Parks			
Atlas Park	Oakdale	0.13	-
Basso Bridge	La Grange	8.00	-
Bonita Pool and Park	Crowslanding	1.02	-
Bonita Ranch Park	Keyes	10.58	-
Burbank Park	West Modesto	0.73	-
Country Stone Park	Salida	5.13	-
Empire Park	Empire	6.05	-
Empire Tot Lot	Empire	0.16	-
Fairview Park	South Modesto	4.66	-
Hatch Neighborhood Park	Keyes	4.48	
L. Fitzsimmons Park	Grayson	0.52	-
Mono Park	Airport District	2.25	-
Murphy Park	Salida	4.24	-
Oregon Park	Airport District	1.60	-
Parklawn	South Modesto MAC	3.99	-
Riverdale Park & Fishing Access	Riverdale	2.00	-
Salida (Broadway) Park	Salida	2.09	-
Segesta Park	Salida	9.35	-
Sterling Ranch	Denair	4.20	-
Undeveloped Salida Park	Salida	-	11.79
United Community Park	Grayson	4.93	-
Wincanton Park	Salida	2.27	-
Subtotal Neighborhood Parks		78.38	11.79
Regional Parks / Open Space			
Fox Grove Fishing Access	Hughson	-	32.47
Frank Raines OHV Park	Patterson	764.90	1,121.55
Kawanis Youth Camp	La Grange	48.04	-
LaGrange OHV Park	La Grange	149.12	-
LaGrange Dredge	La Grange	-	15.33
La Grange Regional Park	La Grange	-	484.36
La Grange Historic Barn	La Grange	-	0.49
La Grange Jail and Museum	La Grange	-	0.85
La Grange School/Cemetery	La Grange	3.63	-
Laird Park	Honor Farm	98.96	-
Las Palmas Fishing Access	East Patterson	4.59	-
Minear Day Use Area	Patterson	-	937.83
Modesto Reservoir	Modesto Res.		1,125.36
Shiloh Fishing Access	Westside	-	1.43
Turlock Lake Fishing Access	Turlock Lake	-	-
Woodward Reservoir	Oakdale/Valley Home	-	2,982.03
Subtotal Regional Parks / Open Space		1,069.24	6,701.70
Total		1,147.62	6,713.49

Source: Stanislaus County.

Unit Costs

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

The unit costs used to estimate the total investment in parkland facilities are shown in **Table 11.3**. Land acquisition costs and improvement costs are based on the County's experience with park development. An inventory of vehicles and equipment can be found in **Appendix Table A.12**. An inventory of technological assets can be found in **Appendix Table A.11**.

Table 11.3: Parkland Unit Costs

	Building SF	Unit Cost	Total Cost	Cost Per Acre
Regional / Open Space - Countywide Park Improvements/Special Use Facilities				
Buildings				
Fox Grove Regional Park, 1200 Geer Road	1,500	$ 206	$ 309,000	
Frank Raines Park, Del Puerto Canyon Road	13,573	206	2,796,000	
La Grange Regional Park, 161 South Old LaGrange Road	600	206	123,600	
Modesto Reservoir, 18143 Reservoir Road	9,203	206	1,895,800	
Woodward Reservoir, 14528 26 Mile Road	10,973	206	2,260,400	
Subtotal	35,849		$ 7,384,800	
Vehicles and Equipment *(Table A.12)*			$ 2,755,611	
Technology *(from Table A.11)*			76,902	
Total Special Use Facilities			$10,217,313	
Equivalent Improved Park Acres			2,375.61	
Special Use Facilities Cost per Improved Acre				$ 4,000
Regional Park Improvements				16,520
Regional Park Improvements Per Acre Subtotal				$ 20,520
Neighborhood - Unincorporated Park Improvements				
Buildings				
Bonita Pool, Crows Landing	1,000	$ 206	$ 206,000	
Subtotal			$ 206,000	
Equivalent Improved Park Acres			81.22	
Special Use Facilities Cost per Improved Acre				$ 3,000
Neighborhood Park Improvements				220,280
Park Improvements Per Acre Subtotal				$ 223,280

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

To calculate new development's need for new parks, a ratio expressed in terms of developed park acres per 1,000 residents is used, known as a park standard. To compare all parkland in the system, the undeveloped park acres must be converted into an equivalent amount of improved acres. This conversion is based on the cost of an unimproved acre relative to an improved acre and is displayed in **Table 11.4.**

Table 11.4: Unimproved Acreage - Parkland Equivalent

Parkland Type	Calculation		
Neighborhood Parks - Unincorporated			
Average Land Cost per Acre	*A*	$	70,000
Improvements Cost per Acre	*C*		220,280
Total Cost per Acre	*C = A + B*	$	290,280
Equivalent Improved Acres	*D = A / C*		0.24
Number of Unimproved Acres	*E*		11.79
Equivalent Improved Acres	*F = D x E*		2.84
Regional Parks / Open Space - Countywide			
Average Land Cost per Acre	*G*	$	4,000
Improvements Cost per Acre	*H*		16,520
Total Cost per Acre	*I = G + H*	$	20,520
Equivalent Improved Acres	*J = G / I*		0.19
Number of Unimproved Acres	*K*		6,701.70
Equivalent Improved Acres	*L = J x K*		1,306.37

Sources: Table 11.2 and 11.3, Willdan Financial Services.

Table 11.5 shows the existing equivalent park standard per 1,000 residents for the current service population. The standard for unincorporated area neighborhood parks is calculated separately from the countywide regional parks and open space standard.

Table 11.5: County Parks and Open Space Facility - Existing Standards

	Calculation	Neighborhood Parks - Unincorporated	Regional Parks / Open Space - Countywide
Improved Park Acreage	*A*	78.38	1,069.24
Equivalent Improved Acres	*B*	2.84	1,306.37
Total Acres of Improved Parkland	*C = A + B*	81.22	2,375.61
Service Population (Residents)	*D*	112,100	533,800
Existing Standard (Acres per 1,000 Residents)	*E = C / (D/1,000)*	0.72	4.45

Sources: Tables 11.1, 11.2 and 11.4, Willdan Financial Services.

Table 11.6 calculates cost of needed facilities to serve new development. This is done in two steps: first, the facility standard is multiplied by the projected growth to determine the acreage needed by 2045 to serve the projected growth; then the unit costs from Table 11.3 are multiplied

by the needed acreage to determine the total cost of needed facilities to accommodate new development.

Table 11.6: Park Facilities to Accommodate New Development

	Neighborhood Parks	Regional Parks / Open Space
Parkland and Improvements (Mitigation Fee Act)		
Facility Standard (acres/1,000 residents)	0.72	4.45
Resident Growth (2016-2045)	71,100	338,400
Facility Needs (acres)	51.19	1,505.88
Average Land Cost (per acre)	$ 70,000	$ 4,000
Subtotal - Land Costs	3,583,000	6,024,000
Average Improvements Cost (per acre)	$ 223,280	$ 20,520
Subtotal - Improvements Costs	$ 11,430,000	$ 30,901,000
Total Cost of Facilities	$ 15,013,000	$ 36,925,000

Sources: Tables 11.1, 11.3, 11.4 and 11.5, Willdan Financial Services.

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

Table 11.7: Park Facilities Investment Per Capita

	Calculation	Land Acquisition	Improvements
Neighborhood Parks - Unincorporated			
Parkland Investment (per acre)	*A*	$ 70,000	$ 223,280
Facility Standard (acres per 1,000 residents)	*B*	0.72	0.72
Total Cost Per 1,000 capita	*C = A x B*	$ 50,000	$ 161,000
Cost Per Resident	*D = C / 1,000*	$ 50	$ 161
Regional Parks / Open Space - Countywide			
Parkland Investment (per acre)	*E*	$ 4,000	$ 20,520
Facility Standard (acres per 1,000 residents)	*F*	4.45	4.45
Total Cost Per 1,000 capita	*G = E x F*	$ 18,000	$ 91,000
Cost Per Resident	*H = G / 1,000*	$ 18	$ 91

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

Use of Fee Revenues

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

As shown in **Table 11.6** above, new development's fair share of planned parks facilities is $15 million for neighborhood parks and $36.9 million for regional parks and open space through 2045.

Fee Schedule

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

Table 11.8: Park Facilities Impact Fee

Land Use	A Cost Per Capita	B Density	C=AxB Fee[1]
Neighborhood Parks - Unincorporated			
Single Family			
Land Acquisition	$ 50	3.18	$ 159
Improvements	161	3.18	512
Total			$ 671
Multifamily			
Land Acquisition	$ 50	2.07	$ 104
Improvements	161	2.07	333
Total			$ 437
Accessory Dwelling Unit			
Land Acquisition	$ 50	1.00	$ 50
Improvements	161	1.00	161
Total			$ 211
Regional Parks / Open Space - Countywide			
Single Family			
Land Acquisition	$ 18	3.18	$ 57
Improvements	91	3.18	289
Total			$ 346
Multifamily			
Land Acquisition	$ 18	2.07	$ 37
Improvements	91	2.07	188
Total			$ 225
Accessory Dwelling Unit			
Land Acquisition	$ 18	1.00	$ 18
Improvements	91	1.00	91
Total			$ 109

[1] Fee per dwelling unit.

Sources: Tables 2.2 and 11.7.

12. Sheriff Patrol and investigation

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

Service Population

Both residents and workers in unincorporated portions of Stanislaus County benefit from services provided by the sheriff department. Therefore, demand for sheriff patrol and investigation facilities is based on the County's combined unincorporated residential and worker populations. While specific data is not available to estimate the actual ratio of demand per resident to demand by businesses (per worker) for this service, it is reasonable to assume that demand for these services is less for one employee compared to one resident, because nonresidential buildings are typically occupied less intensively than dwelling units. The 0.31-weighting factor for workers is based on a 40-hour workweek divided by the total number of non-work hours in a week (128) and reflects the degree to which nonresidential development yields a lesser demand for sheriff patrol and investigation facilities. **Table 12.1** provides estimates of the resident and worker populations in the unincorporated areas of the County with forecasts for the year 2045.

Table 12.1: Sheriff Patrol and Investigation Service Population

	Residents	Workers	Service Population
Existing - Unincorporated (2016)	112,100	45,600	126,200
New Development - Unincorporated (2016-2045)	71,100	12,300	74,900
Total - Unincorporated Countywide (2045)	183,200	57,900	201,100
Weighting factor[1]	1.00	0.31	

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

Sources: Table 2.1, Willdan Financial Services.

Facility Standards

The sheriff patrol and investigation fee uses the existing standard to calculate the impact fees for sheriff patrol and investigation facilities. This standard is based on the current investment per capita in sheriff patrol and investigation facilities in Stanislaus County. **Table 12.2** presents a complete inventory of existing facilities. Vehicles currently owned by the Stanislaus County Sheriff Department are listed in **Appendix Table A.13.** An inventory of technological assets can be found in **Appendix Table A.11**.

Table 12.2: Sheriff Patrol and Investigation Existing Facility Inventory

Existing Facilities	Inventory		Unit Cost[1]	Total Value
Land				
Former City Hall Building (801 11th St)	0.10	acres	$ 653,400	$ 65,340
Public Safety Center (Sheriff Operations) - 200 - 442 Hackett	2.69	acres	50,000	134,500
County Center III - 909 - 939 County Center III Drive, Modesto	0.58	acres	522,720	303,178
County Center III - Coroner	4.22	acres	522,720	2,205,878
Subtotal	7.59	acres		$ 2,708,896
Buildings				
Equestrian Center	755	sq. ft.	$ 206	$ 155,500
Public Safety Center Support Services Building	44,450	sq. ft.	206	9,156,700
Sheriff Information Technology Office	4,800	sq. ft.	206	988,800
Canine Unit	896	sq. ft.	206	184,600
Equestrian Unit Building B	755	sq. ft.	206	155,500
Bureau of Administrative Services	2,160	sq. ft.	206	445,000
Sheriff Storage Modular	720	sq. ft.	206	148,300
Sheriff's Storage Modular #2	1,440	sq. ft.	206	296,600
Evidence Bunker	988	sq. ft.	206	203,500
Sheriff's Operations Center	41,616	sq. ft.	206	8,572,900
County Center III - Coroner	25,720	sq. ft.	206	5,298,300
Subtotal	124,300	sq. ft.		$ 25,605,700
Vehicles & Equipment (from Table A.13)				$ 11,497,090
Technology (from Table A.11)				$ 2,682,022
Existing PFF Fund Balance[2]				$ 345,600
Total Existing Facilities				$ 42,839,308

[1] Unit costs based on current market value estimates provided by Stanislaus County.

[2] Current as of December 31, 2016. Rounded to the hundreds.

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

Table 12.3 shows per capita costs for sheriff patrol and investigation based on existing facilities for the 2016 service population. The value of all existing facilities is divided by the current service population to determine an existing cost per capita.

Table 12.3: Sheriff Patrol and Investigation Facilities Existing Standard

Existing Sheriff Patrol and Investigation Facilities	$	42,839,308
Existing Service Population		126,200
Facility Standard per Capita	$	339
Cost per Resident	$	339
Cost per Worker[1]		105

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

Sources: Tables 12.1 and 12.2; Willdan Financial Services.

Use of Fee Revenues

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

Table 12.4 shows an estimate of sheriff patrol and investigation impact fee revenue through 2045.

Table 12.4: Projected Sheriff Facilities Fee Revenue - Existing Standard

Facility Standard per Capita	$	339
Service Population Growth in Unincorporated (2016-2045)		74,900
New Development Fair Share of Planned Facilities	$	25,391,100

Sources: Tables 12.1 and 12.3.

Fee Schedule

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

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

Land Use	*A* Cost Per Capita	*B* Density	*C = A x B* Fee[1]	*D = C / 1,000* Fee per Sq. Ft.
Residential				
Single Family	$ 339	3.18	$ 1,078	
Multifamily	339	2.07	702	
Accessory Dwelling Unit	339	1.00	339	
Nonresidential				
Commercial	$ 105	2.41	$ 253	$ 0.25
Office	105	2.87	301	0.30
Industrial (Small)	105	0.64	67	0.07
Industrial (Large)				
Manufacturing	105	0.92	97	0.10
Distribution	105	0.37	39	0.04
Warehouse	105	0.18	19	0.02

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

Sources: Tables 2.2 and 12.3.

13. Regional Transportation Impact Fee (RTIF)

This section provides a brief overview of the Stanislaus County Regional Transportation Impact Fee (RTIF) program. It also presents the maximum justified and recommended RTIF schedules based on analysis meeting the requirements of the *Mitigation Fee Act.*

RTIF Overview

The RTIF program collects impact fees from new development throughout the County, both in cities and the unincorporated area, to fund the regional transportation facilities required to accommodate growth. The RTIF is charged to new development at the same rate countywide, including incorporated cities.

The RTIF was originally established in 1990 as part of Stanislaus County's Public Facilities Fee (PFF) program. The fee has been comprehensively updated several times since the initial adoption, most recently in 2010. The program was also updated for inflation in 2014 but has not been updated since that time.

2020 RTIF Update Process

The analysis contained in this chapter was initiated by Stanislaus County in order to ensure that the RTIF could fund new development's share of needed transportation projects, since it had not been updated in some time. This update comprehensively updates all assumptions that are used to calculate the fees: project lists, project costs, trip demand by land use, growth projections and project responsibility allocations.

Stanislaus County Public Works staff comprehensively reviewed the RTIF project list. County staff removed completed projects from the fee program and added projects that are needed as a result of demand from new development. Project cost assumptions were updated by Stanislaus County Public Works to current dollars for the revised RTIF project list.

Fehr & Peers traffic engineers validated the project list and completed a "select link" traffic modeling analysis on the revised project list using StanCOG's Three-County Travel Demand Model to determine the project responsibility and cost allocation for each project. Project costs attributable to new development are included in the RTIF update. Costs attributable to existing development in the County (existing deficiencies) and "pass through trips" (trips starting and ending outside of the County) are not allocated to the fee program. The cost allocation was examined for each project included in the RITF program.

Willdan reevaluated the growth projections used to allocate the fees. Based on discussions with County staff, the residential growth projection was modified to match the Ace Train project "mid" growth scenario, consistent with the County's 2019 PFF update. This growth projection anticipates more residential growth than is assumed by the Three-County Travel Demand Model, which allows the RTIF program to spread costs over more trips, resulting in a lower RTIF cost per trip.

Willdan comprehensively re-calibrated the trip demand factors used to allocate fees by land use using current trip generation rates from the Institute of Traffic Engineers (ITE), trip length data for Stanislaus County from the California Travel Survey and data trip purpose from SANDAG. Trip demand factors are a holistic measure of facilities demand that incorporate trip generation rates, average trip length and trip purpose into a single demand factor. This recalibration of the factors was based on current local data and resulted in fees for certain land use categories that deviate significantly from the existing RTIF. Earlier RTIF programs trip demand factors for certain land

uses were based on policy objectives rather than justifiable trip demand data. This recalibration allows land uses to be charged at rates that more closely match actual trip demand and results in a fee schedule that meets the requirements of the Mitigation Fee Act.

While fees for some land uses are decreasing, based on the trip demand factor recalibration, fees for other land use categories are increasing significantly. County staff is recommending a 20-percent cap on fee increases for any land use.

This chapter summarizes an analysis of the need for regional traffic improvement facilities, including roadway and intersection improvements, to accommodate new development. The chapter documents a reasonable relationship between new development and the impact fee for funding of these facilities.

Trip Demand

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

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

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

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

These adjustments allow for a holistic quantification of trip demand that takes trip purpose and length into account for fee calculation purposes.

Table 13.1 shows the calculation of trip demand factors by land use category based on the adjustments described above. PM peak hour trip rates are based on data from the Institute of Transportation Engineers' Trip Generation Manual, 10th Edition.

Trip length estimates were derived by Fehr & Peers using data specific to Stanislaus County from the most recent California Household Travel Survey.

The trip purpose assumptions in Table 13.1 are based on extensive and detailed trip surveys conducted in the San Diego region by the San Diego Association of Governments (SANDAG). The SANDAG data is used to supplement the PM peak hour trip rates and trip length assumptions, because the SANDAG surveys provide one of the most comprehensive databases available of pass-by trips factors for a wide range of land uses. It should be noted that the projections of current and future trip demand generation in this report are based on data specific to the County.

Most projected development in Stanislaus County can be classified under one of the land uses in Table 13.1. Some agriculturally related businesses operating on agricultural land are classified as an industrial land use (warehouse, manufacturing, or distribution) due to similarities in trip generation rates for the purposes of calculating a fee. Agricultural buildings that are designed and constructed to house farm implements, hay, grain, poultry, livestock or other horticultural products which are not places of human habitation or employment where agricultural products are

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

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

Table 13.1: Trip Demand Factors

	ITE Category	Primary Trips[1]	Diverted Trips[1]	Total Excluding Pass-by[1]	Average Trip Length[2]	Adjust-ment Factor[3]	PM Peak Hour Trips[4]	Trip Demand Factor[5]
		A	*B*	*C = A + B*	D	*E = C x D / 6.8*	*F*	*G = E x F*
Residential - per Dwelling Unit								
Single Family	Single Family Housing (210)	86%	11%	97%	9.1	1.30	1.00	1.30
Multifamily	Multifamily Housing (220)	86%	11%	97%	9.1	1.30	0.67	0.87
Accessory Dwelling Unit[6]	Single Family Housing (210)	86%	11%	97%	9.1	1.30	0.28	0.36
Nonresidential - per Employee								
Commercial	Shopping Center (820)	47%	31%	78%	4.5	0.52	1.89	0.98
Office	Business Park (710)	77%	19%	96%	8.6	1.21	0.39	0.47
Industrial with Rail Credit (assumes 3.9% trip reduction)	Industrial Park (130)	79%	19%	98%	8.6	1.24	0.40	0.50
Nonresidential - per 1,000 Sq. Ft								
Office	Business Park (710)	77%	19%	96%	8.6	1.21	1.42	1.72
Industrial								
Industrial (Small)	General Light Industrial (110)	79%	19%	98%	8.6	1.24	0.83	1.03
Industrial (Large)								
Manufacturing	Manufacturing (140)	79%	19%	98%	8.6	1.24	0.79	0.98
Mixed Use / Distribution	Industrial Park (130)	79%	19%	98%	8.6	1.24	0.40	0.50
Warehouse[4]	Warehousing (150)	79%	19%	98%	8.6	1.24	0.24	0.30
Rail Served Manufacturing	See Appendix Table B.1	79%	19%	98%	8.6	1.24		0.96
Rail Served Mixed Use/Distribution	See Appendix Table B.1	79%	19%	98%	8.6	1.24		0.48
Rail Served Warehouse[4]	See Appendix Table B.1	79%	19%	98%	8.6	1.24		0.28
Commercial								
Small Retail (<50 ksf)	Variety Store (814)	45%	40%	85%	4.5	0.56	7.42	4.16
Medium Retail (50-100 ksf)	Discount Superstore (813)	45%	40%	85%	4.5	0.56	4.40	2.46
Shopping Center (100-300 ks	Shopping Center (820)	47%	31%	78%	4.5	0.52	4.21	2.19
Shopping Mall (>300 ksf)	Factory Outlet Center (823)	54%	35%	89%	4.5	0.59	1.94	1.14
Church	Church (560)	64%	25%	89%	4.5	0.59	0.80	0.47
Hospital	Hospital (610)	73%	25%	98%	4.5	0.65	0.97	0.63
Nursing Home	Nursing Home (620)	86%	11%	97%	4.5	0.64	0.86	0.55
Special Cases								
Drive Through (per lane)	Drive Through Window[7]	51%	37%	88%	4.5	0.58	5.32	3.09
Gas Station (per pump)	Gasoline/Service Station (944)	21%	51%	72%	4.5	0.48	14.41	6.92
Motel/Hotel (per room)	Hotel (310)	58%	38%	96%	4.5	0.64	0.61	0.39
Golf Course (per acre)	Golf Course (430)	52%	39%	91%	4.5	0.60	0.39	0.23

[1] Percent of total trips. Primary trips are trips with no midway stops, or "links". Diverted trips are linked trips whose distance adds at least one mile to the primary trip. Pass-by trips are links that do not add more than one mile to the total trip.
[2] In miles. Based on 2012 California Household Travel Survey data for Stanislaus County.
[3] The trip adjustment factor equals the percent of non-pass-by trips multiplied by the average trip length and divided by the statewide average trip length of 6.8 miles.
[4] Trips per dwelling unit or per 1,000 building square feet.
[5] The trip demand factor is the product of the trip adjustment factor and the trip rate.
[6] The trip rate for accessory dwelling units assumes one resident per ADU and 0.28 trips per person per PM peak hour, consistent with single family residential.
[7] Trip rate calculated on the difference between Fast-Food Restaurant with Drive-Through Window (934) and Fast-Food Restaurant without Drive-Through Window (933) for an assumed 2,000 square foot building.

Sources: 2012 California Household Travel Survey, Stanislaus County data; San Diego Association of Governments, Brief Guide of Vehicular Traffic Generation Rates for the San Diego Region, April 2002, Institute of Traffic Engineers, Trip Generation, 10th Edition; Willdan Financial Services.

Trip Generation

StanCOG's Three-County Travel Demand Model and the Ace Train project population projections are the basis for estimating future trips in this study. The base year (2019) estimates of existing development are based on data from DOF for residential development, and data from traffic model for nonresidential development. Population from group quarters, and employees from local government jobs have been excluded from the estimates.

The 2045 projection of dwelling units was modified from the Three-County Travel Demand Model estimate to match the Ace Train project "mid" growth scenario. This growth projection anticipates more residential growth than is assumed by the tri-county traffic model, which allows the RTIF program to spread costs over more trips, resulting in a lower RTIF cost per trip. This projection is also consistent with the County's 2019 PFF program update.

The 2045 projection of employees is based on data from the Three-County Travel Demand Model.

Table 13.2 lists the existing and projected land uses in the County based on the data sources described above. As estimate of trip demand is calculated by multiplying the trip demand factors in Tables 13.1 by the land use estimates in Table 13.2 for both 2019 and 2045 conditions.

Table 13.2: Land Use Scenario and Total Trips

	Trip	2019		2045		Growth 2019 to 2045	
Land Use	Demand Factor	Units / Employees	Trip Demand	Units / Employees	Trip Demand	Units / Employees	Trip Demand
Residential[1]							
Single Family	1.30	144,015	187,220	212,538	276,299	68,523	89,079
Multifamily	0.87	38,499	33,494	94,893	82,557	56,394	49,063
Subtotal		182,514	220,714	307,431	358,856	124,917	138,142
Nonresidential[2]							
Commercial	0.98	81,435	79,806	100,486	98,476	19,051	18,670
Office	0.47	50,069	23,532	75,241	35,363	25,172	11,831
Industrial	0.50	42,276	21,138	51,539	25,770	9,264	4,632
Subtotal		173,779	124,476	227,267	159,609	53,487	35,133
Total			345,190		518,465		173,275
Share			66.6%		100.0%		33.4%

[1] Current dwelling unit estimate from California Department of Finance (DOF). Population forecast based on Center for Rural Entrepreneurship's ACE Train Population "Low" Scenario for 2045. Assumes current density per single family and multifamily unit, per ACS data. Assumes Three-County Travel Demand Model ratio of single family to multifamily dwelling units.

[2] Current employment estimate from U.S. Census Bureau, OnTheMap Application. Projection of total employment in 2042 from Three-County Travel Demand Model, as provided by StanCOG and SJCOG, 2019, allocated to generalized land uses by Willdan. Excludes local government employment.

Sources: California Department of Finance, Table E-5; U.S. Census Bureau,Three-County Travel Demand Model, as provided by StanCOG and SJCOG, 2019; Table 13.1, Willdan Financial Services

RTIF Project List

The current RTIF has a capital improvement list made up of projects related to road widening, intersection improvements and traffic signals, state highway projects, and project initiation and development projects to conduct planning and engineering studies necessary to define future projects. Since the RTIF was last updated, some of these projects have been constructed and others have been modified as a result of more recent planning processes.

The County provided an updated list of projects and cost estimates to include in this RTIF nexus update. The updated project list is made up of 36 transportation-related projects, including 14

road widening projects, 17 signal projects, two state highway projects, and three project initiation and development projects.

The updated project list, including the cost estimates provided by the County staff, is shown in **Table 13.3.** In total, nearly $894 million in RTIF project costs are included in Table 13.3.

Table 13.4 programs anticipated alternative funding to specific projects included in the RTIF. This information was provided by County staff. The net cost of these facilities is included in the impact fee calculation.

Table 13.3: RTIF Total Project Costs

Project	Description	Total Project Cost
RTIF Signal Projects		
Carpenter Rd at Crows Landing Rd	Improve Intersection	$ 2,500,000
Carpenter Rd at Grayson Rd	Improve Intersection	2,500,000
Carpenter Rd at Keyes Rd	Improve Intersection	2,500,000
Carpenter Rd at Whitmore Ave	Improve Intersection	2,500,000
Crows Landing Rd at Fulkerth Ave	Improve Intersection	2,500,000
Crows Landing Rd at Grayson Rd	Improve Intersection	2,500,000
Crows Landing Rd at Keyes Rd	Improve Intersection	2,500,000
Faith Home Road at Roeding Road	Improve Intersection	2,500,000
Faith Home Road at Service Road	Improve Intersection	3,000,000
Faith Home Road at Whitmore Ave	Improve Intersection	3,000,000
Santa Fe Ave at East Ave	Improve Intersection	3,000,000
Santa Fe Ave at Keyes Rd	Improve Intersection	3,000,000
Santa Fe Ave at Main St	Improve Intersection	3,000,000
Santa Fe Ave at Service Rd	Improve Intersection	3,000,000
West Main at Carpenter Rd	Improve Intersection	2,500,000
West Main at Central Ave	Improve Intersection	5,000,000
West Main at Faith Home Rd	Improve Intersection	2,500,000
Subtotal		$ 48,000,000
RTIF Road Widening Projects		
Crows Landing Rd (Bridge over SJ River)	Widen Bridge to 3 lanes	$ 20,000,000
Crows Landing Rd (Carpenter to River)	Widen to 3 lanes	2,000,000
Crows Landing Rd (SR99 Interchange)	Reconstruct Interchange	35,000,000
Faith Home Road (Bridge over the Tuolumne)	New Bridge to 4 lanes	72,000,000
Geer-Albers Road (Claribel to Warnerville)	Widen to 5 Lanes	5,600,000
Geer-Albers Road (Milnes to Claribel)	Widen to 3 lanes	5,600,000
Keyes Road Interchange at SR99	Reconstruct Interchange	15,000,000
McHenry Ave (Hogue to San Joaquin County)	Widen to 5 lanes	12,783,000
McHenry Ave (Ladd to Hogue)	Widen to 5 lanes	4,100,000
North County Corridor (Rt 99 to Rt 120)	Expwy from SR 99 to SR120	428,000,000
West Main (Carpenter to Crows Landing)	Widen to 3 lanes	2,800,000
West Main (Crows Landing to Michell)	Widen to 3 lanes	4,300,000
West Main (Mitchell to Washington)	Widen to 3 lanes	2,900,000
West Main (San Joaquin River to Carpenter)	Widen to 3 lanes	3,900,000
Subtotal		$ 613,983,000
RTIF State Highway Projects		
State Route 132 (Dakota to Gates)	Expwy on new alignment	$ 122,297,000
State Route 132 (SR99 to Dakota)	Expwy on new alignment	92,000,000
Subtotal		$ 214,297,000
Project Initiation & Development Projects		
Faith Home Road (SR132 to SR99)	Study Corridor	$ 10,000,000
South County Corridor	Study Corridor	5,000,000
State Route 33 Corridor (Stanislaus County Limits)	Study Corridor	2,500,000
Subtotal		$ 17,500,000
Totals		**$ 893,780,000**

Source: Stanislaus County Public Works.

Table 13.4: Alternative Funding

Project	Total Project Cost	Identified Funding: Measure L	Identified Funding: SB1	Identified Funding: Federal Non Competitive (HBP/CMAQ)	Identified Funding: Federal or State Competitve Grant	Net Project Costs
RTIF Signal Projects						
Carpenter Rd at Crows Landing Rd	$ 2,500,000	$ 1,000,000	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 1,500,000
Carpenter Rd at Grayson Rd	2,500,000	1,000,000	-	-	-	1,500,000
Carpenter Rd at Keyes Rd	2,500,000	1,000,000	-	-	-	1,500,000
Carpenter Rd at Whitmore Ave	2,500,000	1,000,000	-	-	-	1,500,000
Crows Landing Rd at Fulkerth Ave	2,500,000	1,000,000	-	-	-	1,500,000
Crows Landing Rd at Grayson Rd	2,500,000	1,000,000	-	-	-	1,500,000
Crows Landing Rd at Keyes Rd	2,500,000	1,000,000	-	-	-	1,500,000
Faith Home Road at Roeding Road	2,500,000	1,000,000	-	-	-	1,500,000
Faith Home Road at Service Road	3,000,000	1,000,000	-	-	-	2,000,000
Faith Home Road at Whitmore Ave	3,000,000	1,000,000	-	-	-	2,000,000
Santa Fe Ave at East Ave	3,000,000	1,000,000	-	-	-	2,000,000
Santa Fe Ave at Keyes Rd	3,000,000	1,000,000	-	-	-	2,000,000
Santa Fe Ave at Main St	3,000,000	1,000,000	-	-	-	2,000,000
Santa Fe Ave at Service Rd	3,000,000	1,000,000	-	-	-	2,000,000
West Main at Carpenter Rd	2,500,000	1,000,000	-	-	-	1,500,000
West Main at Central Ave	5,000,000	1,000,000	-	-	-	4,000,000
West Main at Faith Home Rd	2,500,000	1,000,000	-	-	-	1,500,000
Subtotal	$ 48,000,000	$ 17,000,000	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 31,000,000
RTIF Road Widening Projects						
Crows Landing Rd (Bridge over SJ River)	$ 20,000,000	$ -	$ -	$ 18,279,500	$ -	$ 1,720,500
Crows Landing Rd (Carpenter to River)	2,000,000	-	-	-	-	2,000,000
Crows Landing Rd (SR99 Interchange)	35,000,000	-	-	-	-	35,000,000
Faith Home Road (Bridge over the Tuolumne)	72,000,000	17,925,000	-	-	15,000,000	39,075,000
Geer-Albers Road (Claribel to Warnerville)	5,600,000	-	-	-	-	5,600,000
Geer-Albers Road (Milnes to Claribel)	5,600,000	-	-	-	-	5,600,000
Keyes Road Interchange at SR99	15,000,000	-	-	-	-	15,000,000
McHenry Ave (Hogue to San Joaquin County)	12,783,000	2,605,000	2,000,000	-	-	8,178,000
McHenry Ave (Ladd to Hogue)	4,100,000	-	-	-	-	4,100,000
North County Corridor (Rt 99 to Rt 120)	428,000,000	59,750,000	30,000,000	-	80,000,000	258,250,000
West Main (Carpenter to Crows Landing)	2,800,000	-	-	-	-	2,800,000
West Main (Crows Landing to Michell)	4,300,000	-	-	-	-	4,300,000
West Main (Mitchell to Washington)	2,900,000	-	-	-	-	2,900,000
West Main (San Joaquin River to Carpenter)	3,900,000	-	-	-	-	3,900,000
Subtotal	$ 613,983,000	$ 80,280,000	$ 32,000,000	$ 18,279,500	$ 95,000,000	$ 388,423,500
RTIF State Highway Projects						
State Route 132 (Dakota to Gates)	$ 122,297,000	$ 25,927,000	$ 10,000,000	$ -	$ 30,000,000	$ 56,370,000
State Route 132 (SR99 to Dakota)	92,000,000	15,011,000	10,000,000	-	30,000,000	36,989,000
Subtotal	$ 214,297,000	$ 40,938,000	$ 20,000,000	$ -	$ 60,000,000	$ 93,359,000
Project Initiation & Development Projects						
Faith Home Road (SR132 to SR99)	$ 10,000,000	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 10,000,000
South County Corridor	5,000,000	-	-	-	-	5,000,000
State Route 33 Corridor (Stanislaus County Limits)	2,500,000	-	-	-	-	2,500,000
Subtotal	$ 17,500,000	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 17,500,000
Totals	**$ 893,780,000**	**$ 138,218,000**	**$ 52,000,000**	**$ 18,279,500**	**$ 155,000,000**	**$ 530,282,500**

Source: Stanislaus County Public Works.

Facility Standards

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

The County's traffic facility standards are based on a measure of congestion commonly used in traffic planning and known as level of service (LOS). LOS is calculated based on the volume of traffic on a roadway or at an intersection compared to the capacity of the roadway or intersection. LOS "A," "B," and "C" suggest that delays are insignificant to acceptable. LOS "D" suggests

tolerable delays, though traffic is high, and some short-term back-ups occur. LOS "E" and "F" suggest restricted speeds and significant delays as traffic volumes meet or exceed the capacity of the facility.

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

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

Project Confirmation and Existing Deficiencies

The fundamental purpose of an impact fee program is to charge a fee to new development to cover the costs of providing infrastructure needed by that new development. If there are situations where a facility is currently operating at levels that do not meet the current performance standards, then new development should not be charged the full cost of constructing an improvement at that location because it already experiences an "existing deficiency." Therefore, an important step in the nexus analysis is to determine if there are existing deficiencies that should be accounted for in the fee calculations. Further, it should be confirmed that the capital improvement projects identified for inclusion in the fee program are needed to support the travel needs of the future residents and employees of Stanislaus County.

As in previous nexus studies, the project confirmation and determination of existing deficiencies is drawn from the results of prior traffic analyses, and no new traffic data has been collected as part of this nexus analysis. Based on the locations of the RTIF projects, the following studies were reviewed:

- West Landing Specific Plan (2011)
- State Route 132 West Freeway/Expressway PA/ED (2012)
- Traffic Operations Report for the North County Corridor PA/ED (2015)
- South County Corridor Feasibility Study (2015)
- Stanislaus County General Plan and Environmental Impact Report (2016)
- Ceres General Plan (2017)
- Faith Home Road / Garner Road Bridge Transportation Analysis Report (2018)
- Crows Landing Industrial Business Park Specific Plan (2018)

All the RTIF projects have been identified in one or more of the studies listed above as being part of the County's plans to accommodate projected future travel demands. Furthermore, with one exception described below, all the RTIF projects are located on facilities that have been determined to operate acceptably under existing conditions. For example, the most geographically comprehensive study is the Stanislaus County General Plan and Environmental Impact Report, published in 2016; most of the RTIF projects are located on facilities described in that EIR, and all those facilities were found to operate acceptably under existing conditions.

One project location, the Geer-Albers Road (Claribel to Warnerville) widening project, was identified in the Traffic Operations Report for the North County Corridor PA/ED, dated March 2015, as operating at less-than-acceptable conditions. That analysis evaluated existing roadway segment operations along Geer-Albers Road, including the Claribel to Warnerville segment, and that segment was determined to operate at LOS E under existing conditions. County performance standards are LOS C for all County roadways and intersections, except within a sphere of

influence near urban areas, where LOS D applies. As this segment is within the Modesto and Riverbank spheres of influence, the LOS D standard applies. A 25-percent adjustment has been applied to the cost of this road widening project to account for this existing deficiency, as an estimate for the level of traffic volume reduction needed to improve current operations from LOS E to an acceptable LOS D.

The project list with adjusted costs due to addressing existing deficiencies is shown in **Table 13.5**.

Modeling Analysis of Future Usage

Another important step in the nexus analysis is to conduct an analysis of the future usage of the RTIF facilities. Only the trips expected from future development in Stanislaus County will be subject to the fee program. Following the same procedures used in the prior RTIF update, this analysis uses the currently available travel demand model to estimate the proportion of traffic on each facility that is attributable to development in Stanislaus County.

As described above, the Three-County Travel Demand Model is the most current available model for this purpose. After obtaining the model, Fehr & Peers reviewed the model's future (year 2042) roadway network to ensure that it represents all the projects proposed to be included in the updated RTIF. For each of the RTIF projects, the links in the model network that represent that project location were identified. Then, "select link" model runs were conducted for each of the proposed RTIF projects. The select link analysis identifies the origins and destinations of each vehicle that uses the roadways included on the RTIF project list; with this information, the fair share of cost associated with each project can be allocated to development in Stanislaus County and included in the impact fee.

For fair share calculations, there are four types of trips identified through the select link process:

1. Trips that both start and end in Stanislaus County;
2. Trips that have an origin inside the County and a destination outside the County;
3. Trips that have an origin outside the County and a destination inside the County; and,
4. Trips that have neither an origin nor a destination in Stanislaus County, but are using roads that pass through the County (also referred to as "external" trips).

Trips that fall into the final category, "external" trips, are not subject to the fee program. Trips from the other three categories are attributable to development in Stanislaus County and are included in the RTIF calculations.

The results are shown in Table 13.5. The table lists each of the RTIF projects and the column titled "RTIF Allocation" shows the percentage of traffic on each facility that falls within the first three categories described above (i.e., the traffic that is linked to development in Stanislaus County). The percentage of Stanislaus County traffic on each facility is then used as the percentage of that facility's cost that will be considered eligible for inclusion in the RTIF program.

Similar to the procedure in the prior nexus study, it has been assumed that 100% of the cost of the Project Initiation and Development projects will be included in the fee. These are planning and engineering studies that are required in order to define new projects and prepare initial designs; thus, by definition, these are studies that are looking toward the future needs for transportation facilities in Stanislaus County so it is reasonable to include those costs in the fee program.

It should be noted that the intent of this analysis is solely for the purposes of the RTIF process. The primary result is the percentage of trips projected to use each facility that are attributable to Stanislaus County development. It is not intended for these results to be used to determine the appropriate size or configuration for any particular facility, or to directly support any project-specific planning activities.

Table 13.5: RTIF Project Cost Allocation

Project	Total Cost Less Other Funding	Existing Deficiency %	Adjusted Total Cost	RTIF Allocation	RTIF-Eligible Cost
RTIF Signal Projects					
Carpenter Rd at Crows Landing Rd	$ 1,500,000	0%	$ 1,500,000	72.6%	$ 1,089,000
Carpenter Rd at Grayson Rd	1,500,000	0%	1,500,000	94.7%	1,420,500
Carpenter Rd at Keyes Rd	1,500,000	0%	1,500,000	97.0%	1,455,000
Carpenter Rd at Whitmore Ave	1,500,000	0%	1,500,000	97.3%	1,459,500
Crows Landing Rd at Fulkerth Ave	1,500,000	0%	1,500,000	88.3%	1,324,500
Crows Landing Rd at Grayson Rd	1,500,000	0%	1,500,000	89.2%	1,338,000
Crows Landing Rd at Keyes Rd	1,500,000	0%	1,500,000	82.0%	1,230,000
Faith Home Road at Roeding Road	1,500,000	0%	1,500,000	94.7%	1,420,500
Faith Home Road at Service Road	2,000,000	0%	2,000,000	94.0%	1,880,000
Faith Home Road at Whitmore Ave	2,000,000	0%	2,000,000	96.0%	1,920,000
Santa Fe Ave at East Ave	2,000,000	0%	2,000,000	85.0%	1,700,000
Santa Fe Ave at Keyes Rd	2,000,000	0%	2,000,000	82.7%	1,654,000
Santa Fe Ave at Main St	2,000,000	0%	2,000,000	82.8%	1,656,000
Santa Fe Ave at Service Rd	2,000,000	0%	2,000,000	91.2%	1,824,000
West Main at Carpenter Rd	1,500,000	0%	1,500,000	81.5%	1,222,500
West Main at Central Ave	4,000,000	0%	4,000,000	78.4%	3,136,000
West Main at Faith Home Rd	1,500,000	0%	1,500,000	78.1%	1,171,500
Subtotal	$ 31,000,000		$ 31,000,000		$ 26,901,000
RTIF Road Widening Projects					
Crows Landing Rd (Bridge over SJ River)	$ 1,720,500	0%	$ 1,720,500	72.6%	$ 1,249,083
Crows Landing Rd (Carpenter to River)	2,000,000	0%	2,000,000	72.6%	1,452,000
Crows Landing Rd (SR99 Interchange)	35,000,000	0%	35,000,000	94.5%	33,075,000
Faith Home Road (Bridge over the Tuolumne)	39,075,000	0%	39,075,000	97.0%	37,902,750
Geer-Albers Road (Claribel to Warnerville)	5,600,000	25%	4,200,000	78.7%	3,305,400
Geer-Albers Road (Milnes to Claribel)	5,600,000	0%	5,600,000	85.3%	4,776,800
Keyes Road Interchange at SR99	15,000,000	0%	15,000,000	97.0%	14,550,000
McHenry Ave (Hogue to San Joaquin County)	8,178,000	0%	8,178,000	90.8%	7,425,624
McHenry Ave (Ladd to Hogue)	4,100,000	0%	4,100,000	91.7%	3,759,700
North County Corridor (Rt 99 to Rt 120)	258,250,000	0%	258,250,000	91.7%	236,815,250
West Main (Carpenter to Crows Landing)	2,800,000	0%	2,800,000	76.3%	2,136,400
West Main (Crows Landing to Michell)	4,300,000	0%	4,300,000	76.1%	3,272,300
West Main (Mitchell to Washington)	2,900,000	0%	2,900,000	76.2%	2,209,800
West Main (San Joaquin River to Carpenter)	3,900,000	0%	3,900,000	87.7%	3,420,300
Subtotal	$ 388,423,500		$ 387,023,500		$ 355,350,407
RTIF State Highway Projects					
State Route 132 (Dakota to Gates)	$ 56,370,000	0%	$ 56,370,000	81.6%	$ 45,997,920
State Route 132 (SR99 to Dakota)	36,989,000	0%	36,989,000	89.2%	32,994,188
Subtotal	$ 93,359,000		$ 93,359,000		$ 78,992,108
Project Initiation & Development Projects					
Faith Home Road (SR132 to SR99)	$ 10,000,000	0%	$ 10,000,000	100.0%	$ 10,000,000
South County Corridor	5,000,000	0%	5,000,000	100.0%	5,000,000
State Route 33 Corridor (Stanislaus County Limits)	2,500,000	0%	2,500,000	100.0%	2,500,000
Subtotal	$ 17,500,000		$ 17,500,000		$ 17,500,000
Totals	**$ 530,282,500**		**$ 528,882,500**		**$ 478,743,515**

Source: Stanislaus County Public Works; Fehr & Peers.

Cost per Trip

Table 13.6 shows the cost per trip. Cost per trip is calculated by dividing the total project costs allocated to the RTIF from Table 13.5 by the total new trips identified in Table 13.3. For projects with a prepared traffic study and trip generation projections from an engineer, the fee can be calculated by multiplying the cost per trip by the number of PM peak hour trips that will be generated, adjusted by the applicable trip rate adjustment factors in Table 13.1.

Table 13.6: Cost per Trip to Accommodate Growth

Costs Allocated to New Development	$ 478,743,515
Growth in Daily Trips	173,275
Cost per Trip	$ 2,763

Sources: Tables 13.2 and 13.5.

Fee Schedule

Based on the cost per trip calculated above, **Table 13.7** shows the maximum justified regional traffic impact fee schedule, by land use. The fee for a given land use is calculated by multiplying the cost per trip by the trip demand factor for that land use from Table 13.1.

An administrative charge of two percent of the total impact fee is also calculated in Table 13.7. The administrative charge funds costs that include: (1) a standard overhead charge applied to all County programs for legal, accounting, and other departmental and Countywide administrative support, (2) capital planning and programming associated with the share of projects funded by the impact fee, and (3) impact fee program administrative costs including revenue collection, revenue and cost accounting, mandated public reporting, and fee justification analyses. The administrative charge can be used for costs related to the preparation and management of capital improvement project documents whose tasks clearly tie to facilities required to accommodate growth, including master facility planning documents.

Table 13.7: Maximum Justified Regional Transportation Impact Fee Schedule

Land Use	A Cost Per Trip	B Trip Demand Factor	C = A x B Total Fee[1]	E / 1,000 Fee per Sq. Ft.
Residential - per Dwelling Unit				
Single Family	$ 2,763	1.30	$ 3,592	
Multifamily	2,763	0.87	2,404	
Accessory Dwelling Unit	2,763	0.36	995	
Nonresidential - per 1,000 Sq. Ft				
Office	$ 2,763	1.72	$ 4,752	$ 4.75
Industrial				
Industrial (Small)	$ 2,763	1.03	$ 2,846	$ 2.85
Industrial (Large)				
Manufacturing	$ 2,763	0.98	$ 2,708	n/a
Mixed Use / Distribution	2,763	0.50	1,382	n/a
Warehouse	2,763	0.30	829	n/a
Rail Served Manufacturing	2,763	0.96	2,652	$ 2.65
Rail Served Mixed Use/Distribution	2,763	0.48	1,326	1.33
Rail Served Warehouse	2,763	0.28	774	0.77
Commercial				
Small Retail (<50 ksf)	$ 2,763	4.16	$ 11,494	$ 11.49
Medium Retail (50-100 ksf)	2,763	2.46	6,797	6.80
Shopping Center (100-300 ksf)	2,763	2.19	6,051	6.05
Shopping Mall (>300 ksf)	2,763	1.14	3,150	3.15
Church	$ 2,763	0.47	$ 1,299	$ 1.30
Hospital	2,763	0.63	1,741	1.74
Nursing Home	2,763	0.55	1,520	1.52
Special Cases				
Drive Through (per lane)	$ 2,763	3.09	$ 8,538	
Gas Station (per pump)	2,763	6.92	19,120	
Motel/Hotel (per room)	2,763	0.39	1,078	
Golf Course (per acre)	2,763	0.23	635	

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

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

Sources: Tables 13.1 and 13.6.

Recommended Fee Schedule

County staff recognizes that due to the comprehensive recalibration of the fees described in this report, the maximum justified fees for certain nonresidential land uses are increasing significantly. Consequently, County staff is recommending a 20% increase cap on fees for any particular land use. **Table 13.8** presents the recommended fee schedule.

Table 13.8: Recommended Regional Transportation Impact Fee Schedule

Land Use	Maximum Justified Fee	Existing Fee	Recommended Fee Capped at 20% Increase	Fee per Square Foot
Residential - per Dwelling Unit				
Single Family	$ 3,592	$ 4,379	$ 3,592	
Multifamily	2,404	2,684	2,404	
Accessory Dwelling Unit	995	1,215	995	
Nonresidential - per 1,000 Sq. Ft				
Office	$ 4,752	$ 3,531	$ 4,237	$ 4.24
Industrial				
Industrial (Small)	$ 2,846	$ 1,610	$ 1,932	$ 1.93
Industrial (Large)				
Manufacturing	n/a	n/a	n/a	
Mixed Use / Distribution	n/a	n/a	n/a	
Warehouse	n/a	n/a	n/a	
Rail Served Manufacturing	2,652	1,695	2,034	$ 2.03
Rail Served Mixed Use/Distribution	1,326	1,978	1,326	1.33
Rail Served Warehouse	774	1,045	774	0.77
Commercial				
Small Retail (<50 ksf)	$ 11,494	$ 2,006	$ 2,407	$ 2.41
Medium Retail (50-100 ksf)	6,797	2,995	3,594	3.59
Shopping Center (100-300 ksf)	6,051	2,769	3,323	3.32
Shopping Mall (>300 ksf)	3,150	1,695	2,034	2.03
Church	$ 1,299	$ 650	$ 780	$ 0.78
Hospital	1,741	1,158	1,390	1.39
Nursing Home	1,520	424	509	0.51
Special Cases				
Drive Through (per lane)	$ 8,538	$ 17,600	$ 8,538	
Gas Station (per pump)	19,120	6,865	8,238	
Motel/Hotel (per room)	1,078	706	847	
Golf Course (per acre)	635	848	635	

Source: Table 13.7.

14. Countywide Information Technology

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

Service Population

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

Table 14.1 shows the estimated service population in 2016 and 2045. The demand for information technology equipment is related to the demands that both residents and businesses place on the County's information technology infrastructure. While specific data is not available to estimate the actual ratio of demand per resident to demand by businesses (per worker) for this service, it is reasonable to assume that demand for these services is less for one employee compared to one resident, because nonresidential buildings are typically occupied less intensively than dwelling units. The 0.31-weighting factor for workers is based on a 40-hour workweek divided by the total number of non-work hours in a week (128) and reflects the degree to which nonresidential development yields a lesser demand for information technology equipment.

Table 14.1: Countywide IT Service Population

	Residents	Workers	Service Population
Existing (2016)	533,800	181,800	590,200
New Development (2016-2045)	338,400	58,900	356,700
Total (2045)	872,200	240,700	946,900
Weighting factor[1]	1.00	0.31	

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

Sources: Table 2.1, Willdan Financial Services.

Facility Standards

This study uses the existing inventory method to calculate impact fees for Enterprise specific information technology equipment (see *Chapter 1: Introduction* for further information). Department specific IT is inventories in each category's impact fee (when appropriate) so that fee revenue from each category can be spent on IT to serve new development. **Table 14.2** shows the

existing inventory of information technology assets owned by Stanislaus County. The total value of existing information technology assets is approximately $2.1 million.

Table 14.2: Countywide IT Inventory[1]

Item	Total Cost
Computers	$ 140,214
Fileservers	544,383
Miscellaneous	112,703
Network Hardware	898,874
Software	272,461
Total	$ 1,968,635
PFF Fund Balance[2]	$ 92,500
Total	$ 2,061,135

[1] This inventory primarily contains software, although the net amounts listed may include some incidental non-depreciated hardware (hardware that does not meet the cost threshold of being considered an asset). The inventory only includes the initial purchase cost of the systems, and does not include license renewals.
[2] Current as of December 31, 2016. Rounded to the hundreds.

Source: Stanislaus County.

Table 14.3 shows current per capita investment in information technology equipment. This value was calculated by dividing the existing investment in information technology assets by the current service population. The cost per capita is $3.

Table 14.3: Countywide IT Existing Standard

Existing Value of Countywide IT	$	2,061,135
Existing Service Population		590,200
Facility Standard per Capita	$	3
Cost per Resident	$	3
Cost per Worker[1]		1

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

Sources: Tables 14.1 and 14.2.

Use of Fee Revenues

The County can use information technology equipment fee to purchase new information technology assets that expand the capacity of the existing system to serve new development. Fee revenues may not be used for replacement of aging facilities or equipment or to otherwise correct existing deficiencies unrelated to new development. **Table 14.4** shows an estimate of information technology impact fee revenue through 2045.

Table 14.4: Fee Revenue Projection - Existing Standard

Facility Standard per Capita	$	3
Service Population Growth Within District (2016-2045)		356,700
New Development Fair Share of Planned Facilities	$	1,070,100

Sources: Tables 14.1 and 14.3.

Fee Schedule

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

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

Land Use	*A* Cost Per Capita	*B* Density	*C = A x B* Fee[1]	*D = C / 1,000* Fee per Sq. Ft.
Residential				
Single Family	$ 3	3.18	$ 10	
Multifamily	3	2.07	6	
Accessory Dwelling Unit	3	1.00	3	
Nonresidential				
Commercial	$ 1	2.41	$ 2	$ 0.002
Office	1	2.87	3	0.003
Industrial (Small)	1	0.64	1	0.001
Industrial (Large)				
Manufacturing	1	0.92	1	0.001
Distribution	1	0.37	-	-
Warehouse	1	0.18	-	-

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

Sources: Tables 2.2 and 14.3.

15. PFF Administrative Charge

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

Tables 15.1, **15.2 and 15.3** show the total fee, including the administrative charge for each fee zone scenario, corresponding with Tables E.1, E.2 and E.3. The fees shown include the *recommended* RTIF from Table 13.8 as opposed to the maximum justified RTIF.

Table 15.1: Administrative Fee - Unincorporated

Land Use	Total Base Impact Fee	Admin Charge (2%)	Total Fee
Residential (Per Dwelling Unit)			
Single Family / Duplex	$ 9,972	$ 199	$ 10,171
Multifamily / Mobile Home Park	6,557	131	6,688
Accessory Dwelling Unit	3,001	60	3,061
Nonresidential (Per Thousand Square Feet)			
Office	$ 5,606	$ 112	$ 5,718
Industrial			
Industrial (Small)	$ 2,237	$ 45	$ 2,282
Industrial (Large)			
Manufacturing	2,473	49	2,522
Distribution	1,503	30	1,533
Warehouse	859	17	876
Commercial[1]			
Small Retail	$ 3,556	$ 71	$ 3,627
Medium Retail	4,743	95	4,838
Shopping Center	4,472	89	4,561
Shopping Mall	3,183	64	3,247
Church	$ 1,929	$ 39	$ 1,968
Hospital	2,539	51	2,590
Nursing Home	1,658	33	1,691
Special Cases			
Drive Through (per lane)	$ 8,538	$ 171	$ 8,709
Gas Station (per pump)	8,238	165	8,403
Motel/Hotel (per room)	847	17	864
Golf Course (per acre)	635	13	648

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

Source: Table E.1; Willdan Financial Services.

Table 15.2: Administrative Fee - Cities of Ceres, Hughson, Modesto, Patterson and Waterford

Land Use	Total Base Impact Fee	Admin Charge (2%)	Total Fee
Residential (Per Dwelling Unit)			
Single Family / Duplex	$ 7,167	$ 143	$ 7,310
Multifamily / Mobile Home Park	4,730	95	4,825
Accessory Dwelling Unit	2,119	42	2,161
Nonresidential (Per Thousand Square Feet)			
Office	$ 5,009	$ 100	$ 5,109
Industrial			
Industrial (Small)	$ 2,105	$ 42	$ 2,147
Industrial (Large)			
Manufacturing	2,282	46	2,328
Distribution	1,425	29	1,454
Warehouse	822	16	838
Commercial[1]			
Small Retail	$ 3,055	$ 61	$ 3,116
Medium Retail	4,242	85	4,327
Shopping Center	3,971	79	4,050
Shopping Mall	2,682	54	2,736
Church	$ 1,428	$ 29	$ 1,457
Hospital	2,038	41	2,079
Nursing Home	1,157	23	1,180
Special Cases			
Drive Through (per lane)	$ 8,538	$ 171	$ 8,709
Gas Station (per pump)	8,238	165	8,403
Motel/Hotel (per room)	847	17	864
Golf Course (per acre)	635	13	648

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

Source: Table E.2; Willdan Financial Services.

Table 15.3: Administrative Fee - Cities of Turlock, Oakdale, Newman and Riverbank

Land Use	Total Base Impact Fee	Admin Charge (2%)	Total Fee
Residential (Per Dwelling Unit)			
Single Family / Duplex	$ 7,049	$ 141	$ 7,190
Multifamily / Mobile Home Park	4,653	93	4,746
Accessory Dwelling Unit	2,082	42	2,124
Nonresidential (Per Thousand Square Feet)			
Office	$ 5,009	$ 100	$ 5,109
Industrial			
Industrial (Small)	$ 2,105	$ 42	$ 2,147
Industrial (Large)			
Manufacturing	2,282	46	2,328
Distribution	1,425	29	1,454
Warehouse	822	16	838
Commercial[1]			
Small Retail	$ 3,055	$ 61	$ 3,116
Medium Retail	4,242	85	4,327
Shopping Center	3,971	79	4,050
Shopping Mall	2,682	54	2,736
Church	$ 1,428	$ 29	$ 1,457
Hospital	2,038	41	2,079
Nursing Home	1,157	23	1,180
Special Cases			
Drive Through (per lane)	$ 8,538	$ 171	$ 8,709
Gas Station (per pump)	8,238	165	8,403
Motel/Hotel (per room)	847	17	864
Golf Course (per acre)	635	13	648

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

Source: Table E.3; Willdan Financial Services.

16. Crows Landing Industrial Business Park Impact Fees

This chapter presents an analysis of the need for backbone infrastructure to accommodate new development at the Crows Landing Industrial Business Park (CLIBP) in Stanislaus County. Each facilities fee in this chapter is calculated using the planned facilities standard methodology to fund the improvements identified in the CLIBP Specific Plan Financing Plan. Fee calculated in this chapter are charged in addition to unincorporated area PFF and RTIF program fees.

Land Use Scenario

Estimates of existing development and projections of future growth are critical assumptions used throughout this chapter. It is assumed that there is *de minimis* base year development, so new development will be the only development served by the proposed infrastructure. Estimates of growth through buildout are used to allocate facility costs to new development.

The demand for public facilities is based on increases in trip generation, water flow generation, wastewater flow generation, and impervious surface associated with nonresidential development at the CLIBP.

Land Use Types

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

- **Logistics/Distribution:** Includes packaging, warehouse, and distribution uses.
- **Light Industrial:** Includes light manufacturing and machine shops.
- **Business Park:** Includes office uses such as call centers, research and development, and business support uses.
- **Aviation Related:** Includes uses that support airport operations, such as airport-related cargo (parcel) distribution and emergency services.

Some developments may include more than one land use type, such as a mixed-use development with both light industrial and distribution uses. In those cases, the facilities fee would be calculated separately for each land use type.

The County has the discretion to determine which land use type best reflects a development project's characteristics for purposes of imposing an impact fee and may adjust fees for special or unique uses to reflect the impact characteristics of the use. If a project results in the intensification of use, at its discretion, the County can charge the project the difference in fees between the existing low intensity use and the future high intensity use.

Existing and Future Development

Table 16.1 shows the complete land use scenario, by phase for development at CLIBP. This information comes from the CLIBP Specific Plan. The estimates include development acres, floor-area-ratio (FAR) assumptions, and the resulting building square feet and employment that can be accommodated at the CLIBP.

Table 16.1: Crows Landing Industrial Business Park Land Use And Employment Summary

Developable Land Use By Phase	Developable Acres	Floor-Area Ratio	Building Area (per 1,000 SF)	Employees (per 1,000 SF)	Total Employees
PHASE 1 (764 Acres)					
Phase 1A:					
Fink Road Corridor					
Logistics/Distribution	52	0.35	785	0.35	275
Light Industrial	41	0.35	628	0.97	609
Business Park	10	0.35	157	2.80	440
Subtotal	103		1,570		1,324
Phase 1B:					
Bell Road Corridor					
Logistics/Distribution	138	0.35	2,104	0.35	736
Light Industrial	110	0.35	1,683	0.97	1,633
Business Park	28	0.35	421	2.80	1,178
Subtotal	276		4,208		3,547
Airport - Phases 1 through 3 (Part of Phase 1 Infrastructure)	370	NA	NA	NA	1
Public Facilities	15	0.25	163	2.80	457
Phase 1B Subtotal	661		4,371		4,005
PHASE 1 TOTAL	**764**		**5,941**		**5,329**
PHASE 2 (236 Acres)					
SR 33 Corridor (South)					
Logistics/Distribution	57	0.40	990	0.69	683
Light Industrial	71	0.40	1,237	0.97	1,200
Business Park	14	0.40	247	2.80	693
Aviation Related	46	0.40	802	0.35	281
Subtotal	188		3,276		2,857
Transp. Corridor/Green Space	13	NA	NA	NA	2
Public Facilities	35	0.25	381	2.80	1,067
PHASE 2 TOTAL	**236**		**3,657**		**3,926**
PHASE 3 (274 Acres)					
SR 33 Corridor (North)					
Logistics/Distribution	102	0.40	1,784	0.69	1,231
Light Industrial	128	0.40	2,230	0.97	2,163
Business Park	26	0.40	446	2.80	1,249
Subtotal	256		4,460		4,643
Public Facilities	18	0.25	196	2.80	549
PHASE 3 TOTAL	**274**		**4,656**		**5,192**
GRAND TOTAL	**1,274**		**14,254**		**14,447**

Source: Crows Landing Specific Plan, Table A-1: Crows Landing Industrial Business Park Land Use And Employment Summary.

Table 16.2 summarizes the information from Table 16.1 across all phases in terms of total acres, building square feet and employees.

Table 16.2: Crows Landing Industrial Business Park Land Use Scenario

	Total Acres	Total KSF	Total Employees
Total Land Use Plan - All Phases			
Logistics/Distribution	349	5,663	2,925
Light Industrial	350	5,778	5,605
Business Park	78	1,271	3,560
Airport	370	802	281

Source: Table 16.1.

Transportation Facilities Impact Fee

This section summarizes an analysis of the need for transportation facilities to accommodate new development. It documents a reasonable relationship between new development and the impact fee for funding of these facilities.

Trip Generation Rates

The need for transportation facilities is based on the trip demand placed on the system by development. A reasonable measure of demand is the number of PM peak hours trips generated by a development project. Impact fee programs typically adjust trip rates for trip purpose and trip length in order to fairly allocate trip facilities responsibility between residential and nonresidential development. However, in this case the CLIBP is only comprised of nonresidential development, so no adjustments are made to the PM peak hour trip rates used to quantify demand amongst land uses. **Table 16.3** displays the PM peak hour trip rates per 1,000 building square feet, by land use.

Table 16.3: PM Peak Hour Trip Rates

	ITE Category	PM Peak Hour Trip Rate per KSF
Logistics/Distribution	High-Cube Transload and Short-Term Storage Warehouse (154)	0.16
Light Industrial	General Light Industrial (110)	0.83
Business Park	Business Park (770)	1.26
Airport[1]	General Aviation Airport (022)	0.55

[1] ITE estimate of 1.57 trips per employee converted to equivalent trips per KSF assumes 0.35 employees per KSF, consistent with CLIBP Specific Plan Assumptions.

Sources: Institute of Traffic Engineers, Trip Generation, 10th Edition; Crows Landing Industrial Business Park Specific Plan, Table A-1.

Growth in Trip Demand from New Development

Table 16.4 multiplies the projected land use assumptions from Table 16.2 by the trip rates from Table 16.3 to estimate total trip generation at the CLIBP through buildout.

Table 16.4: Traffic Facilities Trip Generation

	PM Peak Hour Trip Rate[1]	Projected Growth (KSF)	Total Trip Generation
Logistics/Distribution	0.16	5,663	906
Light Industrial	0.83	5,778	4,796
Business Park	1.26	1,271	1,601
Airport	0.55	802	441
Total		13,514	7,744

[1] Per thousand building square feet.

Sources: Tables 16.1 and 16.3, Willdan Financial Services.

Project Costs and Cost Allocation

Table 16.5 displays the traffic facilities cost assumptions, by phase and by subcategory. All costs are in current year dollars. Costs are distinguished between onsite and offsite costs.

Onsite costs are eligible to be funded completely by the impact fee, whereas some offsite costs cannot be funded by new development at CLIBP. The Crows Landing Industrial Business Park Transportation Infrastructure Plan has identified a fair share allocation of costs to development at the CLIBP, which is listed in the “Maximum Allocation to Impact Fee” column of Table 16.5

The final two columns summarize the maximum onsite and offsite allocations to the CLIBP transportation impact fee.

Table 16.5: Traffic Facilities Costs

Description	Onsite Costs	Offsite Costs	Total	County Funded (Onsite)	County Funded (Offsite)	Maximum Allocation To Impact Fee	Total Max Allocation	Total Max Onsite Allocation	Total Max Offsite Allocation
Earthwork and Grading									
Phase 1A									
Backbone Roadway 2 - Fink Rd to DMC	$ 24,294	$ -	$ 24,294	$ 24,294	$ -	0%	$ -	$ -	$ -
Phase 1B									
Bridge Ramp (DMC)	$ 55,116	$ -	$ 55,116	$ -	$ -	100%	$ 55,116	$ 55,116	$ -
Bell & Davis Rds	-	148,349	148,349	-	-	100%	148,349	-	148,349
Backbone Roadways	215,227	-	215,227	-	-	100%	215,227	215,227	-
Subtotal	$ 270,344	$ 148,349	$ 418,693	$ -	$ -		$ 418,693	$ 270,344	$ 148,349
Phase 2									
Backbone Roadways Only	$ 215,946	$ -	$ 215,946	$ -	$ -	100%	$ 215,946	$ 215,946	$ -
W. Marshall Rd - CLIBP to SR 33	-	36,062	36,062	-	-	100%	36,062	-	36,062
Subtotal	$ 215,946	$ 36,062	$ 252,008	$ -	$ -		$ 252,008	$ 215,946	$ 36,062
Phase 3									
Backbone Roadways Only	$ 360,516	$ -	$ 360,516	$ -	$ -	100%	$ 360,516	$ 360,516	$ -
W. Marshall Rd – CLIBP to Ward Ave.	-	105,272	105,272	-	-	85%	89,481	-	89,481
Subtotal	$ 360,516	$ 105,272	$ 465,789	$ -	$ -		$ 449,998	$ 360,516	$ 89,481
Subtotal - Construction	$ 871,100	$ 289,683	$ 1,160,783	$ 24,294	$ -		$ 1,120,698	$ 846,806	$ 273,892
Contingency[1]	$ 217,775	$ 72,421	$ 290,196	$ 6,074	$ -		$ 280,175	$ 211,702	$ 68,473
Civil Engineering and Construction Staking[2]	69,688	23,175	92,863	1,944	-		89,656	67,744	21,911
Agency Plan Checking[3]	8,711	2,897	11,608	243	-		11,207	8,468	2,739
Agency Inspection - Construction Management[4]	43,555	14,484	58,039	1,215	-		56,035	42,340	13,695
Total - Earthwork and Grading	$ 1,210,829	$ 402,659	$ 1,613,489	$ 33,769	$ -		$ 1,557,770	$ 1,177,060	$ 380,710

Note: Assumes onsite roads and traffic facilities funded by EFID.

[1] 25% of construction costs

[2] 8% of construction costs

[3] 1% of construction costs

[4] 5% of construction costs

Source: Crows Landing Industrial Business Park Financing Plan, Appendix K.

Table 16.5: Traffic Facilities Costs Continued

Description	Onsite Costs	Offsite Costs	Total	County Funded (Onsite)	County Funded (Offsite)	Maximum Allocation To Impact Fee	Total Max Allocation	Total Max Onsite Allocation	Total Max Offsite Allocation
Greenway Transportation Corridor									
Phase 2									
Multimodal Transportation Corridor/Green Space	$ 1,433,026	$ -	$ 1,433,026	$ -	$ -	100%	$ 1,433,026	$ 1,433,026	$ -
Contingency[1]	$ 358,257	$ -	$ 358,257	$ -	$ -		$ 358,257	$ 358,257	$ -
Civil Engineering and Construction Staking[2]	114,642	-	114,642	-	-		114,642	114,642	-
Agency Plan Checking[3]	14,330	-	14,330	-	-		14,330	14,330	-
Agency Inspection - Construction Management[4]	71,651	-	71,651	-	-		71,651	71,651	-
Total - Multimodal Transportation Corridor/Green Space	$ 1,991,906	$ -	$ 1,991,906	$ -	$ -		$ 1,991,906	$ 1,991,906	$ -
Right-Of-Way Acquisition									
Phase 2									
Marshall Rd (CLIBP to SR 33)	$ -	$ 54,014	$ 54,014	$ -	$ -	98%	$ 52,934	$ -	$ 52,934
Phase 3									
Marshall Rd (Ward Ave to CLIBP Entrance)	$ -	$ 84,879	$ 84,879	$ -	$ -	85%	$ 72,147	$ -	$ 72,147
SR 33 (Marshall Rd to Sperry Ave)	-	652,027	652,027	-	-	71%	462,939	-	462,939
Subtotal	$ -	$ 736,906	$ 736,906	$ -	$ -		$ 535,086	$ -	$ 535,086
Subtotal	$ -	$ 790,920	$ 790,920	$ -	$ -		$ 588,020	$ -	$ 588,020
Contingency[1]	$ -	$ 197,730	$ 197,730	$ -	$ -		$ 147,005	$ -	$ 147,005
Civil Engineering and Construction Staking[2]	-	63,274	63,274	-	-		47,042	-	47,042
Agency Plan Checking[3]	-	7,909	7,909	-	-		5,880	-	5,880
Agency Inspection - Construction Management[4]	-	39,546	39,546	-	-		29,401	-	29,401
Total - Right of Way Acquisition	$ -	$ 1,099,379	$ 1,099,379	$ -	$ -		$ 817,348	$ -	$ 817,348

Note: Assumes onsite roads and traffic facilities funded by EFID.
[1] 25% of construction costs
[2] 8% of construction costs
[3] 1% of construction costs
[4] 5% of construction costs

Source: Crows Landing Industrial Business Park Financing Plan, Appendix K.

Table 16.5: Traffic Facilities Costs Continued

Description	Onsite Costs	Offsite Costs	Total	County Funded (Onsite)	County Funded (Offsite)	Maximum Allocation To Impact Fee	Total Max Allocation	Total Max Onsite Allocation	Total Max Offsite Allocation
Miscellaneous									
Phase 1B									
Delta Mendota Bridge Crossing	$ 1,267,677	$ -	$ 1,267,677	$ -	$ -	100%	$ 1,267,677	$ 1,267,677	$ -
I-5 / Fink Road Interchange Improvements	-	16,534,918	16,534,918	-	-	47%	7,771,411	-	7,771,411
Subtotal - Construction	$ 1,267,677	$16,534,918	$17,802,595	$ -	$ -		$ 9,039,088	$ 1,267,677	$ 7,771,411
Contingency[1]	$ 316,919	$ 4,133,729	$ 4,450,649	$ -	$ -		$ 2,259,772	$ 316,919	$ 1,942,853
Civil Engineering and Construction Staking[2]	101,414	1,322,793	1,424,208	-	-		723,127	101,414	621,713
Agency Plan Checking[3]	12,677	165,349	178,026	-	-		90,391	12,677	77,714
Agency Inspection - Construction Management[4]	63,384	826,746	890,130	-	-		451,954	63,384	388,571
Total - Miscellaneous	$ 1,762,071	$22,983,535	$24,745,606	$ -	$ -		$12,564,333	$ 1,762,071	$ 10,802,262

Note: Assumes onsite roads and traffic facilities funded by EFID.

[1] 25% of construction costs

[2] 8% of construction costs

[3] 1% of construction costs

[4] 5% of construction costs

Source: Crow s Landing Industrial Business Park Financing Plan, Appendix K.

Table 16.5: Traffic Facilities Costs Continued

Description	Onsite Costs	Offsite Costs	Total	County Funded (Onsite)	County Funded (Offsite)	Maximum Allocation To Impact Fee	Total Max Allocation	Total Max Onsite Allocation	Total Max Offsite Allocation
Street Lighting									
Phase 1A									
200 Watt Electrolier - Fink Rd (I-5 to Bell Rd)	$ -	$ 198,419	$ 198,419	$ -	$ 198,419	0%	$ -	$ -	$ -
201 Watt Electrolier - Backbone Roadway 2 (Fink Rd to DMC)	48,502	-	48,502	48,502	-	0%	-	-	-
Subtotal	$ 48,502	$ 198,419	$ 246,921	$ 48,502	$ 198,419		$ -	$ -	$ -
Phase 1B									
200 Watt Electrolier - Backbone Roadways 1, 2, 4	$ 370,382	$ -	$ 370,382	$ -	$ -	100%	$ 370,382	$ 370,382	$ -
200 Watt Electrolier - Bell and Davis Rds	-	176,372	176,372	-	-	100%	176,372	-	176,372
Subtotal	$ 370,382	$ 176,372	$ 546,755	$ -	$ -		$ 546,755	$ 370,382	$ 176,372
Phase 2									
200 Watt Electrolier	$ 396,838	$ -	$ 396,838	$ -	$ -	100%	$ 396,838	$ 396,838	$ -
200 Watt Electrolier (W. Marshall Rd - CLIBP to SR 33)	-	92,596	92,596	-	-	100%	92,596	-	92,596
Subtotal	$ 396,838	$ 92,596	$ 489,434	$ -	$ -		$ 489,434	$ 396,838	$ 92,596
Phase 3									
200 Watt Electrolier	$ 714,308	$ -	$ 714,308	$ -	$ -	100%	$ 714,308	$ 714,308	$ -
200 Watt Electrolier (W. Marshall Rd – CLIBP to Ward Ave.)	-	141,098	141,098	-	-	100%	141,098	-	141,098
Subtotal	$ 714,308	$ 141,098	$ 855,406	$ -	$ -		$ 855,406	$ 714,308	$ 141,098
Subtotal - Construction	$ 1,530,031	$ 608,485	$ 2,138,516	$ 48,502	$ 198,419		$ 1,891,595	$ 1,481,529	$ 410,066
Contingency[1]	$ 382,508	$ 152,121	$ 534,629	$ 12,126	$ 49,605		$ 472,899	$ 370,382	$ 102,516
Civil Engineering and Construction Staking[2]	122,402	48,679	171,081	3,880	15,874		151,328	118,522	32,805
Agency Plan Checking[3]	15,300	6,085	21,385	485	1,984		18,916	14,815	4,101
Agency Inspection - Construction Management[4]	76,502	30,424	106,926	2,425	9,921		94,580	74,076	20,503
Total - Street Lighting	$ 2,126,743	$ 845,794	$ 2,972,537	$ 67,418	$ 275,802		$ 2,629,316	$ 2,059,325	$ 569,992

Note: Assumes onsite roads and traffic facilities funded by EFID.

[1] 25% of construction costs

[2] 8% of construction costs

[3] 1% of construction costs

[4] 5% of construction costs

Source: Crows Landing Industrial Business Park Financing Plan, Appendix K.

Table 16.5: Traffic Facilities Costs Continued

Description	Onsite Costs	Offsite Costs	Total	County Funded (Onsite)	County Funded (Offsite)	Maximum Allocation To Impact Fee	Total Max Allocation	Total Max Onsite Allocation	Total Max Offsite Allocation
Striping And Signage									
Phase 1A									
Signage (Fink Rd Entrance)	$ -	$ 137,791	$ 137,791	$ -	$ 137,791	0%	$ -	$ -	$ -
Phase 1B									
Signage	$ 220,466	$ -	$ 220,466	$ -	$ -	100%	$ 220,466	$ 220,466	$ -
Striping	220,466	-	220,466	-	-	100%	220,466	220,466	-
Striping (Davis Rd)	-	137,791	137,791	-	-	100%	137,791	-	137,791
Subtotal	$ 440,931	$ 137,791	$ 578,722	$ -	$ -		$ 578,722	$ 440,931	$ 137,791
Phase 2									
Signage	$ 220,466	$ 110,233	$ 330,698	$ -	$ -	100%	$ 330,698	$ 220,466	$ 110,233
Striping	220,466	330,698	551,164	-	-	100%	551,164	220,466	330,698
Subtotal	$ 440,931	$ 440,931	$ 881,862	$ -	$ -		$ 881,862	$ 440,931	$ 440,931
Phase 3									
Signage	$ 220,466	$ -	$ 220,466	$ -	$ -	100%	$ 220,466	$ 220,466	$ -
Signage - Offsite	-	440,931	440,931	-	-	100%	440,931	-	440,931
Striping	220,466	440,931	661,397	-	-	100%	661,397	220,466	440,931
Subtotal	$ 440,931	$ 881,862	$ 1,322,793	$ -	$ -		$ 1,322,793	$ 440,931	$ 881,862
Subtotal - Construction	$ 1,322,793	$ 1,598,375	$ 2,921,169	$ -	$ 137,791		$ 2,783,378	$ 1,322,793	$ 1,460,584
Contingency[1]	$ 330,698	$ 399,594	$ 730,292	$ -	$ 34,448		$ 695,844	$ 330,698	$ 365,146
Civil Engineering and Construction Staking[2]	105,823	127,870	233,694	-	11,023		222,670	105,823	116,847
Agency Plan Checking[3]	13,228	15,984	29,212	-	1,378		27,834	13,228	14,606
Agency Inspection - Construction Management[4]	66,140	79,919	146,058	-	6,890		139,169	66,140	73,029
Total - Striping and Signage	$ 1,838,683	$ 2,221,742	$ 4,060,425	$ -	$ 191,529		$ 3,868,895	$ 1,838,683	$ 2,030,212

Note: Assumes onsite roads and traffic facilities funded by EFID.
[1] 25% of construction costs
[2] 8% of construction costs
[3] 1% of construction costs
[4] 5% of construction costs

Source: Crow s Landing Industrial Business Park Financing Plan, Appendix K.

Table 16.5: Traffic Facilities Costs Continued

Description	Onsite Costs	Offsite Costs	Total	County Funded (Onsite)	County Funded (Offsite)	Maximum Allocation To Impact Fee	Total Max Allocation	Total Max Onsite Allocation	Total Max Offsite Allocation
Roadways									
Phase 1A									
Backbone Roadway 1 between Fink Rd and DMC	$ 903,027	$ -	$ 903,027	$ 903,027	$ -	0%	$ -	$ -	$ -
Bell Road (Fink Rd to W. Ike Crow Rd) - Initial .25' Overlay - Plate 3-A11 (60' ROW)	-	465,623	465,623	-	-	100%	465,623	-	465,623
Fink Road (I-5 to Bell Rd) - 25' Overlay (32' wide)	-	977,985	977,985	-	-	100%	977,985	-	977,985
W. Ike Crow Rd Overlay (Bell Rd to SR 33) Plate 3-A11 to 3-A12	-	559,101	559,101	-	-	100%	559,101	-	559,101
Subtotal	$ 903,027	$ 2,002,709	$ 2,905,736	$ 903,027	$ -		$ 2,002,709	$ -	$ 2,002,709
Phase 1B									
Backbone Roadways 1,2,4 (3 lanes, 120 ft ROW includes two 24' swales, 6' sidewalks, 3 travel lanes and parking)	$ 7,097,228	$ -	$ 7,097,228	$ -	$ -	100%	$ 7,097,228	$ 7,097,228	$ -
Bell Rd (82' ROW to include 2 travle lanes & center-aligned left turn lane, 24' swale, 12' shoulder/landscape, and 10' bike/ped path)	-	2,502,725	2,502,725	-	-	100%	2,502,725	-	2,502,725
Davis Rd (Fink Rd to CLIBP W. Entrance) Plate 3-A11 for non-fronting and 72' ROW with 24' swale for project fronting.	-	2,643,047	2,643,047	-	-	100%	2,643,047	-	2,643,047
Subtotal	$ 7,097,228	$ 5,145,772	$ 12,243,000	$ -	$ -		$ 12,243,000	$ 7,097,228	$ 5,145,772
Phase 2									
Backbone Roadways (3 lanes, 120 ft)	$ 9,361,409	$ -	$ 9,361,409	$ -	$ -	100%	$ 9,361,409	$ 9,361,409	$ -
Marshall Rd (CLIBP frontage) 4 lanes (94' ROW)	-	1,649,404	1,649,404	-	-	98%	1,616,416	-	1,616,416
Subtotal	$ 9,361,409	$ 1,649,404	$ 11,010,813	$ -	$ -		$ 10,977,825	$ 9,361,409	$ 1,616,416

Note: Assumes onsite roads and traffic facilities funded by EFID.

[1] 25% of construction costs

[2] 8% of construction costs

[3] 1% of construction costs

[4] 5% of construction costs

Source: Crow s Landing Industrial Business Park Financing Plan, Appendix KI Table XII: Fair Share Analysis - Intersections, Table XIII: Fair Share Analysis - Segments, Crow s Landing Industrial Business Park – Transportation Infrastructure Plan Page 39, 2018.

Table 16.5: Traffic Facilities Costs Continued

Description	Onsite Costs	Offsite Costs	Total	County Funded (Onsite)	County Funded (Offsite)	Maximum Allocation To Impact Fee	Total Max Allocation	Total Max Onsite Allocation	Total Max Offsite Allocation
Phase 3									
Backbone Roadways (3 lanes, 120 ft)	$14,785,193	$ -	$14,785,193	$ -	$ -	100%	$14,785,193	$14,785,193	$ -
Marshall Rd (Ward Ave to CLIBP) Plate 3-A12	-	916,140	916,140	-	-	85%	778,719	-	778,719
North Entrance Backbone Roadways (4 lanes,120 ft)	2,010,481	-	2,010,481	-	-	100%	2,010,481	2,010,481	-
SR 33 (Marshall Rd to Sperry Ave) Plate 3-A15	-	11,158,589	11,158,589	-	-	71%	7,922,598	-	7,922,598
Subtotal	$16,795,673	$12,074,729	$28,870,403	$ -	$ -		$25,496,991	$16,795,673	$ 8,701,317
Subtotal - Construction	$34,157,337	$20,872,615	$55,029,952	$ 903,027	$ -		$50,720,525	$33,254,310	$ 17,466,215
Contingency[1]	$ 8,539,334	$ 5,218,154	$13,757,488	$ 225,757	$ -		$12,680,131	$ 8,313,577	$ 4,366,554
Civil Engineering and Construction Staking[2]	2,732,587	1,669,809	4,402,396	72,242	-		4,057,642	2,660,345	1,397,297
Agency Plan Checking[3]	341,573	208,726	550,300	9,030	-		507,205	332,543	174,662
Agency Inspection - Construction Management[4]	1,707,867	1,043,631	2,751,498	45,151	-		2,536,026	1,662,715	873,311
Total - Roadways	$47,478,698	$29,012,935	$76,491,633	$1,255,207	$ -		$70,501,529	$46,223,490	$ 24,278,039

Note: Assumes onsite roads and traffic facilities funded by EFID.

[1] 25% of construction costs

[2] 8% of construction costs

[3] 1% of construction costs

[4] 5% of construction costs

Source: Crow s Landing Industrial Business Park Financing Plan, Appendix KI Table XII: Fair Share Analysis - Intersections, Table XIII: Fair Share Analysis - Segments, Crow s Landing Industrial Business Park – Transportation Infrastructure Plan Page 39, 2018.

Table 16.5: Traffic Facilities Costs Continued

Description	Onsite Costs	Offsite Costs	Total	County Funded (Onsite)	County Funded (Offsite)	Maximum Allocation To Impact Fee	Total Max Allocation	Total Max Onsite Allocation	Total Max Offsite Allocation
Traffic Signals									
Phase 1B									
Fink Rd at Bell Rd	$ -	$ 496,048	$ 496,048	$ -	$ -	80%	$ 396,838	$ -	$ 396,838
Fink Rd at Project Entrance	-	496,048	496,048	-	-	100%	496,048	-	496,048
Sperry Ave at SR 33	-	1,433,026	1,433,026	-	-	52%	745,174	-	745,174
W. Ike Crow Rd at SR 33	-	1,433,026	1,433,026	-	-	75%	1,074,770	-	1,074,770
Subtotal	$ -	$ 3,858,147	$ 3,858,147	$ -	$ -		$ 2,712,829	$ -	$ 2,712,829
Phase 2									
Fink Rd at SR 33	$ -	$ 1,433,026	$ 1,433,026	$ -	$ -	57%	$ 816,825	$ -	$ 816,825
Marshall Rd at SR 33	-	1,433,026	1,433,026	-	-	79%	1,132,091	-	1,132,091
Subtotal	$ -	$ 2,866,052	$ 2,866,052	$ -	$ -		$ 1,948,916	$ -	$ 1,948,916
Phase 3									
Carpenter Rd at W. Main St	$ -	$ 496,048	$ 496,048	$ -	$ -	37%	$ 183,538	$ -	$ 183,538
Crows Landing Rd at Marshall Rd	-	496,048	496,048	-	-	48%	238,103	-	238,103
Crows Landing Rd at W. Main St	-	496,048	496,048	-	-	29%	143,854	-	143,854
Marshall Rd at Project Entrance	-	496,048	496,048	-	-	100%	496,048	-	496,048
Marshall Rd at Ward Ave	-	496,048	496,048	-	-	74%	367,075	-	367,075
Subtotal	$ -	$ 2,480,238	$ 2,480,238	$ -	$ -		$ 1,428,617	$ -	$ 1,428,617
Subtotal - Construction	$ -	$ 9,204,437	$ 9,204,437	$ -	$ -		$ 6,090,361	$ -	$ 6,090,361
Contingency[1]	$ -	$ 2,301,109	$ 2,301,109	$ -	$ -		$ 1,522,590	$ -	$ 1,522,590
Civil Engineering and Construction Staking[2]	-	736,355	736,355	-	-		487,229	-	487,229
Agency Plan Checking[3]	-	92,044	92,044	-	-		60,904	-	60,904
Agency Inspection - Construction Management[4]	-	460,222	460,222	-	-		304,518	-	304,518
Total - Traffic Signals	$ -	$ 12,794,168	$ 12,794,168	$ -	$ -		$ 8,465,602	$ -	$ 8,465,602

Note: Assumes onsite roads and traffic facilities funded by EFID.

[1] 25% of construction costs

[2] 8% of construction costs

[3] 1% of construction costs

[4] 5% of construction costs

Source: Crows Landing Industrial Business Park Financing Plan, Appendix KI Table XII: Fair Share Analysis - Intersections, Table XIII: Fair Share Analysis - Segments, Crows Landing Industrial Business Park –

EIFD Funding

The County is pursuing the establishment of an enhanced infrastructure financing district (EIFD) to fund infrastructure at the CLIBP. EIFDs are tax increment financing districts that can be used to finance facilities. In this case, the County has directed Willdan to assume that an EIFD at the CLIBP can be used to fund onsite transportation improvements. **Table 16.6** summaries the value of the projected EIFD revenue that can be credited against the impact fee program through buildout of the CLIBP.

Table 16.6: Net Present Value of Estimated EIFD Revenue by Phase

		NPV
Discount Rate:		**2.0%**
Phase 1 (2023 - 2042)	$	14,529,000
Phase 2 (2043 - 2052)		19,555,000
Phase 3 (2053 - 2062)		32,461,000

Source: Table 7, Crow s Landing Industrial Business Park Tax Increment Analysis, Economic & Planning Systems, Inc. (EPS), April 28, 2020; Willdan Financial Services.

Net Impact Fee Cost Allocation

This analysis makes two adjustments to the maximum onsite and offsite impact fee allocations from Table 16.5:

1. The County will fund certain Phase 1a costs from a source other than impact fees. These costs have been subtracted from the total costs allocated to the impact fee.
2. The present value of the EIFD revenue estimated in Table 16.6 is subtracted from the total costs allocated to the impact fee.

After these adjustments a total of $35.9 million worth of transportation facilities is allocated to this impact fee. The impact fee allocation is summarized in **Table 16.7.**

Table 16.7: Summary of Traffic Costs Net of EIFD Revenue

	Phase 1A Onsite	Phase 1A Offsite	Phase 1B Onsite	Phase 1B Offsite	Phase 2 Onsite	Phase 2 Offsite	Phase 3 Onsite	Phase 3 Offsite	Total
Project Costs	$ 975,824	$ 2,338,919	$ 9,446,562	$ 26,001,350	$ 11,848,150	$ 5,139,059	$ 18,311,429	$ 16,420,106	$ 90,481,398
Contingency	243,956	584,730	2,361,640	6,500,337	2,962,038	1,284,765	4,577,857	4,105,026	22,620,350
Civil Engineering and Construction Staking	78,066	187,114	755,725	2,080,108	947,852	411,125	1,464,914	1,313,608	7,238,512
Agency Plan Checking	9,758	23,389	94,466	260,013	118,482	51,391	183,114	164,201	904,814
Agency Inspection - Construction Management	48,791	116,946	472,328	1,300,067	592,408	256,953	915,571	821,005	4,524,070
Total	$ 1,356,395	$ 3,251,098	$ 13,130,721	$ 36,141,876	$ 16,468,929	$ 7,143,292	$ 25,452,886	$ 22,823,947	$ 125,769,143
Dedicated County Funding	$ 1,356,395	$ 467,332	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 1,823,727
Net Costs	$ -	$ 2,783,766	$ 13,130,721	$ 36,141,876	$ 16,468,929	$ 7,143,292	$ 25,452,886	$ 22,823,947	$ 123,945,417
Maximum DIF Allocation	$ -	$ 2,783,766	$ 13,130,721	$ 22,368,609	$ 16,468,929	$ 5,821,117	$ 25,452,886	$ 16,370,673	$ 102,396,701
Estimated EIFD Revenue (2020$)	$ -	$ -	$ 14,529,000	$ -	$ 19,555,000	$ -	$ 32,461,000	$ -	$ 66,545,000
Net DIF Allocation	$ -	$ 2,783,766	$ (1,398,279)	$ 22,368,609	$ (3,086,071)	$ 5,821,117	$ (7,008,114)	$ 16,370,673	$ 35,851,701

Sources: Tables 16.5 and 16.6.

Cost per Trip Demand Unit

Every impact fee consists of a dollar amount, or the cost of projects that can be funded by a fee, divided by a measure of development. In this case, all fees are first calculated as a cost per PM peak hour trip. These amounts are translated into fees per 1,000 square feet of nonresidential building space by multiplying the cost per trip by the trip generation rate for each land use category. These amounts become the fee schedule.

Table 16.8 calculates the cost the cost per trip by dividing the net costs allocated to new development summarized in Table 16.7, by the total growth in trips calculated in Table 16.4.

Table 16.8: Cost per Trip

Cost Allocated to New Development	$	35,851,701
Total Trips		7,744
Cost per Trip	$	4,630

Sources: Tables 16.4 and 16.7.

Fee Schedule

Table 16.9 shows the maximum justified transportation facilities fee schedule. The County can adopt any fee up to this amount. The proposed fees are based on the costs per trip shown in Table 16.8. The cost per trip is multiplied by the trip rates in Table 16.3 to determine a fee per unit of new development. The total fee includes a two-percent (2%) administrative charge to fund costs that include: a standard overhead charge applied to all County programs for legal, accounting, and other departmental and administrative support, and fee program administrative costs including revenue collection, revenue and cost accounting, mandated public reporting, and fee justification analyses.

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

Table 16.9: Maximum Justified Traffic Impact Fee Schedule

Land Use	A Cost Per Trip	B PM Peak Hour Trip Rate	C = A x B Base Fee[1]	D = C x 0.02 Admin Charge[1, 2]	E = C + D Total Fee[1]	E / 1,000 Fee per Sq. Ft.
Logistics/Distribution	$ 4,630	0.16	$ 741	$ 15	$ 756	$ 0.76
Light Industrial	4,630	0.83	3,843	77	3,920	3.92
Business Park	4,630	1.26	5,834	117	5,951	5.95
Airport	4,630	0.55	2,547	51	2,598	2.60

[1] Fee 1,000 square feet of nonresidential building square feet.

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

Sources: Tables 16.3 and 16.8

Water Facilities Impact Fee

This section summarizes an analysis of the need for backbone water infrastructure to accommodate growth within the CLIBP. It documents a reasonable relationship between new development and a water fee to fund water facilities that serve new development.

Water Demand

Estimates of new development and its consequent increased water demand provide the basis for calculating the water facilities fee. The need for water facilities improvements is based on the water demand placed on the system by development. A reasonable measure of demand is water flow generation, expressed as the number of gallons per day (GPD) generated by a specific type of land use. Flow generation rates are a reasonable measure of demand on the County's system of water improvements because they represent the average rate of demand that will be placed on the system per land use designation.

Table 16.10 shows the calculation of flow generation per 1,000 square feet of nonresidential space for each land uses included in this study. The flow generation assumptions per acre come from the Crows Landing Industrial Business Park Water Supply (Potable & Non-Potable) Infrastructure and Facilities Study. FAR assumptions are used to convert the flow generation per acre, into an equivalent amount of flow generation per 1,000 square feet.

Table 16.10: Water Demand by Land Use

Land Use Type	Flow Generation[1]	FAR	Density[2]	Average Flow Generation per KSF
Logistics/Distribution	2,500	0.37	16.12	155.09
Light Industrial	2,500	0.38	16.55	151.06
Business Park	2,500	0.37	16.12	155.09
Airport	5.60	N/A	0.48	2.66

[1] Gallons per day per acre for all land uses except airport. Gallons per capita per day for airport land uses.
[2] Thousand building square feet per acre for nonresidential. Service population per KSF for airport land uses, including employees and visitors.

Sources: Crows Landing Industrial Business Park Water Supply (Potable & Non-Potable) Infrastructure And Facilities Study February 27, 2015 (Updated January 11, 2018)

Flow Generation by New Development

Table 16.11 shows the estimated flow generation from new development through buildout. The projected growth in terms of building square feet is multiplied by the flow generation assumptions from Table 16.10 to estimate flow generation for each land use. New development will generate nearly two million gallons of water flow per day at buildout.

Table 16.11: Water Facilities Flow Generation

	Flow Generation Factor per KSF	Projected Growth (KSF)	Total Flow Generation (GPD)
Logistics/Distribution	155.09	5,663	878,257
Light Industrial	151.06	5,778	872,810
Business Park	155.09	1,271	197,115
Airport	2.66	802	2,134
Total		13,514	1,950,316

Sources: Tables 16.2 and 16.10.

Facility Needs and Costs

Table 16.12 identifies the planned backbone water facilities needed to facilitate development at the CLIBP. The project list and costs assumptions come from Appendix K of the Crows Landing Industrial Business Park Financing Plan. All facilities are needed to serve new development and can be allocated to the impact fee. Note that the County intends to fund Phase 1a facilities costs with a funding source other than this impact fee.

Table 16.12: Water Facilities Project Costs

	Total
Potable Water	
Phase 1A	
12" Gate Valve	$ 4,409
12" PVC	303,802
Potable Water Storage Tanks (1.4 MG)	2,810,936
Potable Water Well and Booster Pump Station	2,755,820
Wellhead Treatment System	2,370,005
Engineering Costs (20% of Project Costs)	1,648,994
Contingency (20% of Project + Engineering Costs)	1,978,793
Subtotal	$ 11,872,759
Phase 1B	
12" Gate Valve	$ 37,479
12" PVC	2,469,104
Engineering Costs (20% of Project Costs)	501,317
Contingency (20% of Project + Engineering Costs)	601,580
Subtotal	$ 3,609,480
Phase 2	
12" Gate Valve (Potable Water)	$ 35,274
12" PVC (Potable Water)	2,342,998
Potable Water Storage Tanks (1.4 MG)	1,818,841
Potable Water Well and Booster Pump Station	2,755,820
Wellhead Treatment System	2,370,005
Engineering Costs (20% of Project Costs)	1,864,588
Contingency (20% of Project + Engineering Costs)	2,237,505
Subtotal	$ 13,425,030
Phase 3	
12" Gate Valve	$ 22,047
12" PVC	1,433,026
Water Well and Booster Pump Station	2,755,820
Wellhead Treatment System	2,370,005
Engineering Costs (20% of Project Costs)	1,316,179
Contingency (20% of Project + Engineering Costs)	1,579,415
Subtotal	$ 9,476,492
Total	$ 38,383,761

Note: All costs are onsite.

Source: Crow s Landing Industrial Business Park Financing Plan, Appendix K.

Table 16.12: Water Facilities Project Costs Continued

	Total
Non-Potable Water	
Phase 1A	
12" Gate Valve	$ 4,409
12" PVC	250,780
Fire Hydrant, Bury, and Gate Valve	60,628
Non-Potable Water Storage Tanks (0.75 MG)	1,377,910
Engineering Costs (20% of Project Costs)	338,745
Contingency (20% of Project + Engineering Costs)	406,494
Subtotal	$ 2,438,966
Phase 1B	
12" Gate Valve	$ 31,968
12" PVC	2,113,714
18" Gate Valve	27,558
18" PVC	584,234
Fire Hydrant, Bury, and Gate Valve	490,536
New Nonpotable Well & Booster Pump Station	2,755,820
Non-Potable Water Well Pump	1,102,328
Engineering Costs (20% of Project Costs)	1,421,231
Contingency (20% of Project + Engineering Costs)	1,705,478
Subtotal	$ 10,232,865
Phase 2	
12" Gate Valve	$ 36,377
12" PVC	2,364,493
Fire Hydrant, Bury, and Gate Valve	457,466
Engineering Costs (20% of Project Costs)	571,667
Contingency (20% of Project + Engineering Costs)	686,001
Subtotal	$ 4,116,004
Phase 3	
12" Gate Valve	1,433,026
12" PVC	22,047
Fire Hydrant, Bury, and Gate Valve (Non-Potable Water)	275,582
Water Well Pump	551,164
Engineering Costs (20% of Project Costs)	456,364
Contingency (20% of Project + Engineering Costs)	547,636
Subtotal	$ 3,285,819
Total	$ 20,073,654

Note: All costs are onsite.

Source: Crows Landing Industrial Business Park Financing Plan, Appendix K.

Cost per GPD

Table 16.13 calculates a cost per GPD by dividing the total cost of projects allocated to new development identified in Table 16.12, by the increase in flow generation identified in Table 16.11. The costs allocated to the impact fee exclude Phase 1a costs.

Table 16.13: Cost per GPD

Potable Water Facilities	$26,511,002
Non-Potable Water Facilites	17,634,688
Cost Allocated to New Development	$44,145,690
Total GPD	1,950,316
Cost per GPD	$ 23

Note: Facilities costs exclude Phase 1a costs funded by the County.

Sources: Tables 16.11 and 16.12.

Fee Schedule

The maximum justified fee for water facilities is shown in **Table 16.13**. The cost per GPD is converted to a fee per unit of new development based on the GPD factors shown in Table 16.10. The total fee includes an administrative charge to fund costs that include: (1) a standard overhead charge applied to all County programs for legal, accounting, and other departmental and citywide administrative support, (2) capital planning, programming, project management costs associated with the share of projects funded by the facilities fee, and (3) fee program administrative costs including revenue collection, revenue and cost accounting, mandated public reporting, and fee justification analyses.

Table 16.14: Water Facilities Impact Fee

	A Cost Per GPD	*B* Flow Generation Factor	*C = A x B* Base Fee[1]	*D = C x 0.02* Admin Charge[1, 2]	*E = C + D* Total Fee[1]	*E / 1,000* Fee per Sq. Ft.
Logistics/Distribution	$ 23	155.09	$ 3,567	$ 71	$ 3,638	$ 3.64
Light Industrial	23	151.06	3,474	69	3,543	3.54
Business Park	23	155.09	3,567	71	3,638	3.64
Airport	23	2.66	61	1	62	0.06

[1] Fee per 1,000 building square feet.

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

Sources: Tables 16.10 and 16.13.

Wastewater Facilities Impact Fee

This section summarizes an analysis of the need for backbone wastewater infrastructure to accommodate growth within the CLIBP. It documents a reasonable relationship between new development and a wastewater fee to fund wastewater facilities that serve new development.

Wastewater Demand

Estimates of new development and its consequent increased wastewater demand provide the basis for calculating the wastewater facilities fee. The need for wastewater facilities improvements is based on the wastewater demand placed on the system by development. A reasonable measure of demand is wastewater flow generation, expressed as the number of gallons per day (GPD) generated by a specific type of land use. Flow generation rates are a reasonable measure of demand on the County's system of wastewater infrastructure because they represent the average rate of demand that will be placed on the system per land use designation.

Table 16.15 shows the calculation of flow generation per 1,000 square feet of nonresidential space for each land uses included in this study. The flow generation assumptions per acre come from the Crows Landing Industrial Business Park Sanitary Sewer Infrastructure and Facilities Study. FAR assumptions are used to convert the flow generation per acre, into an equivalent amount of flow generation per 1,000 square feet.

Table 16.15: Wastewater Demand by Land Use

Land Use Type	Flow Generation[1]	FAR	Density[2]	Average Flow Generation per KSF
Logistics/Distribution	1,000	0.37	16.12	62.05
Light Industrial	1,000	0.38	16.55	60.41
Business Park	1,000	0.37	16.12	62.05
Airport	4	N/A	0.48	2.66

[1] Gallons per day per acre for all land uses except airport. Gallons per capita per day for airport land uses.

[2] Thousand building square feet per acre for nonresidential. Service population per KSF for airport land uses, including employees and visitors.

Sources: Crows Landing Industrial Business Park Specific Plan; Crows Landing Industrial Business Park Sanitary Sewer Infrastructure And Facilities Study January 30, 2015 (Updated March 29, 2016 And November 30, 2017).

Flow Generation by New Development

Table 16.16 shows the estimated flow generation from new development through buildout. The projected growth in terms of building square feet is multiplied by the flow generation assumptions from Table 16.15 to estimate flow generation for each land use. New development will generate over 781,000 gallons of wastewater flow per day at buildout.

Table 16.16: Wastewater Facilities Flow Generation

	Flow Generation Factor per KSF	Projected Growth (KSF)	Total Flow Generation (GPD)
Logistics/Distribution	62.05	5,663	351,364
Light Industrial	60.41	5,778	349,065
Business Park	62.05	1,271	78,860
Airport	2.66	802	2,134
Total		13,514	781,423

Sources: Tables 16.2 and 16.15.

Facility Needs and Costs

Table 16.17 identifies the planned backbone wastewater facilities needed to facilitate development at the CLIBP. The project list and costs assumptions come from Appendix K of the Crows Landing Industrial Business Park Financing Plan. All facilities are needed to serve new development and can be allocated to the impact fee. Note that the County intends to fund Phase 1a facilities costs with a funding source other than this impact fee.

Table 16.17: Wastewater Facilities

	Onsite	Offsite	Total
Phase 1A			
0.32 MGD Lift Station	$ 220,466	$ -	$ 220,466
12" Force Main	1,640,264	-	1,640,264
12" Pipe	329,816	-	329,816
18" Pipe	1,505,537	-	1,505,537
2.80 MGD Lift Station	1,929,074	-	1,929,074
8" Pipe	189,248	-	189,248
Sewer Connection Cost	3,968,380	-	3,968,380
Tunneled Crossing (Delta Mendota Canal South of Airport)	82,675	-	82,675
Type A Case I Manhole	555,573	-	555,573
Engineering Costs (20% of Project Costs)	2,084,207	-	2,084,207
Contingency (20% of Project + Engineering Costs)	2,501,048	-	2,501,048
Subtotal	$ 15,006,287	$ -	$ 15,006,287
Phase 1B			
10" Pipe	$ 532,457	$ -	$ 532,457
12" Pipe	333,785	-	333,785
15" Pipe	62,811	-	62,811
8" Pipe	1,519,272	-	1,519,272
Sewer Connection Cost	10,913,046	-	10,913,046
Type "A" Case I Manhole	277,787	-	277,787
Engineering Costs (20% of Project Costs)	2,727,831	-	2,727,831
Contingency (20% of Project + Engineering Costs)	3,273,398	-	3,273,398
Subtotal	$ 19,640,387	$ -	$ 19,640,387
Phase 2			
10" Pipe	$ 96,332	$ -	$ 96,332
12" Force Main	-	1,041,700	1,041,700
12" Pipe	145,287	-	145,287
8" Pipe	675,595	-	675,595
Sewer Connection Cost	7,165,131	-	7,165,131
Type "A" Case I Manhole	198,419	-	198,419
Engineering Costs (20% of Project Costs)	1,656,153	208,340	1,864,493
Contingency (20% of Project + Engineering Costs)	1,987,383	250,008	2,237,391
Subtotal	$ 11,924,300	$ 1,500,048	$ 13,424,348
Phase 3			
10" Pipe	$ 301,299	$ -	$ 301,299
8" Pipe	1,175,170	-	1,175,170
Sewer Connection Cost	11,794,908	-	11,794,908
Type "A" Case I Manhole	327,391	-	327,391
Engineering Costs (20% of Project Costs)	2,719,754	-	2,719,754
Contingency (20% of Project + Engineering Costs)	3,263,704	-	3,263,704
Subtotal	$ 19,582,226	$ -	$ 19,582,226
Total	$ 66,153,200	$ 1,500,048	$ 67,653,247

Source: Crow s Landing Industrial Business Park Financing Plan, Appendix K.

Cost per GPD

Table 16.18 calculates a cost per GPD by dividing the total cost of projects allocated to new development identified in Table 16.17, by the increase in flow generation identified in Table 16.16. The costs allocated to the impact fee exclude Phase 1a costs.

Table 16.18: Cost per GPD

Cost Allocated to New Development	$52,646,961
Total GPD	781,423
Cost per GPD	$ 67

Note: Facilities costs exclude Phase 1a costs funded by the County.

Sources: Tables 16.16 and 16.17.

Fee Schedule

The maximum justified fee for wastewater facilities is shown in **Table 16.19**. The cost per GPD is converted to a fee per unit of new development based on the GPD factors shown in Table 16.15. The total fee includes an administrative charge to fund costs that include: (1) a standard overhead charge applied to all County programs for legal, accounting, and other departmental and citywide administrative support, (2) capital planning, programming, project management costs associated with the share of projects funded by the facilities fee, and (3) fee program administrative costs including revenue collection, revenue and cost accounting, mandated public reporting, and fee justification analyses.

Table 16.19: Wastewater Facilities Impact Fee

	A	*B*	*C = A x B*	*D = C x 0.02*	*E = C + D*	*E / 1,000*
	Cost Per GPD	**Flow Generation Factor**	**Base Fee[1]**	**Admin Charge[1, 2]**	**Total Fee[1]**	**Fee per Sq. Ft.**
Logistics/Distribution	$ 67	62.05	$ 4,157	$ 83	$ 4,240	$ 4.24
Light Industrial	67	60.41	4,048	81	4,129	4.13
Business Park	67	62.05	4,157	83	4,240	4.24
Airport	67	2.66	178	4	182	0.18

[1] Fee per 1,000 building square feet.

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

Sources: Tables 16.15 and 16.18

Storm Drain Facilities Impact Fee

This section summarizes an analysis of the need for storm drain facilities to accommodate growth within the CLIBP. This section documents a reasonable relationship between new development and a storm drain fee to fund storm drain infrastructure that serves new development.

Storm Drain Demand

Most new development generates storm water runoff by increasing the amount of land that is impervious to precipitation that must be controlled through storm drain facilities. **Table 16.20** shows the calculation of impervious surface generation per 1,000 building square feet using FAR and average percent impervious assumptions. The impervious surface coefficients are based on from California Environmental Protection Agency data.

Table 16.20: Storm Drain Demand

	FAR	KSF per Acre	Average Percent Impervious per Acre[1]	Impervious Sq. Ft. per Building Sq. Ft.
Logistics/Distribution	0.37	16.12	0.81	2.19
Light Industrial	0.38	16.55	0.81	2.13
Business Park	0.37	16.12	0.69	1.87
Airport	0.40	17.42	0.81	2.03

[1] Percent impervious coefficients identified in User's Guide for the California Impervious Surface Coefficients, CA EPA.

Sources: Crow s Landing Industrial Business Park Specific Plan; Page 10, User's Guide for the California Impervious Surface Coefficients, Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment California Environmental Protection Agency, December 2010.

Impervious Surface Generation by New Development

Table 16.21 shows the estimated impervious surface generated by new development through buildout. The "impervious square feet per building square feet" assumption from Table 16.20 quantifies how much impervious surface will be generated by each type of land use relative to the building square feet. These assumptions are multiplied by the increase in building square footage to estimate the total impervious surface generated at CLIBP.

New development will generate approximately 28.7 million square feet of impervious surface at the CLIBP through buildout. This figure exceeds the 13.5 million building square feet because the facilities supporting that building space also generate impervious surface. For example, parking lots, sidewalks and shade structures all prevent water from being absorbed into the ground, but none of these items are included in a building's square footage. It is the total impervious surface generated by development, including building space, parking lots, sidewalks and other facilities that creates the need for storm drainage facilities.

Table 16.21: Impervious Surface

	Impervious Sq. Ft. per Building Sq. Ft.	Projected Growth (KSF)	Total Impervious Surface (KSF)
Logistics/Distribution	2.19	5,663	12,396
Light Industrial	2.13	5,778	12,319
Business Park	1.87	1,271	2,370
Airport	2.03	802	1,624
Total		13,514	28,709

Sources: Tables 16.2 and 16.20.

Planned Facilities

Table 16.22 identifies the planned drainage infrastructure needed to facilitate development at the CLIBP. The project list and costs assumptions come from Appendix K of the Crows Landing Industrial Business Park Financing Plan. All facilities are needed to serve new development and can be allocated to the impact fee. Note that the County intends to fund Phase 1a facilities costs with a funding source other than this impact fee.

Table 16.22: Stormwater Management and Drainage Facilities

	Total
Phase 1A	
Davis Rd Raise	$ 248,299
Subtotal	$ 248,299
Phase 1B	
Detention Basin/Stormwater Pond Earthwork	$2,032,731
Detention Basin/Stormwater Pond Inlet/Outlet Works	55,116
Headwalls	55,116
Infiltration Trenches	462,730
On-Site Channel Earthwork	440,931
Triple 4x8 Box Culverts	1,838,683
Subtotal	$4,885,308
Phase 2	
Detention Basin/Stormwater Pond Earthwork	$ 627,913
Infiltration Trenches	142,944
Subtotal	$ 770,858
Phase 3	
Detention Basin/Stormwater Pond Earthwork	$ 729,013
Infiltration Trenches	165,955
Subtotal	$ 894,969
Total Construction Costs	$6,799,434
Contingency (25% of Construction Costs)	$1,699,858
Civil Engineering and Construction Staking (8% of Construction Costs)	543,955
Agency Plan Checking (1% of Construction Costs)	67,994
Agency Inspection - Construction Management (5% of Construction Costs)	339,972
Grand Total	$9,451,213

Note: All costs are onsite.

Source: Crows Landing Industrial Business Park Financing Plan, Appendix K.

Cost per 1,000 Square Feet of Impervious Surface

Table 16.23 calculates a cost per 1,000 square feet of impervious surface by dividing the total cost of projects allocated to new development identified in Table 16.22, by the increase in impervious surface identified in Table 16.21. The costs allocated to the impact fee exclude Phase 1a costs.

Table 16.23: Cost per KSF of Impervious Surface

Cost Allocated to New Development	$ 9,106,077
Growth in KSF of Impervious Surface	28,709
Cost per KSF of Impervious Surface	$ 317

Note: Facilities costs exclude Phase 1a costs funded by the County.

Sources: Tables 16.21 and 16.22.

Fee Schedule

The maximum justified fee for storm drain facilities is shown in **Table 16.24**. The County can adopt any fee up to this amount. The cost per 1,000 square feet of impervious surface from Table 16.23 is converted to a fee per unit of new development based on the impervious surface generation assumptions shown in Table 16.20. The total fee includes a two-percent (2.0%) administrative charge to fund costs that include: a standard overhead charge applied to all County programs for legal, accounting, and other departmental and administrative support, and fee program administrative costs including revenue collection, revenue and cost accounting and mandated public reporting.

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

Table 16.24: Storm Drain Facilities Fee

	A	*B*	*C = A x B*	*D = C x 0.02*	*E = C + D*	*E / 1,000*
	Cost Per KSF of Impervious Surface	**Impervious Sq. Ft. per Building Sq. Ft.**	**Base Fee[1]**	**Admin Charge[1, 2]**	**Total Fee[1]**	**Fee per Sq. Ft.**
Logistics/Distribution	$ 317	2.19	$ 694	$ 14	$ 708	$ 0.71
Light Industrial	317	2.13	676	14	690	0.69
Business Park	317	1.87	591	12	603	0.60
Airport	317	2.03	642	13	655	0.66

[1] Fee per 1,000 building square feet.

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

Sources: Tables 16.20 and 16.23.

Combined CLIBP Fee Schedule

Table 16.25 summarizes the maximum justified combined CLIBP impact fee schedule including the traffic facilities, water facilities, wastewater facilities and storm drain facilities fees calculated earlier in this chapter.

Table 16.25: Crows Landing Industrial Business Park - Maximum Justified Impact Fee Schedule

	Traffic Facilities	Water Facilities	Wastewater Facilities	Strom Drain Facilities	Total Fees per 1,000 Sq. Ft.[1]	Fee per Sq. Ft.[1]
Fee per KSF						
Logistics/Distribution	$ 756	$ 3,638	$ 4,240	$ 708	$ 9,342	$ 9.34
Light Industrial	3,920	3,543	4,129	690	12,282	12.28
Business Park	5,951	3,638	4,240	603	14,432	14.43
Airport[2]	2,598	62	182	655	3,497	3.50

[1] Includes 2% administration fee for (1) legal, accounting, and other administrative support and (2) impact fee program administrative costs including revenue collection, revenue and cost accounting, mandated public reporting, and fee justification analyses.

Sources: Tables 16.9, 16.14, 16.19, 16.24.

17. Implementation

Impact Fee Program Adoption Process

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

Inflation Adjustment

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

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

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

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

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

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

For all of the fee categories except the park facilities fees, the steps are as follows:

1. For each facility type (land, buildings, equipment), identify the percent change in facility value since the last update, based on changes in each inflation index or for each type of land.
2. Modify the value of each facility, existing and planned (if applicable) by the percent change identified in Step 1.
3. Depending on fee methodology for each particular fee category calculate the total value of existing facilities (existing inventory method), or the value of existing facilities plus planned facilities (system plan method) using the updated figures from Step 2.
4. Recalculate the cost per capita for each fee category by dividing the results of Step 3 by either the existing service population if the fee is calculated using the existing inventory method, or by the future service population is the fee is calculated using the system plan methodology. Both the existing and future service populations are identified in the first table of every chapter in this report.

5. Calculate the cost per worker (if applicable) for fee categories that are charged to nonresidential development. The cost per worker is equal to the cost per capita calculated in Step 4 multiplied by 0.31.
6. Update the fee schedule by multiplying the cost per capita and the cost per worker calculated in Step 5 by the density factors listed in Table 2.2 to determine the base fee for each land use.

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

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

Once all of the fees have been inflated, multiply the sum of all the fees, per land use, by two percent (2%) to determine the administrative charge. As part of this update the administrative fee is being increased from one percent (1%) to two percent (2%). Future updates to the fee program should review the administrative fee to ensure that it fully covers the cost of administering the fee program.

Reporting Requirements

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

Programming Revenues and Projects with the CIP

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

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

18. Mitigation Fee Act Findings

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

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

Purpose of Fee

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

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

Use of Fee Revenues

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

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

Benefit Relationship

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

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

Burden Relationship

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

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

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

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

Proportionality

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

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

See *Chapter 2, Growth Forecasts and Unit Cost Estimates,* or the *Service Population* section in each facility category chapter for a description of how service populations 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: Vehicle and Equipment Inventories

All vehicle and equipment inventories in this appendix document replacement cost, as provided by Stanislaus County in 2016.

Table A.1: Animal Services Vehicle and Equipment Inventory

Equip #	Description	Acquire Cost
Animal Services Agency Admin		
04-56	2004 Ford F250 Xl Sd	16,422
Animal Services		
02-42	2002 Ford F350 Supercab	43,731
06-39	2006 Chevrolet Silverado 3500	40,580
09-44	2009 Ford F350 Supercab	50,839
09-56	2009 Ford F350 Supercab	51,123
0T-100	2010 Big Tex Trailer	4,754
0T-46	2000 Circle J Varied	-
14-42	2014 Ford F350 Supercab	50,228
15-34	2015 Ford F350 Supercab	25,733
Animal Services		
0T-44	2001 Featherlite Trailer	-
Animal Services		
02-33	2002 Ford Windstar	22,763
04-30	2004 Chevrolet Venture	17,446
08-34	2008 Chevrolet Uplander	18,042
Total		341,661

Source: Stanislaus County.

Table A.2: Behavioral Health Vehicle Inventory

Equip #	Description	Acquire Cost
BHRS Patients Rights		
00-50	2000 Chevrolet Malibu	14,533
BHRS Data Management Services		
01-108	2001 Gmc Safari	18,739
04-36	2004 Chevrolet Colorado	15,537
06-41	2006 Ford E150 Cargo	13,436
BHRS Facilities		
16-25	2016 Ford Fusion	25,422
16-49	2016 Ford F250 Sd 4X4Crew	33,482
16-65	2016 Chevrolet Cargo Van	22,519
BHRS Patient Finance		
14-37	2014 Ford Fusion	19,194
BHRS Public Guardian		
07-21	2007 Ford Taurus	13,956
07-35	2007 Ford Taurus	13,956
07-37	2007 Ford Taurus	15,436
10-44	2010 Ford Fusion	17,438
11-47	2011 Ford Police Int	24,263
13-32	2013 Ford F 250	22,634
BHRS Integrated Forensic Team Post Release		
13-31	2013 Ford Focus	17,713
14-39	2014 Ford Fusion	19,194
BHRS West Modesto Regional Services		
01-104	2001 Gmc Safari	21,540
07-28	2007 Ford Taurus	13,956
10-35	2010 Dodge Caravan	19,505
11-31	2011 Chevrolet Impala	18,926
15-63	2015 Dodge Caravan	22,519
BHRS Turlock Regional Services		
07-34	2007 Ford Freestar Se	18,681
10-36	2010 Dodge Caravan	19,505
15-43	2015 Ford Fusion	19,106
BHRS Community Response Team		
14-35	2014 Ford Fusion	19,194
14-36	2014 Ford Fusion	19,194
16-78	2016 Ford Fusion	18,855

Source: Stanislaus County.

Table A.2: Behavioral Health Vehicle Inventory

Equip #	Description	Acquire Cost
BHRS Juvenile Justice		
01-64	2001 Ford Windstar	20,469
12-22	2012 Dodge Grand Caravan	22,243
BHRS Parent Partners		
07-56	2007 Chevrolet Uplander	16,047
BHRS Youth & Family Services		
00-47	2000 Chevrolet Malibu	14,533
07-36	2007 Ford Taurus	13,956
BHRS Childeren's SED		
07-29	2007 Ford Taurus	13,956
09-43	2009 Ford Fusion	17,898
15-67	2015 Dodge Caravan	22,519
16-77	2016 Ford Fusion	18,855
BHRS Leaps & Bounds		
03-40	2003 Ford Windstar	19,281
05-40	2005 Ford Taurus	13,620
BHRS Family Partnership		
14-41	2014 Ford Fusion	19,194
BHRS Consultation & Education Primary Prevention		
12-23	2012 Dodge Grand Caravan	22,335
BHRS Adult Drug Court		
01-125	2001 Ford Crown Victoria	26,556
BHRS Co-Occurring Disorders		
15-44	2015 Ford Fusion	19,106
16-58	2016 Dodge Caravan	22,519
BHRS Prevention & Early Intervention		
15-48	2015 Ford Fusion	19,106
16-103	2016 Dodge Caravan	22,519
BHRS Peer Support		
16-63	2016 Dodge Caravan	22,519

Source: Stanislaus County.

Table A.2: Behavioral Health Vehicle Inventory

Equip #	Description	Acquire Cost
BHRS Housing Programs		
15-46	2015 Ford Fusion	19,106
16-105	2016 Dodge Caravan	22,519
16-106	2016 Dodge Caravan	22,519
16-20	2016 Ford Fusion	18,855
16-61	2016 Dodge Caravan	22,519
BHRS Employment		
10-39	2010 Dodge Caravan	19,505
BHRS High Risk Health & Senior Access		
00-82	2000 Chevrolet Malibu	13,349
13-33	2013 Dodge Grand Caravan	23,003
14-40	2014 Ford Fusion	19,194
15-89	2015 Dodge Ram Promaster	66,105
16-104	2016 Dodge Caravan	22,519
16-52	2016 Chevrolet Impala	19,158
16-60	2016 Dodge Caravan	22,519
MHSA Admin		
15-47	2015 Ford Fusion	19,106
15-64	2015 Dodge Caravan	22,519
MHSA Integrated Forensic Team		
13-34	2013 Dodge Grand Caravan	23,003
14-38	2014 Ford Fusion	19,194
16-59	2016 Dodge Caravan	22,519
MHSA Transitional Age Youth Drop In Center		
07-24	2007 Ford Freestar Se	18,681
13-36	2013 Dodge Grand Caravan	23,003
16-62	2016 Dodge Caravan	22,519
MHSA Families Together		
01-107	2001 Gmc Safari	21,540
15-74	2015 Dodge Caravan	22,519
MHSA Juvenile Justice Fsp		
07-55	2007 Chevrolet Uplander	18,805
13-35	2013 Dodge Grand Caravan	23,003
15-49	2015 Ford Fusion	19,106
15-62	2015 Dodge Caravan	22,519
15-75	2015 Dodge Caravan	22,519
16-53	2016 Dodge Caravan	21,980
Total		$1,539,060

Source: Stanislaus County.

Table A.3: Criminal Justice Vehicle Inventory

Equip #	Description	Acquire Cost
D.A. Administration		
00-101	2000 Chevrolet Malibu	13,349
00-113	2000 Ford Crown Victoria	25,022
00-70	2000 Chevrolet Impala	20,267
00-96	2000 Chevrolet Malibu	13,349
00-97	2000 Chevrolet Malibu	13,349
01-43	2001 Dodge Intrepid	19,491
02-58	2002 Dodge Intrepid	15,267
02-59	2002 Buick Century Custom	15,231
02-67	2002 Ford Taurus	17,628
02-68	2002 Dodge Intrepid	20,522
02-70	2002 Dodge Intrepid	20,522
06-63	2006 Pontiac Grand Prix	16,286
07-129	2007 Toyota Camry Xle	1
09-40	2009 Chevrolet Impala	17,999
09-41	2009 Chevrolet Impala	17,999
09-42	2009 Chevrolet Impala	17,999
11-34	2011 Chevrolet Tahoe Ls 4X4	25,471
11-45	2011 Dodge Durango	-
13-39	2013 Chevrolet Impala	19,437
13-40	2013 Chevrolet Impala	19,437
15-100	2015 Ford Taurus	19,863
15-54	2015 Ford Taurus	-
15-71	2015 Ford F250 Sd 4X4Crew	31,237
15-78	2015 Chevrolet Tahoe Ls 4X4	43,293
15-92	2015 Ford Taurus	19,863
15-98	2015 Ford Taurus	19,863
15-99	2015 Ford Taurus	19,863
16-56	2016 Chevrolet Impala	19,698
16-57	2016 Chevrolet Impala	20,194
97-62	1997 Ford Aerostar	18,539
Probation Casework		
01-109	2001 Ford E350 15-Pass	29,507
01-112	2001 Ford Police Int	24,241
01-113	2001 Ford Police Int	23,556
01-70	2001 Ford Crown Victoria	20,639
01-72	2001 Ford Crown Victoria	20,639
01-73	2001 Ford Crown Victoria	20,639
03-24	2003 Ford Police Int	23,386
03-25	2003 Ford Police Int	23,386
03-48	2003 Ford Police Int	23,623
03-63	2003 Nissan Xterra	246
05-33	2005 Ford Police Int	23,899
05-46	2005 Dodge Stratus Sxt	12,248

Source: Stanislaus County.

Table A.3: Criminal Justice Vehicle Inventory

Equip #	Description	Acquire Cost
05-69	2005 Ford Police Int	23,253
05-76	2005 Ford Police Int	21,017
06-52	2006 Chevrolet Silverado 1500	14,008
06-65	2006 Ford Police Int	23,201
07-75	2007 Ford Police Int	23,835
07-76	2007 Ford Police Int	23,835
07-78	2007 Ford Police Int	23,835
07-79	2007 Ford Police Int	23,835
08-49	2008 Ford Expedition	28,960
08-50	2008 Ford Police Int	23,025
08-51	2008 Ford Police Int	23,025
08-59	2008 Ford Crown Victoria	24,469
09-26	2009 Ford Police Int	23,025
0T-43	1999 Spcns Trailer	-
11-37	2011 Ford Police Int	23,759
11-38	2011 Ford Police Int	23,759
11-39	2011 Ford Police Int	23,759
11-40	2011 Ford Police Int	23,759
11-41	2011 Ford Police Int	23,759
11-42	2011 Ford Police Int	23,759
11-43	2011 Ford Police Int	23,759
11-44	2011 Ford Police Int	23,759
13-01	2013 Ford Police Int	24,125
13-02	2013 Ford Police Int	24,125
13-03	2013 Ford Police Int	24,125
15-37	2015 Ford Explorer	27,399
15-38	2015 Ford Explorer	27,399
15-39	2015 Ford Explorer	29,073
15-93	2015 Ford Taurus	19,863
15-94	2015 Ford Taurus	19,863
16-107	2016 Chevrolet Traverse	26,518
16-108	2016 Chevrolet Equinox	23,684
16-80	2016 Ford Police Int	28,252
16-81	2016 Ford Police Int	28,252
16-82	2016 Ford Police Int	28,252
16-83	2016 Ford Police Int	28,252
97-50	1997 Ford Aerostar	17,436
Probation-Institutions		
06-47	2006 Chevrolet Express	23,281
07-77	2007 Ford Police Int	23,835
09-27	2009 Ford Crown Victoria	23,025
09-28	2009 Ford Crown Victoria	23,025
96-53	1996 Ford Econoline	18,650

Source: Stanislaus County.

Table A.3: Criminal Justice Vehicle Inventory

Equip #	Description	Acquire Cost
Public Defender Operations		
00-98	2000 Chevrolet Malibu	13,349
07-61	2007 Ford Fusion	18,140
16-84	2016 Chevrolet Impala	19,444
16-85	2016 Chevrolet Impala	19,444
Total		$ 1,835,251

Source: Stanislaus County.

Table A.4: Detention Vehicle Inventory

Equip #	Description	Acquire Cost
S/O Jail Alternatives		
07-18	2007 Ford Police Int	$ 23,899
08-47	2008 Chevrolet Impala	16,181
10-23	2010 Ford Expedition	32,405
11-52	2011 Ford Police Int	24,048
11-63	2011 Ford Police Int	24,048
S/O Inmate Program		
02-64	2002 Arctic Cat Atv 400 4X4	$ 5,353
0C-10	2011 Various Cart	8,072
S/O Men's Jail		
05-19	2005 Ford Police Int	$ 23,899
06-22	2006 Ford E350 15-Pass	20,465
06-38	2006 Chevrolet Suburban 2500	32,550
08-26	2008 Ford Police Int	22,361
09-30	2009 Ford Police Int	23,784
09-91	2009 Ford E150 Cargo	19,137
Total		$ 276,202

Source: Stanislaus County.

Table A.5: Emergency Services Vehicle Inventory

Equip #	Description	Acquire Cost
Stanislaus		
06-29	2006 Jeep Liberty Sport	16,131
08-58	2008 Chevrolet Impala	16,181
OSE - Emergency Services		
06-34	2006 Ford Taurus	13,956
07-31	2007 Ford F150	15,444
08-43	2008 Ford Expedition	26,389
0T-77	2008 Wells Cargo Tw122	5,358
0T-78	2008 Wells Cargo Tw122	5,358
0T-79	2008 Wells Cargo Tw122	5,358
Oesg	2006 Various Unk	-
OSE - Grant Funded		
06-46	2006 Chevrolet Kodiak C4500	55,623
07-123	2007 Chevrolet Tahoe Ls 4X4	36,259
07-81	2007 Ford F150	16,366
07-95	2007 Ford F150	20,131
09-57	2009 Chevrolet Motorhome	198,408
0T-64	2005 Featherlite Trailer	163,528
0T-86	2007 Bauer Trailer	77,710
OES - Fire Prevention		
02-36	2002 Chevrolet Tahoe Ls 4X4	33,892
07-32	2007 Ford F150	15,444
07-82	2007 Chevrolet Tahoe Ls 4X4	33,904
07-96	2007 Chevrolet Tahoe Ls 4X4	33,904
OES - Special Operations		
07-80	2007 Chevrolet Tahoe Ls 4X4	33,904
OES - Grant Money		
0T-117	2012 Featherlite Trailer	6,915
11-22	2011 Ford F250 Crewcab	32,082
Total		$ 862,245

Source: Stanislaus County.

Table A.6: Health Services Vehicle Inventory

Equip #	Description	Acquire Cost
HSA Public Health		
06-58	2006 Ford Taurus	12,881
07-117	2007 Ford Taurus	13,833
07-121	2007 Ford Taurus	13,667
07-38	2007 Ford Taurus	15,436
07-53	2007 Pontiac Grand Prix	15,876
07-69	2007 Ford Taurus	12,616
0T-29	1998 Pcms Varied	20,921
14-25	2014 Ford Fusion	19,194
14-26	2014 Ford Fusion	19,194
14-27	2014 Ford Fusion	19,194
14-28	2014 Ford Fusion	19,194
14-29	2014 Ford Fusion	19,194
14-30	2014 Ford Fusion	19,194
14-31	2014 Ford Fusion	19,194
14-32	2014 Ford Fusion	19,194
14-33	2014 Ford Fusion	19,194
14-34	2014 Ford Fusion	19,193
HSA Central Services		
08-44	2008 Chevrolet Uplander	16,462
HSA Purchasing		
00-28	2000 Dodge Cargo Van	15,388
06-20	2006 Ford E150 Cargo	13,581
07-50	2007 Ford E350 Cargo	18,689
HSA Housekeeping		
08-56	2008 Dodge Ram 25Oo	19,961
HSA Public Health (W.I.C.)		
09-23	2009 Toyota Prius	24,297
09-63	2009 Dodge Caravan	19,002
11-21	2011 Ford Fusion	19,184
HSA Emergency Preparedness		
0T-80	2008 Royal Trailer	17,060
0T-81	2008 Royal Trailer	17,060
0T-88	2009 Royal Trailer	-
HSA Medical Residency Program		
RPGAS	2009 Various Varied	-
Total		$ 477,853

Source: Stanislaus County.

Appendix Table A.7: Stansislaus County Library Collections Inventory

Branch	Adult Materials	Value @ $27	Children's Materials	Value @ $20	Total books	Total Value
Ceres	$ 11,500	$ 310,500	$ 13,478	$ 269,560	$ 24,978	$ 580,060
Denair	5,964	161,028	6,605	132,100	12,569	293,128
Empire	5,203	140,481	5,602	112,040	10,805	252,521
Hughson	6,158	166,266	6,279	125,580	12,437	291,846
Keyes	3,522	95,094	8,503	170,060	12,025	265,154
Modesto	222,257	6,000,939	89,952	1,799,040	312,209	7,799,979
Newman	7,823	211,221	9,200	184,000	17,023	395,221
Oakdale	26,666	719,982	19,782	395,640	46,448	1,115,622
Patterson	15,450	417,150	14,156	283,120	29,606	700,270
Riverbank	15,679	423,333	12,306	246,120	27,985	669,453
Salida	41,705	1,126,035	39,892	797,840	81,597	1,923,875
Turlock	45,251	1,221,777	35,033	700,660	80,284	1,922,437
Waterford	9,756	263,412	8,659	173,180	18,415	436,592
WIC	1,106	29,862	5	100	1,111	29,962
Total	$ 418,040	$ 11,287,080	$ 269,452	$ 5,389,040	$ 687,492	$ 16,676,120

Source: Stanislaus County, June 30, 2016.

Table A.8: Library Vehicle Inventory

Equip #	Description	Acquire Cost
06-53	2006 Ford E350 Cargo	$ 18,689
07-91	2007 Ford Fusion	18,140
13-24	2013 Ford E250 Cargo	21,704
13-25	2013 Ford E250 Cargo	21,704
Total		$ 80,236

Source: Stanislaus County.

Table A.9: General Government Vehicle Inventory

Equip #	Description	Acquire Cost	Countywide Allocation %	Countywide Allocation $	Unincorporated Only Allocation %	Unincorporated Only Allocation $
Agriculture Commissioner						
04-33	2004 Chevrolet Silverado	15,177				
04-34	2004 Chevrolet Silverado	15,896				
04-35	2004 Chevrolet Silverado	14,824				
04-37	2004 Ford Ranger	14,168				
04-38	2004 Ford Ranger Xlt	14,617				
04-39	2004 Ford F150Xl Heritage	15,587				
05-28	2005 Chevrolet Cargo Van	17,528				
05-62	2005 Ford Ranger Xl	11,801				
07-100	2007 Ford F150 Supercab	19,288				
07-124	2007 Ford Freestar Se	16,898				
07-73	2007 Ford Ranger	13,565				
07-74	2007 Ford Ranger	13,565				
07-83	2007 Chevrolet Uplander	16,296				
08-37	2008 Ford Ranger Xlt	15,196				
08-38	2008 Ford Ranger Xlt	15,143				
08-39	2008 Ford Ranger Xlt	15,143				
08-40	2008 Ford Ranger Xlt	15,143				
08-45	2008 Peterbilt 365	171,624				
08-62	2008 Ford F250 Xl Sd	26,853				
08-63	2008 Ford F250 Xl Sd	26,853				
08-64	2008 Ford F250 Xl Sd	26,853				
09-24	2009 Ford Ranger Xlt	14,912				
09-25	2009 Ford Ranger Xlt	14,912				
09-59	2009 Ford F150 Supercab	18,674				
09-60	2009 Ford F150 Supercab	18,674				
09-61	2009 Ford Ranger Xlt	15,005				
09-62	2009 Ford Ranger Xlt	15,005				
0T-02	2015 Trailer Haul Trailer	3,299				
0T-102	2011 Yacht Club Trailer	1,165				
0T-120	2006 Pem/Fab Trailer	50,711				
0T-23	1957 Hmde Wt Trailer	-				
0T-65	2006 Pem/Fab Trailer	50,711				
0T-66	2006 Pem/Fab Trailer	30,834				
10-20	2010 Ford Ranger Xlt	16,690				
10-21	2010 Ford Ranger Xlt	16,690				
10-22	2010 Ford F150 Supercab	18,130				
10-40	2010 Ford Ranger Xlt	17,045				
10-41	2010 Ford Ranger Xlt	17,045				
10-46	2010 Ford F 150	18,430				
11-32	2011 Ford Ranger Xlt	15,790				
11-33	2011 Polaris A11Mh46Ax	6,092				
12-28	2012 Ford F150 Supercab	19,573				
12-29	2012 Ford F150 4X4	22,955				
15-28	2015 Ford F150 Supercab	22,010				
15-55	2015 Ford F150 Supercab	22,010				
15-79	2015 Ford F150 Supercab	22,696				
15-80	2015 Ford F150 Supercab	22,696				
15-81	2015 Ford F150 Supercab	22,696				
83-26	1983 Jeep Cj-5 4X4	7,612				
		1,034,076	100%	$ 1,034,076	0%	$ -

Source: Stanislaus County.

Table A.9: General Government Vehicle Inventory

Equip #	Description	Acquire Cost	Countywide Allocation %	Countywide Allocation $	Unincorporated Only Allocation %	Unincorporated Only Allocation $
Assessor						
05-53	2005 Ford Ranger Xlt	14,634				
06-21	2006 Dodge Stratus Sxt	12,194				
07-105	2007 Ford Focus	12,125				
07-106	2007 Ford Focus	12,125				
07-107	2007 Ford Focus	12,125				
07-108	2007 Ford Focus	12,125				
		75,327	100%	$ 75,327	0%	$ -
GSA - Central Services						
01-34	2001 Dodge Cargo Van	15,119				
02-43	2002 Ford Taurus	17,904				
05-67	2005 Chevrolet Express	25,408				
08-24	2008 Chevrolet Uplander	15,943				
08-73	2008 Chevrolet Uplander	19,520				
08-74	2008 Chevrolet Uplander	20,405				
85-45	1985 Toyota Forklift	-				
85-57	1985 Yale Y407067	750				
		115,049	50%	$ 57,525	50%	$ 57,525
GSA - Fleet Services						
01-117	2001 Ford Focus	13,032				
04-42	2004 Ford Taurus	14,676				
16-99	2016 Ford F550	74,941				
91-72	1991 Ford Tow Truck	14,665				
91-74	1991 Gmc 1/2 Ton Pickup	11,311				
99-19	1999 Dodge Ram B150	14,371				
99-77	1999 Chevrolet Silverado	16,378				
Fl-01	1998 Yale Forklift	-				
Fl-02	1998 Yale Forklift	-				
Shop	1996 Indirect Unk	10				
Shop01	2000 Misc Misc	-				
		229,784	20%	$ 45,957	80%	$ 183,827
GSA - Motor Pool						
00-60	2000 Ford Windstar	22,867				
01-106	2001 Gmc Safari	21,540				
01-118	2001 Ford Focus	13,032				
01-119	2001 Ford Focus	13,032				
02-81	2002 Ford Windstar	-				
03-36	2003 Ford E150 Xl	17,478				
05-45	2005 Dodge Stratus Sxt	12,248				
06-31	2006 Ford Freestar Se	18,681				
07-113	2007 Ford Taurus	13,806				
07-40	2007 Pontiac Grand Prix	15,553				
07-48	2007 Ford Freestar Se	16,113				
07-59	2007 Ford Fusion	18,140				
07-60	2007 Ford Fusion	18,140				
07-65	2007 Dodge Caravan	16,080				
07-93	2007 Ford Fusion	18,140				
07-97	2007 Ford E-350 12-Pass	22,919				
09-35	2009 Dodge Caravan	19,650				
09-79	2009 Chevrolet Impala	17,930				
99-50	1999 Gmc Savana	21,834				
99-73	1999 Ford 1-Ton Hi-Cube	26,216				
		343,400	100%	$ 343,400	0%	$ -

Source: Stanislaus County.

Table A.9: General Government Vehicle Inventory

Equip #	Description	Acquire Cost	Countywide Allocation %	Countywide Allocation $	Unincorporated Only Allocation %	Unincorporated Only Allocation $
GSA - Facilities Maintenance						
00-36	2000 Dodge Dakota	13,286				
00-39	2000 Dodge Dakota	12,735				
00-41	2000 Dodge Dakota	15,110				
00-Up	2000 Upright 63700-003	-				
01-20	2001 Dodge 3/4 Ton Ut	17,369				
01-41	2001 Dodge 3/4 Ton Ut	18,189				
01-85	2001 Dodge Ram 3500	21,471				
01-96	2001 Ford Ranger	13,233				
02-63	2002 Arctic Cat Atv 400 4X4	5,353				
03-22	2003 Ford Ranger	14,182				
04-32	2004 Chevrolet Silverado	15,177				
05-63	2005 Ford Ranger Edge	13,966				
06-42	2006 Ford Ranger Sport	15,256				
06-43	2006 Ford Ranger Sport	15,041				
06-54	2006 Ford F150	15,906				
06-55	2006 Ford F150	15,906				
07-119	2007 Chevrolet Silverado	19,919				
07-25	2007 Ford Ranger Xl	13,957				
0T-74	2009 Bc Trailer Sale Varied	6,802				
15-56	2015 Ford F250 Xl Sd	30,014				
15-57	2015 Ford F250 Xl Sd	30,014				
15-58	2015 Ford F250 Xl Sd	30,014				
15-61	2015 Ford F 250	26,496				
16-109	2016 Ford F 250	31,042				
16-110	2016 Ford F 250	31,042				
16-111	2016 Ford F 250	26,673				
16-112	2016 Ford F 250	26,673				
1A	1995 Taylor/Dun R3-80	16,432				
94-94	1994 Snorkelift Lift	-				
97-48	1997 Ford 1/2 Ton Pickup	14,817				
99-76	1999 Carryall Golf Cart	-				
		962,180	20%	$ 192,436	80%	$ 769,744
Cooperative Extension						
00-139	2000 John Deere Tractor	-				
01-26	2001 Dodge 1/2 Ton Pickup	14,308				
04-41	2004 Ford Ranger Xl	16,725				
05-50	2005 Dodge Caravan	15,469				
07-26	2007 Chevrolet Silverado	12,285				
07-27	2007 Chevrolet Silverado	12,349				
07-49	2007 Ford Freestar Se	16,113				
15-09	2015 Ford F250 Xl Sd	21,579				
73-99	1973 Ford D4014C	-				
96-21	1996 Dodge 1/2 Ton Pickup	14,455				
		123,283	100%	$ 123,283	0%	$ -

Source: Stanislaus County.

Table A.9: General Government Vehicle Inventory

Equip #	Description	Acquire Cost	Countywide Allocation %	Countywide Allocation $	Unincorporated Only Allocation %	Unincorporated Only Allocation $
Area Agency On Aging						
02-29	2002 Chevrolet Express	-				
06-48	2006 Chevrolet Express	19,751				
06-49	2006 Chevrolet Express	18,114				
06-60	2006 Ford Taurus	13,409				
07-122	2007 Ford Focus	12,840				
10-33	2010 Ford Focus	14,591				
13-28	2013 Ford Focus	14,710				
13-29	2013 Ford Focus	14,710				
13-30	2013 Ford Focus	14,710				
		122,835	100%	$ 122,835	0%	$ -
Alliance Worknet (Det)						
01-136	2001 Ford E150 Cargo	16,858				
		16,858	100%	$ 16,858	0%	$ -
Environmental Resources Administration						
01-55	2001 Dodge Ram 1500	15,172				
02-37	2002 Dodge Dakota	13,147				
02-38	2002 Dodge Dakota	13,147				
02-40	2002 Dodge Dakota	13,147				
02-41	2002 Dodge Dakota	13,147				
02-65	2002 Ford Flatbed Tr	57,714				
03-47	2003 Ford F550	80,776				
03-49	2003 Chevrolet S-10 Ext Cab Ls	15,491				
03-50	2003 Chevrolet S-10 Ext Cab Ls	15,491				
03-51	2003 Ford Taurus	16,096				
03-52	2003 Ford Taurus	16,096				
04-27	2004 Dodge Dakota	14,665				
05-32	2005 Ford Ranger Xlt	14,381				
05-41	2005 Toyota Prius	23,051				
05-42	2005 Toyota Prius	23,051				
05-43	2005 Toyota Prius	23,051				
05-44	2005 Toyota Prius	24,175				
05-57	2005 Toyota Prius	24,395				
05-58	2005 Toyota Prius	24,395				
05-59	2005 Toyota Prius	24,395				
05-60	2005 Toyota Prius	24,395				
05-61	2005 Toyota Prius	24,395				
07-84	2007 Toyota Prius	23,381				
07-85	2007 Toyota Prius	23,381				
07-86	2007 Toyota Prius	23,381				
07-88	2007 Toyota Prius	23,381				
08-22	2008 Ford Escape	25,925				
0T-118	2013 Haulmark Passport	4,978				
0T-41	1999 Nucen Trailer	-				
0T-55	2015 Big Tex Trailer	-				
0T-62	2006 Wells Cargo Tote Wagon	4,197				
12-30	2012 Ford F250 Supercab	24,845				
14-60	2014 Ford F350 Crewcab	52,612				
15-25	2015 Ford F150	22,010				
15-26	2015 Ford F150 Supercab	26,716				
15-27	2015 Ford F150 Supercab	26,716				
15-41	2015 Ford Escape	23,699				
15-42	2015 Ford Escape	23,699				
15-60	2015 Chevrolet Silverado	39,182				
15-82	2015 Ford F150 Supercab	27,755				
15-83	2015 Ford F150 Supercab	27,755				
15-84	2015 Ford F150 Supercab	22,696				
15-85	2015 Ford F150 Supercab	22,696				
15-86	2015 Ford F150 Supercab	22,696				
15-87	2015 Ford F150 Supercab	22,696				
16-16	2016 Ford F150 Supercab	22,650				
16-26	2016 Ford Escape	22,418				
95-28	1995 Ford 3/4 Ton Pu	18,134				
99-53	1999 Chevrolet Astro	19,565				
		1,110,932	100%	$ 1,110,932	0%	$ -

Source: Stanislaus County.

Table A.9: General Government Vehicle Inventory

Equip #	Description	Acquire Cost	Countywide Allocation %	Countywide Allocation $	Unincorporated Only Allocation %	Unincorporated Only Allocation $
DER - Abandoned Vehicle						
07-87	2007 Toyota Prius	23,381				
08-23	2008 Ford Escape	24,260				
		95,283	100%	$ 95,283	0%	$ -
Bldg. Permits Division						
01-29	2001 Dodge Dakota	16,237				
05-54	2005 Ford Ranger Xlt	13,693				
06-44	2006 Chevrolet Colorado	13,464				
08-32	2008 Ford Ranger Xl	14,129				
08-33	2008 Ford Ranger Xl	14,129				
15-65	2015 Ford Escape	23,699				
16-68	2016 Ford Escape	23,741				
16-69	2016 Ford Escape	23,741				
		285,666	0%	$ -	100%	$ 285,666
DER Landfill						
Lf-500	1997 Ford F150 Supercab	18,500				
Lf-501	1996 Dodge Ram 2500 4X4 St	-				
Lf-515	1999 Dodge 4X4 Pickup	-				
Lf-522	2008 Ford F 450	-				
		18,500	100%	$ 18,500	0%	$ -
CSA						
00-107	2000 Chevrolet Malibu	13,349				
02-27	2002 Ford E250 Mobility	33,075				
03-35	2003 Ford Windstar	17,574				
05-47	2005 Dodge Stratus Sxt	12,248				
05-48	2005 Dodge Caravan	15,469				
05-49	2005 Dodge Caravan	15,469				
06-33	2006 Ford Taurus	13,956				
06-35	2006 Ford Taurus	13,956				
07-103	2007 Ford E250 Cargo	74,083				
07-20	2007 Ford Taurus	13,956				
07-54	2007 Ford Freestyle	27,754				
07-58	2007 Ford Fusion	18,140				
07-89	2007 Ford Fusion	18,140				
07-90	2007 Ford Fusion	18,140				
07-98	2007 Ford E350 Cargo	22,919				
08-66	2008 Chevrolet Uplander	19,770				
08-67	2008 Chevrolet Uplander	20,571				
08-68	2008 Chevrolet Uplander	18,434				
08-69	2008 Chevrolet Uplander	18,434				
09-01	2009 Ford Fusion	16,872				
09-02	2009 Ford Fusion	16,872				
09-31	2009 Dodge Caravan	19,650				
09-32	2009 Dodge Caravan	19,650				
09-33	2009 Dodge Caravan	19,650				
09-34	2009 Dodge Caravan	19,650				
10-26	2010 Dodge Grand Caravan	19,505				
10-27	2010 Dodge Grand Caravan	19,505				
10-28	2010 Dodge Grand Caravan	19,505				
10-29	2010 Dodge Grand Caravan	19,505				
10-30	2010 Dodge Grand Caravan	19,505				
10-31	2010 Dodge Grand Caravan	19,505				
10-32	2010 Dodge Grand Caravan	19,505				
11-23	2011 Ford Fusion	19,184				

Source: Stanislaus County.

Table A.9: General Government Vehicle Inventory

Equip #	Description	Acquire Cost	Countywide Allocation %	Countywide Allocation $	Unincorporated Only Allocation %	Unincorporated Only Allocation $
11-24	2011 Ford Fusion	19,184				
11-25	2011 Ford Fusion	19,184				
11-26	2011 Ford Fusion	19,184				
11-27	2011 Ford Fusion	19,184				
11-28	2011 Ford Fusion	19,184				
11-29	2011 Ford Fusion	19,184				
11-30	2011 Ford Fusion	19,184				
12-38	2012 Dodge Grand Caravan	22,243				
12-39	2012 Dodge Grand Caravan	21,207				
12-40	2012 Dodge Grand Caravan	21,207				
12-41	2012 Dodge Grand Caravan	21,207				
12-42	2012 Ford Fusion	19,757				
12-43	2012 Ford Fusion	19,757				
12-44	2012 Ford Fusion	19,757				
12-45	2012 Ford Fusion	19,757				
12-46	2012 Ford Fusion	19,757				
12-47	2012 Ford Fusion	20,519				
12-48	2012 Ford Fusion	19,757				
12-49	2012 Ford Fusion	19,757				
12-50	2012 Ford Fusion	19,757				
12-51	2012 Ford Fusion	19,757				
12-52	2012 Ford Fusion	19,757				
12-53	2012 Ford Fusion	19,757				
14-43	2014 Ford Fusion	18,950				
14-44	2014 Ford Fusion	18,220				
14-45	2014 Ford Fusion	18,220				
14-46	2014 Ford Fusion	18,220				
14-47	2014 Ford Fusion	18,220				
14-48	2014 Ford Fusion	18,220				
14-49	2014 Ford Fusion	18,220				
14-50	2014 Ford Fusion	18,220				
16-09	2016 Ford Van Cargo	23,152				
16-101	2016 Chevrolet Express	26,809				
16-102	2016 Dodge Caravan	22,519				
16-15	2016 Dodge Grand Caravan	22,519				
16-42	2016 Dodge Grand Caravan	22,519				
16-43	2016 Ford Fusion	20,306				
16-44	2016 Ford Fusion	20,306				
16-45	2016 Ford Fusion	23,908				
16-54	2016 Dodge Caravan	21,978				
16-55	2016 Dodge Caravan	21,978				
16-71	2016 Ford Fusion	18,855				
16-72	2016 Ford Fusion	18,855				
16-73	2016 Ford Fusion	18,855				
16-74	2016 Ford Fusion	18,855				
16-75	2016 Ford Fusion	18,855				
16-76	2016 Ford Fusion	18,855				
97-56	1997 Ford Ranger	12,839				
99-54	1999 Ford Windstar	19,854				
99-58	1999 Ford Windstar	21,499				
		3,300,579	100%	$ 3,300,579	0%	$ -
Strategic Business Technology						
01-32	2001 Gmc Safari	18,203				
		18,203	80%	$ 14,563	20%	$ 3,641

Source: Stanislaus County.

Table A.9: General Government Vehicle Inventory

Equip #	Description	Acquire Cost	Countywide Allocation %	Countywide Allocation $	Unincorporated Only Allocation %	Unincorporated Only Allocation $
SBT Telecommunications						
01-33	2001 Gmc Safari	18,203				
		18,203	80%	$ 14,563	20%	$ 3,641
Department Of Child Support Services						
02-76	2002 Ford E250 Mobility	30,871				
08-20	2008 Chevrolet Impala	16,181				
08-21	2008 Chevrolet Impala	16,181				
10-42	2010 Ford Fusion	18,185				
10-43	2010 Ford Fusion	18,185				
11-36	2011 Dodge Grand Caravan	22,450	100%	$ 22,450	0%	$ -
		122,054				
Senior Access Team						
01-124	2001 Ford Police Int	23,556				
		23,556	100%	$ 23,556	0%	$ -
SRC COT Residentail						
00-27	2000 Dodge Cargo Van	15,388				
01-103	2001 Gmc Safari	21,540				
01-98	2001 Gmc Safari	21,540				
02-84	2002 Dodge Ram 25Oo	1				
10-34	2010 Dodge Caravan	19,505				
		77,975	100%	$ 77,975	0%	$ -
Total		5,767,487		$ 6,690,097		$ 1,304,044

Source: Stanislaus County.

Table A.10: Public Works Morgan Shop Equipment Inventory (2016)

Asset #	Unit #	Description	Current replacement cost
916765	1001	3/4 Ton Pick Up	21,000
916775	1002	3/4 Ton Pick Up	21,000
916787	1003	3/4 Ton Pick Up	21,000
64170	1064	Mid Size Pick Up	18,000
10853	1071	3/4 Ton Pick Up	21,000
10852	1072	3/4 Ton Pick Up	21,000
10846	1075	3/4 Ton Pick Up	21,000
10849	1076	3/4 Ton Pick Up	21,000
10851	1077	3/4 Ton Pick Up	21,000
10847	1078	3/4 Ton Pick Up	21,000
38742	1081	Mid Size Pick Up	21,000
39554	1082	3/4 Ton Pick Up	21,000
39555	1083	3/4 Ton Pick Up	21,000
42262	1085	Mid Size Pick Up	18,000
58201	1086	4 Door 1/2 Ton Pickup	25,000
69306	1087	3/4 Ton Pick Up	21,000
69307	1088	3/4 Ton Pick Up	21,000
69308	1089	3/4 Ton Pick Up	21,000
69309	1090	3/4 Ton Pick Up	21,000
69310	1091	3/4 Ton Pick Up	21,000
69786	1092	3/4 Ton Pick Up	21,000
69787	1093	3/4 Ton Pick Up	21,000
69788	1094	3/4 Ton Pick Up	21,000
69789	1095	3/4 Ton Pick Up	21,000
428906	1096	3/4 Ton Pick Up	21,000
428907	1097	3/4 Ton Pick Up	21,000
428908	1098	3/4 Ton Pick Up	21,000
890927	1099	Electric Gem Cart	14,500
37641	1109	Med Duty Flatbed Truck	103,000
46341	1110	Med Duty Flatbed Truck	103,000
46581	1111	Med Duty Panel Truck	105,000
413906	1112	1 Ton Flatbed Truck	27,000
13243	1226	Med Duty 4 Door Flatbed Truck	178,000
20424	1227	Med Duty 4 Door Flatbed Truck	125,000
46481	1228	Med Duty Service Truck	195,000
82906	1229	Med Duty Service Truck	125,000
89207	1230	Med Duty Sign Truck	125,000
568907	1231	Med Duty Sign Truck	178,000
38641	1317	Hd 3 Axle Truck Tractor	150,000
43141	1318	Hd 3 Axle Truck Tractor	150,000
13239	1403	Hd Sand Spreader Truck	105,000
65822	1404	2 Axle Truck Tractor	110,000
157906	1405	2 Axle Truck Tractor	110,000
32862	1504	Transfer Truck Set	202,000
66987	1508	Transfer Truck Set	202,000
890936	1511	Transfer Truck Set	202,000
46582	1604	Med Duty 2 Axle Dump Truck	115,000
46583	1605	Med Duty Claw Truck	210,000
44261	1803	Med Duty Stencil Truck	130,000
46421	1804	Med Duty Stencil Truck	130,000
36361	1905	Super Dump Truck	175,000

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

Source: Stanislaus County.

Table A.10: Public Works Morgan Shop Equipment Inventory (2016)

Asset #	Unit #	Description	Current replacement cost
42341	1906	Super Dump Truck	175,000
66989	1909	Super Dump Truck	175,000
66990	1910	Super Dump Truck	175,000
46521	2002	Med Duty Chemical Spray Truck	230,000
29061	2102	Hd Tree Truck With Man Lift	205,000
35201	2103	Med Duty Man Lift Truck	125,000
44961	2206	HD 3 Axle Water Truck	150,000
66964	2207	HD 3 Axle Water Truck	150,000
66965	2208	HD 3 Axle Water Truck	150,000
30702	2305	Med Duty Patch Truck	190,000
30701	2306	Med Duty Patch Truck	190,000
51541	2307	Med Duty Patch Truck	190,000
378906	2308	Med Duty Patch Truck	190,000
58481	2502	HD Suction Truck	350,000
32961	2603	Street Sweeper	270,000
65882	2604	Street Sweeper	270,000
1057039	2605	Street Sweeper	270,000
66984	3002	Fork Lift	55,000
12972	3203	Motor Grader	260,000
12977	3204	Motor Grader	260,000
50981	3205	Motor Grader	260,000
66983	3206	Motor Grader	260,000
66982	3207	Motor Grader	260,000
1057040	3208	Motor Grader	260,000
65962	3305	4 Yd Wheel Loader	210,000
65963	3306	4 Yd Wheel Loader	210,000
65964	3307	4 Yd Wheel Loader	210,000
23099	3404	Backhoe Loader	105,000
65602	3405	Backhoe Loader	105,000
57301	3502	Skid Steer Loader	830,000
158907	3609	Wheel Tractor With Roadside Mower	90,000
158906	3610	Wheel Tractor With Roadside Mower	90,000
161906	3611	Wheel Tractor With Roadside Mower	90,000
199906	3612	Skip Loader With Scraper	90,000
56121	3703	4 Ton Steel Drum Roller	51,000
916789	3802	10 Ton Steel Drum Roller	125,000
69790	3902	Rubber Tire Roller	910,000
13245	4001	Tow Type Rubber Tire Roller	15,000
58441	4103	Self Propelled Broom	70,000
66969	4104	Self Propelled Broom	70,000
66970	4105	Self Propelled Broom	70,000
568906	4106	Self Propelled Broom	70,000
1057037	4107	Self Propelled Broom	70,000
12934	4202	Tow Type Broom	43,000
915124	4203	Tow Type Broom	43,000
13246	4401	Concrete Saw	6,000
13247	4501	Cold Milling Machine	250,000
170906	4602	Chip Spreader	245,000
16131	4802	Quad	7,000
13251	5001	Utility Trailer	1,800
13252	5002	Utility Trailer	1,800

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

Source: Stanislaus County.

Table A.10: Public Works Morgan Shop Equipment Inventory (2016)

Asset #	Unit #	Description	Current replacement cost
13253	5003	Utility Trailer	1,800
44361	5004	Utility Trailer	1,800
44721	5005	Utility Trailer	1,800
13037	5201	Transport Trailer	30,000
13036	5202	Transport Trailer	100,000
13035	5203	Transport Trailer	80,000
13258	5206	Pipe Trailer	8,000
56741	5210	Transport Trailer	8,500
1057035	5211	Transport Trailer	30,000
12896	5301	Bottom Dump Trailer	60,000
12901	5302	Bottom Dump Trailer	60,000
12953	5303	Bottom Dump Trailer	60,000
12954	5304	Bottom Dump Trailer	60,000
56481	6006	Towable Air Compressor	16,000
13264	6103	Trailer Mounted Trash Pump	6,000
12893	6104	Trailer Mounted Trash Pump	6,000
12897	6105	Trailer Mounted Trash Pump	6,000
15080	6203	Trailer Mounted Brush Chipper	42,000
12891	6301	Concrete Mixer	6,000
29441	6502	Trailer Mounted Message Board	20,000
29461	6503	Trailer Mounted Message Board	20,000
29462	6504	Trailer Mounted Message Board	20,000
29463	6505	Trailer Mounted Message Board	20,000
57401	6509	Trailer Mounted Message Board	20,000
57402	6510	Trailer Mounted Message Board	20,000
57421	6511	Trailer Mounted Message Board	20,000
57441	6512	Trailer Mounted Message Board	20,000
1057527	6513	Trailer Mounted Message Board	20,000
1057528	6514	Trailer Mounted Message Board	20,000
1057529	6515	Trailer Mounted Message Board	20,000
1057530	6516	Trailer Mounted Message Board	20,000
13266	6702	Trailer Mounted 400 Gal Emulsion Tank	30,000
13267	6801	Crack Seal Kettle	40,000
15079	6802	Crack Seal Kettle	40,000
12868	6901	Trailer Mounted Core Driller	6,000
911308	7002	Self Propelled Shoulder Machine	202,000
35062	7102	Asphalt Dike Machine	20,000
13270	7302	Walk Behind Sidewalk Grinder	3,000
13276	8101	Paver	350,000
890926	9002	Electric 4 Door Sedan	40,000
06-07	9004	4 Door Sedan	22,000
07-11	9005	4 Door Sedan	22,000
1057033	9006	Hybrid 4 Door Sedan	34,000
918345	9007	4 Door Sedan	22,000
12450	9108	1/2 Ton Pickup	39,000
20385	9111	1/2 Ton Pickup	39,000
20386	9112	1/2 Ton Pickup	39,000
20387	9113	1/2 Ton Pickup	39,000
20404	9114	1/2 Ton Pickup	39,000
20405	9115	1/2 Ton Pickup	39,000

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

Source: Stanislaus County.

Table A.10: Public Works Morgan Shop Equipment Inventory (2016)

Asset #	Unit #	Description		Current replacement cost
20406	9116	1/2 Ton Pickup		39,000
20407	9117	1/2 Ton Pickup		39,000
35401	9118	3/4 Ton Pick Up		39,000
35402	9119	3/4 Ton Pick Up		39,000
35561	9120	3/4 Ton Pick Up		39,000
35562	9121	3/4 Ton Pick Up		39,000
35641	9122	3/4 Ton Pick Up		39,000
35642	9123	3/4 Ton Pick Up		39,000
915114	9124	3/4 Ton Pick Up		39,000
915115	9125	3/4 Ton Pick Up		39,000
69457	9126	1/2 Ton Pickup		39,000
69459	9127	1/2 Ton Pickup		39,000
69460	9128	1/2 Ton Pickup		39,000
1057110	9129	3/4 Ton Pick Up		39,000
1057156	9130	3/4 Ton Pick Up		39,000
1057173	9131	3/4 Ton Pick Up		39,000
1057211	9132	3/4 Ton Pick Up		39,000
13277	9201	Med Duty Truck W/ Chipper Box		100,000
13278	9202	Med Duty Flatbed Truck		100,000
13279	9301	Med Duty Panel Truck		130,000
12425	9401	Hd Paint Striper Truck		
27264	9501	Hd Roll Off Body Truck		175,000
66966	9502	Hd Roll Off Body Truck		175,000
44604	CART	Electric Golf Cart		8,000
Total				$ 16,223,000
Countywide Allocation[1]			40%	$ 6,489,200
Unincorporated Allocation[1]			60%	9,733,800

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

Source: Stanislaus County.

Table A.11 Technology Allocation

PFF Category	Computers	Fileservers	Miscellaneous	Network Hardware	Printers	Software[1]	Total (2017)
Detention	$ 16,499	$ -	$ 8,101	$ -	$ 2,496	$ 16,510	$ 43,606
RTIF	127,515	19,813	159,208	-	16,351	255,310	578,197
Criminal Justice	299,070	254,080	418,613	72,656	17,415	44,360	1,106,194
Library	243,603	67,987	30,673	80,741	12,446	486,748	922,199
Regional Parks	61,478	-	5,277	5,404	4,743	-	76,902
Health	702,041	363,981	812,641	909,385	178,142	1,646,730	4,612,921
Behavioral Health	357,007	217,268	170,647	254,576	32,086	392,540	1,424,125
Sheriff	1,392,205	541,651	248,366	140,256	62,660	296,885	2,682,022
Emergency Services	83,338	-	3,457	981	5,216	41,350	134,341
Animal Services	36,204	-	7,761	-	5,541	-	49,505
Admin (Other County)	2,302,170	353,564	1,290,188	1,842,563	586,516	2,034,024	8,409,026
Total	$ 5,621,129	$1,818,344	$ 3,154,932	$ 3,306,563	$ 923,613	$5,214,457	$20,039,037

[1] Excludes enterprise IT software included in Table 14.2

Source: Stanislaus County.

Appendix Table A.12: Parks Vehicle & Equipment Inventory

Vehicle Description	Replacement Cost
2001 Dodge Extended Cab Truck	$ 19,155
2001 Dodge Ram 1500	14,308
2001 Ford F250 Crewcab	23,113
2001 Ford F250 Crewcab	23,113
2001 Ford F250 Crewcab	23,113
2001 Dodge BR 2500	18,888
2001 Dodge 2500 Truck	19,424
2002 GMC Topkick Dumptruck	54,845
2002 GMC Topkick Dumptruck	54,845
2002 Dodge Dakota	13,147
2004 GMC Ford F250	24,978
2003 GMC Garbage Truck	20,499
2004 Ford F250	16,422
2007 Dodge Ram 2500 Pickup	16,422
2007 Chevrolet Silverado 4X4	19,692
2007 Ford F350	25,298
2007 Ford 1 Ton Super Duty	17,504
Ford F250 4X4 Crew Cab Pick Up	26,193
Ford F250 2012 Truck	22,127
Ford F250 2012 Truck	22,127
Ford F250 2012 Truck	26,511
Ford F250 2012 Truck	26,511
Ford F250 2012 Truck	26,511
Ford F250 Truck 2012	26,511
Ford F250 2012 Truck	26,511
2015 Ford F250 Truck	25,624
2015 Ford F250 Truck	26,533
2015 Ford F-250	24,746
2016 Ford F-250	28,621
2016 Ford F-250 Supercab	70,993
2016 Ford F-250 Supercab	26,984
2016 Ford F-250	31,689
2016 Ford F-250 Supercab	26,984
2016 Ford F250	28,621
2016 Ford F250	16,422
John Deere 300D Loader/Backhoe	31,996
Polaris 4 X 6 Big Boss All Terrain Vehicl	5,708
Caterpillar 1990 Model D3C	53,089
1998 Used 8-Passenger Golf/Utility Cart	4,826
Trailer 10' Wells Cargo Tw101	3,168
Wayne Pup Trailer	26,137

Source: Stanislaus County, 9/16/2016.

Appendix Table A.12: Parks Vehicle & Equipment Inventory

Vehicle Description	Replacement Cost
Wayne Pup Trailer	31,157
Wayne Pup Trailer	26,137
8 Ft Flat Bed Trailer	12,880
4WDTractor W/Scraper	36,073
NU Century 6X12 Dump Trailer	4,708
4Wd Tractor W/Digger	37,233
JD641 Tractor W/Loader	45,596
GMC Topkick Dumptruck	54,845
MB 2070XL Twister Chipper Cummins 85Hp	19,879
Nisson Forklift	28,898
Aerial Lift Truck	100,898
Kubota 4WD Tractor	61,458
Toro Groundmaster	43,231
Dargo Dump Trailer	6,045
Easy Load Trailer For Mower	5,745
Dargo Dump Trailer	6,045
2003 GMC Garbage Truck	70,538
New Holland 4WD Loader/Backhoe	54,220
Kohler Bobcat	2,745
Trailer	4,197
Easy Loader Tilt Bed Trailer	5,268
Yamaha Grizzley 4 X 4 Quad '04	6,624
Lift Truck	88,262
Bobcat Forklift	66,687
Jacobsn 18' Tilt Bed Trailer	5,483
2007 Ford F650 Water Truck	63,994
2007 Ford F650 Water Truck	63,994
2007 Ford Econoline Van	17,589
Trailer -Dump Big Tex Lic#1342835	7,418
2007 Ford Enconoline Van	17,589
2007 Ford Econoline Van	17,589
Polaris HD 800 Eps ATV	14,165
Pj Dump Trailer D7122	7,343
Big Tex Trailer 2011	6,500
Big Tex Tilt Trailer 2011	5,923
PJ Dump Trailer 83 X 12 10K	7,470
Gm4000D Toro Riding Mower 30448	56,414
John Deer Backhoe Loader	106,717
Tractor And Mavrick Boom	132,963
Utility Tractor John Deer	61,317
Backhoe 410K John Deere	117,996
2016 Caterpillar D6K2 XL Dozer	185,871
Total	$ 2,755,611

Source: Stanislaus County, 9/16/2016.

Table A.13: Sheriff Vehicle Inventory

Equip #	Description	Acquire Cost
S/O Administration		
05-17	2005 Chevrolet Impala	$ 18,538
05-66	2005 Chevrolet Impala	18,354
06-68	2006 Chrysler Town & Country	16,336
07-114	2007 Ford Taurus	13,806
07-22	2007 Ford Taurus	13,956
07-39	2007 Pontiac Grand Prix	15,553
08-36	2008 Dodge Charger	24,851
14-15	2014 Chevrolet Tahoe	31,353
14-52	2014 Chevrolet Impala	19,607
14-55	2014 Chevrolet Tahoe	31,208
14-81	2014 Chevrolet Tahoe	31,353
15-10	2015 Chevrolet Tahoe Ls 4X4	36,351
15-12	2015 Chevrolet Impala	19,698
15-50	2015 Chevrolet Tahoe	36,032
S/O Internal Affairs		
07-42	2007 Pontiac Grand Prix	$ 15,553
13-19	2013 Chevrolet Impala	22,151
15-29	2015 Ford Taurus	19,863
S/O Information Technology		
05-22	2005 Ford Taurus	$ 13,620
06-26	2006 Chevrolet Tahoe	29,278
10-25	2010 Dodge Charger	23,539
13-09	2013 Chevrolet Tahoe	30,127
16-19	2016 Ford Escape	20,693
99-67	1999 Chevrolet Astro Carg	19,219
S/O Employee Relations		
03-29	2003 Ford Taurus	$ 16,703
07-41	2007 Pontiac Grand Prix	15,553
07-57	2007 Pontiac Grand Prix	15,508
08-72	2008 Ford Explorer	17,454
15-90		19,863
S/O Operations Training		
03-20	2003 Chevrolet Silverado	$ 31,465
04-20	2004 Ford Police Int	23,645
05-82	2005 Ford Police Int	22,692
07-02	2007 Ford Police Int	23,835
08-02	2008 Ford Police Int	23,025
09-22	2009 Ford Police Int	22,719
09-64	2009 Ford Police Int	24,222
10-09	2010 Ford Police Int	21,552
14-51	2014 Chevrolet Impala	19,607

Source: Stanislaus County, 9/16/2016.

Table A.13: Sheriff Vehicle Inventory - Continued

Equip #	Description	Acquire Cost
S/O Volunteers (Stars)		
01-97	2001 Ford Ranger	$ 13,233
01-99	2001 Gmc Safari	21,540
05-81	2005 Ford Police Int	18,899
06-02	2006 Ford Police Int	23,899
06-03	2006 Ford Police Int	23,899
06-11	2006 Ford Police Int	22,682
07-92	2007 Ford Fusion	18,140
08-31	2008 Ford Escape	18,503
09-06	2009 Ford Police Int	21,150
09-17	2009 Ford Police Int	22,719
09-65	2009 Ford Police Int	21,644
09-71	2009 Ford Police Int	21,714
10-03	2010 Ford Police Int	21,552
10-04	2010 Ford Police Int	21,552
10-10	2010 Ford Police Int	21,552
10-24	2010 Ford Expedition	32,405
11-03	2011 Ford Police Int	21,548
15-20	2015 Chevrolet Suburban	40,050
99-20	1999 Gmc Yukon	35,448
S/O ID Unit		
13-06	2013 Ford Police Int	$ 27,524
13-07	2013 Ford Police Int	27,524
15-02	2015 Ford Explorer	27,673
S/O Property and Evidence		
02-34	2002 Chevrolet Express	$ 18,503
08-42	2008 Ford F150	14,827
S/O Patrol		
01-123	2001 Ford F250 Crewcab	$ 37,020
02-25	2002 Ford Police Int	23,105
02-30	2002 Freightliner Motorhome	282,544
03-57	2003 Ford F350 Supercab	26,084
07-19	2007 Ford Police Int	23,899
08-18	2008 Ford Police Int	23,815
08-41	2008 Ford F150	14,827
09-03	2009 Ford Police Int	22,249
09-08	2009 Ford Police Int	21,150
09-38	2009 Ford F 150	13,418
09-54	2009 Ford Police Int	23,362
09-70	2009 Ford Police Int	21,644
0T-114	2006 Magnum Light Tower	-
10-13	2010 Ford Police Int	21,552
11-08	2011 Ford Police Int	21,548

Source: Stanislaus County, 9/16/2016.

Table A.13: Sheriff Vehicle Inventory - Continued

Equip #	Description	Acquire Cost
11-09	2011 Ford Police Int	21,548
11-12	2011 Ford Police Int	21,548
11-50	2011 Ford Police Int	24,048
11-51	2011 Ford Police Int	24,048
11-54	2011 Ford Police Int	24,048
11-57	2011 Ford Police Int	24,048
11-58	2011 Ford Police Int	24,048
11-59	2011 Ford Police Int	24,048
11-60	2011 Ford Police Int	24,048
11-61	2011 Ford Police Int	24,048
11-62	2011 Ford Police Int	24,048
14-01	2014 Ford Explorer	28,915
14-03	2014 Ford Explorer	28,065
14-05	2014 Ford Explorer	28,065
14-06	2014 Ford Explorer	28,065
14-07	2014 Ford Explorer	28,065
15-03	2015 Ford Explorer	27,673
15-06	2015 Ford Explorer	27,673
15-08	2015 Ford Explorer	27,673
15-15	2015 Ford Explorer	28,649
15-18	2015 Ford Explorer	28,649
15-19	2015 Ford Explorer	28,649
15-21	2015 Ford Explorer	28,649
15-22	2015 Ford Explorer	28,649
16-02	2016 Ford Explorer	31,522
16-03	2016 Ford Explorer	31,522
16-04	2016 Ford Explorer	31,522
16-05	2016 Ford Explorer	31,522
16-06	2016 Ford Explorer	31,522
16-07	2016 Ford Explorer	31,522
16-113	2016 Ford Explorer	31,522
16-18	2016 Ford Explorer	31,522
16-29	2016 Ford Explorer	31,522
16-30	2016 Ford Explorer	31,522
16-32	2016 Ford Explorer	31,522
16-33	2016 Ford Explorer	31,522
16-34	2016 Ford Explorer	31,522
16-35	2016 Ford Explorer	31,522
16-36	2016 Ford Explorer	31,522
16-37	2016 Ford Explorer	31,522
16-38	2016 Ford Explorer	31,522
94-90	1994 Ford F 450	16,000
96-72	1996 Yamaha Golf Cart	-
SHERF(	2002 Various Unk	-

Source: Stanislaus County, 9/16/2016.

Table A.13: Sheriff Vehicle Inventory - Continued

Equip #	Description	Acquire Cost
S/O Air Support		
07-125	2007 Ford Ranger	$ 15,041
16-51	2016 Ford F250 Sd 4X4Crew	31,887
68-56		-
S/O Bomb Unit		
00-30	2000 Ford E350 Cargo	$ 25,165
07-148	2007 Gmc C5500	66,398
0T-11	1996 Bomb Trailer	12,900
0T-119	2015 Ken Trailer	320,450
S/O K9 Unit		
09-13	2009 Ford Police Int	$ 21,150
10-12	2010 Ford Police Int	21,552
11-11	2011 Ford Police Int	21,548
11-13	2011 Ford Police Int	21,548
12-18	2012 Chevrolet Tahoe	31,521
13-10	2013 Chevrolet Tahoe	30,127
13-37	2013 Chevrolet Tahoe	3,183
13-38	2013 Chevrolet Tahoe	3,183
14-14	2014 Chevrolet Tahoe	31,208
14-80	2014 Ford Explorer	35,230
16-46	2016 Chevrolet Tahoe	37,630
16-48	2016 Chevrolet Tahoe	37,630
97-30	1997 Ford 1/2 Ton Pickup	15,276
S/O SWAT		
02-72	2002 Chevrolet Express	$ 20,365
03-21	2003 Chevrolet Tahoe Z71 4X4	29,884
03-42	2003 Chevrolet Silverado	30,704
04-22	2004 Dodge Intrepid	16,497
04-24	2004 Dodge Intrepid	16,497
04-25	2004 Dodge Intrepid	16,497
04-26	2004 Dodge Intrepid	16,497
05-29	2005 Chevrolet Tahoe Ls 4X4	33,638
05-64	2005 Ford Taurus	14,494
05-68	2005 Chevrolet 1/2 Ton Pickup	23,360
07-109	2007 Freightliner 1 Ton Truck	261,381
08-61	2008 Dodge Charger	26,300
08-75	2008 Chevrolet Suburban	31,735
08-80	2008 Dodge Durango Slt	-
09-95	2009 Kia Sedona	-
0T-108	2006 Pace Trailer	-
12-26	2012 Chevrolet Impala	19,288
14-16	2014 Chevrolet Tahoe	31,353
14-82	2014 Chevrolet Tahoe	31,353

Source: Stanislaus County, 9/16/2016.

Table A.13: Sheriff Vehicle Inventory - Continued

Equip #	Description	Acquire Cost
S/O Dive Team		
06-67	2006 Chevrolet Silverado	$ 410
09-39	2009 Ford F 150	13,418
0T-82	2006 Wells Cargo Trailer	38,568
0T-87	2008 Carry On Trailer	3,112
16-100	2016 Ford F550	82,484
S/O Mounted Unit		
09-47	2009 Chevrolet Silverado 3500	$ 38,844
09-48	2009 Chevrolet Silverado 3500	39,594
0T-123	2015 Logan Trailer	-
0T-20	1993 Logan Carrier-Ho	-
0T-89	2009 Logan Trailer	79,949
0T-90	2009 Logan Trailer	79,949
16-10	2016 Dodge Ram 3500	52,729
S/O Marine Unit		
07-45	2007 Dodge Ram 1500	$ 24,407
07-46	2007 Dodge Ram 1500	25,082
07-99	2007 Dodge Ram 1500	24,407
09-45	2009 Jeep Wrangler	32,974
09-49	2009 Ford Police Int	22,719
0T-03	2015 Pj Trailers Trailer	1,995
0T-103	2012 Ezldr Trailer	7,875
0T-104	2010 Shorelandr Trailer	-
0T-28	1998 Shorelandr Carrier	574
0T-51	2003 Tricker Carrier	2,500
0T-52	2003 Tricker Carrier	2,500
0T-76	2001 Shorelandr Trailer	-
0T-83	2009 Shorelandr Carrier	-
0T-85	2008 Tricker Trailer	6,700
0T-91	1997 Ezldr Trailer	-
10-07	2010 Ford Police Int	21,552
10-11	2010 Ford Police Int	21,552
11-06	2011 Ford Police Int	21,548
14-24	2014 Ford F250 Sd 4X4Crew	30,232
14-89	2014 Chevrolet Tahoe Ls 4X4	37,801
16-17	2016 Ford F250 Xl Sd	32,920
16-21	2016 Zero Dsp Zf 13.0	20,723
16-22	2016 Zero Dsp Zf 13.0	20,723
16-23	2016 Zero Dsp Zf 13.0	20,723
16-50	2016 Ford F250 Sd 4X4Crew	31,887
MARINE	2003 Rocky Mountain Luxor	24,475
MARINE	2003 Rocky Mountain Patrol Boat	24,475
MARINE	2008 Boulton Patrol Boat	80,774

Source: Stanislaus County, 9/16/2016.

Table A.13: Sheriff Vehicle Inventory - Continued

Equip #	Description	Acquire Cost
MARINE	2011 Boulton Patrol Boat	70,873
OT-124	2016 Aluma Es 300	-
OT-125	2016 Wells Cargo Fasttrac	-
SKI 1	2007 Yamaha Jetski	7,708
SKI 2	2007 Yamaha Jetski	7,708
SKI 3	2007 Yamaha Jetski	7,708
SKI 4	2007 Yamaha Jetski	7,708
SKI 5	1997 Bombardie Jetski	-
SKI 6	1997 Bombardie Jetski	-
SKI 7	2013 Yamaha Jetski	8,499
SKI 8	2013 Yamaha Jetski	8,499
S/O Orvet		
07-101	2007 Arctic Cat 500 4Wd Quad	$ -
07-102	2007 Arctic Cat 500 4Wd Quad	-
07-111	2007 Suzuki Dr-Z400Sk7	-
07-112	2007 Suzuki Dr-Z400Sk7	-
07-126	2007 Arctic Cat 500 4Wd Quad	7,225
07-127	2007 Arctic Cat 500 4Wd Quad	7,285
07-70	2007 Suzuki Dr-Z400Sk7	5,988
07-71	2007 Suzuki Dr-Z400Sk7	5,988
08-70	2008 Polaris 6 Wheeler	-
09-46	2009 Jeep Wrangler	32,974
09-77	2009 Suzuki Dr-Z400Sk9	6,175
0T-21	1995 Pace A Trailer	-
0T-72	2006 Snowbear Trailer	-
0T-73	2007 Snowbear Trailer	-
0T-75	2007 Pacifi Trailer	1,133
0T-84	2008 Echo Trailer	1,530
0T-95	2009 Echo Trailer	1,530
14-72	2014 Kawasaki Kl650	64,760
14-73	2014 Kawasaki Kl650	64,760
14-74	2014 Kawasaki Kl650	6,476
14-75	2014 Kawasaki Kl650	64,760
14-76	2014 Kawasaki Kl650	6,314
15-11	2015 Jeep Wrangler	38,060
16-79	2016 Ford F250 Crewcab	37,761
SxS-1	2015 Honda Off Road 4X4	9,262
SxS-2	2015 Honda Off Road 4X4	9,262
S/O HNT		
13-08	2013 Chevrolet Tahoe	$ 30,127

Source: Stanislaus County, 9/16/2016.

Table A.13: Sheriff Vehicle Inventory - Continued

Equip #	Description	Acquire Cost
S/O MFF		
06-40	2006 Ford Expedition	$ 25,279
09-15	2009 Ford Police Int	22,297
09-69	2009 Ford Police Int	21,644
13-21	2013 Chevrolet Tahoe Ls 4X4	33,137
S/O Community Deputies		
14-09	2014 Ford Police Int	$ 28,177
S/O Riverbank Operations		
06-15	2006 Ford Police Int	$ 22,682
06-59	2006 Ford Taurus	14,676
07-43	2007 Pontiac Grand Prix	15,553
07-63	2007 Buick Lacrosse	15,000
08-78	2008 Dodge Charger	32,817
09-36	2009 Ford F 150	13,418
10-15	2010 Kawasaki Zg1400Cafi	32,299
11-10	2011 Ford Police Int	21,548
11-17	2011 Chevrolet Tahoe	31,417
13-04	2013 Ford Explorer	27,524
13-05	2013 Ford Explorer	27,524
13-20	2013 Harley Street Glide	19,292
13-27	2013 Ford Explorer	28,531
15-05	2015 Ford Explorer	27,673
15-07	2015 Ford Explorer	27,673
15-52	2015 Dodge Charger	20,115
16-31	2016 Ford Explorer	31,522
95-20	1995 Ford 3/4 T Crew Cab	18,910
S/O Patterson Operations		
07-44	2007 Pontiac Grand Prix	$ 15,553
09-37	2009 Ford F 150	13,418
09-74	2009 Ford Police Int	21,644
09-94	2009 Nissan Altima 2.5S	-
0T-122	2012 Various Unk	-
11-05	2011 Ford Police Int	21,548
11-14	2011 Ford Police Int	24,263
11-53	2011 Ford Police Int	24,048
11-64	2011 Ford Police Int	24,048
12-27	2012 Chevrolet Impala	19,292
13-22	2013 Chevrolet Tahoe	31,786
14-02	2014 Ford Explorer	28,065
14-04	2014 Ford Explorer	28,065
14-10	2014 Ford Explorer	28,177
14-17	2014 Nissan Maxima	19,578
14-22	2014 Ford Explorer	28,115
14-601	2014 Harley Street Glide	19,292
15-17	2015 Ford Explorer	28,649
15-53	2015 Harley Street Glide	-
15-68	2015 Kia Sedona	19,800

Source: Stanislaus County, 9/16/2016.

Table A.13: Sheriff Vehicle Inventory - Continued

Equip #	Description	Acquire Cost
S/O Waterford Operations		
05-16	2005 Chevrolet Impala	$ 18,538
11-04	2011 Ford Police Int	21,548
11-56	2011 Ford Police Int	24,048
14-08	2014 Ford Explorer	28,065
15-01	2015 Ford Explorer	27,673
15-04	2015 Ford Explorer	27,673
16-08	2016 Ford Explorer	30,230
S/O Hughson Operations		
09-18	2009 Ford Police Int	$ 22,719
09-20	2009 Ford Police Int	22,719
15-16	2015 Ford Explorer	28,649
15-23	2015 Ford Explorer	28,649
S/P Investigations (Detective)		
01-137	2001 Ford E250 Cargo	$ 18,146
05-27	2005 Ford Taurus	13,620
07-104	2007 Pontiac Grand Prix	17,268
07-110	2007 Dodge Charger	18,367
07-62	2007 Toyota Solara	-
07-64	2007 Jeep Laredo	-
08-48	2008 Chevrolet Impala	16,181
09-58	2009 Ford F150 4X4	29,917
09-96	2009 Chevrolet Equinox Fwd Lt	11,745
0T-47	2002 Dargo Varied	5,940
0T-98	2010 Spcns Trailer	-
13-13	2013 Chevrolet Impala	19,542
13-14	2013 Chevrolet Impala	19,542
13-15	2013 Chevrolet Impala	19,542
13-16	2013 Chevrolet Impala	22,151
13-17	2013 Chevrolet Impala	22,151
13-18	2013 Chevrolet Impala	22,151
13-44	2013 Toyota Camry	17,600
14-18	2014 Nissan Maxima	20,948
14-23	2014 Ford Explorer	27,789
14-53	2014 Chevrolet Impala	19,607
14-70	2014 Honda Trx	6,848
14-71	2014 Honda Trx	6,848
15-13	2015 Chevrolet Impala	19,698
15-31	2015 Chevrolet Silverado	30,637
15-51	2015 Chrysler Awd S200	20,959
15-66	2015 Dodge Charger	21,216

Source: Stanislaus County, 9/16/2016.

Table A.13: Sheriff Vehicle Inventory - Continued

Equip #	Description	Acquire Cost
15-69	2015 Scion Tc	19,200
15-70	2015 Ford F250 Sd 4X4Crew	31,237
15-77	2015 Chevrolet Traverse	26,615
15-91	2015 Ford Taurus	19,863
15-95	2015 Ford Taurus	19,863
15-96	2015 Ford Taurus	19,863
15-97	2015 Ford Taurus	19,863
16-24	2016 Ford Fusion	19,267
16-28	2016 Dodge Grand Caravan	24,406
93-14	1993 Ford F 250	13,133
S/O Sting Unit		
14-83	2014 Chevrolet Tahoe	$ 31,353
14-84	2014 Chevrolet Tahoe	31,353
14-85	2014 Chevrolet Tahoe	31,353
14-86	2014 Chevrolet Tahoe	31,353
14-87	2014 Chevrolet Tahoe	31,353
14-88	2014 Chevrolet Tahoe	31,353
S/O Records		
02-61	2002 Ford Taurus	$ 16,675
08-30	2008 Ford Escape	18,503
S/O Public Administrator		
05-31	2005 Dodge Caravan	$ 14,842
S/O Coroner		
07-116	2007 Ford E250 Cargo	$ 33,752
07-118	2007 Ford Taurus	13,941
08-46	2008 Chevrolet Impala	16,181
0T-101	2010 Wells Cargo Road Force	35,300
10-45	2010 Chevrolet Suburban	37,612
12-19	2012 Chevrolet Suburban	33,637
12-20	2012 Chevrolet Suburban	33,637
15-33	2015 Chevrolet Impala	19,607
15-35	2015 Ford F250 Sd 4X4Crew	32,217
S/O Drug Enforcement		
00-136	2000 Dodge Ram 3500	$ 8,862
01-28	2001 Ford E250 Cargo	85,270
05-30	2005 Chevrolet Silverado	35,404
09-92	2009 Chrysler Sebring	10,000
0T-116	2010 Haulmark Box Type	-

Source: Stanislaus County, 9/16/2016.

Table A.13: Sheriff Vehicle Inventory - Continued

Equip #	Description	Acquire Cost
S/O HIDTA		
03-54	2003 Ford Ambul Van	$ 122,421
05-55	2005 Ford F350 Supercab	27,585
S/O Civil Division		
13-41	2013 Chevrolet Tahoe	$ 31,239
13-42	2013 Chevrolet Tahoe	31,239
13-43	2013 Chevrolet Tahoe	31,239
14-11	2014 Chevrolet Tahoe	31,208
14-12	2014 Chevrolet Tahoe	31,208
14-13	2014 Chevrolet Tahoe	31,208
16-27	2016 Chevrolet Tahoe	37,630
16-47	2016 Chevrolet Tahoe	37,630
S/O Roadside Crew		
0T-110	2012 Itm, Inc. Box Type	$ 2,174
0T-111	2012 Haulmark Box Type	4,770
0T-112	2012 Iron Panther Trailer	9,053
0T-113	2013 Iron Panther Trailer	10,707
0T-70	2006 Loadt Carrier	7,865
11-15	2011 Ford 15-Pass. Van	25,987
11-16	2011 Ford 15-Pass. Van	25,987
12-24	2012 Ford F250 Crewcab	26,987
12-25	2012 Ford F350 Crewcab	28,853
S/O Cert Team		
08-65	2008 Chevrolet Suburban	$ 36,485
16-39	2016 Chevrolet Express	90,825
S/O BAS		
00-20	2000 Ford Police Int	$ 31,827
05-24	2005 Ford Taurus	13,620
06-57	2006 Ford Taurus	12,357
06-62	2006 Chevrolet Silverado	26,133
07-23	2007 Ford Taurus	13,956
08-29	2008 Ford E350 15-Pass	22,734
08-53	2008 Ford 15-Pass. Van	22,734
0C-02	1993 Yamaha Golf Cart	-
0T-07	1977 Rideon Carrier	-
0T-34	1999 Carson C-Van	4,105
11-19	2011 Chevrolet Impala	18,926
13-26	2013 Ford Explorer	28,531

Source: Stanislaus County, 9/16/2016.

Table A.13: Sheriff Vehicle Inventory - Continued

Equip #	Description	Acquire Cost
S/O Public Safety Center		
00-115	2000 Ford 4X4 Pickup	$ 21,646
03-26	2003 Ford Police Int	23,386
03-53	2003 Ford E350 15-Pass	24,554
04-21	2004 Ford Crown Victoria	24,910
04-44	2004 Ford Crown Victoria	24,915
05-51	2005 Dodge Ram 2500 4X4 St	21,601
05-77	2005 Ford Police Int	18,722
06-23	2006 Ford E350 15-Pass	20,465
06-24	2006 Ford E350 15-Pass	20,465
06-25	2006 Ford E350 15-Pass	20,465
06-45	2006 Dodge Caravan	16,445
06-50	2006 Ford E350 Cargo	20,574
08-19	2008 Ford Expedition	24,075
08-27	2008 Ford E350 15-Pass	22,734
08-28	2008 Ford E350 15-Pass	22,734
08-55	2008 Ford E350 15-Pass	22,734
08-71	2008 Chevrolet Impala	17,802
09-07	2009 Ford Police Int	21,150
09-29	2009 Dodge Charger	21,033
09-53	2009 Ford F250 Crewcab	21,342
09-55	2009 Chevrolet Impala	18,275
0C-01	2004 Club Car Cart	8,734
0C-07	2007 Club Car Cart	-
0C-08	2011 E-Z-Go Golf Cart	7,370
0C-09	2004 E-Z-Go Golf Cart	-
0T-3	1973 Spcns Trailer	1,501
0T-33	1986 Cal Trailer Trailer	644
0T-57	2004 Pace Varied	2,466
0T-58	2004 Pace Varied	2,837
0T-92	1974 Hmde Trailer	-
11-20	2011 Ford E350 15-Pass	25,012
16-40	2016 Chevrolet Cargo Larg	28,927
16-64	2016 Chevrolet Cargo Van	22,519
83-29	1983 Gillig 40 Pass Bu	2,500
86-20	1986 Ford 40 Pass Bu	7,001
S/O Central Kitchen		
04-46	2004 International 1-Ton Hi-Cube	$ 79,947
15-32	2015 Ford F650	87,463
99-09	1999 Dodge 1/2 Ton Pickup	14,296
99-69	1999 Chevrolet Cargo Van	19,219

Source: Stanislaus County, 9/16/2016.

Table A.13: Sheriff Vehicle Inventory - Continued

Equip #	Description	Acquire Cost
S/O Statewide Transport		
07-72	2007 Ford E350 15-Pass	$ 20,574
13-11	2013 Chevrolet Suburban	38,960
13-12	2013 Ford E350 Cargo	27,195
15-30	2015 Chevrolet Suburban	40,002
15-36	2015 Freightliner Truck	297,668
16-41	2016 Chevrolet Cargo Larg	28,927
S/O Court Security		
09-04	2009 Ford Police Int	$ 22,249
11-01	2011 Ford Police Int	21,717
15-40	2015 Ford Explorer	29,073
S/O Commisary		
00-126	2000 Ford 1 Ton Truck	$ 23,740
S/O Cal-ID		
08-76	2008 Chevrolet Uplander	$ 20,405
S/O VTU StanCATT		
06-70	2006 Ford Expedition	$ 1
07-01	2007 Chevrolet Tahoe	1
07-128	2007 Toyota Tundra	1
94-70	1994 Honda Accord	194
S/O Driver Training Program		
04-07	2004 Ford Police Int	$ 25,316
05-03	2005 Ford Police Int	21,749
05-09	2005 Ford Police Int	23,899
05-14	2005 Ford Police Int	23,899
05-65	2005 Chevrolet Impala	18,354
05-73	2005 Ford Police Int	19,136
05-85	2005 Ford Police Int	5,300
05-86	2005 Ford Police Int	5,300
05-88	2005 Ford Police Int	5,676
06-09	2006 Ford Police Int	22,682
06-17	2006 Ford Police Int	23,899
06-18	2006 Ford Police Int	23,899
07-12	2007 Ford Police Int	21,471
08-04	2008 Ford Police Int	23,025
08-05	2008 Ford Police Int	23,025
08-06	2008 Ford Police Int	23,025
09-09	2009 Ford Police Int	21,150
09-11	2009 Ford Police Int	21,150
09-12	2009 Ford Police Int	21,150
09-19	2009 Ford Police Int	22,719
09-50	2009 Ford Police Int	22,755
09-51	2009 Ford Police Int	22,719
09-52	2009 Ford Police Int	22,719
09-66	2009 Ford Police Int	21,644
09-67	2009 Ford Police Int	21,644

Source: Stanislaus County, 9/16/2016.

Table A.13: Sheriff Vehicle Inventory - Continued

Equip #	Description		Acquire Cost
09-68	2009 Ford Police Int		21,644
09-73	2009 Ford Police Int		21,644
0T-121	2015 Haulmark Passport		5,593
0T-14	1940 Randy Trailer		3,162
0T-25	1997 Spcns Portapotty		-
0T-48	2002 Jacobsen Trailer		4,798
0T-93	2004 Trailer Haul Trailer		4,400
10-06	2010 Ford Police Int		21,552
10-14	2010 Ford Police Int		21,552
92-37	1992 Ford 3/4 Ton Ut		15,500
95-58	1995 Ford Ambul Van		-
S/O CAL-MMET 2009-10			
08-79	2008 Ford F150 Supercab	$	-
08-81	2008 Mazda Mazda 6		-
09-75	2009 Ford Police Int		23,579
09-76	2009 Dodge Journey		-
09-93	2009 Nissan Frontier Se		-
12-54	2012 Chrysler Town & Country		-
HIDTA ISC			
01-27	2001 Ford 4X4 Pickup	$	83,298
Distinct Count of Equipment: 1			
Total		$	11,497,090

Source: Stanislaus County, 9/16/2016.

Appendix Table A.14: Existing County-Owned Land

Property	Department	Acreage
Animal Services Shelter - 3647 Cornucopia Way	Animal Services	4.53
County Center II, 700-1020 Scenic Dr	Behavioral Health	1.85
County Center II, 700-1020 Scenic Dr - CSA	Other County Facilities	0.07
County Center II, 700-1020 Scenic Dr - GSA Print Shop	Other County Facilities	0.47
County Center II, 700-1020 Scenic Dr	Health	14.10
Subtotal		16.49
1905 Memorial Drive, Ceres	Behavioral Health	15.37
Former Bank of America Building, 1021 I Street, Modesto	Criminal Justice	0.28
Former Bank of America Building, 1021 I Street, Modesto	Other County Facilities	0.41
Subtotal - Former Bank of America Building		0.69
Ray Simon Reg Criminal Justice Training Ctr, Modesto	Criminal Justice	26.83
Former City Hall Building - 801 11th Street, Modesto	Criminal Justice	0.22
Former City Hall Building - 801 11th Street, Modesto	Other County Facilities	0.11
Former City Hall Building - 801 11th Street, Modesto	Sheriff	0.10
Former City Hall Building - 801 11th Street, Modesto - Sup Court	Non-County	0.06
Subtotal - Former City Hall Building		0.49
12th Street Office Building, 832 12th Street	Criminal Justice	0.20
12th Street Office Building, 832 12th Street	Other County Facilities	0.07
12th Street Office Building, 832 12th Street	Non-County	0.13
Subtotal - 12th Street Office Building		0.40
Juvenile Justice Center, 2215 Blue Gum Road, Modesto	Detention	34.36
Downtown Jail, Modesto	Detention	0.86
Public Safety Center 200-442 Hackett Road, Modesto	Detention	97.31
Public Safety Center (Sheriff Operations) - 200 - 442 Hackett	Sheriff	2.69
Subtotal - Public Safety Center		100.00
3705 Oakdale Road	Emergency Services	0.84
3705 Oakdale Road	Non-County	1.35
Subtotal - 3705 Oakdale Road		2.19

Note: This appendix does not include parkland.

Source: Stanislaus County.

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

Property	Department	Acreage
1305 Kern Street, Newman Branch Library	Library	0.29
1500 I Street, Modesto Main Library	Library	1.69
151 South 1st Street, Oakdale Branch Library	Library	0.23
2250 Magnolia Street, Ceres Branch Library	Library	0.12
324 E Street, Waterford Branch Library	Library	0.14
3442 Santa Fe Avenue, Riverbank Branch Library	Library	0.22
46-48 West Salida, Patterson Branch Library	Library	0.14
4835 Sisk Road, Nick W. Blom Salida Regional Library	Library	4.95
550 Minaret Avenue, Turlock Branch Library	Library	1.46
18 South Abie Street, Empire Community Center	Library	0.96
Tenth Street Place, 1010 10th Street	Other County Facilities	0.08
Tenth Street Place, 1010 10th Street	Other County Facilities	0.56
Tenth Street Place, 1010 10th Street	Other County Facilities	0.73
Subtotal - Tenth Street Place		1.37
Agricultural Center 3800 Cornucopia Way, Modesto	Other County Facilities	15.58
Community Services Facility 3800 Cornucopia Way, Modesto	Other County Facilities	26.45
Vacant/future Development - 3800 Cornucopia Way, Modesto	Other County Facilities	27.33
Subtotal - 3800 Cornucopia Way, Modesto		69.36
Landfill, 400 Fink Road (Dry Land)	Other County Facilities	122.56
Subtotal - 400 Fink Road		122.56
Burbank-Paradise Hall, 1325 Beverly Drive	Other County Facilities	0.11
Morgan Road - Public Works Yard, 1716 Morgan Road	Other County Facilities	14.96
Public Works Yard, 301 South First Str	Other County Facilities	1.29
Fleet Services Facility, 448 East Hackett Road	Other County Facilities	10.00
Public Works Yard, 551 South Center Str	Other County Facilities	2.00
Geer Road Landfill, 751 Geer Road (Dry Land)	Other County Facilities	85.19
12th Street Parking Garage, 820 12th Street	Other County Facilities	0.89
County Center III - 909 - 939 County Center III Drive, Modesto	Sheriff	0.58
County Center III - Chief Executive Office/CARE Unit	Other County Facilities	1.03
County Center III - Clerk Recorder	Other County Facilities	2.23
County Center III - General Services Agency	Other County Facilities	2.37
County Center III - Health Services Agency	Other County Facilities	2.84
County Center III - Sheriff Coroner	Sheriff	4.22
Subtotal - County Center III		13.27

Note: This appendix does not include parkland.

Source: Stanislaus County.

Appendix Table A.15: Existing County-Owned Buildings

Property	Department	Square Feet
Animal Services Shelter	Animal Services	34,800
800 Scenic, Modesto		
Behavioral Health Share	Behavioral Health	26,414
County Center II, 700-1020 Scenic Dr		
Administration Offices	Health	35,570
Clinic/Medical Offices	Health	148,187
Shop/Warehouse	Health	17,320
Central Services, 1018 Scenic Drive, Modesto - Central Services	Other County Facilities	7,752
Community Services Agency, County Center II	Other County Facilities	1,000
General Services Agency Print Shop - County Center II	Other County Facilities	6,752
Subtotal - County Center II		216,581
CSA Bldg.-Hackett Rd.	Behavioral Health	2,600
Ray Simon Regional Criminal Justice Training Center	Criminal Justice	22,530
Child Support, Probation - 801 11th Street, Modesto	Criminal Justice	16,761
Guardian Ad Litem, 801 11th Street, Modesto (former City Hall)	Other County Facilities	373
Child Support Services, 801 11th Street, Modesto (former City Hall)	Other County Facilities	1,267
Superior Court of California	NA	4,457
Strategic Business Technology, 801 11th Street	Other County Facilities	5,068
Subtotal - 810 11th Street, Modesto		27,926
Public Defender - 1021 I Street (former Bank of America) I Street	Criminal Justice	14,177
Clerk-Recorder, 1021 I Street (former Bank of America) I Street	Other County Facilities	21,516
Strategic Business Technology, 1021 I Street (former Bank of America)	Other County Facilities	400
Subtotal - 1021 I Street (former Bank of America)		36,093
12th Street Office Building - District Attorney	Criminal Justice	43,800
12th Street Office Building - StanCera	NA	14,600
Subtotal - 12th Street Office Building		58,400
Juvenile Commitment Center, 2215 Blue Gum Avenue, Modesto	Detention	47,207
Juvenile Justice Center, 2215 Blue Gum Avenue, Modesto	Detention	78,908
Juvenile Justice Center Human Resources Office, 2215 Blue Gum Ave.	Detention	2,160
Juvenile Justice Center Training Building A, 2215 Blue Gum Ave.	Detention	2,160
Juvenile Justice	Behavioral Health	1,440
Juvenile Justice	Behavioral Health	2,150
Subtotal - 2215 Blue Gum Avenue		134,025

Source: Stanislaus County.

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

Property	Department	Square Feet
Jail Immediate Action Plan -- Units A-G	Detention	148,220
Unit One (Minimum Security Housing)	Detention	34,350
Jail Unit Two	Detention	28,753
Re-Entry and Enhanced Alterntives to Custody Training (REACT)	Detention	56,102
Public Safety Center Intake/Release/Transportation	Detention	33,645
Public Safety Center Jail Expansion-Max Sec-Med/MH Hsng	Detention	137,276
Ceres Branch Library, 2250 Magnolia Street, Ceres	Library	4,200
Empire Branch Library, 18 South Abie Street, Empire	Library	4,300
Keyes Branch Library, 5506 Jennie, Keyes	Library	7,400
Modesto Main Library, 1500 I Street, Modesto	Library	62,000
Newman Branch Library, 1305 Kern Street, Newman	Library	2,613
Oakdale Branch Library, 151 South 1st Street, Oakdale	Library	6,500
Patterson Branch Library, 46-48 West Salida, Patterson	Library	6,800
Riverbank Branch Library, 3442 Santa Fe Avenue, Riverbank	Library	3,594
Salida Branch Library, 4835 Sisk Road, Salida	Library	61,000
Turlock Branch Library, 550 Minaret Avenue, Turlock	Library	10,000
Waterford Branch Library, 324 E Street, Waterford	Library	3,000
Office of Emergency Services - 3705 Oakdale Road	Emergency Services	4,000
County Share of Emergency Dispatch (36%) - 3705 Oakdale Road	Emergency Services	2,880
Non-County Share - 3705 Oakdale Road	NA	10,320
Subtotal - 3705 Oakdale Road		17,200
Area Agency on Aging/Vets, 718 Tuolumne, Modesto - Mancini Hall	Other County Facilities	6,000
Assessor, 1010 10th Street, Modesto	Other County Facilities	18,861
Auditor-Controller, 1010 10th Street, Modesto	Other County Facilities	14,158
Board of Supervisors, 1010 10th Street, Modesto	Other County Facilities	10,899
Chief Executive Office, 1010 10th Street, Modesto	Other County Facilities	22,225
Clerk of the Board, 1010 10th Street, Modesto	Other County Facilities	2,127
County Counsel, 1010 10th Street, Modesto	Other County Facilities	9,053
Planning/Com. Dev., 1010 10th Street, Modesto	Other County Facilities	9,614
Public Works, 1010 10th Street, Modesto	Other County Facilities	14,646
Treasurer-Tax Collector, 1010 10th Street, Modesto	Other County Facilities	16,995
Subtotal - 1010 10th Street, Modesto		118,576
Child Support Services, 251 E Hackett Road, Ceres	Other County Facilities	53,693
Community Services Agency, 251 E Hackett Road, Ceres	Other County Facilities	144,970
Employment & Training, 251 E Hackett Road, Ceres	Other County Facilities	53,693
Subtotal - 251 E Hackett Road, Ceres		252,356
Central Services, 909 Oakdale Road, Modesto - Training Center	Other County Facilities	23,544
Central Services, 909 Oakdale Road, Modesto - Warehouse #1	Other County Facilities	14,400
Central Services, 909 Oakdale Road, Modesto - Warehouse #2	Other County Facilities	13,600
Subtotal - Central Services		51,544
Initial Access and Outreach Center, 825 12th Street	Other County Facilities	2,100
Argriculture Commissioner - 3800 Cornucopia Way	Other County Facilities	50,783
Cooperative Extension, 3800 Cornucopia Way	Other County Facilities	30,470
Environmental Resources, 3800 Cornucopia Way	Other County Facilities	40,626
Subtotal - 3800 Cornucopia Way		121,879

Source: Stanislaus County.

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

Property	Department	Square Feet
District Attorney, 832 12th Street	Other County Facilities	44,691
Subtotal - 1100 I Street		44,691
Fleet Services, 442 E Hackett Road - Fleet Services Office/Shop	Other County Facilities	9,374
Fleet Services, 442 E Hackett Road - Fleet Services Office/Shop	Other County Facilities	9,374
Subtotal - 442 E Hackett Road - Fleet Services Office/Shop		18,748
Public Works, 1716 Morgan Rd. Bridge Shop	Other County Facilities	4,000
Public Works, 1716 Morgan Rd. Carpenter/Paint Shop	Other County Facilities	2,740
Public Works, 1716 Morgan Rd. Equipment Storage Shop	Other County Facilities	10,000
Public Works, 1716 Morgan Rd. DER Office	Other County Facilities	180
Public Works, 1716 Morgan Rd. Heavy Equipment Maintenance Shop	Other County Facilities	12,000
Public Works, 1716 Morgan Rd. Household Hazardous Waste Facility	Other County Facilities	1,547
Public Works, 1716 Morgan Rd. Public Works Office	Other County Facilities	9,504
Public Works, 1716 Morgan Rd. Material Storage	Other County Facilities	5,850
Public Works, 1716 Morgan Rd. Parks Pesticide Storage Facility	Other County Facilities	5,600
Public Works, 1716 Morgan Rd. Pesticide Storage Facility	Other County Facilities	90
Public Works, 1716 Morgan Rd. Sign Shop	Other County Facilities	2,500
Public Works, 1716 Morgan Rd. Storage Building	Other County Facilities	4,836
Public Works, 1716 Morgan Rd. Public Works Storage Building I	Other County Facilities	7,040
Public Works, 1716 Morgan Rd. Combustable Liquid Storage Facility	Other County Facilities	440
Public Works, 1716 Morgan Rd. Storage Building	Other County Facilities	64
Public Works, 1716 Morgan Rd. Warehouse	Other County Facilities	624
Subtotal - 1716 Morgan Road		67,015
Environmental Resources, 400 Fink Road	Other County Facilities	500
Environmental Resources, 400 Fink Road	Other County Facilities	2,500
Environmental Resources, 400 Fink Road	Other County Facilities	800
Environmental Resources, 400 Fink Road	Other County Facilities	1,600
Subtotal - 400 Fink Road		5,400
Environmental Resources, 751 Geer Road	Other County Facilities	2,500
Public Works, 551 South Center - Public Works Office	Other County Facilities	1,600
Public Works, 551 South Center - Public Works Shop	Other County Facilities	8,000
Public Works, 551 South Center - Public Works Shop	Other County Facilities	3,000
Subtotal - 551 South Center Center		12,600
Public Works, 301 South First Street - Roads Modular Unit	Other County Facilities	800
Chief Executive Office/CARE Unit - County Center III	Other County Facilities	6,278
Clerk Recorder - County Center III	Other County Facilities	13,600
General Services Agency - County Center III	Other County Facilities	14,400
HSA - County Center III	Health	17,266
County Center III - Sheriff Coroner	Sheriff	25,720
Subtotal - County Center III		77,264

Source: Stanislaus County.

Appendix B: Industrial Rail Credit

As a policy decision, Stanislaus County staff has decided to adjust each of the large industrial land use trip rates down to account for trips served by rail. **Appendix Table B.1** details the calculation of the adjusted tip demand factor.

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

- The assumed square footage for each land use category is multiplied by the non-discounted trip demand factor from Table 13.1 to determine the daily PM peak hour trips generated by that land use.
- Daily PM peak hour trips are multiplied by the number of weekdays in a year (260) to determine the annual PM peak hour trips generated by a land use.
- The number of annual PM peak hour trips reduced by rail (estimated at half of the total rail trips) are subtracted from the total PM peak hour trips calculated in the previous step.
- The adjusted annual PM peak hour trips calculated in the previous step are divided by the number of weekdays in a year (260) to determine the daily adjusted PM peak hour trip demand factor.

Appendix Table B.1: Rail Served Industrial Trip Demand Factor

Land Use	1,000 Square feet of Space[1] [A]	Trip Demand Factor (PM Peak Hour)[2] [B]	Daily PM Peak Hour Trips [C = A x B]	Yearly PM Peak Hour Trips[3] [D = C x 260]	Annual PM Peak Hour Trips Reduced by Rail[4] [E]	Total Annual PM Peak Hour Trips (after Reduction) [F = D - E]	Adjusted Trip Factor [F / 260 / A]
Large Industrial							
Manufacturing	3,333	0.98	3,267	849,420	20,000	829,420	**0.96**
Mixed Use / Distribution	3,333	0.50	1,667	433,420	20,000	413,420	**0.48**
Warehouse	3,333	0.30	1,000	260,000	20,000	240,000	**0.28**
Total	10,000		5,934	1,542,840	60,000	1,482,840	

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

[2] See Table 13.1.

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

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

Sources: Beard Industrial Tract; Table 13.1, Willdan Financial Services.