



DATE: April 16, 2025

TO: Mayor and Members of the City Council

FROM: John R. Gillison, City Manager

INITIATED BY: Matt Burris, Deputy City Manager
Zack Neighbors, Director of Building and Safety Services
Jason C. Welday, Director of Engineering Services/City Engineer

SUBJECT: Public Hearing for Consideration of Resolution No. 2025-010, A Resolution of the City Council of Rancho Cucamonga, California, Approving the Development Impact Fee Nexus Study for the Community and Recreation Center Impact Fee, Library Impact Fee, Animal Center Impact Fee, Police Impact Fee, Park Impact Fees and Fire Impact Fee , Adopting Capital Improvement Programs as Part of the Nexus Study, Updating and Establishing the Fee Amounts for Such Development Impact Fees, and Making a Determination of Exemption Under California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and Consideration of First Reading of Ordinance No. 1038, to Be Read by Title Only and Waive Further Reading, An Ordinance of the City of Rancho Cucamonga, Adding Chapter 3.80 to the Rancho Cucamonga Municipal Code, Establishing a Development Impact Fee for Fire Impacts of Residential and Business Development, Amending Chapter 3.68 to Remove References to Quimby Act in Lieu Fees, and Making a Determination of Exemption from the CEQA. **(RESOLUTION NO. 2025-010) (ORDINANCE NO. 1038) (CITY)**

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends that the City Council:

1. Reopen the noticed public hearing to receive comments and testimony from the public on the proposed impact fees and nexus study for the Community and Recreation Center Impact Fee, Library Impact Fee, Animal Center Impact Fee, Police Impact Fee, Park Impact Fees and Fire Impact Fee;
2. Adopt Resolution No. 2025-010 adopting the nexus study for the Community and Recreation Center Impact Fee, Library Impact Fee, Animal Center Impact Fee, Police Impact Fee, Park Impact Fees and Fire Impact Fee, adopting capital improvement programs as part of the nexus study, and approving the updated Development Impact Fee amounts, including findings in support thereof; and
3. Conduct the first reading of Ordinance No.1038, Adding Chapter 3.80 to the Rancho Cucamonga Municipal Code, Establishing a Development Impact Fee for Fire Impacts of Residential and Business Development, Amending Chapter 3.68 to Remove References

to Quimby Act in Lieu Fees, and Making a Determination of Exemption from the California Environmental Quality Act

BACKGROUND:

Impact fees are charges that local governments impose on developers to offset the impacts and cost of new development on public services and infrastructure, such as roads, schools, parks, and emergency services. These fees aim to ensure that growth supports itself financially, rather than placing a burden on existing residents and taxpayers. In recent years, California has faced a housing shortage, driven by high demand and limited supply. To address this crisis, the state has sought to regulate the fees associated with development, ensuring that they are applied in a way that supports housing development and balances infrastructure needs.

One key regulation addressing development fees is the **Mitigation Fee Act** (Government Code Sections 66000-66025), which governs how local governments can charge developers impact or mitigation fees to address the effects of new developments on public infrastructure and services. The Mitigation Fee Act has recently been updated with **Assembly Bill 602** (AB 602), which in part addresses the application of impact fees on housing development projects.

The most recent update to the City's Development Impact Fees (DIFs) was adopted by Council on December 2, 2020. Construction costs have experienced significant increases from December 2020 to the present, driven by several factors including supply chain disruptions, labor shortages, inflation, and rising prices for materials, among other things. Construction inflation has typically outpaced general inflation, with industry-specific inflation in the construction sector often reaching 5 -10% annually. The rising cost of inflation has significant implications for the City's ability to fund and expand the public infrastructure and facilities required to support growth driven by new development. In order to ensure that the DIFs continue to reflect current costs, are properly apportioned, and meet current legal requirements, to ensure the City can effectively meet the demands of future growth.

This staff report provides an overview of the legal and procedural background for the establishment and implementation of Development Impact Fees, specifically in accordance with the **Mitigation Fee Act** as amended. It outlines the required procedures, methodology, and guidelines for adopting impact fees to mitigate the effects of new development on public infrastructure and services. The goal is to ensure that new development pays its fair share of the costs for public facilities and services that are necessitated by the development, without placing an undue burden on existing residents or taxpayers.

DIFs are charges levied on new development projects to fund the construction or expansion of public infrastructure and facilities needed to support the growth generated by the development. Included in the current DIFs are Park Impact Fees, Community and Recreation Impact Fees, Library Impact Fees, Animal Center Impact Fees, and Police Impact Fees which ensures that new development and redevelopment projects will pay their "fair share" towards new and expanded infrastructure and facilities that mitigate the impacts caused by this growth. Further, given the impact of new development on fire and emergency response facilities, a Fire Impact Fee has been developed for consideration by the City Council. The City also has a Transportation Impact Fee, which will be considered by the City Council at its May 7th meeting.

Mitigation Fee Act: The Mitigation Fee Act provides the legal framework for the imposition of development fees in California. It requires that fees imposed on new development must be reasonably related to the impact caused by the development. AB 602 modified the Mitigation Fee Act to enhance transparency and accountability in the process of collecting and expending development impact fees. The Mitigation Fee Act requires that agencies provide clear and detailed accounting of fees collected and ensure the use of funds aligns with the purpose for which they were intended.

The Mitigation Fee Act sets forth the following key provisions regarding the establishment and collection of development impact fees:

- **Nexus Requirement:** The imposition of development impact fees must demonstrate a clear nexus between the proposed fee and the public infrastructure, or services needed to support the development. In other words, there must be a reasonable connection between the fee charged and the impacts of the new development on public facilities.
- **Proportionality:** The fees must be proportional to the impact caused by the development. This means the fee cannot exceed the fair share of the cost of providing necessary infrastructure or services that the development necessitates.
- **Fee Transparency:** The public must be notified of any proposed fees, and a detailed report on the fees must be provided that explains the methodology used to calculate the fees, including the specific improvements that the fees are intended to fund.
- **Accountability:** Fees collected must be used solely for the purpose for which they were collected and must be expended in a timely manner. After certain periods of time, unspent fees may need be returned to the developers or held in a separate interest-bearing account.

The Mitigation Fee Act also requires agencies to follow other requirements including:

- **Annual Reporting:** Local agencies that collect development impact fees are required to provide an annual report to the public detailing the amounts of fees collected, how the fees have been spent, and the status of any projects funded by the fees.
- **Five-Year Accounting Requirement:** Every five years, the City must make certain findings regarding the fees, including the expected dates when the funds will be spent, and progress made on constructing the funded infrastructure. This requirement aims to ensure that collected fees are used in a timely manner to address the impacts of development.
- **Fee Transparency:** Agencies must now provide a clear, itemized accounting of the fee amounts collected and the projects funded, making the process more transparent for developers, the public, and other stakeholders. An annual report is required to show the fees collected, how the fees have been spent, and the progress of the related capital projects.

The process for establishing DIFs involves several steps, including data collection, analysis, and stakeholder engagement. A typical methodology for setting up development impact fees includes the following steps:

- **Assess the Impact:** Analyze the types and scale of infrastructure and services needed to serve new development, based on projected growth and land use patterns.
- **Consult with Relevant Departments:** Coordinate with public agencies, including transportation, parks, water, and education departments, to assess facility and service

needs.

- **Nexus Analysis:** A Nexus Study is typically required to determine the appropriate amount of the impact fee. The study should demonstrate a clear connection between the new development and the infrastructure, or services required to support it.
- **Proportionality:** The study should also demonstrate that the fees are proportional to the level of service that the new development will require.
- **Fee Calculation:** The fee level is determined based on the estimated cost of infrastructure improvements and the number of new residents or employees that will be generated by the development. Various methodologies can be used, such as:
 - **Level of Services Method:** Charges developers for the actual costs of providing facilities or services.
 - **Plan-based Method:** Calculates fees based on an adopted capital improvement plan or facility master plan.
 - **System-based Method:** Calculates the fees associated with the Fire Development Impact Fee.
- **Public Review:** The public must be given an opportunity to review the proposed fees. This includes a public hearing where stakeholders can provide input.
- **Adoption of Fees:** After the public hearing, the governing body (e.g., City Council) may adopt the fees.

In order to ensure that newly established or updated fees are in alignment with the Mitigation Fee Act, the City contracted with NBS, a consulting firm with extensive experience in the preparation of nexus studies, to prepare the attached nexus study.

On April 2, 2025, the City Council opened the duly noticed public hearing regarding the proposed non-transportation impact fees, as well as the proposed transportation impact fee. The City Council continued the public hearing as the non-transportation impact fees described herein to the April 16, 2025, City Council meeting and continued the public hearing as to the transportation impact fees to the May 7, 2025, meeting.

ANALYSIS:

The DIF Program is designed around key projects and improvements outlined in the City's General Plan. With the enactment of new State laws and updates to existing regulations, the General Plan has undergone revisions to align with these changes. Notably, these updates include provisions to accommodate more than 10,000 new residential units mandated by the State of California and implement new infrastructure to accommodate new development. These revisions directly affect the City's DIFs.

As a result of these updates, the City's approach to levying fees has evolved, particularly in response to the new requirements of AB 602, which became effective on January 1, 2022. This legislation mandates that impact fees levied on residential development be calculated based on square footage for future units rather than the prior standard of per dwelling unit. A nexus study must evaluate how existing and future residential development can be estimated by square footage or provide justification for why square footage is not relevant in this context, if it does not appropriately reflect the relationship between the fee, facility demand, and residential land use.

Additionally, AB 602 requires that, effective July 1, 2022, large jurisdictions adopting a nexus study must also adopt a capital improvement plan as part of the study. To comply with this

requirement, the City has prepared an amendment to the Capital Improvement Plan, which is integrated into the Major Projects Program. This amendment has been included in the attached resolution for consideration as part of the process to establish fees under the DIF Program.

To comply with the requirements of AB 602 the Non-Transportation Nexus Study utilized an existing level of service approach while calculating the Park Impact Fees. Chapter 3.68 of the Rancho Cucamonga Municipal Code established and governs impact fees for park land acquisition and park improvements. The City follows the General Plan standard for parkland and as a result the City does not use the Quimby Act.

In 2021, Section 66016.5 was added to the Mitigation Fee by Act AB 602. Paragraph (a)(2) of that section requires that, after January 1, 2022, the level of service used to calculate impact fees in a nexus study must be compared with the existing level of service, and if the proposed new level of service is higher than the existing level of service, an explanation must be included. Because the level of service used to calculate impact fees in this chapter is the same as the existing level of service, no explanation is required to satisfy the requirements of Section 66016.5(a)(2).

Park Land Acquisition Impact Fee and the Park Improvement Impact Fee

The following tables reflect the City's existing park acreage, existing level of service for park land and improve land, the cost per capita of existing park maintenance equipment, cost per capita for park land acquisition and improvements all of which are incorporated into the calculation which creates the Park Land Acquisition Impact Fee per Square Foot and the Park Improvement Impact Fee per Square Foot.

Table 3.1: Existing Parks

Park Name	Total Acres ¹	Improved Acres ⁴
<i>Community Parks</i>		
Central Park	74.45	35.84
Etiwanda Creek Community Park	22.48	14.48
Heritage Community Park	34.02	34.02
Red Hill Community Park	44.20	44.20
Epicenter Adult Sports Complex	48.90	48.90
<i>Subtotal Community Parks</i>	224.05	177.44
<i>Neighborhood Parks</i>		
Bear Gulch Park	4.56	4.56
Beryl Park East	10.10	10.10
Beryl Park West	8.72	8.72
Church Street Park	7.00	7.00
Coyote Canyon Park	4.74	4.74
Day Creek Park	9.98	9.98
Don Tuburcio Tapia Park (Long Term Lease)	4.34	0.00
Ellena Park	6.04	6.04
Garcia Park	5.55	5.55
Golden Oak Park	4.99	4.99
Hermosa Park	9.57	9.57
Kenyon Park	7.82	7.82
Legacy Park	3.76	3.76
Lions Park	2.50	2.50
Los Amigos Park	3.36	3.36
Milliken Park	8.40	8.40
Mountain View Park	5.03	5.03
Old Town Park	5.01	5.01
Olive Grove Park	7.38	7.38
Ralph M. Lewis Park	8.03	8.03
Rancho Summit Park	6.71	6.71
Spruce Avenue Park	3.89	3.89
Victoria Arbors Park	7.75	7.75
Victoria Groves Park	6.02	6.02
Vintage Park	8.02	8.02
West Greenway Park	6.10	6.10
Windrows Park	8.01	8.01
9/11 Park	1.40	0.00
<i>Subtotal Neighborhood Parks</i>	174.78	169.04
Total	398.83	346.48

¹ Source: City of Rancho Cucamonga; park acreage numbers revised February 2025; see maps of individual parks in Appendix C

Existing Level of Service

Table 3.2 calculates existing levels of service in terms of acres per capita and acres per 1,000 population for total City-owned Park land and for improved park land.

Table 3.2: Existing Level of Service - Total/Improved Park Land

Component	Existing Acres ¹	Existing Population ²	Acres per Capita ³	Acres per 1,000 ⁴
Total Park Land	398.83	191,987	0.00208	2.08
Improved Park Land	346.48	191,987	0.00180	1.80

¹ See Table 3.1

² Existing residential population; see Table 2.2

³ Acres per capita = existing acres / existing population

⁴ Acres per 1,000 residents = acres per capita X 1,000

Table 3.3 calculates the costs per capita for park maintenance vehicles and equipment based on the replacement cost of existing park maintenance vehicles and equipment divided by the existing population of the City. That cost per capita is added to the cost per capita for park improvements in Table 3.6 where the per-capita costs are converted into a cost per unit of development.

Table 3.3: Cost per Capita - Existing Park Maintenance Equipment

Total Cost ¹	Existing Population ²	Cost per Capita ³
\$1,450,620	191,987	\$7.56

¹ See Appendix B for a detailed listing of existing park maintenance vehicles and equipment

² Existing population; see Table 2.3

³ Cost per capita = total cost / existing population

Cost Per Capita

Table 3.4 calculates the cost per capita for park land acquisition and for park improvements using the existing level of service in acres per capita and the cost-per-acre estimates for park land acquisition and park improvements.

Table 3.4: Cost per Capita - Park Land Acquisition and Park Improvements

Cost Component	Acres per Capita ¹	Cost per Acre ²	Cost per Capita ³
Park Land Acquisition	0.0018	\$ 1,176,197	\$ 2,117.15
Park Land Acquisition-Adjusted ⁴	0.0007	\$ 1,176,197	\$ 823.34
Park Improvements	0.0018	\$ 850,000	\$ 1,530.00

¹ Acres per capita for both park land acquisition and park improvements is based on the existing level of service for improved park land; see Table 3.2

² Cost per acre for land acquisition based on recent sales data from the CoStar real estate database; see Appendix A for detailed data; cost per acre for park improvements is based on improvement costs, adjusted for specialized improvement or typical improvements that were omitted, with an adjustment for inflation, for a recently completed 4.9 acre dog park

³ Cost per capita = acres per capita X cost per acre

⁴ Park land acres per capita is adjusted to credit future development for 46.61 acres (0.0011 acres per capita) of City-owned, unimproved park land in Central Park and Etiwanda Community Park; that adjustment reduces the total park land to be funded by park land impact fees from 75.42 acres to 29.33 acres; the adjusted cost per capita is used in Table 3.5 to calculate impact fees for park land acquisition

Impact Fees per Square Foot

Table 3.5 shows the calculation of park land acquisition impact fees per square foot for single-family and multi-family residential development. It should be noted that this fee was reduced from the prior version of the nexus study issued for public comment. The lower impact fee reflects a “credit” against existing unimproved land owned by the City and planned for park uses within the City.

Table 3.5: Park Land Acquisition Impact Fee per Square Foot

Development Type	Unit Type ¹	Population per Unit ²	Cost per Capita ³	Impact Fee per Unit ⁴	Avg Sq Ft per Unit ⁵	Impact Fee per Sq Ft ⁶
Residential, Single Family	DU	3.15	\$ 823.34	\$ 2,593.51	2,500	\$ 1.04
Residential, Multi-Family	DU	2.48	\$ 823.34	\$ 2,041.88	1,700	\$ 1.20

¹ DU = dwelling unit

² See Table 2.1

³ See Table 3.4

⁴ Impact fee per unit = population per unit X cost per capita

⁵ Average square feet per unit provided by the City of Rancho Cucamonga

⁶ Impact fee per square foot = impact fee per unit / square feet per unit

Table 3.6 shows the calculation of impact fees per square foot for single-family and multi-family residential development for park improvements.

Table 3.6: Park Improvement Impact Fee per Square Foot (Incl. Maintenance Equipment)

Development Type	Units ¹	Population per Unit ²	Cost per Capita ³	Impact Fee per Unit ⁴	Avg Sq Ft per Unit ⁵	Impact Fee per Sq Ft ⁶
Residential, Single Family	DU	3.15	\$1,537.56	\$ 4,843.30	2,500	\$ 1.94
Residential, Multi-Family	DU	2.48	\$1,537.56	\$ 3,813.14	1,700	\$ 2.24

¹ DU = dwelling unit

² See Table 2.1

³ Includes cost per capita for park improvements from Table 3.4 and cost per capita for park maintenance vehicles and equipment from Table 3.3

⁴ Impact fee per unit = population per unit X cost per capita

⁵ Average square feet per unit provided by the City of Rancho Cucamonga

⁶ Impact fee per square foot = impact fee per unit / square feet per unit

Community and Recreation Center Impact Fee

To comply with Section 66016.5 of the Mitigation Fee Act, the level of service used to calculate impact fees in a nexus study must be compared with the existing level of service, and if the proposed new level of service is higher than the existing level of service, an explanation must be included. Because the level of service used to calculate impact fees in this chapter is the same as the existing level of service, no explanation is required to satisfy the requirements of Section 66016.5(a)(2). This existing level of service approach was utilized in the calculation for the Community and Recreation Center Impact Fee.

Existing Facilities

Table 4.1 lists the City's existing community and recreation centers with their estimated replacement cost. Replacement cost is used in this analysis as an indicator of the cost of

constructing additional facilities to serve future development.

Table 4.1: Existing Community and Recreation Centers Estimated Replacement Cost

Facility Name	Site Acres ¹	Site Value ²	Building Sq. Feet ³	Building Repl Cost ⁴	Impact Fee Cost Basis ⁵
RC Family Resource Center	1.80	\$ 2,117,155	11,800	\$ 6,926,502	\$ 9,043,657
RC Sports Center	1.47	\$ 1,729,010	32,000	\$ 18,783,734	\$ 20,512,744
Lion's Center West	0.24	\$ 282,287	11,400	\$ 6,691,705	\$ 6,973,993
Lion's Center East	0.37	\$ 435,193	11,384	\$ 6,682,313	\$ 7,117,506
Lewis/Brulte Community/Sr. Ctr.	Located in Central Park		57,000	\$ 33,458,527	\$ 33,458,527
Heritage Park Equestrian Center	Located in Heritage Park		3,045	\$ 1,787,390	\$ 1,787,390
Victoria Gardens Cultural Center	1.80	\$ 2,117,155	67,584	\$ 49,005,658	\$ 51,122,812
Total		\$ 6,680,799	194,213	\$ 123,335,829	\$ 130,016,628

¹ Site Acres provided by the City of Rancho Cucamonga Community Services Department

² Existing site value = site acres X estimated land value of \$1,176,197 per acre; see Appendix A

³ Building square footage provided by the City of Rancho Cucamonga Community Services Department

⁴ Building replacement cost based on estimated cost in 2020 impact fee study escalated to 2024 using the California Construction Cost Index

⁵ Impact fee cost basis = site value + building replacement cost

Cost per Capita

Table 4.2 calculates the replacement cost per capita for community and recreation center facilities using the impact fee cost basis from Table 4.1 and the existing population.

Table 4.2: Community and Rec Centers - Existing Level of Service

Impact Fee Cost Basis ¹	Existing Population ²	Cost per Capita ³
\$130,016,628	191,987	\$677.22

¹ See Table 4.1

² Existing population; see Table 2.2

³ Cost per capita = impact fee cost basis / existing population

In the next section, the cost per capita from Table 4.2 is used to calculate community and recreation center impact fees per unit, which are then divided by square-feet-per-unit factors to get impact fees per square foot for single-family and multi-family residential development.

Impact Fees per Square Foot

Table 4.3 shows the calculation of community and recreation center impact fees per square foot for single-family and multi-family residential development.

Table 4.3: Community and Recreation Centers - Impact Fees per Square Foot

Development Type	Units ¹	Population per Unit ²	Cost per Capita ³	Impact Fee per Unit ⁴	Avg Sq Ft per Unit ⁵	Impact Fee per Sq Ft ⁶
Residential, Single Family	DU	3.15	\$677.22	\$ 2,133.23	2,500	\$ 0.85
Residential, Multi-Family	DU	2.48	\$677.22	\$ 1,679.50	1,700	\$ 0.99

¹ Units of development; DU = dwelling unit

² See Table 2.1

³ Cost per capita; see Table 4.2

⁴ Impact fee per unit = population per unit X cost per capita

⁵ Average square feet per unit provided by the City of Rancho Cucamonga

⁶ Impact fee per square foot = impact fee per unit / square feet per unit

Library Impact Fee

To comply with Section 66016.5 of the Mitigation Fee Act the level of service used to calculate impact fees in a nexus study must be compared with the existing level of service, and if the proposed new level of service is higher than the existing level of service, an explanation must be included. Because the level of service used to calculate impact fees in this chapter is the same as the existing level of service, no explanation is required to satisfy the requirements of Section 66016.5(a)(2). This existing level of service approach was utilized in the calculation for the Library Impact Fee.

Existing Facilities

Table 5.1 lists the City's existing libraries with their estimated replacement cost. Replacement cost is used in this analysis as an indicator of the cost of constructing additional facilities to serve future development. Cost for library furniture fixtures and equipment, and the contents of the museum at the Biane Library are listed separately.

Table 5.1: Existing Library Facilities

Facility	Site Acres	Site Value ¹	Building Sq. Feet ²	Building Repl Cost ³	Impact Fee Cost Basis ⁴
Paul A. Biane Library	1.35	\$ 1,587,866	38,912	\$ 26,298,402	\$ 27,886,268
Museum Contents at Biane Library					\$ 3,500,000
Archibald Library	1.67	\$ 1,964,249	22,500	\$ 11,964,272	\$ 13,928,521
Library Furniture, Fixtures, Equipt.					\$ 4,100,000
Library Kiosk (RC Resource Center)			199	\$ 220,000	\$ 220,000
Library Kiosk (Fire Station 178)			199	\$ 220,000	\$ 220,000
Total		\$ 3,552,115	61,810	\$ 38,702,674	\$ 49,854,789

¹ Site value based on \$1,176,197 per acre; see Appendix A

² Building square footage provided by the City of Rancho Cucamonga Library Services Department

³ Building replacement cost based on the estimated cost in 2020 impact fee study escalated to 2024 using the California Construction Cost Index

⁴ Impact fee cost basis = site value + building replacement cost

This analysis also includes the cost of library materials (books and electronic media). Table 5.2 shows the estimated replacement cost of the library system's existing materials.

Table 5.2: Existing Library Materials

Number of Items ¹	Avg Cost per Item ²	Impact Fee Cost Basis ³
269,559	\$54.71	\$14,747,573

¹ Number of items provided by the City of Rancho Cucamonga Library Services Department

² Cost per item estimated by the Library Services Department

³ Impact fee cost basis = cost of existing library materials = number of items X average cost per item

Cost per Capita

Table 5.3 calculates the replacement cost per capita for library facilities and materials using the impact fee cost basis for library facilities from Table 5.1, and the impact fee cost basis for existing library materials from Table 5.2, both divided by the City's existing population.

Table 5.3: Library Facilities and Materials - Cost per Capita

Component	Impact Fee Cost Basis ¹	Existing Population ²	Cost per Capita ³
Library Facilities	\$ 49,854,789	191,987	\$ 259.68
Library Materials	\$ 14,747,573	191,987	\$ 76.82
Total	\$ 64,602,362	191,987	\$ 336.49

¹ See Tables 5.1 and 5.2

² Existing population; see Table 2.2

³ Cost per capita = impact fee cost basis / existing population

In the next section, the total cost per capita from Table 5.3 is used to calculate library impact fees per unit, which are then divided by square feet per unit factors to get impact fees per square foot for single-family and multi-family residential development.

Impact Fees per Square Foot

Table 5.4 shows the calculation of library impact fees per square foot for single-family and multi-family residential development.

Table 5.4: Library Impact Fees per Square Foot

Development Type	Dev Units ¹	Cost per Capita ²	Population per Unit ³	Impact Fee per Unit ⁴	Avg Sq Ft per Unit ⁵	Impact Fee per Sq Ft ⁶
Residential, Single Family	DU	\$ 336.49	3.15	\$ 1,059.96	2,500	\$ 0.42
Residential, Multi-Family	DU	\$ 336.49	2.48	\$ 834.51	1,700	\$ 0.49

¹ Units of development; DU = dwelling unit

² Cost per capita; see Table 5.3

³ See Table 2.1

⁴ Impact fee per unit = population per unit X cost per capita

⁵ Average square feet per unit provided by the City of Rancho Cucamonga

⁶ Impact fee per square foot = impact fee per unit / square feet per unit

Animal Center Impact Fee

The City has not adopted a formal level of service standard for animal center facilities. Consequently, the level-of-service standard used to calculate impact fees is the existing relationship between the City's population and the replacement cost of existing animal center facilities, vehicles and equipment, stated as a cost per capita.

To comply with Section 66016.5 of the Mitigation Fee Act the level of service used to calculate impact fees in a nexus study must be compared with the existing level of service, and if the proposed new level of service is higher than the existing level of service, an explanation must be included. Because the level of service used to calculate impact fees in this chapter is the same as the existing level of service, no explanation is required to satisfy the requirements of Section 66016.5(a)(2). This existing level of service approach was utilized in the calculation for the Animal Center Impact Fee.

Existing Facilities

Table 6.1 shows the estimated replacement cost for the City's existing Animal Center and the value of a 1.92-acre site the City has acquired to expand that facility. Table 6.1 also shows a credit for the current balance in the City's Animal Center impact fee fund which is available to increase the existing level of service.

Table 6.1: Existing Animal Center Replacement Cost

Facility	Site Acres	Site Value ¹	Building Sq. Feet ²	Building Repl Cost ³	Impact Fee Cost Basis ⁴
Existing Animal Center	1.60	\$1,881,915	12,148	\$ 8,305,256	\$ 10,187,171
Animal Center Expansion Site	1.92	\$2,258,298			\$ 2,258,298
Total		\$ 4,140,213	12,148	\$ 8,305,256	\$ 12,445,469

¹ Existing site value = site acres X \$1,176,197 per acre; see Appendix A

² Building square footage provided by the City of Rancho Cucamonga Animal Services Department

³ Building replacement cost based on estimated cost in 2020 impact fee study escalated to 2024 using the California Construction Cost Index

⁴ Impact fee cost basis = site value + building replacement cost

Table 6.2 lists the Animal Services Department's existing vehicles and equipment with replacement costs.

Table 6.2: Animal Center Vehicles and Equipment

Manufacturer	Type	Description	Impact Fee Cost Basis ¹
Ford	F-250	Pickup Truck	\$ 110,000
Ford	F-250	Pickup Truck	\$ 110,000
Ford	Ranger	Pickup Truck	\$ 40,000
Saturn	UT		\$ 30,000
Chevrolet	SV	Cargo Van	\$ 55,000
Chevrolet		Cargo Van	\$ 55,000
Maverick		Horse Trailer	\$ 15,000
Midmark		Dental X-Ray Machine	\$ 22,970
Midmark		Mobile Dental Machine	\$ 12,792
VMS	Plus	Anesthesia Machine (2)	\$ 7,274
VMS		Anesthesia Machine (2)	\$ 6,738
		LED Procedure Light - Dual	\$ 7,851
		LED Procedure Light - Single (4)	\$ 15,704
		LED Procedure Light - Mobile	\$ 3,926
Cuattro	DR	X-Ray Machine	\$ 52,000
Sound Imaging		Ultrasound Machine	\$ 20,000
Total			\$ 564,255

¹ Impact fee cost basis = replacement cost; replacement cost estimated by the Animal Services Department

Cost per Capita

Table 6.3 calculates the cost per capita for Animal Center facilities, vehicles and equipment using the impact fee cost basis from Tables 6.1 and 6.2 and the City's existing residential population

Table 6.3: Animal Shelter Facilities and Equipment - Cost per Capita

Cost Component	Impact Fee Cost Basis ¹	Existing Population ²	Cost per Capita ³
Facilities	\$ 12,445,469	191,987	\$ 64.82
Vehicles & Equipment	\$ 564,255	191,987	\$ 2.94
Total	\$ 13,009,724	191,987	\$ 67.76

¹ See Tables 6.1 and 6.2

² See Table 2.2

³ Cost per capita = impact fee cost basis / existing population

In the next section, the total cost per capita from Table 6.3 is used to calculate animal center impact fees per unit, which are then divided by square feet per unit factors to get impact fees per square foot for single-family and multi-family residential development.

Impact Fees per Square Foot

Table 6.4 shows the calculation of animal center impact fees per square foot for single-family and multi-family residential development.

Table 6.4: Animal Shelter - Impact Fees per Square Foot

Development Type	Units ¹	Population per Unit ²	Cost per Capita ³	Impact Fee per Unit ⁴	Avg Sq Ft per Unit ⁵	Impact Fee per Sq Ft ⁶
Residential, Single Family	DU	3.15	\$ 67.76	\$ 213.46	2,500	\$ 0.09
Residential, Multi-Family	DU	2.48	\$ 67.76	\$ 168.05	1,700	\$ 0.10

¹ Units of development; DU = dwelling unit

² See Table 2.1

³ Cost per capita; see Table 6.3

⁴ Impact fee per unit = population per unit X cost per capita

⁵ Average square feet per unit provided by the City of Rancho Cucamonga

⁶ Impact fee per square foot = impact fee per unit / square feet per unit

Police Impact Fee

The Police Impact Fee is calculated for police facilities needed to serve future development in the City. Chapter 3.64 of the Rancho Cucamonga Municipal Code establishes and governs the police impact fee. The City's primary police facility is the Public Safety Building at the Rancho Cucamonga Civic Center. The other existing City-owned police facility is a satellite police station co-located with Fire Station 172 on San Bernardino Road in the western portion of the City. The

department also has a substation in a leased space in the Victoria Gardens shopping mall and is planning to construct a permanent substation in that area in the future.

To comply with Section 66016.5 of the Mitigation Fee Act the level of service used to calculate impact fees in a nexus study must be compared with the existing level of service, and if the proposed new level of service is higher than the existing level of service, an explanation must be included. Because the level of service used to calculate impact fees in this chapter is the same as the existing level of service, no explanation is required to satisfy the requirements of Section 66016.5(a)(2). This existing level of service approach was utilized in the calculation for the Police Impact Fee.

Existing Facilities

Table 7.1 lists the City's existing police facilities with their estimated replacement cost. Replacement cost is used in this analysis as an indicator of the cost of constructing additional facilities to serve future development.

Table 7.1: Existing Police Facilities

Facility Name	Building Square Feet ¹	Impact Fee Cost Basis ²
Civic Center Public Safety Building	30,500	\$ 30,454,510
Police Department Structure Parking - 62 spaces		\$ 2,759,000
San Bernardino Road Satellite Station	5,673	\$ 6,934,243
Total	36,173	\$ 40,147,754

¹ Building square feet provided by the Rancho Cucamonga Police Department

² Impact fee cost basis for Public Safety Building and Satellite Station = estimated building replacement cost from 2020 impact fee study escalated to 2024 using the California Construction Cost Index; impact fee cost basis for Police Dept structure parking based on current estimated construction cost of \$44,500 per space for structure parking

Cost per Call for Service

Table 7.2 calculates the facility cost per call for service for police facilities using the impact fee cost basis from Table 7.1 and the number of existing calls for service.

Table 7.2: Facility Cost per Call for Service per Year

Impact Fee Cost Basis ¹	Existing Calls for Service ²	Cost per Call for Service ³
\$40,147,754	78,133	\$513.84

¹ See Table 7.1

² See Table 2.3

³ Cost per call for service per year = impact fee cost share / existing calls for service

In the next section, the cost per call from Table 7.2 is multiplied by calls per unit factors to calculate police impact fees per unit for each type of development defined in this study. The residential impact fees per unit are then divided by square feet-per-unit factors to get impact fees per square foot for residential.

The cost per call from Table 7.2 can also be used to customize impact fees for any non-residential project that does not reasonably fit within one of the development types identified in this report. Such a customized fee would be based on the estimated number of police calls per year for the project, multiplied by the cost per call from Table 7.2. The number of police calls per year for a specific type of development project can be estimated by reviewing call records for similar existing projects in the City.

Impact Fees per Square Foot (Residential) and per Unit (Non-Residential)

Table 7.3 shows the calculation of police impact fees per square foot for residential development and per unit for non-residential development.

Table 7.3: Police Impact Fees per Square Foot (Residential) and per Unit (Non-Residential)

Development Type	Units ¹	Cost per Call for Service ²	Calls per Unit ³	Impact Fee per Unit ⁴	Avg Sq Ft per Unit ⁵	Impact Fee per Sq Ft ⁶
Residential, Single Family	DU	\$513.84	0.717	\$ 368.67	2,500	\$ 0.15
Residential, Multi-Family	DU	\$513.84	0.617	\$ 317.07	1,700	\$ 0.19
Senior/Assisted Living Facility	Beds	\$513.84	1.738	\$ 892.88		
Commercial/Retail	KSF	\$513.84	1.966	\$ 1,010.46		
Hotel/Motel	Rooms	\$513.84	0.125	\$ 64.14		
Office	KSF	\$513.84	0.465	\$ 238.89		
Industrial	KSF	\$513.84	0.129	\$ 66.48		

¹ Units of development; DU = dwelling unit; KSF = 1,000 gross square feet of building area;

Room = guest room or suite; Bed = accommodation for one patient or resident

² Cost per call for service per year; see Table 7.2

³ See Table 2.1 and the discussion of calls for service in Chapter 2

⁴ Impact fee per unit = cost per call for service X calls per unit

⁵ Average square feet per residential unit provided by the City of Rancho Cucamonga

⁶ Impact fee per square foot (residential) = impact fee per unit / square feet per unit

Fire Impact Fee

Rancho Cucamonga does not have an existing fire impact fee. This section calculates impact fees for fire protection and emergency response facilities, apparatus and equipment provided by the Rancho Cucamonga Fire Protection District (RCFPD or District) to all development in the City. The boundary of RCFPD encompasses the entire City as well as a small area to the north of the City that is planned to remain within the unincorporated territory of San Bernardino County.

Fire districts lack authority to impose impact fees on their own. Impact fees calculated in this section will be adopted and imposed by the City and revenue from the impact fees will be used to support RCFPD to pay for additional capital facilities and other capital assets serving new development in the City. These impact fees will apply only to the portion of RCFPD that is within the City.

To comply with Section 66016.5 of the Mitigation Fee Act the level of service used to calculate impact fees in a nexus study must be compared with the existing level of service, and if the proposed new level of service is higher than the existing level of service, an explanation must be included. Because the level of service used to calculate impact fees in this chapter is the same as the existing level of service, no explanation is required to satisfy the requirements of Section 66016.5(a)(2). This existing level of service approach was utilized in the calculation for the Fire Impact Fee.

Level of Service

The most important single factor in defining level of service for fire protection and emergency medical services agencies is response time to emergency calls. The 2024 Comprehensive Master Plan for RCFPD states that RCFPD's first due unit currently arrives within 9 minutes and 45 seconds, 90% of the time. The Master Plan makes recommendations to improve total response time, including reducing call processing time. The addition of one fire station will help RCFPD maintain and possibly improve its response time performance as future development occurs.

Facilities, Apparatus and Equipment

At present, RCFPD operates eight fire stations as well as an administrative facility, an all-risk training center (ARTC) and a shop facility. RCFPD is planning to construct one additional fire station and has acquired property on 8th Street as a site for that station.

Table 8.1 lists RCFPD's existing and planned fire stations as well as the administrative and training center buildings and the shop facility. Stations 171 through 178 currently exist. Station 179 is planned for future construction.

Table 8.1: Existing and Future Fire Stations

Facility	Location	Constr Date	Bldg Sq Ft	Site Acres	Building Repl Cost ¹	Useful Life ²	Land Cost ³	Depreciated Bldg Cost ⁴	Impact Fee Cost Basis ⁵
Station 171	Amethyst St	1974	4,480	0.99	\$ 644,687	50	\$ 1,164,435	\$ 0	\$ 1,164,435
Admin Bldg	Amethyst St	1977	2,754	Included	\$ 1,755,420	50		\$ 105,325	\$ 105,325
Station 172	San B'dino Rd	2020	13,341	2.90	\$ 14,053,099	50	\$ 2,728,777	\$ 12,928,851	\$ 15,657,628
Station 173	Firehouse Ct	2005	12,000	2.36	\$ 6,823,656	50	\$ 2,775,825	\$ 4,230,666	\$ 7,006,491
Storage Bldg	Firehouse Ct	2005	2,500	Included	\$ 234,078	50		\$ 145,129	\$ 145,129
Station 174	Jersey Blvd	1992	17,000	6.14	\$ 8,984,714	50	\$ 7,221,850	\$ 3,234,497	\$ 10,456,347
Shop/Garage	Jersey Blvd	2001	14,304	Included	\$ 6,306,495	50		\$ 3,405,507	\$ 3,405,507
Trng Ctr Bldg A	Jersey Blvd	2016	7,000	Included	\$ 3,588,740	50		\$ 3,014,542	\$ 3,014,542
Trng Ctr Bldg B	Jersey Blvd	2016	1,900	Included	\$ 1,180,251	50		\$ 991,411	\$ 991,411
Trng Ctr Bldg C	Jersey Blvd	2016	2,455	Included	\$ 1,064,350	50		\$ 894,054	\$ 894,054
Trng Ctr Bldg D	Jersey Blvd	2016	15,415	Included	\$ 4,006,318	50		\$ 3,365,307	\$ 3,365,307
Trng Ctr Bldg E	Jersey Blvd	2016	3,064	Included	\$ 894,974	50		\$ 751,779	\$ 751,779
Trng Ctr Bldg I	Jersey Blvd	2016	1,300	Included	\$ 1,422,959	50		\$ 1,195,286	\$ 1,195,286
Station 175	Banyan St	1992	13,000	3.05	\$ 7,304,058	50	\$ 3,587,401	\$ 2,629,461	\$ 6,216,862
Station 176	East Av	2003	9,594	1.07	\$ 4,297,952	50	\$ 1,258,531	\$ 2,492,812	\$ 3,751,343
Station 177	Rancho St	2012	6,000	1.23	\$ 4,025,220	50	\$ 1,446,722	\$ 3,059,167	\$ 4,505,890
Station 178	Town Ctr Dr	2023	12,176	3.80	\$ 16,389,052	50	\$ 4,469,549	\$ 16,061,271	\$ 20,530,820
Station 179	8th St	Future	13,000	0.94	\$ 15,600,000	50	\$ 1,105,625	\$ 15,600,000	\$ 16,705,625
Total					\$ 98,576,024		\$ 25,758,714	74,105,065	\$ 99,863,779

¹ Estimated replacement cost for existing buildings other than Station 178 are based on 2020 estimates, escalated by 38% to 2024 costs based on the California Construction Cost Index; cost for Station 178 is actual 2023 construction cost; cost for future Station 179 based on \$1,200 per square foot, which is below the actual cost of the two most recently constructed fire stations; estimated costs include construction soft costs, utilities, site development, and furniture, fixtures and equipment

² Estimated useful life of buildings in years

³ Estimated land value for existing fire stations or land cost for future fire stations = \$1,176,197 per acre

⁴ Depreciated building replacement cost for existing stations using straight-line depreciation over the useful life of the asset; no depreciation applies to future building costs

⁵ Facility replacement cost = depreciated building replacement cost or new building cost + estimated land cost or value

The impact fee cost basis in the right-hand column of Table 8.1 includes the depreciated replacement cost for existing buildings plus the estimated site value for each building. Where multiple buildings are located on one site, the land cost is shown for the first building. For future Station 179, the cost shown is estimated based on recent construction costs.

Table 8.2 lists RCFPD's existing firefighting apparatus and other vehicles and equipment. Costs for all vehicles and equipment shown in the far-right column of Table 8.2 are depreciated replacement costs based on the useful life shown in that table. Vehicles and equipment are assumed to have a residual value of at least 15% of replacement cost, regardless of age. Assets with a value of less than \$10,000 have been omitted from Table 8.2.

Table 8.2: Existing Fire Apparatus and Vehicles

Quantity	Model Year	Description	Useful Life (Yrs)	Unit Repl Cost ¹	Depr Unit Repl Cost ²	Total Depr Repl Cost ³
2	2013	Type 1 Engine (KME)	10	\$ 1,200,000	\$ 180,000	\$ 360,000
2	2003	Type 1 Engine (KME Excel)	10	\$ 1,200,000	\$ 180,000	\$ 360,000
1	2017	Type 1 Engine (KME)	10	\$ 1,200,000	\$ 360,000	\$ 360,000
1	2008	KME Severe Duty Predator	10	\$ 1,200,000	\$ 180,000	\$ 180,000
2	2005	Type 1 Engine (KME Excel)	10	\$ 1,200,000	\$ 180,000	\$ 360,000
1	2018	Type 1 Engine (KME)	10	\$ 1,200,000	\$ 480,000	\$ 480,000
1	2010	Type 1 Engine (KME)	10	\$ 1,200,000	\$ 180,000	\$ 180,000
1	2006	Type 1 Engine (KME Predator)	10	\$ 1,200,000	\$ 180,000	\$ 180,000
1	2020	Type 1 Engine (Rosenbauer)	10	\$ 1,200,000	\$ 720,000	\$ 720,000
1	2023	Type 1 Engine (Rosenbauer Electric)	10	\$ 2,200,000	\$ 1,980,000	\$ 1,980,000
1	2006	Type 3 Engine (West Mark)	10	\$ 600,000	\$ 90,000	\$ 90,000
1	2008	Type 3 Engine	10	\$ 600,000	\$ 90,000	\$ 90,000
1	2014	Type 3 Engine	10	\$ 150,000	\$ 22,500	\$ 22,500
1	2020	Type 6 Engine	10	\$ 150,000	\$ 90,000	\$ 90,000
1	2002	KME Aerial Ladder Truck--Tiller	10	\$ 2,350,000	\$ 352,500	\$ 352,500
1	2008	KME Aerial Ladder Truck	10	\$ 2,350,000	\$ 352,500	\$ 352,500
1	2015	Rosenbauer Aerial Ladder Truck	10	\$ 2,350,000	\$ 352,500	\$ 352,500
1	2022	Rosenbauer Heavy Rescue Unit	10	\$ 1,650,000	\$ 1,320,000	\$ 1,320,000
1	2006	KME Hazmat Unit	10	\$ 1,650,000	\$ 247,500	\$ 247,500
1	2003	KME Water Tender	10	\$ 550,000	\$ 82,500	\$ 82,500
3	2012	Dodge Ram 4WD	7	\$ 110,000	\$ 16,500	\$ 49,500
1	2019	Dodge Ram 4WD V8 Hemi	7	\$ 200,000	\$ 57,143	\$ 57,143
1	2024	Dodge Ram 4WD V8 Hemi	7	\$ 200,000	\$ 200,000	\$ 200,000
1	2015	Ford F-450 Super Duty Stake Bed	7	\$ 120,000	\$ 18,000	\$ 18,000
1	2008	Ford F-350 Medic Squad	10	\$ 100,000	\$ 15,000	\$ 15,000
3	2019	Chevy Bolt EV	7	\$ 35,000	\$ 10,000	\$ 30,000
3	2013	Ford C-Max Hybrid	7	\$ 35,000	\$ 5,250	\$ 15,750
4	2012	Ford Escape Hybrid	7	\$ 35,000	\$ 5,250	\$ 21,000
1	2023	Ford Lightning	7	\$ 110,000	\$ 94,286	\$ 94,286
2	2009	Saturn Vue	7	\$ 35,000	\$ 5,250	\$ 10,500
2	2020	Toyota RAV-4 Hybrid	7	\$ 35,000	\$ 15,000	\$ 30,000
2	2023	Toyota RAV-4 Hybrid	7	\$ 35,000	\$ 30,000	\$ 60,000
1	2024	Toyota RAV-4 Hybrid	7	\$ 35,000	\$ 35,000	\$ 35,000
2	2016	Chevy Colorado 4WD	7	\$ 110,000	\$ 16,500	\$ 33,000
2	2018	Chevy Colorado 4WD	7	\$ 110,000	\$ 16,500	\$ 33,000
1	2017	Ford F-350	7	\$ 200,000	\$ 30,000	\$ 30,000
1	2019	Ford F-350	7	\$ 200,000	\$ 57,143	\$ 57,143
2	2016	Chevy Colorado 4WD	7	\$ 110,000	\$ 16,500	\$ 33,000
2	2018	Chevy Colorado 4WD	7	\$ 110,000	\$ 16,500	\$ 33,000
2	2008	Chevy F-2500 4WD	7	\$ 110,000	\$ 16,500	\$ 33,000
1	2012	Chevy 3/4 Ton Suburban	7	\$ 110,000	\$ 16,500	\$ 16,500
1	2005	GMC Yukon	7	\$ 110,000	\$ 16,500	\$ 16,500
1	2002	Dodge Ram 2500 4WD	7	\$ 110,000	\$ 16,500	\$ 16,500
1	2004	GMC 7500 Series w/ Equipment	7	\$ 200,000	\$ 30,000	\$ 30,000
1	2008	Ford E-350 Van	7	\$ 75,000	\$ 11,250	\$ 11,250
1	2021	Ford Transit-250 Van	7	\$ 110,000	\$ 62,857	\$ 62,857
2	2020	Nissan NV200 Van	7	\$ 30,000	\$ 12,857	\$ 25,714
1	2012	Ford 1-Ton 4x4 Long Bed	7	\$ 110,000	\$ 16,500	\$ 16,500
1	2006	Freightliner Ambulance	10	\$ 480,000	\$ 72,000	\$ 72,000
1	2024	Polaris ATV	10	\$ 50,000	\$ 50,000	\$ 50,000
1	2001	Mitsubishi Forklift	10	\$ 65,000	\$ 9,750	\$ 9,750
1	2011	JLG Telehandler	10	\$ 100,000	\$ 15,000	\$ 15,000
1	2013	Griddle Trailer	10	\$ 75,000	\$ 11,250	\$ 11,250
1	2020	Progressive Trailer	10	\$ 25,000	\$ 15,000	\$ 15,000
Total				\$ 29,085,000	\$ 8,652,286	\$ 9,417,143

¹ Replacement cost provided by the Rancho Cucamonga Fire District

² Depreciated replacement cost using straight-line depreciation over the useful life of the asset; minimum depreciated value = 15% of replacement cost

³ Total depreciated replacement cost = depreciated unit replacement cost X number of units

Table 8.3 shows the cost of future apparatus and equipment needed to serve the City in 2040, including one Type I engine that will be needed for future Fire Station 179. The estimated cost of that engine is based on the current cost of similar equipment. Also shown in that table is the cost of personal protective equipment for nine firefighters that will be needed to staff Station 179.

Table 8.3: Future Fire Apparatus, Vehicles and Equipment

Description	No. of Units	Cost per Unit ¹	Total New Equipt Cost
New Type 1 Engine (Station 179)	1	\$ 1,200,000	\$ 1,200,000
Personal Protective Equipment ²	9	\$ 9,153	\$ 82,377
Total			\$ 1,282,377

¹ Cost per unit provided by the Rancho Cucamonga Fire District

² Personal protective equipment for future added firefighters; estimated cost includes uniforms and personal protective equipment for fire suppression, wild land firefighting and tactical response

Table 8.4 summarizes the costs from the preceding three tables.

Table 8.4: Impact Fee Cost Basis - Existing and Future Assets

Component	Impact Fee Cost Basis ¹
Existing Fire Stations	\$ 83,158,154
Future Fire Station	\$ 16,705,625
Existing - Fire Apparatus, Vehicles and Equipment	\$ 9,417,143
Future - Fire Apparatus, Vehicles and Equipment	\$ 1,282,377
Total	\$ 110,563,299

¹ See Tables 8.1, 8.2 and 8.3

Cost per Call for Service

Table 8.5 calculates the cost per call for service for RCFPD facilities, apparatus and equipment using the total impact fee cost basis from Table 8.4 and the projected number of calls for service per year in 2040. In Table 8.5, the combined cost of existing and planned facilities, apparatus, vehicles and equipment is divided by total 2040 calls to both existing and future development served by RCFPD.

Table 8.5: Cost per Call for Service

Total Impact Fee Cost Basis ¹	2040 Calls for Service per Year ²	Cost per Call for Service per Year ³
\$110,563,299	21,728	\$5,088.58

¹ See Table 8.4

² Projected 2040 calls for service for the District; see Table 2.4

³ Cost per call for service per year = total impact fee cost basis / 2040 calls
for service per year

The number of calls for service per year shown for 2040 includes calls in the area served by RCFPD outside of the City, so that the cost of serving development in that area is not included in the cost per call for impact fees charged by the City. The impact fees calculated in this section are designed to recover new development's proportionate share of the cost of all RCFPD's existing and planned facilities, apparatus and equipment out to 2040. In the next section, the cost per call is multiplied by calls per unit factors to calculate impact fees per unit. Then for residential development, the impact fee per unit is divided by square feet per unit factors to get impact fees per square foot for single-family and multi-family residential development.

The cost per call for service per year in Table 8.5 can also be used to calculate customized impact fees for development of non-residential development projects that do not fit within the categories of development defined in this study. Customized impact fees can be calculated using the cost per call for service per year from Table 8.5 multiplied by the estimated number of calls per year that will be generated by a specific project.

Impact Fees per Square Foot (Residential) and per Unit (Non-Residential)

Table 8.6 shows the calculation of fire impact fees per square foot for residential development and per unit for non-residential development.

Table 8.6: RCFPD Impact Fees per Unit and per Square Foot (Residential)

Development Type	Units ¹	Cost per Call ²	Calls per Unit ³	Impact Fee per Unit ⁴	Avg Sq Ft per Unit ⁵	Impact Fee per Sq Ft ⁶
Residential, Single Family	DU	\$5,088.58	0.185	\$ 941.39	2,500	\$ 0.38
Residential, Multi-Family	DU	\$5,088.58	0.139	\$ 708.97	1,700	\$ 0.42
Senior/Assisted Living Facility	Beds	\$5,088.58	2.829	\$ 14,397.31		
Commercial/Retail	KSF	\$5,088.58	0.231	\$ 1,174.76		
Hotel/Motel	Rooms	\$5,088.58	0.115	\$ 584.65		
Office	KSF	\$5,088.58	0.122	\$ 621.19		
Industrial	KSF	\$5,088.58	0.017	\$ 88.79		

¹ DU = dwelling unit; KSF = 1,000 gross square feet of building area; room = guest room or suite;
Bed = accommodation for a single resident or patient

² Cost per call for service per year; see Table 8.5

³ Calls for service per unit per year; see Table 2.1

⁴ Impact fee per unit = cost per call for service X calls for service per unit

⁵ Average square feet per residential unit provided by the City of Rancho Cucamonga

⁶ Impact fee per square foot (residential) = impact fee per unit / square feet per unit

Fee Adjustment to Avoid Overcollection

The fees shown in Table 8.6 project revenue that exceeds the estimated cost of future assets shown in Table 8.4 by around 3%. To avoid the potential for overcollection, the impact fees from Table 8.6 are reduced by 3.1% in Table 8.7.

Table 8.7: RCFPD Impact Fees per Unit and per Square Foot Adjusted to Avoid Overcollection

Development Type	Units ¹	Adj Cost per Call ²	Calls per Unit ³	Adj Impact Fee per Unit ⁴	Avg Sq Ft per Unit ⁵	Adj Impact Fee per Sq Ft ⁶
Residential, Single Family	DU	\$4,930.83	0.185	\$ 912.20	2,500	\$ 0.36
Residential, Multi-Family	DU	\$4,930.83	0.139	\$ 686.99	1,700	\$ 0.40
Senior/Assisted Living Facility	Beds	\$4,930.83	2.829	\$ 13,950.99		
Commercial/Retail	KSF	\$4,930.83	0.231	\$ 1,138.34		
Hotel/Motel	Rooms	\$4,930.83	0.115	\$ 566.52		
Office	KSF	\$4,930.83	0.122	\$ 601.93		
Industrial	KSF	\$4,930.83	0.017	\$ 86.04		

¹ DU = dwelling unit; KSF = 1,000 gross square feet of building area; room = guest room or suite;
Bed = accommodation for a single resident or patient

² Adjusted cost per call for service per year is reduced by 3.1% from Table 8.6

³ Calls for service per unit per year; see Table 2.1

⁴ Adjusted impact fee per unit = adjusted cost per call for service X calls for service per unit

⁵ Average square feet per residential unit provided by the City of Rancho Cucamonga

⁶ Adjusted impact fee per square foot (residential) = adjusted impact fee per unit / square feet per unit

In order to be in alignment with the requirements of AB 602, the Non-Transportation Nexus Study changed its method of fee levy from the DU (dwelling unit) approach to a square foot approach. The change is illustrated in Tables S.1 and S.3 of the NBS Non-Transportation Nexus Study below:

Table S.1: Summary of Residential Impact Fees per Square Foot Calculated in This Study

Development Type	Units ¹	Park Land	Park Imprvmnts	Comm/Rec Centers	Libraries	Animal Center	Police	RCFPD	Total
Residential, Single Family	SF	\$ 1.04	\$ 2.25	\$ 0.85	\$ 0.42	\$ 0.09	\$ 0.15	\$ 0.38	\$ 5.18
Residential, Multi-Family	SF	\$ 1.20	\$ 2.61	\$ 0.99	\$ 0.49	\$ 0.10	\$ 0.19	\$ 0.42	\$ 6.00

¹ SF = 1 gross square foot of building area

Table S.3 shows the City's existing impact fees.

Table S.3: Existing Impact Fees From City of Rancho Cucamonga 2024 Fee Schedule

Development Type	Units ¹	Park Land	Park Imprvmnts	Comm/Rec Centers	Libraries	Animal Center	Police	RCFPD	Total
Residential, Single Family	DU	\$ 4,744	\$ 4,583	\$ 2,481	\$ 891	\$ 169	\$ 376	\$ 0	\$ 13,244
Residential, Multi-Family	DU	\$ 3,239	\$ 3,129	\$ 1,693	\$ 608	\$ 116	\$ 297	\$ 0	\$ 9,082
Senior/Assisted Living	Bed	\$ 1,576	\$ 1,523	\$ 825	\$ 296	\$ 56	\$ 136	\$ 0	\$ 4,412
Commercial/Retail	KSF						\$ 1,184	\$ 0	\$ 1,184
Hotel/Motel	Room						\$ 182	\$ 0	\$ 182
Office	KSF						\$ 371	\$ 0	\$ 371
Industrial	KSF						\$ 54	\$ 0	\$ 54

¹ DU = dwelling unit; KSF = 1,000 gross square feet of building area; Room = guest room or suite; Bed = accommodation for a single resident or patient

Administrative Fee:

The City is required to implement the fee program according to various administrative, accounting, reporting, and public notice responsibilities that are specified in the Government Code. These responsibilities require the expenditure of staff time and often include retaining outside advisory services. The City proposes to include a fee to allow for reasonable cost recovery for these administrative costs and proposes a fee of two and one-half percent (2.5%) which is in line with representative implementation costs including as specified in the "Nexus Study and Residential Feasibility Calculation Templates in fulfillment of AB 602" prepared by the Turner Center for Housing Innovation at UC Berkeley for the California Department of Housing and Community Development.

Communication:

The City met the requirements of Government Code Section 66016.5(a)(7) by publishing and sending notice to interested parties 30 days prior to the adoption of the impact fee nexus (30 days prior to the advertised hearing). The City published and sent notice thirty-four (34) days prior to the advertised hearing. The City also made a copy of the Nexus Studies available on the City's website and a hard copy available at the City Clerk's office thirty-four (34) days prior to the advertised public hearing. The Public Hearing Notice was advertised twice ten (10) days in advance and at least five (5) days between those dates in the local newspaper. The City met with BIA (Building Industry Association) and other interested parties twice before the previous advertised hearing once in November of 2024 and once in December of 2024 and has had conversations with BIA and interested parties prior to the advertised public hearing date for April 2, 2025. The City has received letters with questions and comments from DVBA (Desert Valley Builders Association), BIA, DPFG (Development Planning & Finance Group) and LLG (Linscott, Law & Greenspan, Engineers) and have provided responses to the questions and comments which have been attached to the Staff Report as Attachment 8. In added, the City Council continued the public hearing initially scheduled for April 2, 2025, to April 16, 2025 for the Non-Transportation Nexus Study and May 7, 2025, for the Transportation Nexus Study, in order to provide for further communication with interested stakeholders on the fees.

Implementation

During last minute discussions with the Building Industry Association (BIA) concerns were expressed about the prepayment of development impact fees prior to increases taking effect, as well as ensuring a level of certainty for projects with already completed applications. Existing state law, known as SB 330, already provides a process for housing developers to freeze fees at the time of application submittal. The City follows existing state law in this regard with no local changes or additions. The City is also proposing that if approved by the City Council, the proposed Development Impact Fee changes outlined in this report would take effect on July 1, 2025, which is more time than would otherwise be required under the Mitigation Fee Act. In practical experience, however, the City has found the fee changes which take effect at the start of a new fiscal year are often easier to notice, apply and update systems.

The BIA expressed concerns that existing deemed complete applications in process, should be allowed several years to finish entitlement and move to permits, during which their fees would be grandfathered. The City, however, did not calculate this type of extended multiple year freeze into the Nexus Study and has significant concerns that this could undermine the validity of the Nexus Study calculations. A second issue the BIA expressed concern about was the deadline

for deemed complete applications as the BIA was requesting a deadline 30 days after the ordinance takes effect. The City has similar concerns with a rush of applications intended to beat the deadline that could result in thousands of units coming in under the old fees, also undermining the validity of the Nexus Study calculations. In response to the BIA concerns, the City is recommending the following:

- Developers with applications submitted prior to close of business on April 16, 2025, and are subsequently deemed complete, may elect to proceed forward under the new or old Development Impact Fee Program.
 - Proceeding forward under the old development impact fee program will be permitted so long as entitlements are received and building permits are pulled prior to July 1, 2026.
 - Proceeding forward under the new development impact fee program, and the payment of fees at the initial rates, prior to issuance of a building permit, will require completion of plans to the point of knowing actual square footages. Otherwise, the option always exists to pay the fees in effect at time of permit issuance or time of certificate of occupancy, however long that might take.
- The City finds the adjustments noted above should not create a significant deviation in the nexus study such that further adjustments would be needed.

An updated draft resolution will be included and available at the City Council meeting on April 16, 2025.

Actions to Update the DIFs:

To implement the updated DIF program as proposed, the City Council must:

- 1) Adopt the Nexus Studies
- 2) Adopt the CIP
- 3) Establish the DIF fee amounts
- 4) Add Chapter 3.80 to the Code to add the Fire Impact Fee
- 5) Amend Chapter 3.68 of the code to update the Park Impact Fees

Items 1, 2, and 3 above are included in Resolution No. 2025-010, which is included as attachment 4. Items 4 and 5 above are included in Ordinance No.1038, which is included as attachment 1.

Staff therefore recommends that the City Council: (1) Adopt A Resolution of the City Council of Rancho Cucamonga, California, Approving Development Impact Fee Nexus Studies, Adopting Capital Improvement Programs as Part of the Nexus Studies, Updating and Establishing the Fee Amounts for the City's Development Impact Fees, and Making a Determination of Exemption Under CEQA and (2) Introduce Ordinance No.1038, to be Read by Title Only and Waive Further Reading, An Ordinance of the City of Rancho Cucamonga, Adding Chapter 3.80 to the Rancho Cucamonga Municipal Code, Establishing a Development Impact Fee for Fire Impacts of Residential and Business Development, Amending Chapter 3.68 to Remove References to

Quimby Act in Lieu Fees, and Making a Determination of Exemption from the California Environmental Quality Act.

ENVIRONMENTAL

The Project (approval of the Nexus Studies, Capital Improvement Plans associated with the Nexus Studies, and the adoption of the development impact fees specified in the Resolution and Ordinance), was reviewed in accordance with the criteria contained in the California Environmental Quality Act ("CEQA") and the State CEQA Guidelines. Approval of the Nexus Studies, Capital Improvement Plans, and the adoption of the development impact fees specified will not have a significant impact on the environment and are exempt from CEQA pursuant to Section 15061(b)(3) of State CEQA Guidelines because these actions involve the adoption of development impact fees and no specific development is authorized by the adoption of the Nexus Studies, Capital Improvement Plans, or the adoption of new or updated development impact fees. Furthermore, the Capital Improvement Program is a prioritizing and funding allocation program and cannot and does not have the potential to cause a significant effect on the environment. No physical activity will occur until all required environmental review is conducted at the time the physical improvements prioritized in the Capital Improvement Program are undertaken at a future unspecified date. Therefore, the approval of the Nexus Studies, Capital Improvement Plans associated with the Nexus Studies, and adoption of the development impact fees does not have the potential for causing a significant effect on the environment. In addition, the adoption of this Project approves and sets forth a procedure for determining fees for the purpose of obtaining funds for capital projects and equipment necessary to maintain service within existing service areas and is statutorily exempt from CEQA pursuant to State CEQA Guidelines 15273(a)(4). Also, approval of the Capital Improvement Plans associated with the Nexus Studies, is exempt from the requirements of CEQA pursuant to State CEQA Guidelines Section 15378(b)(4) because the Plan is not a "project" as defined by CEQA, but involves the creation of government funding mechanisms or other government fiscal activities that do not involve any commitment to any specific project that may result in a potentially significant physical impact on the environment.

FISCAL IMPACT:

The fiscal impacts of DIFs on the City's finances are associated with both increased revenues and expenses. Administrative expenses will be incurred as City staff collect fees and manage the use and application of fee revenues. The City is proposing a two and one-half percent (2.5%) Administrative Fee to cover these costs.

COUNCIL MISSION / VISION / GOAL(S) ADDRESSED:

This item addresses the City Council's vision for building upon our past successes to create a world class community by ensuring that the means are available to continue the City's growth and success.

ATTACHMENTS:

Attachment 1 Proposed Ordinance No.1038 (Fire DIF Program and Park Impact Fee Revision)

Attachment 2 Exhibit A to Ordinance No.1038 (Fire Impact Fee – Chapter 3.80)

Attachment 3 Exhibit B to Ordinance No.1038 (Park Impact Fee Revision)

Attachment 4 Proposed Resolution No. 2025-010 (DIF Program Fee Update)

Attachment 5 Exhibit A to Resolution No. 2025-010 (NBS Nexus Study)

Attachment 6 Exhibit B to Resolution No. 2025-010 (Capital Improvement Plans for Non-Transportation)

Attachment 7 Exhibit C to Resolution No. 2025-010 (Amendments to Non-Transportation Master Fee Schedule)

Attachment 8 Comment Response Memorandum for Comments on Non-Transportation Nexus Study

Attachment 9 Attachment to Comment Response Memorandum (DVBA – Non-Transportation)

Attachment 10 Attachment to Comment Response Memorandum (BIA)

Attachment 11 Attachment to Comment Response Memorandum (DPFG – Non-Transportation)