

TRAFFIC IMPACT FEE STUDY

CITY OF EL CENTRO

SEPTEMBER 14, 2006

DRAFT



Oakland Office

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

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

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

www.muni.com

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION.....	2
Public Facilities Financing In California	2
Background and Study Objectives	2
TRAFFIC DEMAND FROM NEW DEVELOPMENT	4
TRIP DEMAND.....	5
FACILITY STANDARDS	7
FACILITY COSTS TO ACCOMMODATE GROWTH.....	11
FEE SCHEDULE	16
IMPLEMENTATION	17
Adopt Ordinance and Resolution	17
Programming Revenues and Projects with the CIP	17
Inflation Adjustment	17
Reporting Requirements	18
Credits and Reimbursements	18
MITIGATION FEE ACT FINDINGS	19
Purpose of Fee	19
Use of Fee Revenues	19
Benefit Relationship	20
Burden Relationship	20
Proportionality	20
APPENDIX A	A-1

Introduction

This report presents a schedule of traffic impact fees for the City of El Centro in Imperial County, California (the “City”) and areas within its sphere of influence. The report documents a reasonable relationship between approved new development and an impact fee for funding of traffic facilities.

Public Facilities Financing In California

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

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

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

Background and Study Objectives

The City intends to expand its sphere-of-influence and determine the potential traffic impacts from build out of current areas as well as from areas which are to be included within the City’s future sphere-of-influence. The City has a list of known development projects as well as assumptions for build out land uses based on its General Plan.

As part of this process, the City is updating the Circulation Element of the General Plan, which was originally completed in February 2004. It has retained Willdan to prepare the Circulation Element update. Willdan commissioned Higgins Associates to perform the traffic impact analysis, which will incorporate traffic analysis, forecast and modeling, and will provide the inputs for the update to the Circulation Element.

The primary objectives of the traffic impact analysis and the Circulation Element update are to:

1. Update traffic projections for the City and its sphere-of-influence areas;
2. Identify specific roadway improvements; and
3. Enhance roadway capacity.

The primary purpose of this report is to develop an interim traffic impact fee program for the City which will establish a fee structure by land use type that would help pay for traffic improvements needed to serve to future development. This study will be reviewed and updated to be consistent with the Regional model for Imperial County that is in the process of being updated. This traffic impact fee study and its fee schedule have been developed based on the results of the analyses performed by Willdan and Higgins Associates.

The City imposes public facilities fees under authority granted by the Mitigation Fee Act, contained in *California Government Code* Sections 66000 et seq. This report provides the necessary findings required by the Act for adoption of the public facilities fees presented in the fee schedules contained herein. The City should review and update this report and the calculated fees once every five years to incorporate the best information.

Traffic Demand from New Development

The planning area for this study is approximately 16,000 acres in size and includes both the City and those areas within its sphere-of-influence. The area includes both local and regional roadway networks. All land within the incorporated City of El Centro and its expanded sphere-of-influence is included in these networks. The regional roadway network relevant to the City is composed of Interstate 8, the City's primary thoroughfare, which runs east to west and bisects the City. State Route 86 runs through the City from east of Imperial Avenue until Fourth Street and then along Fourth Street from north to south until the City's southern border. County Highway S80 runs from east to west through the City along Adams Avenue, and becomes Evan Hewes Highway near the City's eastern border. Other regionally important highways in and near the City are County Highway S31 and State Route 111, which runs north to south east of the City.

The proposed interim traffic impact fee reflects proposed and potential development within the City or its sphere-of-influence over a twenty year planning horizon. The City provided Higgins Associates a list of approved, proposed and probable projects (the "proposed projects") to be included in the land use analysis. Willdan and Higgins Associates assumed that all land within the El Centro sphere-of-influence would be developed for the General Plan build out scenario, and based on the City's General Land Use Policy Map and/or existing or future zoning. In addition to the proposed projects, there are potential projects or areas within the City's expanded sphere-of-influence which have the potential to be built out under the General Plan build out conditions.

The Higgins land use scenario provided the total number of residential units and nonresidential square footage for each land use category used in the analysis. **Table 1** presents a summary of the planned development within the El Centro areas. See **Table A1** in the Appendix of this report for further detail.

Table 1: Land Use Summary

	Proposed	Potential	Total
<i>Residential (dwelling units)</i> ^{1,2}			
Single Family	11,761	25,397	37,158
Multi-family	908	-	908
<i>Nonresidential (1,000 bldg sq ft)</i>			
Commercial	1,503	2,750	4,253
Industrial	-	6,574	6,574

Higgins Associates Assumptions:

¹ For proposed projects, if the type of housing was not provided, they were assumed to be single family dwelling units.

² For the potential projects, the residential land uses were assumed to be single family dwelling units with a density of 6 dwelling units per acre.

Sources: Table A.1; Higgins Associates: *City of El Centro Circulation Element, Exhibit 6: Land Use Summary Table*, March 15, 2006; MuniFinancial

Trip Demand

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

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

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

Table 2 shows the calculation of trip demand factors by land use category based on the adjustments described above. It apportions the fee burden based on the relative impacts per land use. Data is based on extensive and detailed trip surveys conducted in the San Diego region by the San Diego Association of Governments (SANDAG). The surveys provide one of the most comprehensive databases available of trip generation rates, pass-by trips factors, and average trip length for a wide range of land uses. Table 2 shows the trip generation rates by new development by land use used to develop the traffic facilities impact fee.

Table 3 calculates the total new trips associated with new development based on the land use scenario in Table 1 and trip demand by land use shown in Table 2.

Table 2: Trip Generation Rate by New Development

	<u>Trip Rate Adjustment Factor</u>				Adjustment Factor ³	Average Daily Trips ⁴	Trip Demand Factor ⁵
	Primary Trips ¹	Diverted Trips ¹	Total Excluding Pass-by ¹	Average Trip Length ²			
<i>Residential</i> ⁶							
Single Family	86%	11%	97%	7.9	1.04	10	10.40
Multi-family	86%	11%	97%	7.9	1.04	8	8.32
<i>Nonresidential</i> ⁷							
Commercial	47%	31%	78%	3.6	0.38	68	25.84
Office	77%	19%	96%	8.8	1.14	20	22.80
Industrial	79%	19%	98%	9.0	1.19	7	8.33

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

² In miles.

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

⁴ Trips per dwelling unit or per 1,000 building square feet.

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

⁶ Trip percentages, average trip lengths, and average daily trips based on "residential" category. See SANDAG for source, below.

⁷ Trip percentages, average trip lengths, and average daily trips for commercial based on "community shopping center" category, for office based on "standard commercial office" category, and for industrial based on "industrial park (no commercial)" category.

Sources: San Diego Association of Governments, *(Not so) Brief Guide of Vehicular Traffic Generation Rates for the San Diego Region*, July 1998; MuniFinancial.

Table 3: Total New Trips

Land Use	Trip Demand		Trips
	Factor	Units/ 1K s.f.	
<i>Residential (Units)</i>			
Single Family	10.40	37,158	386,443
Multi-family	8.32	908	7,555
Subtotal		38,066	393,998
<i>Nonresidential (1,000 Sq.Ft.)</i>			
Commercial	25.84	4,253	109,896
Industrial	8.33	6,574	54,762
Subtotal		10,827	164,658
Total			558,656

Sources: Tables 1 and 2; MuniFinancial.

Facility Standards

The City'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 or non-existent. LOS "D" suggests tolerable delays though traffic is high and some short-term back-ups occur. LOS "E" and "F" suggest significant to excessive delays as traffic volumes meet or exceed the capacity of the facility.

The following policies present the performance standards acceptable to the City:

- ◆ Strive to maintain level of service (LOS) "C" or better on arterial and collector streets, at all intersections, and on principal arterials during peak hours. The City has established LOS "C" as the general threshold for acceptable overall traffic operations for both signalized and unsignalized intersections.
- ◆ Accept LOS "D" after finding that there is no practical and feasible way to mitigate LOS "C," and the development causing the lower level of service is of clear, overall public benefit.

The TRAFFIX 7.6 software program was used to model the traffic impact of the land use scenario and to calculate signalized and unsignalized intersection LOS and road segment LOS. The model was calibrated to existing conditions using traffic counts and the land use data discussed above and accounted for external and through trips in the regional road network close to the City. The analysis concluded that mitigating improvements would be required to maintain acceptable levels of service on the road network at build out of the City's expanded sphere-of-influence. The analysis studied congestion during peak periods and mobility in the area and identified the capital projects to be funded by the fee.

Table 4 presents the LOS in the studied intersections based on existing conditions with no traffic improvements and future conditions with planned improvements that minimize the decline in LOS caused by growth. For roadway segments, LOS was determined based on total daily volumes in both directions (ADT) and standards defined within the *Highway Capacity Manual*, Transportation Research Board, 2000. **Table 5** presents the LOS in the studied road segments based on future conditions with planned improvements that minimize the decline in LOS caused by growth. The link analysis does not show existing conditions for the road segments, however the analysis for the intersection documents the existing LOS for the City's street system.

The results of the traffic model shown in the table indicate that new development is responsible for one hundred percent of planned improvements because the improvements either maintain existing LOS or minimize the decline in LOS caused by increased traffic generation from new development. None of the planned improvements would increase LOS above existing levels. The City's only existing deficiency was identified as the intersection of Dogwood Road and West Interstate 8 ramps. Any costs associated with correcting this deficiency have been removed from the analysis.

Table 4: Intersection Operations

Intersection	Existing Intersection Control	Recommended Intersection Control	LOS Standard	Existing Conditions			General Plan Buildout Conditions ³				
				AM Peak Hour		PM Peak Hour		AM Peak Hour		PM Peak Hour	
				Delay (sec) ²	LOS	Delay (sec) ²	LOS	Delay (sec) ²	LOS	Delay (sec) ²	LOS
1 Austin Road / Adams Avenue	4-Way Stop	Signal	C	8.2	A	8.5	A	20.9	C	27.3	C
2 Auston Road / Hamilton Avenue	Future Intersection		C					0.3	A	0.4	A
3 Austin Road / Ross Avenue	4-Way Stop	Signal	C	7.5	A	7.4	A	9.1	A	8.9	A
4 La Brucherie Road / Bradshaw Road	1-Way Stop	Signal	C	1.5	A	4.7	A	15.3	B	22.3	C
5 La Brucherie Road / Villa Avenue	1-Way Stop	Signal	C	2.1	A	1.8	A	18.6	B	27.2	C
6 La Brucherie Road / Adams Avenue	Signal		C	19.4	B	17.7	B	24.4	C	28.3	C
7 La Brucherie Road / Main Street	Signal		C	15.2	B	15.6	B	16.9	B	20.1	C
8 La Brucherie Road / Hamilton Avenue	2-Way Stop	Signal	C	2.2	A	1.9	A	6.4	A	6.5	A
9 La Brucherie Road / Ross Avenue	Signal		C	16.6	B	15.2	B	15.5	B	15.4	B
10 Imperial Avenue / Bradshaw Road	Signal		C	11	B	17.3	B	25	C	43	D
11 Imperial Avenue / Pico Avenue	Signal		C	19.6	B	23.8	C	24.3	C	29.7	C
12 Imperial Avenue / Adams Avenue	Signal		C	18.3	B	18.8	B	32.1	C	39.8	D
13 Imperial Avenue / Main Street	Signal		C	16.9	B	19.6	B	25.8	C	34.9	C
14 Imperial Avenue / State Street	Signal		C	10.6	B	14	B	8.3	A	13.3	B
15 Imperial Avenue / Hamilton Avenue	Signal		C	10.2	B	4.2	A	9.1	A	6.6	A
16 Imperial Avenue / Ross Avenue	Signal		C	17.6	B	16.7	B	16.4	B	25.1	C
17 Imperial Avenue / Ocotillo Drive	Signal		C	17.5	B	18.5	B	13	B	14.8	B
18 Eighth Street / Pico Avenue	4-Way Stop	Signal	C	8.3	A	10.2	B	5.6	A	9.8	A
19 Eighth Street / Villa Avenue	2-Way Stop	Signal	C	0.4	A	0.3	A	22.9	C	26.9	C
20 Eighth Street / Adams Avenue	Signal		C	17.9	B	23.3	C	34.3	C	52.2	D
21 Eighth Street / Broadway Avenue	Signal		C	12.8	B	15.2	B	8.7	A	10.2	B
22 Eighth Street / Main Street	Signal		C	13.6	B	14.8	B	16	B	22.6	C
23 Eighth Street / State Street	Signal		C	14.5	B	15.3	B	10.4	B	11.7	B
24 Eighth Street / Orange Avenue	4-Way Stop	Signal	C	12.7	B	11.8	B	17.5	B	16.5	B
25 Eighth Street / Hamilton Avenue	2-Way Stop	Signal	C	2.9	A	1.9	A	11.8	B	7.6	A
26 Eighth Street / Ross Avenue	Signal		C	17.9	B	16.7	B	39.7	D	53.2	D
27 Eighth Street / Dannenberg Road	2-Way Stop	Signal	C	1.4	A	0.7	A	20.5	C	33.7	C
28 Fourth Street / Main Street	Signal		C	16.5	B	18.9	B	31.9	C	43.6	D
29 Fourth Street / Orange Avenue	4-Way Stop	Signal	C	18	C	24.8	C	20.6	C	26.7	C
30 Fourth Street / Ross Avenue	Signal		C	14.7	B	14.1	B	28.1	C	41	D
31 Fourth Street / Route 8 WB Ramps	Signal		C	15.6	B	18.9	B	20.4	C	48.1	D
32 Fourth Street / Route 8 EB Ramps	Signal		C	15.4	B	17.4	B	21.5	C	19.5	B
33 Fourth Street / Wake Avenue	Signal		C	17.8	B	21.7	C	27.7	C	39.6	D
34 Fourth Street / Dannenberg Road	Signal		C	9.7	A	13.2	B	16.8	B	24.1	C
35 Dogwood Road / Cruickshank Road	Future Study Intersection	Signal	C					30	C	40.3	D
36 Dogwood Road / Villa Road	2-Way Stop	Signal	C	1.5	A	1.3	A	35.5	D	40	D
37 Dogwood Road / Main Street	Signal		C	14.4	B	15	B	33.9	C	43.5	D
38 Dogwood Road / Ross Avenue	Signal		C	15.7	B	15.4	B	38.4	D	72.4	E
39 Dogwood Road / Route 8 WB Ramps	1-Way Stop	Signal	C	4.1	A	12.4	B	19.6	B	43.4	D
40 Dogwood Road / Route 8 EB Ramps	1-Way Stop	Signal	C	3.8	A	5.8	A	15.8	B	37.7	D
41 Dogwood Road / Dannenberg Road	Signal		C	11.6	B	18.7	B	29.8	C	57.7	E

¹ LOS = Level of Service.

² Delay = Average delay for all vehicles passing through the intersection in seconds.

³ For signalized and nonsignalized intersections, the average LOS for all vehicles passing through the intersection is shown. For general plan buildout, the LOS is shown for mitigated conditions. For nonsignalized intersections, Worst Approach Delay/LOS is available for both existing and nonmitigated general plan buildout conditions but is not shown.

Sources: Higgins Associates: *City of El Centro Circulation Element, Level of Service Summary Table for Intersections*, March 14, 2006; MuniFinancial

Table 5: Road Segment ADT's and Road Classification

Street Segment	Segment #	Existing Plus Known And Unknown Projects ADT's	Required Number Of Lanes	Road Classification	LOS
4th Street (SR 86)					
Between Main St. & Ross Ave.	1	33370	4	Arterial	E
Between Ross Ave. & Interstate 8	2	36580	4	Arterial	F
Between Interstate 8 & Dannenberg Drive	3	24390	4	Arterial	B
Between Dannenberg Dr. & McCabe Rd.	4	11400	2	Arterial	B
8th Street					
Between Treshill Rd. & Villa Ave.	83	28650	4	Arterial	C
Between Villa Ave. & Adams Ave.	5	45670	6	Arterial	D
Between Adams Ave. & Main St.	84	37220	6	Arterial	D
Between Main St. & Ross Rd.	6	36890	6	Arterial	B
Between Ross Ave. & Dannenberg Rd.	7	31830	6	Arterial	A
Between Dannenberg Rd. & McCabe Rd.	8	24400	4	Arterial	B
Adams Avenue (SR 86)					
Between Austin Rd. & La Brucherie Rd.	9	17520	4	Arterial	A
Between La Brucherie Rd. & Imperial Ave. (SR 86)	10	14990	4	Arterial	A
Between Imperial Ave. & 8th St.	11	26930	4	Arterial	C
Between 8th St. & 6th St.	12	32720	4	Arterial	D / E
Austin Road					
Between Treshill Rd. & Adams Ave.	13	26140	4	Arterial	C
Between Adams Ave. & Ross Rd.	14	21910	4	Arterial	A
Between Ross Rd. & Interstate 8	15	21290	4	Arterial	A
Between Interstate 8 and Dannenberg Rd.	55	19490	4	Arterial	A
Between Dannenberg Rd. and McCabe Rd.	56	15240	4	Arterial	A
South of McCabe Road	45	15780	4	Arterial	A
Bradshaw Drive / Cruickshank Rd.					
Between Austin Rd. & La Brucherie Rd.	70	10300	2	Arterial	A
Between La Brucherie Rd. & Imperial Ave.	16	22820	4	Arterial	B
Between Imperial Ave. & Eighth St.	71	17280	4	Arterial	A
Between Eighth St. & Fourth St.	72	18110	4	Arterial	A
Between Fourth St. & Dogwood Rd.	73	20280	4	Arterial	A
Between Dogwood Rd. & Cooley Rd.	74	32320	4	Arterial	D
Between Cooley Rd. & SR 111	75	30240	4	Arterial	D
Dannenberg Road (Chick Rd.)					
Between Austin Rd. & La Brucherie Rd.	85	6390	2	Arterial	A
Between La Brucherie Rd. & Imperial Ave.	86	10290	2	Arterial	A
Between Imperial Ave. & Eighth St.	58	22740	4	Arterial	B
Between Eighth St. & Fourth St. (SR 86)	57	15790	4	Arterial	A
Between Fourth St. (SR 86) & Dogwood Rd.	18	25110	4	Arterial	C
Between Dogwood Rd. & SR 111	17	21070	4	Arterial	A
Dogwood Road (S31)					
Between Treshill Rd. & Bradshaw Dr.	94	28320	4	Arterial	C
Between Bradshaw Dr. / Cruickshank Rd. & Villa Rd.	51	35870	6	Arterial	B
Between Villa Rd. & Main St.	50	52530	6	Arterial	E
Between Main St. & Ross Rd.	49	52130	6	Arterial	E
Between Ross Rd. & Interstate 8	48	50070	6	Arterial	E
Between Interstate 8 & Dannenberg Rd.	19	69650	6	Arterial	F
Between Dannenberg Rd. & McCabe Rd.	20	55020	6	Arterial	F
Hamilton Avenue					
West of La Brucherie Rd.	21	1000	2	Collector	A
East of La Brucherie Rd.	22	2460	2	Arterial	A
Imperial Avenue (SR 86)					
Between Treshill Rd. & Bradshaw Dr.	87	50920	6	Arterial	E
Between Bradshaw Dr. & Villa Ave.	88	52220	6	Arterial	E
Between Villa Ave. & Adams Ave.	23	58360	6	Arterial	F
Between Adams Ave. & Main St.	89	49730	6	Arterial	E
Between Main St. & Hamilton Ave.	24	47940	6	Arterial	D
Between Hamilton Ave. & Ross Rd.	46	48240	6	Arterial	D
Between Ross Rd. & Interstate 8	47	43850	6	Arterial	D
Between Interstate 8 & Wake Ave.	59	14570	4	Arterial	A
Between Wake Ave. & Dannenberg Rd.	60	11000	4	Arterial	A
Between Dannenberg Rd. & McCabe Rd.	61	13830	4	Arterial	A

Table 5: Road Segment ADT's and Road Classification

Street Segment	Segment #	Existing Plus Known And Unknown Projects ADT's	Required Number Of Lanes	Road Classification	LOS
La Brucherie Road					
Between Treshill Rd. & Bradshaw Dr.	91	19700	4	Arterial	A
Between Bradshaw Dr. & Villa Ave.	92	29030	4	Arterial	C / D
Between Villa Ave. & Adams Ave.	25	31460	4	Arterial	D
Between Adams Ave. & Main St.	93	29820	4	Arterial	D
Between Main St. & Orange Ave.	26	27400	4	Arterial	C
Between Orange Ave. & Interstate 8	27	28350	4	Arterial	C
Between Interstate 8 & Wake Ave.	62	16670	4	Arterial	A
Between Wake Ave. & Dannenberg Rd.	63	16180	4	Arterial	A
Between Dannenberg Rd. & McCabe Rd.	64	17830	4	Arterial	A
Main St. (Evan Hewes Hwy)					
Between Austin and La Brucherie	28	6970	2	Arterial	A
Between La Brucherie & Imperial	29	16260	4	Arterial	A
Between Imperial & 8th	30	15100	4	Arterial	A
Between 8th & 4th	31	12470	2	Arterial	B
Between 4th & Dogwood	32	25530	4	Arterial	C
Ocotillo Drive					
Between La Brucherie & Imperial	33	7740	2	Collector	C
Between Imperial & Cypress	34	4260	2	Collector	A
Orange Avenue					
Between Dogwood Rd. & SR 111	90	11460	4	Arterial	A
Pico Avenue					
Between La Brucherie & Imperial	35	4190	2	Collector	A
Between Imperial & 8th St.	36	10650	2	Collector	D / E
Pitzer Road					
Between Ross & I-8	52	19680	4	Arterial	A
Between I-8 & Dannenberg	53	24820	4	Arterial	B
Between Dannenberg & McCabe	54	19640	4	Arterial	A
Between Ross Rd. and Main St.					
Between Main St. and Villa Rd.					
Between Villa Rd. and Cruickshank Rd.					
Ross Avenue					
Between Austin & La Brucherie	37	7490	2	Arterial	A
Between La Brucherie & Imperial	38	12290	4	Arterial	A
Between Imperial & 8th St.	39	15110	4	Arterial	A
Between 8th St. & 4th St.	40	17940	4	Arterial	A
Between 4th St. & Dogwood	41	21370	4	Arterial	A
Between Dogwood Rd. & Pitzer Rd.	65	29040	4	Arterial	C / D
Between Pitzer Rd. & SR 111	66	24820	4	Arterial	B
Treshill Road					
Between La Brucherie Rd. & Imperial Ave.	77	15630	4	Arterial	A
Between Imperial Ave. & Eighth St.	78	18390	4	Arterial	A
Between Eighth St. & Fourth St.	79	16560	4	Arterial	A
Between Fourth St. & Dogwood Rd.	80	16760	4	Arterial	A
Between Dogwood Rd. & Cooley Rd.	81	24660	4	Arterial	B
Between Cooley Rd. & SR 111	82	20990	4	Arterial	A
Villa Ave. (East of La Brucherie)					
Between Austin Rd. & La Brucherie Rd.	67	7890	2	Arterial	A
Between La Brucherie Rd. & Imperial Ave.	42	13390	2	Arterial	C
Between Imperial Ave. & Eighth St.	68	12400	2	Arterial	B
Between Eighth St. & Fourth St.	69	21090	4	Arterial	A
Between Fourth St. & Dogwood Rd.	44	26650	4	Arterial	C
Between Dogwood Rd. & Cooley Rd.	43	20070	4	Arterial	A

¹ LOS = Level of Service. LOS C is the general threshold for acceptable overall traffic operations for both signalized and unsignalized intersections for the City of El Centro and Imperial County. The Caltrans LOS standard is LOS C/D threshold: LOS C is acceptable in all cases and LOS D is acceptable on a case-by-case basis.

² The LOS threshold ranges for roadway classifications is shown in Appendix A4 of the Higgins Associates report. The LOS is available for general plan buildout and is not reported for existing conditions.

Sources: Higgins Associates: *City of El Centro Circulation Element, Appendix H: Road Segment ADT's and Classifications*, March 15, 2006; MuniFinancial

Facility Costs to Accommodate Growth

This report includes a list of roadway improvements that are necessary to accommodate new development through build out of the General Plan. These improvements include intersection, road segment, and bridge and interchange improvements. All improvements are located within the City of El Centro and its sphere-of-influence. The cost estimates were completed by Willdan based on the projects identified by the traffic impact analysis completed by Higgins Associates. The estimates include all costs for land acquisition, construction, administration, and a contingency. **Table 6, Table 7, and Table 8** present the improvements and costs. A summary of the total costs associated with these improvements is shown in **Table 9**.

Table 6: Intersection Improvements and Costs

Intersection Number	Intersection	Signal	Lane Construction	Lane Acquisition	Total
1	Austin Road / Adams Avenue	\$ 200,000	\$ 221,250	\$ 255,000	\$ 676,250
2	Auston Road / Hamilton Avenue	1,000	-	-	1,000
3	Austin Road / Ross Avenue	200,000	60,200	42,000	302,200
4	La Brucherie Road / Bradshaw Road	200,000	201,000	189,000	590,000
5	La Brucherie Road / Villa Avenue	1,000	170,275	84,000	255,275
6	La Brucherie Road / Adams Avenue	250,000	180,000	54,000	484,000
7	La Brucherie Road / Main Street	200,000	130,325	78,000	408,325
8	La Brucherie Road / Hamilton Avenue	200,000	-	-	200,000
9	La Brucherie Road / Ross Avenue	200,000	30,000	9,000	239,000
10	Imperial Avenue / Bradshaw Road	200,000	150,000	45,000	395,000
11	Imperial Avenue / Pico Avenue	400,000	170,000	51,000	621,000
12	Imperial Avenue / Adams Avenue	200,000	-	-	200,000
13	Imperial Avenue / Main Street	200,000	60,000	18,000	278,000
14	Imperial Avenue / State Street	200,000	30,000	9,000	239,000
15	Imperial Avenue / Hamilton Avenue	200,000	30,000	9,000	239,000
16	Imperial Avenue / Ross Avenue	400,000	60,000	18,000	478,000
17	Imperial Avenue / Ocotillo Drive	200,000	60,000	18,000	278,000
18	Eighth Street / Pico Avenue	200,000	80,000	24,000	304,000
19	Eighth Street / Villa Avenue	200,000	270,175	102,000	572,175
20	Eighth Street / Adams Avenue	200,000	90,375	114,000	404,375
21	Eighth Street / Broadway Avenue	200,000	-	-	200,000
22	Eighth Street / Main Street	200,000	30,000	9,000	239,000
23	Eighth Street / State Street	200,000	60,000	18,000	278,000
24	Eighth Street / Orange Avenue	200,000	30,000	9,000	239,000
25	Eighth Street / Hamilton Avenue	200,000	30,000	9,000	239,000
26	Eighth Street / Ross Avenue	200,000	100,000	69,000	369,000
27	Eighth Street / Dannenberg Road	200,000	-	105,000	305,000
28	Fourth Street / Main Street	200,000	260,450	132,000	592,450
29	Fourth Street / Orange Avenue	200,000	60,000	18,000	278,000
30	Fourth Street / Ross Avenue	200,000	120,075	78,075	398,150
31	Fourth Street / Route 8 WB Ramps	200,000	30,000	9,000	239,000
32	Fourth Street / Route 8 EB Ramps	200,000	-	-	200,000
33	Fourth Street / Wake Avenue	200,000	110,000	33,000	343,000
34	Fourth Street / Dannenberg Road	200,000	90,175	48,000	338,175
35	Dogwood Road / Cruickshank Road	200,000	320,975	276,000	796,975
36	Dogwood Road / Villa Road	200,000	371,125	342,000	913,125
37	Dogwood Road / Main Street	200,000	210,250	93,000	503,250
38	Dogwood Road / Ross Avenue	200,000	250,325	114,000	564,325
39	Dogwood Road / Route 8 WB Ramps ¹	-	440,000	180,000	620,000
40	Dogwood Road / Route 8 EB Ramps	200,000	230,000	138,000	568,000
41	Dogwood Road / Dannenberg Road	200,000	220,725	177,000	597,725
Subtotal Costs		\$ 8,052,000	\$ 4,957,700	\$ 2,976,075	\$ 15,985,775
Additional Costs (35%) ²		2,818,200	1,735,195		4,553,395
Total		\$ 10,870,200	\$ 6,692,895	\$ 2,976,075	\$ 20,539,170

¹ Intersection #39: deficiency currently identified as LOS F. Excluded \$200,000 signal costs and included \$440,000 lane construction and \$180,000 lane acquisition costs.

² Additional Costs (35% of Construction Costs): Traffic Control (5%), EIR (5%), Construction Management (10%) and Contingency (15%)

Source: Willdan, *Intersection Improvement List and Costs*, dated September 12, 2006

Table 7: Road Segment Improvements and Costs

Count	Segment	To	From	Construction	Land Acquisition	Total
1	Austin Road	Treshill Road	McCabe Road	\$ 10,187,760	\$ 5,753,088	\$ 15,940,848
2	Bradshaw/Cruikshank Road	Austin Road	La Brucherie Road	3,265,786	2,680,128	5,945,914
3	Bradshaw/Cruikshank Road	Eighth Street	Dogwood Road	7,381,440	6,336,000	13,717,440
4	Bradshaw/Cruikshank Road	Dogwood Road	State Route 111	9,200,400	2,597,760	11,798,160
5	Dannenberg Road	Austin Road	Imperial Avenue	5,176,618	6,336,000	11,512,618
6	Dannenberg Road	Imperial Avenue	Eighth Street	2,460,480	2,112,000	4,572,480
7	Dannenberg Road	Eighth Street	Fourth Street	2,509,690	2,154,240	4,663,930
8	Dannenberg Road	Fourth Street	State Route 111	13,374,240	3,776,256	17,150,496
9	Dogwood Road	Treshill Road	Bradshaw/Cruikshank	2,199,120	620,928	2,820,048
10	Dogwood Road	Bradshaw/Cruikshank	Dannenberg Road	14,044,800	7,704,576	21,749,376
11	Dogwood Road	Dannenberg Road	McCabe Road	4,481,400	1,229,184	5,710,584
12	Eighth Street	Villa Avenue	Dannenberg Road	11,734,800	3,218,688	14,953,488
13	Eighth Street	Dannenberg Road	McCabe Road	4,488,000	1,267,200	5,755,200
14	Hamilton Avenue	Lotus Avenue	Austin Road	1,910,832	-	1,910,832
15	Imperial Avenue	Treshill Road	Interstate 8	14,137,200	3,877,632	18,014,832
16	Imperial Avenue	Interstate 8	McCabe Road	7,283,021	6,251,520	13,534,541
17	La Brucherie Road	Main Street	McCabe Road	12,521,520	3,535,488	16,057,008
18	McCabe Road	Austin Road	State Route 111	12,658,800	13,888,512	26,547,312
19	Orange Avenue	Dogwood Road	State Route 111	9,989,549	8,574,720	18,564,269
20	Pitzer Road	Treshill Road	Interstate 8	15,008,928	12,883,200	27,892,128
21	Pitzer Road	Interstate 8	McCabe Road	6,552,480	1,850,112	8,402,592
22	Ross Avenue	La Brucherie Road	State Route 111	20,061,360	5,664,384	25,725,744
23	Villa Avenue	Austin Road	La Brucherie Road	3,265,786	8,321,280	11,587,066
24	Villa Avenue	Imperial Avenue	Eighth Street	1,702,378	3,801,600	5,503,978
25	Villa Avenue	Eighth Street	Pitzer/Cooley Road	11,175,120	823,680	11,998,800
26	Wake Avenue	Austin Road	Eighth Street	6,844,253	2,069,760	8,914,013
27	Wake Avenue	Eighth Street	Second Street	2,756,160	258,720	3,014,880
28	Wake Avenue	Second Street	Dogwood Road	2,258,256	2,745,600	5,003,856
	Subtotal Costs			\$ 218,630,174	\$ 120,332,256	\$ 338,962,430
	Additional Costs (35%) ¹			76,520,561	NA	76,520,561
	Total			\$ 295,150,735	\$ 120,332,256	\$ 415,482,991

¹ Additional Costs (35% of Construction Costs): Traffic Control (5%), EIR (5%), Construction Management (10%) and Contingency (15%)

Source: Willdan, *Road Segment Improvement List and Costs*, dated September 12, 2006

Table 8: Interchange and Bridge Improvements and Costs

Road	New Interchanges, Interchange Improvements, New Bridges and Bridge Widening	Bridge Widening	New Bridge	Ramp Bridge over Canal	Loop Ramp	Slip Ramp	Total
Austin Road	Construct new interchange at Austin Road and Interstate 8	\$ -	\$ 4,000,000	\$ 2,000,000	\$ -	\$ 7,200,000	\$ 13,200,000
La Brucherie Road	Widen La Brucherie Road bridge over Interstate 8 to 4 lanes	4,000,000	-	-	-	-	4,000,000
Imperial Avenue	Modify interchange at Imperial Avenue and Interstate 8 to full interchange	6,000,000	-	-	1,300,000	1,800,000	9,100,000
Dogwood Road ¹	Widen Dogwood Road bridge over Interstate 8 to 6 lanes	4,000,000	-	-	-	-	2,000,000
Dogwood Road	Construct NB to WB & SB to EB loop on-ramps at I-8 interchange	-	-	-	2,600,000	-	2,600,000
Pitzer Road	Construct new interchange at Pitzer Road and Interstate 8	-	4,000,000	-	-	7,200,000	11,200,000
McCabe Road ¹	Construct new interchange at McCabe Road and Interstate 111	-	4,000,000	-	-	7,200,000	5,600,000
Total		\$ 14,000,000	\$ 12,000,000	\$ 2,000,000	\$ 3,900,000	\$ 23,400,000	\$ 47,700,000

¹ Shared Costs: 50% City of El Centro and 50% Imperial County

Source: Willdan, *Interchange and Bridge Improvement List and Costs*, dated September 12, 2006

Table 9: Total Cost Summary

Improvement Category	Total Costs	Percent
Intersection	\$ 20,539,170	4.25%
Segment	415,482,991	85.89%
Interchange and Bridge	<u>47,700,000</u>	<u>9.86%</u>
Total	\$ <u>483,722,161</u>	<u>100.00%</u>

Source: Willdan, *Intersection, Road Segment and Interchange/Bridge Improvements*, dated March 14 and 15, 2006

Different development projects impact the transportation network at different rates depending on the number of trips generated. The average cost of planned improvements per trip generated by new development is used to calculate each project's fair share of total planned improvement costs. The cost per trip is calculated by dividing the total planned facility costs by the total trips generated by new development (from Table 3) and is shown in **Table 10**.

Table 10: Cost per Trip to Accommodate New Growth

Fee Share of Planned Facilities Cost	\$ 483,722,161	
Total Trips	<u>558,656</u>	
Cost Per Trip		\$ 866

Source: Tables 3 and 9; MuniFinancial

Fee Schedule

Table 11 shows the traffic facilities impact fee based on the cost per trip calculated in Table 10 and the trip rates used to model development impacts shown in Table 2. The cost per trip is converted to a fee per unit of development based on number of residential units or commercial square footage. The administration fee is based on an estimated cost of 2.5 percent of the traffic fee. The amount of the administration fee is an estimate. It should be adjusted when sufficient data is available to determine the actual cost.

Table 11: Traffic Facilities Impact Fee

Land Use	Trip Demand Factor	Cost per Trip	Traffic Fee	Admin Fee ³	Total Fee
<i>Residential</i> ¹					
Single Family	10.40	\$ 866	\$ 9,006	\$ 225	\$ 9,232
Multi-family	8.32	866	7,205	180	7,385
<i>Nonresidential</i> ²					
Commercial	25.84	\$ 866	\$ 22,377	\$ 559	\$ 22,937
Office	22.80	866	19,745	494	20,238
Industrial	8.33	866	7,214	180	7,394

¹ Per residential unit for residential land uses

² Per 1,000 building square feet for commercial land use

³ Based on an estimate of 2.5 percent of traffic fee.

Sources: Tables 2 and 10; MuniFinancial.

Implementation

This section identifies tasks that the City should complete when implementing the fee programs.

Adopt Ordinance and Resolution

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

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

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

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

Programming Revenues and Projects with the CIP

The City should update its Capital Improvement Plan (CIP) on an annual basis to show the programming of fee revenues to the traffic facilities. Use of the CIP in this manner provides ongoing and up to date documentation of a reasonable relationship between new development and the use of fee revenues.

The City may alter the scope of the planned projects listed in Tables 6, 7, and 9, or substitute new projects, as long as the project list continues to represent improvements needed to accommodate new development in the City of El Centro. If the total cost of all planned projects net of non-fee funding sources, if any, varies from the total cost used as a basis for the fee, the City should revise the fee accordingly.

For the five-year planning period of the CIP, the City should allocate all existing fund balances and projected fee revenue to traffic projects. The City can hold funds in a project account for planned improvements longer than five years if necessary to collect sufficient funds to complete the project.

Inflation Adjustment

The City should identify appropriate inflation indexes in the fee ordinance and adopt an automatic inflation adjustment to the fee annually. If right-of-way acquisition is planned the City should use separate indexes for land and construction costs. Calculating the land cost index may require use of a

property appraiser every several years. The construction cost index can be based on the City's recent capital project experience or taken from any reputable source, such as the *Engineering News Record*. To calculate the fee increases, each index should be weighted by the share of total planned facility costs represented by land or construction, as appropriate.

Reporting Requirements

The City should comply with the annual and five-year reporting requirements of *Government Code 66000 et seq.* For facilities to be funded with a combination of impact fees and other revenues, the City must identify the source and amount of the other revenues. The City must also identify when the other revenues are anticipated to be available to fund the project.

Credits and Reimbursements

The City may provide fee credits or possibly reimbursements to developers who dedicate land or construct facilities that are shown in the fee program as being fee-funded. Fee credits or reimbursements may be provided up to the cost of the improvements included in the fee program, subject to periodic inflation adjustments, or the actual cost paid by the developer, whichever is lower. For construction cost overruns, only that amount shown in the fee program, subject to periodic inflation adjustments, should be credited or reimbursed.

The City will evaluate the appropriate fee credit or reimbursement based on the value of the dedication or improvement. Credits or reimbursement may be repaid based on the priority of the capital improvements, as determined by the City. In some cases, repayment for constructed facilities that have low priority may be postponed. The determination of providing fee credits must be based upon the priority of when certain transportation improvements are required. Lower priority improvements may not be eligible for fee credits.

Mitigation Fee Act Findings

Traffic facilities fees, also referred to as public facility 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

For the first finding the City must:

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

The policy of the City of El Centro is that new development will not burden existing development with the cost of public facilities, including traffic facilities, required to accommodate growth. The purpose of the public facilities fee is to implement this policy by providing a funding source from new development for capital improvements to serve that development. The fee advances a legitimate interest of the City by enabling the City to provide municipal services to new development.

Use of Fee Revenues

For the second finding the City must:

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

The traffic facilities fee will fund expanded facilities to serve new development. All planned facilities will be located within the City of El Centro. These facilities included in the findings presented here include:

- ◆ Roadway widening;
- ◆ Intersection signalization, and;
- ◆ Other roadway improvements in the City of El Centro.

Planned traffic facilities are identified in this report. This report provides the name and cost estimate for each planned facility. More detailed descriptions of certain planned facilities, including their specific location if known at this time, are included in various facility master plans and other City planning documents. The City may change the list of planned traffic facilities to meet changing circumstances and needs, as it deems necessary. The fee program should be updated if these changes result in a significant change in the fair share cost allocated to new development.

Benefit Relationship

For the third finding the City must:

Determine how there is a reasonable relationship between the fee's use and the type of development project on which the fee is imposed. (§66001(a)(3))

The City will restrict fee revenues to the acquisition of right-of-way and construction of traffic facilities needed to serve new development. Public facilities funded by the fee will provide a citywide network of transportation improvements accessible to the additional vehicle trips associated with new development. Thus, there is a reasonable relationship between the use of fee revenues and the residential and nonresidential types of new development that will pay the fee.

Burden Relationship

For the fourth finding the City must:

Determine how there is a reasonable relationship between the need for the public facility and the type of development project on which the fee is imposed. (§66001(a)(4))

Number of units and building square footage and the associated new trips are indicators of the demand for traffic facilities needed to accommodate growth. The need for the fee is based on traffic engineering reports prepared by the City that quantify the expected traffic impacts of new development. The LOS analysis documents that new development will only be responsible for maintaining and not improving the existing LOS.

Proportionality

For the fifth finding the City must:

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

This reasonable relationship between the traffic impact fee for a specific development project and the cost of the facilities attributable to that project is based on the estimated vehicle trips the project will add to public roadways. The total fee for a specific project is based on number of units for residential development and building square feet for nonresidential development. The fee schedule converts the estimated units for residential projects and estimated square footage for nonresidential projects into a fee based on the size of the project. Larger projects of a certain land use type will have a higher trip generation and pay a higher fee than smaller projects of the same land use type. Thus, the fee schedule ensures a reasonable relationship between the traffic impact fee for a specific development project and the cost of the facilities attributable to that project.

Appendix A

TABLE A1: FUTURE PLANNED DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS

Table A1: New Developments Identified

Name of Development	PROPOSED PROJECTS								POTENTIAL PROJECTS			
	Residential Single Family (Dwelling Units)	Multi- family (Dwelling Units)	Commercial (Square Feet) (Acres)	Industrial (Square Feet) (Acres)	Mixed-Use (Acres)	Public Facilities (Schools) (Students)		Residential (Dwelling Units)	Commercial (Square Feet)	Industrial (Square Feet)	Public Facilities (Square Feet)	
Imperial Plaza			341,516									
El Centro Town Center				26.5								
8th Street Industrial Park		172			21.7							
North Gate			178,803									
Wal-Mart			203,007									
Lerno Verhaegan Specific Plan9	2,708				700.0							
Rosswood	152										348,480	
Alex Proctor	37											
Courtyard Villas	54											
Miller Burson	599						1					
Imperial Valley Commons			780,000									
Waterford/Anderson Specific Plans	5,400											
Imperial Valley Mall7				160.0								
Countyside Subdivision - South	152											
Countyside Subdivision - North	330											
Citrus Grove Estates	120											
Desert Village #6	95	260			55.0							
Buena Vista	465											
Wake Avenue Auto Park						34.6						
Linda Vista	172					80.0						
Willow Bend	122											
Farmer's Estates	89											
Lotus Ranch	616						1					
Mc Cabe Ranch	428											
Heber Elementary School											600	
Heber Meadows	222	476										
Potential (Future)								3,684	471,101		282,596	
Potential (Future)								4,590	587,189		352,292	
Potential (Future)								3,552	454,331		272,577	
Potential (Future)								1,902	242,738		145,599	
Potential (Future)								4,548	581,526			
Potential (Future)										6,574,075		
Potential (Future)									716		54,886	
Potential (Future)									936	119,790	71,874	
Potential (Future)									485		37,178	
Potential (Future)									692		53,121	
Potential (Future)									2,000			
Potential (Future)									2,292	292,941	175,765	
Total	11,761	908	1,503,326	186.5	-	891.3	2	600	25,397	2,749,616	6,574,075	1,794,368

Sources: Higgins Associates; City of El Centro Circulation Element, Exhibit 6: Land Use Summary Table, March 15, 2006; MuniFinancial