



# DEVELOPMENT IMPACT MITIGATION FEE | NEXUS STUDY PARKS FACILITIES

MARCH 5, 2019

Prepared by:  
CITY OF REDDING  
Community Services Department  
777 Cypress Avenue  
Redding, California 96001

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

**Executive Summary** ..... 1

**Introduction**..... 3

**Population, Employment, and Housing Estimates** ..... 7

**Park and Recreation Facilities Impact Fee**..... 8

    Introduction and General Methodology..... 8

    Parks Service Population..... 8

    Existing Parks Facilities..... 9

    Unit Costs and Per Capita Standards ..... 10

        Parks..... 10

        Trails..... 12

        Regional Benefit Facilities ..... 12

    Maximum Defensible Residential-Only Fee Schedule ..... 14

    Comprehensive Park and Recreation Facilities Development Impact Fees..... 14

    Comprehensive Fee Schedule ..... 16

**Implementation**..... 17

**Appendix A – Parks, Trails, and Regional Benefit Facility Inventories** ..... 21

**Appendix B – Large Neighborhood Park Construction Model**..... 26

**Appendix C – Trail Construction Cost Estimates** ..... 28

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This fee nexus report presents the results of a comprehensive update of the City of Redding's impact fee programs for park and trail facilities. This report thoroughly documents the findings necessary for compliance with State of California's Mitigation Fee Act (Government Code 66000 et seq.), which prescribes the means by which public agencies may impose development impact fees, in order to adopt the proposed impact fees. This study was managed and prepared by Community Services Department staff with quality assurance and oversight by Robert Spencer, principal of Urban Economics. Mr. Spencer is a widely-recognized expert in development impact fees in California and has been engaged in several of the past impact fee updates in the City of Redding.

### Background and Study Objectives

The City of Redding adopted a Comprehensive Impact Fee Program in 2000, establishing impact fees for fire, parks, water, wastewater, storm drain, and transportation. The impact fees have been updated since then. In 2004, as part of the *Parks, Trails and Open Space Master Plan*, park fees were reviewed and updated to reflect the community's investment in park and recreation facilities and to further refine the park level of service. The 2013 Development Impact Mitigation Fee Nexus Study and staff report recommended an increase of the Park Development Impact Fee. At the time, the City Council declined to adopt this recommendation in anticipation of an update to the *Parks, Trails, and Open Space Master Plan*. Staff has since updated the Plan, and the resulting inventories are utilized herein. For current Park and Recreation Facility Impact Fees, see **Table 10, pg. 16**.

The City continues to face challenges in funding public facilities to accommodate growth. Since the passage of Proposition 13, property tax revenues have been insufficient for capital funding, and federal and state assistance has not replaced the decline in local revenue sources. These funding shortfalls have caused the rate of a decline in the level of service, placed a higher demand on existing facilities, and, given the value and benefits provided by parks illustrated in countless studies, may ultimately lower the quality of life in the community. Given these funding difficulties and the impacts new growth has on existing parks, the City ensures new development pays fees to help fund the park facilities necessary to maintain the level of service enjoyed by people living and working within the City.

This report documents the relationship between new development in Redding and the related cost of public facilities to serve growth in the community. It also provides estimates of the cost of facilities necessary for growth and calculates the updated public facilities fees by land use or customer type that would generate revenues equal to these costs. The estimates of public facilities that would be required to serve growth assume that new development will provide facilities that ensure the City can maintain its current level of service standards for these facilities.

The City relies on its authority to levy public facilities impact fees under the police powers granted by the State Constitution which provides that cities and counties may make and enforce ordinances which are not in conflict with state law. This report provides the documentation and findings necessary for the adoption of proposed public facilities impact and capacity fees.

## Population, Housing, and Employment Projections

The existing population and employment numbers for this report were obtained from U.S. Census Bureau 2016 Community Survey 1-Year Estimates and Center for Economic Studies. Population metrics are summarized in **Table 1, pg. 9**.

## Fee Schedules and Revenues

**Tables 6 and 10** (pages 14 and 16, respectively) depict the maximum defensible Park and Recreation Facilities Development Impact Fee for several development types resulting from this analysis.

## Other Potential Mitigation Programs

This study does not address the full impact of every development project in the City of Redding. Any given project due to its size, density, the intensity of activity, and location may impose additional burdens upon the City's facilities and services. Based on the findings of a project-specific impact analysis, an applicant for such a development project may be required to construct other improvements, develop or participate in other fee, assessments, and/or special tax programs, or otherwise provide or fund mitigation(s) for those additional impacts. These additional mitigations are independent of the fees set forth in this study and are designed to address different project-specific impacts. Consequently, payment of the fees set forth in this study may not reduce or eliminate these additional mitigations, and conversely, fulfillment of these additional mitigations may not reduce or eliminate the fees set forth herein.

## Authority to Impose Other Mitigation Measures

**Impact Fees and Other Development Project Mitigation and Funding Measures.** The adoption of an impact fee program does not preclude the City's ability to levy other additional fees taxes, or special assessments or to impose project-specific mitigation measures or exactions including those measures found to be necessary to mitigate ongoing fiscal impacts or impacts to public facilities, if the project-specific mitigation measures provide and/or fund facility improvements or ongoing public services that are not or will not be funded by the impact fee program.

**Fee Updates.** This impact fee study update and the recommended fees establish the maximum defensible fee under state law. The Park system is not part of a utility, nor does it benefit from a rate paying system. Park and Recreation Facility Development Impact Fees and In Lieu Fees are the only dedicated funding source. Under this scenario, development must pay for the impacts of new population growth on the existing system. As growth in the park system occurs and the inventory or population adjusts, regular updates are recommended.

## INTRODUCTION

This impact fee nexus report presents an overview of the analysis process for development impact fees in the City of Redding. The report is intended to explain the methods used to determine the need for and cost of public facilities to accommodate new development in Redding. This introduction provides the general background and purpose of impact fees and how the fees are established in Redding. The following topics are included in this section:

- Public Facilities Financing in California
- Authority to Impose Impact Fees
- Mitigation Fee Act and Required Findings
- Organization of the Report
- Facility Standards and Levels of Service

### Public Facilities Financing in California

The changing economic landscape in California during the past four decades has steadily undercut the financial capacity of local governments to fund infrastructure needed for growth. 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 26 in 2010.
- Declining popular support for bond measures to finance infrastructure for the next generation of residents and businesses and related public support for the development community to mitigate impacts of their development projects on community infrastructure.
- Steep reductions in federal and state assistance.

Faced with these trends, many cities and counties have shifted the burden of funding infrastructure expansion from existing rate and taxpayers to new development. This funding shift has been partly accomplished by the imposition of development impact fees, also known as public facility, capital facility, and mitigation fees. A majority vote of the City Council is required for adoption.

Most local agencies have implemented impact fee programs that charge new development close to the full cost required to preserve the existing level of service standards as growth occurs. When local agencies do not collect the full amount, the effect is a decline in facility standards. In some cases, communities can increase other revenue sources such as grants to compensate. This strategy comes with risk, as grant programs are competitive and may not fund the improvements desired.

### Authority to Impose Impact Fees

The authority for the City of Redding to impose fees for mitigation of impacts to public facilities generated by land development is rooted in its fundamental police powers under Article XI Section 7 of the California Constitution, which provides that cities and counties may make and enforce ordinances which are not in conflict with state law. Under its broad authority to protect the public's health and safety, the City may regulate land development including the right to impose conditions on development which may require direct provision of public improvements, land dedications, and in-lieu fees. The State of California

Mitigation Fee Act, discussed below, established the procedures and findings necessary to impose generally applicable development impact fees.

## **Mitigation Fee Act and Required Findings**

As a result of the growing use of impact fees after the passage of Proposition 13 and concern over inconsistencies in their application, the State Legislature passed the Mitigation Fee Act, (“Act”) starting with Assembly Bill 1600 in 1988. The Act, contained in California Government Code Section 66000 et seq., establishes ground rules for the imposition and ongoing administration of impact fee programs. The Act became law in April 1989 and requires local governments to document the following when adopting an impact fee. Together, these items constitute a “nexus study” when documented and presented in a report to the City Council that:

- Identifies the purpose of the fee.
- Identifies the use of fee revenues.
- Determines there is a reasonable relationship between the fee's use and the type of development paying the fee.
- Determines there is a reasonable relationship between the need for the fee and the type of development paying the fee.
- Determines there is a reasonable relationship between the amount of the fee and the cost of the facility attributable to development paying the fee.

This impact fee nexus study and report comply with California Government Code Section 66000 et seq. by providing the required documentation for the above findings and the determinations that establish the basis for the recommended fees. *It is important to note that the fee calculation shown in this report is the maximum defensible fee that is justifiable by the methodology and its required data. Because of this, the City is not required to establish the fee levels documented in the nexus study and may choose to adopt a lower (but not a higher) fee.* Another fundamental premise of impact fees is that the burden of the fees cannot total more than the actual cost of the public facility needed to serve the development paying the fee, including costs associated with administering the fee program. Also, fee revenues can only be used for their intended purposes, and the Act has specific accounting and reporting requirements both annually and after every five-year period for the use of fee revenues. These requirements are outlined in the Implementation section of this report. Impact fee revenues may not be used for staffing, operations, and maintenance of either existing or new facilities. Because of this, the cost of the park facilities analyzed does not include the operational costs of any of these facilities, which, over their life-cycle, will be quite substantial.

## **Organization of the Report**

This report includes a discussion of the population and employment assumptions used in the fee analyses. This report solely addresses park and recreation facilities. For Fire Protection, Citywide Transportation, Water, and Wastewater see the 2017 Development Impact Mitigation Fee Nexus Study approved by City Council on December 5, 2017.

The nexus study is generally organized using the following sections to clearly document the requirements of the Mitigation Fee Act discussed above:

- **The Purpose of the Fee.**
- **The Existing Facilities Inventory.** Where the current investment in these facilities is identified.
- **The Service Population.** Defines what type of development requires this type of facility, whether (1) only residents, or (2) residents and businesses (measured by employment). Because park facilities are constructed in conjunction with growth, population projections are not necessary, and fees are not collected to meet future demands, rather, they are collected to mitigate the immediate impacts of population growth spurred by new construction.
- **The Facility Standards and Unit Costs.** Establishes a reasonable relationship between the need for the fee and the type of development paying the fee. Using common factors such as facility costs per capita, this analysis ensures that each development project pays its fair share of total facility costs.
- **The Fee Schedule.** Establishes a reasonable relationship between the amount of the fee and impacts to the existing level of service by development paying the fee by basing the fee on the facility's cost per capita, then using household occupancy rates, employment density rates, or dwelling unit equivalence to calculate the fee per development unit.
- **Comprehensive Fees.** Establishes a reasonable relationship between the impacts of non-residential construction on park facilities from employee demand on City-owned facilities. This strategy will supplement a reduced residential fee structure. Combined, a residential and non-residential fee (comprehensive) may not exceed the per capita maximum or maximum justifiable fee amount.

## Facility Standards, Level of Service, and Deficiencies

Throughout this report, the words “standard” and “level of service” are used (at times interchangeably) to describe the level of investment in capital facilities that are needed to serve the community. A standard is defined as the adopted policy, or benchmark, that the City would like to achieve for any particular facility.

**Level of Service Methodologies.** The method used to establish the LOS for park and recreation facilities is the “Existing Inventory Method”, also used in the fire protection fee study. This method requires a calculation of the total replacement cost for park, trail, and recreation facilities. This total system value (estimated construction cost) comes from a per acre, or per mile cost for each type of facility. The LOS referenced in this document, therefore, is the total cost for replacement of these facilities applied on a per capita basis to the service population. Depending on the population and fee model used, the LOS is \$2,396.14 per capita with the comprehensive service population or \$2,693.26 per capita with the residential population only.

With this method, new development funds the expansion of facilities at the same level of service, or current standard, enjoyed by the service population (residents and/or workers) in existing development. By definition, this approach results in no facility deficiencies attributed to existing development. If applied in full, the Existing Inventory Method assures that new development will fund at a fair share rate, paying for only the impact of the development to the current system, not deficiencies, and supporting LOS that is equivalent to the LOS enjoyed by the existing population. Use of the existing LOS in the nexus study does not establish them as City policy, which may only occur through the General Plan process. Like Redding, many jurisdictions consider their existing levels of service to be deficient compared to the goals stated in their General Plans.

# POPULATION, EMPLOYMENT, AND HOUSING ESTIMATES

## Introduction

The estimate of the existing population is a critical factor in the Existing Inventory Method for determining the LOS provided to residents. Redding's current residential population is taken from the US Census Bureau, 2016 American Communities Survey 1-Year Estimates. Current employment (jobs within the city as opposed to employed residents who live in the city but may work elsewhere) are based on data from the U.S. Census Bureau, Center for Economic Studies. See **Table 1, pg. 9** for the current estimates.

## Occupancy Rates

Occupancy rates measure the number of persons in a typical dwelling unit or the number of employees in a particular floor area; in this study, that floor area is 1,000 square feet. The use of occupancy rates ensures a reasonable relationship between the increase in service population and the amount of the fee. For residential development, it is commonly considered that single-family units impose a more significant impact on public facilities than multi-family units, especially if census data is available that documents a higher rate of persons per household in single-family homes. If the data shows a differential in occupancy, and the level of service is stated in per capita terms (i.e., system value per resident), then the fee charged must vary according to the estimated service population generated by a particular development project.

The various non-residential land uses in this study each have a different employee occupancy rate, and therefore impose a unique burden on public facilities. Developers pay the fee based on the number of additional housing units or building square feet, so the fee analysis must convert service population estimates to these measures of project size to derive a fee per unit of development. This conversion is performed with the occupancy factors by land use category. The occupancy rates used in this study are shown in **Table 10, pg. 16**. This table shows five of the City's construction types applicable to the Park and Recreation Facility Development Impact Fee.

## Use of Current Estimates

These estimates are used as follows:

- Estimates of existing population and land development are used to determine current facility standards. For example, in this report, the value of park, trail, and regional benefit facility assets per capita are relevant to current facility standards.
- Estimates of the value of constructed park, trail, and regional benefit facilities are used to establish a total system replacement value specific to each type of trail, facility, and park, within the city.

## Land Use Categories

Measuring the impact of growth requires identification of land use categories for summarizing the many different types of new development. The general land use categories used in this analysis are defined below:

- **Single-family:** Detached one-family dwelling units.
- **Multi-family:** Attached dwelling units such as condominiums, duplexes, and apartments.
- **Commercial:** Includes but is not limited to: service commercial, retail, retail-warehouse, educational, and hotel/motel development.
- **Office:** All general, professional, and medical office development.
- **Industrial:** All manufacturing, fabrication, food processing, warehousing, truck yards, terminals, and distribution centers. This category may also encompass business parks, and research and development space.

**Applying the Impact Fees to Development Projects Involving More Than One Land Use.** Some developments may include more than one land use category, such as mixed-use development with both residential and commercial uses. In these cases, the impact fee would be calculated, following the City’s adopted fee methodology for mixed-use development. The Redding City Council has adopted Administrative Guidelines for the Calculation and Determination of Development Impact Fees that provides additional detail on this methodology and other impact fee administration direction.

## **Parks Service Population**

Different types of development use public facilities at different rates in relation to each other, depending on the services provided. In general, the service population is calculated by weighting one land use category against another based on each category's demand for services. In this report, the following service populations apply:

- Citywide residents for residential-only model
- Citywide residents and 20% of the working population for the comprehensive fee model

Like the fire, water, and traffic fees residents and workers are part of the same service population. It is reasonable to assume that one resident places greater demand on public services and associated facilities than one worker who commutes to his/her job in Redding. Therefore, workers are “factored” or weighted for purposes of determining their relative demand and the demand commercial, office, and industrial development has on public facilities included in this study. For more information on the service population for the comprehensive fee model, see the maximum defensible comprehensive fee schedule in **Table 10, pg. 16**.

# PARK AND RECREATION FACILITIES IMPACT FEE

## Introduction

This section summarizes an analysis of the cost of additional park and recreation facilities needed to accommodate new development and maintain the current level of service enjoyed by Redding's residents. The section will document a reasonable relationship between new development and the recommended fee for funding of such facilities.

Staff hired the consulting firm Urban Economics and utilized information and figures from the 2017 update to the Development Impact Fee Program and the *Draft 2018 Parks, Trails, and Open Space Master Plan* to reevaluate and update the Park Development Impact Fee. To assist with this effort, the City Manager and City staff assembled the Park Fee Advisory Committee (PFAC) led by City staff and consisting of two representatives from the Community Services Advisory Commission (CSAC), two members of the Public Works citizen advisory group (AG), three members of the City Manager's Goals and Objectives Committee and two members of the Redding Planning Commission. The nine-member group held four meetings facilitated by City staff between March and June 2018. The inventories, methodology, and maximum defensible figures are the results of that process.

The current Redding park system included in the calculations for the Impact Fee Program encompasses over 461 acres of total developed parkland and 21 miles of trail. The park inventory comprises the following classifications of parks and recreation areas:

- Small neighborhood parks
- Large neighborhood parks
- Community parks
- Regional parks
- Special purpose facilities (e.g., boat launches, dog parks)
- Natural area parks
- Trails
- Regional Benefit Facilities

The general methodology for establishing the maximum defensible Park Development Impact Fee relies on the "Existing Inventory Method." By definition, this approach does not identify any existing facility deficiencies or attempt to raise the level of service (LOS). In the most basic form, the park impact fee uses the present construction costs for all existing park and recreation facilities and divides them by the service population as a basis to establish a per capita cost, for all park users. This per capita value is multiplied by the development density factors found in this report to establish the maximum defensible fee amount. If applied in full, the Existing Inventory Method assures that new development will fund at a fair share rate, paying for only the impact of the development to the current system, not deficiencies, and supporting LOS that is equivalent to the LOS enjoyed by the existing population.

**Appendix A** contains the complete park facility inventory and a summary and total of park acreages.

## Parks Service Population

There are two fee structure models outlined in this plan. These fees are examined in depth with the result being calculations representing the maximum defensible fees for a residential-only and a comprehensive development model. Both fee structure options require the use of a different service population. These two service populations are outlined below:

**Residential Only Fee-** For purposes of calculating the residential fee, the City’s park and recreation facilities are assumed to only serve the residents of Redding.

**Comprehensive Fee-** For the purposes of a comprehensive fee applicable to both residential and non-residential construction, the City’s park and recreation facilities are assumed to serve employees of businesses in Redding as well as residents. An explanation of the related service population, which includes both residential population and workers in Redding with their use discounted to an industry standard 20 percent to accommodate for the additional impacts of use from workers use compared with a residential user. See page 14 for more detail on the comprehensive fee structure.

The current population service population is shown in **Table 1** below.

**Table 1 - Existing Population**

City of Redding	2018
Population <sup>1,2</sup>	91,808
Employment <sup>2</sup>	44,070
Service Population (Residential)	91,808
Service Population (Comprehensive) <sup>3</sup>	100,622

<sup>1</sup> Current population for City of Redding is the U.S. Census Bureau, 2016 American Communities Survey 1-Year Estimates

<sup>2</sup> Estimated based on 2015 data escalated to 2018 based on 2010-2015 growth rate. See U.S. Census Bureau, Center for Economic Studies.

<sup>3</sup> Service population must be utilized when a comprehensive fee structure is used. See *Comprehensive Park and Recreation Facilities Development Impact Fees section for details.*

## Existing Park and Recreation Facilities

Redding’s existing park and recreation facilities are divided into three categories to describe the Level of Service provided by the parks system. The three metrics to that factor into the LOS is the estimated per capita construction cost of park acres for parks, trail miles for trails, and acreage for regional benefit facilities. The parks inventory is the same used in the *Draft 2018 Parks, Trails, and Open Space Master Plan*. For this nexus study, the three included inventories provide the data to calculate cumulative LOS for parks, trails, and regional benefit facilities. The inventories used in the *Master Plan* document have some minor reductions for trails and regional benefit facilities are segregated from the park inventory. Each category is mutually exclusive. For example, trails in Caldwell Park do not count toward the trail level of service as they are absorbed within the park’s acreage. Furthermore, facilities like the Redding Aquatic Center, the skate park, boat ramps, and the Redding Sports Park Complex are classified as regional benefit facilities and their acreage is calculated separately and excluded from parks. **Table 2, pg. 10**, is a summary of the LOS in 2018.

**Table 2 - Existing Facilities**

Parks	Trails	Regional Benefit/Recreation Facilities
375.26 Acres	21.00 Miles	86.47 Acres

**Parks Inventory.** The Park Inventory from the *Parks, Trails, and Open Space Master Plan* was closely evaluated to establish the Park Level of Service (LOS). All of the acreage for regional benefit facilities and trails are isolated from this figure and inventoried elsewhere to avoid duplication. Additionally, the acreage associated with private neighborhood parks, traditionally given a 50% fee credit during the development process, is absent from the inventory and excluded from the LOS calculation. This methodology established the parks acreage at 375.26 acres. See **Appendix A, pg. 21** for a full inventory of park facilities.

**Trails Inventory.** The trail inventory from the *2018 Parks, Trails, and Open Space Master Plan* calculated a total of 21 miles of City-owned/maintained trail within city limits. More specifically there are 6.61 miles of natural surface trails, 12.59 miles of asphalt trail, and 1.8 miles of concrete trail within the Level of Service. These specific units are applied in the system cost to their engineered cost per mile calculation for a full system valuation. These trails are owned or maintained by the City of Redding, and categorically exclude trails owned by other private or government groups (such as those at Lema Ranch or on BLM property) or those found within park boundaries such as the portions of the Sacramento River Trail in Caldwell and Lake Redding Park. This exclusion also applies to trails like the Dana to Downtown Bikeway and the 299 trails, both of which are owned by the California Department of Transportation. Furthermore, the Westside Trail system is outside of city limits and is therefore not included herein. See **Appendix A, pg 21** for a full inventory of trail facilities that are inside city limits and owned or maintained by the City.

**Regional Benefit and Recreation Facilities Inventory.** Regional benefit and recreation facilities are those that include park features that provide recreation amenities to City and County residents alike and help to bolster Redding’s reputation as a recreation hub for the region. These facilities include Big League Dreams, the California Soccer Park, the Rodeo Grounds, the Caldwell Skate Park, and all boat ramp facilities. To establish a value for these facilities, the acreage of these areas is calculated and removed from the overall developed park acreage. The overall result of this effort is a net decrease of 86.47 acres of measured park acreage. This measure ensures there is no duplication in valuation by transferring facilities from a general park construction cost per acre, outlined below, to their actual construction cost. See **Appendix A** for a full inventory of regional benefit and recreation facilities.

### **Unit Costs and Per Capita Standards**

To calculate the cost of new park, trail, and regional benefit facilities needed to serve new development, cost estimates were developed for a typical large neighborhood park, all regional benefit facilities, and the three main types of trail found in the city. Costs for parks were based on the actual escalated construction cost per acre using the Highland Park Project. For trails, various escalated unit prices for public works construction projects were used. For regional benefit facilities the actual final project costs were escalated to today’s costs and, when available, quotes were utilized for facility replacement. Staff used the Engineering News-Record Construction Cost Index to escalate costs from past projects. This method establishes a total system value which represents the cost to reconstruct the inventory as a whole in 2018.

**Park Development Cost Model.** To calculate the cost of new park facilities needed to serve new development, a cost estimate was developed for a typical large neighborhood park, conforming to the standard established by the *Parks, Trails and Open Space Master Plan* and uses actual construction costs from the recent Highland Park Project. Large neighborhood parks include the following amenities:

- Play equipment for 2-5 yrs. and 5-11 yrs., with engineered wood play surfaces;
- Full-court basketball;
- Additional amenities, e.g. bocce court, horseshoe pit or volleyball court;
- Concrete trash receptacles;
- Concrete picnic areas w/concrete, ADA compliant picnic tables;
- 6' wide concrete trails connecting surrounding residential areas to the park;
- 4' wide trail circuit around a park;
- Minimum 200'x300' irrigated turf;
- Drinking fountains, including water supply and backflow devices;
- Concrete mow strip surrounding planting beds;
- Restrooms.

The cost of the typical large neighborhood park is \$357,339 per acre, not including the land. This cost model was derived using data and costs from the aforementioned projects and received concurrence from both the PFAC and the Public Works Engineering Division as an accurate representation of park construction costs. This cost estimate compares well with other fee studies. See **Appendix B, pg. 26** for the cost model detail.

Typical park construction cost per acre represents an economy of scale. Larger parks with more green space tend to be cheaper per acre (typical cost above) than those smaller parks which typically feature much of the same hardscape improvements and less green space, escalating their construction cost per acre. The total valuation for park facilities, using the typical park construction cost model applied to the 375.26 total parkland acres, is \$134,095,355. (See **Appendix B, pg. 26** for a detailed estimate and **Appendix A, pg. 21** for the inventory).

**Parkland Cost.** A portion of the land for parks is dedicated per the City's Quimby Act ordinance (RMC Chapter 17.54). This chapter of the municipal code requires either dedication of land for public parks, or a payment-in-lieu of land dedication, as a condition of approval of final maps or parcels maps. The dedication rate is specified in the code at five acres per 1,000 residents (the maximum allowed by the Quimby Act). This calculation, described below, is used only to calculate the difference between the amount dedicated from the park in-lieu process and the current LOS. These figures of park land per capita include parks, trails, and regional benefit facilities, but only represent between \$116 and \$195 (depending on the fee model employed) of the per capita system cost. This is the only case in the methodology established by this Nexus Study that trail mileage requires an acreage conversion. Because of the width of the easements, land purchases, infrastructure and maintained footprint of trails varies, it was found by the *2004 Parks, Trails, and Open Space Master Plan* that an average corridor width of 50' should be used to equate trail mileage with acreage (6.06 acres per mile). The conversion accounts for land required to construct drainage improvements, open space improvements, studies, landscaping, parking lots, restrooms and more. The trail mileage to acres conversion represents only a small portion, approximately

22%, of the parkland acquisition cost referenced above, a range of \$25-\$43 depending on the fee model employed.

**Residential Fee** - When calculated as a whole, using the residential-only service population, the existing park LOS is 6.42 acres per 1,000 residents. The City may make up the net difference between the Quimby Act maximum and the existing level of service standard through the impact fee. This net difference is 1.42 acres per 1,000 residents (0.00142 acres per capita). **Table 5, pg. 14** includes the value of additional parkland acquisition cost that is applied to the total cost per capita. The typical cost of an acre of parkland is needed to calculate per capita cost. Shasta County Assessor data shows the average cost for an acre of developable residential land (appropriate for park usage) to be \$137,339 per acre.

**Comprehensive Model** - For the comprehensive fee model, a service population that includes a percentage of workers, lowering the LOS to 5.85 acres per thousand population. The resulting parkland cost is therefore lower, per capita, equating to an additional .00085 acres per capita at \$137,339 per acre. This data is reflected in the comprehensive fee schedule in **Table 10, pg. 16**.

**Trail Development Cost Model.** The City of Redding engineering staff generated estimates based on past projects to develop typical cost models that reflect trail construction for the three main types of trails found in the city, not including land acquisition. Staff engineers examined and applied past project costs, Caltrans construction data, and historic bid pricing reports in conjunction with the Engineering News-Record Construction Cost Index to develop a cost by facility type. This cost was applied per mile for natural surface, paved, and concrete trails. These values correspond to the inventory, which was broken up into asphalt, concrete, and natural trails, and their costs distributed accordingly. Additionally, features such as bridges (not including the Sundial Bridge or Stress Ribbon Bridge), parking, and restrooms are quantified and their value distributed on a per mile basis over the entire system. See **Table 3** below for a detailed evaluation of trail facility costs by type and feature. See **Appendix A, pg. 21** for inventory.

**Table 3 – Replacement Value of Existing Trails**

Type	Unit	Quantity*	Cost Per Unit	Total
Concrete Trail	Mile	1.80	\$1,895,512.50	\$3,411,922.50
Asphalt Trail	Mile	12.59	\$666,688.25	\$8,393,605.07
Natural Trail	Mile	6.61	\$441,803.67	\$2,920,322.27
Parking Lots	Sq. Ft	110,723	\$24.20	\$2,679,496.60
Bridges	Each	27	\$50,750	\$1,370,250.00
Restrooms	Each	4	\$94,975	\$379,900.00
<b>Totals</b>				<b>\$19,155,496.44</b>

\*The total cost for bridges and restrooms are shown in this table based on the replacement cost of existing facilities (three bridge types found in a combined 27 locations and four restrooms with their prices averaged over the quantity).

**Regional Benefit and Recreation Facilities Costs.** As explained above, these facilities include park features that tend to have a wider, regional, draw. To establish a true cost for these facilities staff used as-built plans and construction costs, escalated to 2018 rates. Where these costs were unknown, staff solicited quotes from the companies that originally built the structures. For generic structures such as the Caldwell Park Teen Center, the Carter House, and the Enterprise Park Community Room, a generic government

building construction cost per square foot was used. In total, it is estimated that the regional benefit and recreation facilities shown in **Table 4** below would cost \$76,107,383.89 to reconstruct in 2018, not including the land acquisition required to construct said facilities.

**Table 4 – Replacement Value of Existing Regional Benefit Facilities**

Facility	Unit	Qty	Engineered Cost	Facility Acreage	Total Construction
Big League Dreams	EA	1	\$26,057,805.55	35.00	\$26,057,805.55
Caldwell Recreation Center	SF	8,660	\$260.68	0.25	\$2,257,488.80
Caldwell Skate Park	SF	21,228	\$1,000,000.00	0.49	\$1,000,000.00
Carter House	SF	2,004	\$260.68	0.05	\$522,402.72
Clover Creek Preserve Clubhouse	SF	4,252	\$465,000.00	0.01	\$465,000.00
Enterprise Community Room	SF	2,148	\$260.68	0.05	\$559,940.64
Lake Redding Boat Launch	EA	1	\$3,318,762.30	1.35	\$3,318,762.30
MLK Center	SF	4,512	\$260.68	0.14	\$1,176,188.16
Redding Aquatic Center (RAC)	EA	1	\$12,692,141.52	3.00	\$12,692,141.52
RAC Change House	SF	3,219	\$260.68	0.00	\$839,128.92
Redding Soccer Park	EA	1	\$15,987,926.01	25.00	\$15,987,926.01
Reginato River Access	EA	1	\$1,735,747.35	2.00	\$1,735,747.35
Rodeo Grounds	EA	1	\$2,000,000.00	12.00	\$2,000,000.00
Sculpture Park	EA	1	\$1,294,591.79	2.50	\$1,294,591.79
Senior Citizens Hall	SF	13,104	\$260.68	2.56	\$3,415,950.72
Teen Center	SF	2,004	\$260.68	0.07	\$522,402.72
Turtle Bay Boat Launch	EA	1	\$2,261,906.69	2.00	\$2,261,906.69
<b>Totals</b>				<b>86.47</b>	<b>\$76,107,383.89</b>

Note: Average cost of construction for government facilities, including engineering, is \$260.68 per Sq Foot

**Per Capita Standards.** The valuation for each category must be divided by the service population to establish a system-wide cost per capita standard. This establishes the estimated cost to reconstruct Redding’s park and recreation amenities system applied to individual residents. The following table calculates the cost per capita using the population of Redding’s residents in a residential-only fee model. As discussed previously, the parkland acquisition cost per capita excludes new development obligations under the City’s Quimby Act ordinance.

**Table 5 - System Value and Residential Cost Per Capita**

Cost Category	Calculated Value	Population*	Cost Per Capita
Park Development	\$134,095,355.1	91,808	\$1,460.61
Trail Development	\$19,155,496.44	91,808	\$208.65
Recreation Facilities	\$76,107,383.89	91,808	\$828.98
Parkland Acquisition	\$17,904,522.86	91,808	\$195.02
<b>Total System Value</b>	<b>\$247,262,758.28</b>	<b>Total Cost Per Capita</b>	<b>\$2,693.26</b>

\*Population data used to calculate the fee is derived from the U.S. Census Bureau’s 2016 American Community Survey, which determined the City’s population to be 91,808. For an impact fee program utilizing the comprehensive fee model, the service population must increase to accommodate worker population to a total of 100,622. This lowers the cost per capita to \$2,369.14. See **Table 7, pg. 15** for more information.

### Maximum Defensible Residential-Only Fee Schedule

**Table 6** shows the maximum defensible parks impact fee amount for new development based on the facilities cost per capita explored previously. The fee represents the amount required to fund the new park facilities needed to accommodate growth based on the existing inventory standard. Citywide residential development would pay the fee based on the service population for the facilities.

**Table 6 - Residential-Only Fee Schedule**

Development Type	Cost Per Capita <sup>1</sup>	Occupancy <sup>2</sup>	Maximum Defensible Fee <sup>3</sup>	Current Fee
Single-Family	\$2,693.26	2.50	\$6,733.15	\$4,331.15
Multi-Family	\$2,693.26	1.89	\$5,090.26	\$3,376.34

<sup>1</sup> Cost per capita represents the full system value divided by population, excluding parkland associated with Quimby Act ordinance obligations for new development to dedicate parkland or pay a fee in lieu of dedication.

<sup>2</sup> Representing occupants per household. See U.S. Census Bureau, 2016 American Community Survey 1-Year Estimates, Tables B25033 and DP04.

<sup>3</sup> The maximum defensible fee is the highest defensible fee amount found by this study and supported by state law.

### Comprehensive Park and Recreation Facilities Development Impact Fees

The comprehensive fee model includes both residential and non-residential construction. This section clarifies the differences between the two fee models examined in this document. For the comprehensive fee model, the assumptions, methodology, as well as the studies cited here were reviewed by the project consultant, the Park Fee Advisory Committee (PFAC), and the Community Services Advisory Commission (CSAC) found to be sound and applicable to this study.

**Employee Park Usage Factors.** For an impact fee program utilizing a comprehensive fee model an inclusive service population, rather than purely the residential population, must be utilized to accommodate for actual park usage by other users. To allocate costs for impacts to a park system, those realizing the benefits of the system can also be compelled to pay their fair share as well. This includes employees residing in and out of city limits, who typically use parks more than those that work outside of the city. The comprehensive model shares the cost of impact mitigation to parks and facilities across all types of

development. The comprehensive fee model includes analysis of commercial, office, and industrial construction impacts to the existing LOS and the facilities enjoyed by Redding’s residents.

Though applying results from other cities poses challenges for a number of reasons, including differences in the acreage of parks, differences in the proximity of parks to employment areas, and differences in the propensity of the local workforce to access park amenities, several other programs were examined in the development of this analysis. Of the many California cities reviewed, a broad range of employee park usage factors (equivalency factors) between 0.2 and 0.5 were identified. This estimation is common practice for park impact fee programs. In this instance, the comprehensive fee model utilizes the lowest employee park usage factor figure found within these studies (0.2), being the most conservative figure available and commonly used by other studies. The Employee Park Usage factor means that an employee uses a park facility 20% of the time that a resident would, regardless of their residency status. The workplace location within the city limits equates leads to a demand on park facilities, for example the lunchtime jogger or the after work recreation program user. In essence, a resident has a park usage factor of 1, and a resident-worker has a park usage factor of 1.2. Therefore, residents living and working in the City will have a higher demand on parks than those working outside of the city, with those living outside the city having only 20% of the demand of a full-time Redding resident (a .2 park usage factor).

**Citywide Cost Per Capita.** Using the information contained in **Table 1, pg. 9**, the population of workers for the City of Redding, as calculated by the U.S. Census Bureau Center for Economic Studies, is 44,070. With an employee usage factor of 20%, the daytime worker population was assigned a value that reflects the impact placed on parks by all workers, thereby resulting in the service population of the parks system. With total worker use calculated at 20 percent of the amount a resident would use parks, additional 8,814 persons to the total service population under the comprehensive fee model. The higher service population (100,622) is then applied the cost per capita model, distributing the costs across new residential, commercial, industrial, and office development, resulting in a lower citywide cost per capita of \$2,369.14. This translates into a reduced maximum defensible fee of \$5,990.35, seen below in **Table 7**.

**Table 7 - Comprehensive Fee Cost Per Capita**

Cost Category	Calculated Value	Population	Cost Per Capita
Parks	\$134,095,355.10	100,622	\$1,332.66
Trails	\$19,155,496.44	100,622	\$190.37
Recreation Facilities	\$76,107,383.89	100,622	\$756.37
Park Acreage <sup>1</sup>	\$11,746,426.13	100,622	\$116.74
<b>Total System Value</b>	<b>\$241,104,661.56</b>	<b>Total Cost Per Capita</b>	<b>\$2,396.14</b>

<sup>1</sup> The cost of park acreage is reduced using the comprehensive fee model because the increased population lowers the acres per 1,000 to 5.85 from 6.42.

**Commercial, Office, and Industrial Cost Per Capita.** For the comprehensive fee model, the impact of individual workers must be quantified by calculating a park user equivalent. The total per capita cost is multiplied by the park-usage factor of .2 (i.e. non-residential employee use of facilities is 20 percent of a resident). This further reduces the cost per capita for commercial, office, and industrial development (\$479.23 down from \$2,396.14) is applied to the employee per 1,000 square foot units to yield a fee these types of construction. The employee occupancy factors are the same as used in the Fire Fee analysis and are shown in **Table 8, pg. 16**.

**Table 8 - Employee Occupancy Factors**

Land Use	Employee Occupancy Factor	Employees per 1,000 square feet
Commercial	400 building square feet per worker	2.50
Office	270 building square feet per worker	3.70
Industrial	500 building square feet per worker	2.00

**Table 9 - Non-Residential Cost Per Capita**

Construction Type	Population	System Cost per Capita	Employee Usage Factor	Comprehensive Cost per capita
Commercial	100,622	\$2,396.14	.20	\$479.23
Office	100,622	\$2,396.14	.20	\$479.23
Industrial	100,622	\$2,396.14	.20	\$479.23

### Comprehensive Fee Schedule

Under the comprehensive fee model the net combined cost for park, trail, and regional benefit facility development is \$2,396.14 per capita (see **Table 7, pg. 15**). This cost is then multiplied by the standard occupancy rates for the City of Redding. For residential development, these rates are 2.50 persons per household (PPH) for a single-family unit, 1.89 PPH for a multi-family unit. For commercial, office, and industrial construction, the total cost per capita must be reduced to 20% of its full value to accommodate just for the demand placed on the park and recreation system by workers (See **page 14** for detailed discussion). Then, the reduced cost per capita is multiplied by the employee density factors utilized from **Table 8** above. The end result of these figures is the maximum legally defensible Park and Recreation Facilities Impact Fee.

Over the course of four meetings, staff and the PFAC vetted the above methodology and inputs to calculate a comprehensive maximum defensible fee. See **Table 10** below for the full fee schedule.

**Table 10 - Maximum Defensible Comprehensive Fee Schedule**

Development Type	Cost Per Capita <sup>1</sup>	Occupancy <sup>2</sup>	Maximum Defensible Fee <sup>3</sup>	Current Fee
Single-Family	\$2,396.14	2.50	\$5,990.35	\$4,331.15
Multi-Family	\$2,396.14	1.89	\$4,528.70	\$3,376.34
Commercial	\$479.23	2.5 emp/ksf	\$1,198.08	N/A
Office	\$479.23	3.7 emp/ksf	\$1,773.15	N/A
Industrial	\$479.23	2 emp/ksf	\$958.46	N/A

<sup>1</sup> When utilizing the comprehensive fee schedule, the Service Population is more inclusive, resulting in a reduction in the cost per capita for the residential occupants by applying a portion of the fee to non-residential occupants.

<sup>2</sup> The maximum defensible fee is the highest defensible fee amount found by this study and supported by state law.

<sup>3</sup> 100,622 Service population must be utilized when a comprehensive fee structure is used. See **page 14** for details.

## **IMPLEMENTATION**

This section identifies tasks that pursuant to California Government Code Section 66000 et seq., the City should complete when implementing and/or updating any impact fee program.

### **Impact Fee Program Adoption Process**

Impact fee program adoption procedures are found in the California Government Code Section 66000 et seq. Adoption of an impact fee program requires the City Council to follow certain procedures including holding a public hearing (California Government Code Section 6062a). Mailed notice 14 days prior to the public hearing is required only for those individuals who request such notification. Data, such as this impact fee report, and referenced material must be made available at least ten days prior to the public hearing.

The City's legal counsel should inform the City of any other procedural requirements as well as advice regarding adoption of an enabling ordinance and/or a resolution. After adoption, there is a mandatory 60-day waiting period before the fees go into effect, unless an Urgency Ordinance, valid for 30 days, is adopted making certain findings regarding the urgency being claimed. The ordinance must be readopted at the end of the first period (and possibly at the end of the second period depending on City Council meeting dates) to cover the next 30 days and therefore the entire 60-day waiting period. Fees adopted by urgency go into effect immediately. This procedure must also be followed for fee increases and updates.

### **Programming Revenues and Capital Improvement Projects**

The City should adjust its Capital Improvement Plan on an on-going basis to identify specific projects and program fee revenues to those projects. Use of the Capital Improvement Plan in this manner documents a reasonable relationship between new development and the use of impact fee revenues. For the planning period of the Capital Improvement Plan, the City should allocate all existing fund balances and projected fee revenue to facilities projects. The City should plan its Capital Improvement Plan expenditures at least five years in advance and show where all collected development impact fee revenues will be spent. The impact fee revenue can be held in a project account for longer than five years if necessary to collect sufficient funds to complete a given project.

### **Inflation Adjustment**

The costs in this report are shown in 2018 dollars (unless otherwise noted) based on information provided by the City and researched sources. To ensure that the fee program stays current with the prevailing cost of construction, the City should periodically adjust the costs by an inflation index, or by a factor based on experience with actual local construction projects. The Engineering News Record Construction Cost Index 20-City average or other suitable index may be used to adjust impact fees. However, for specific cost categories, the City may apply a factor that is more appropriate to the type of facility.

## Combining Fees

Impact fee revenues may be combined into two or more fee categories at the City's discretion, to facilitate administration, as long as an accounting is kept as to the revenues generated by each facility category (see "Earmarking of fee revenues" below).

## Compliance Requirements

The California Mitigation Fee Act (Government Code Section 66000 et seq.) mandates procedures for administration of impact fee programs, including collection, accounting, refunds, updates, and reporting. The City should comply with the annual and five-year reporting requirements. 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. The City's compliance obligations vis-à-vis the Act include but are not limited to the following specific requirements:

**Collection of Fees.** Section 66007 provides that a local agency shall not require payment of fees by developers of residential projects prior to the date of final inspection, or issuance of a certificate of occupancy, whichever comes first. In a residential development of more than one dwelling unit, the local agency may choose to collect fees either for individual units or for phases upon final inspection, or for the entire project upon final inspection of the first dwelling unit when it is completed. The local agency may require the payment of those fees at an earlier time if: (A) the local agency determines that the fees or charges will be collected for public improvements or facilities for which an account has been established and funds appropriated and for which the local agency has adopted a proposed construction schedule or plan prior to final inspection or issuance of the certificate of occupancy, or (B) the fees or charges are to reimburse the local agency for expenditures previously made. "Appropriated" as used in this subdivision, means authorization by the governing body of the local agency for which the fee is collected to make expenditures and incur obligations for specific purposes.

**Fee Exemptions, Reductions and Waivers.** In the event that a development project is found to have no impact on facilities for which fees are charged, such project must be exempted from the fees. If a project has characteristics that indicate its impacts on a particular public facility or infrastructure system will be significantly and permanently smaller than the average impact used to calculate impact fees in this study, the fees should be reduced accordingly. In some cases, the City may desire to voluntarily waive or reduce impact fees that would otherwise apply to a project to promote goals such as affordable housing or economic development. Such a waiver or reduction may not result in increased costs to other development projects, and are allowable only if the City offsets the lost revenue from other fund sources.

**Credit for Improvements by Developers.** If the City requires a developer, as a condition of approval, to construct facilities or improvements for which impact fees have been or will be charged, the impact fee imposed on that development project for that type of facility must be adjusted to reflect a credit for the cost of facilities or improvements constructed or otherwise provided by the developer. If the reimbursement would exceed the amount of the fee to be paid by the development for that type of facility, the City may seek to negotiate a reimbursement agreement with the developer.

**Earmarking of Fee Revenues.** Government Code Section 66006 mandates that the City shall: "deposit... fees for the improvement in a separate capital facilities account or fund in a manner to avoid any

commingling of the fees with other revenues and funds of the City, except for temporary investments” ...Fees must be expended solely for the purpose for which they were collected. Interest earned on the fee revenues must also be placed in the capital account and used for the same purpose. The Act is not clear as to whether depositing fees “for the improvements” refers to a specific capital improvement or a class of improvements (e.g., fire protection, traffic or park facilities). Recommended practice is for the City is to maintain separate funds or accounts for impact fee revenues by facility category, but not necessarily for individual projects.

**Reporting.** Government Code Section 66006 requires that once each year, within 180 days of the close of the fiscal year, the City must make available to the public the following information for each account established to receive impact fee revenues:

1. Brief description of the type of fee in the account.
2. The amount of the fee.
3. The beginning and ending balance of the account or fund.
4. The amount of the fees collected and interest earned.
5. Identification of each public improvement on which fee revenues were expended and the amount of the expenditures on each improvement, including the percentage of the cost of the public improvement that was funded with fee revenues.
6. Identification of the approximate date by which the construction of a public improvement will commence if the City determines sufficient funds have been collected for the financing of an incomplete public improvement.
7. A description of each inter-fund transfer or loan made from the account or fund, including interest rates, repayment dates, and a description of the improvements on which the transfer or loan will be expended.
8. The amount of any refunds or allocations made pursuant to Government Code Section 66001, paragraphs (e) and (f).

The above information must be reviewed by the City Council at its next regularly scheduled public meeting, but not less than 15 days after the statements are made public.

**Findings and Refunds.** Government Code Section 66001 requires that, for the fifth fiscal year following the first deposit of any impact fee revenue into an account or fund as required by Government Code Section 66006, and every five years thereafter, the City shall make all of the following findings for any fee revenues that remain unexpended, whether committed or uncommitted:

1. Identify the purpose to which the fee will be put.
2. Demonstrate the reasonable relationship between the fee and the purpose for which it is charged.
3. Identify all sources and amounts of funding anticipated to complete financing of incomplete improvements for which the impact fees are to be used.
4. Designate the approximate dates on which the funding necessary to complete financing of those improvements will be deposited into the appropriate account of funds.

**Annual Update of Capital Improvement Program.** Government Code Section 66002 provides that if a local agency adopts a Capital Improvement Plan to identify the use of impact fees, that program must be adopted and annually updated by a resolution of the governing body at a noticed public hearing. The alternative is to identify improvements in other public documents.

The City's current Capital Improvement Program is structured around a two-year update cycle. While the City also identifies the improvements in other documents (master plans, budget documents, fee nexus studies, etc.) the City should move to the annual approval of the CIP per Sec. 66002, or, alternately, re-describe the purpose of the CIP.

## **Local Implementation**

Local administrative procedures will be necessary to ensure that the on-going application and collection of the impact fees on a project-specific basis meets the direction and intent of CGC Section 66000 et seq. The City of Redding has adopted such procedures that address topics such as a change in use or the demolition of a building, calculation of fees for specific types of uses, the transfers of credits from one property to another, the calculation of fees for mixed-use projects, and similar issues. The full range of these topics is beyond the scope of this nexus study, but they must be consistent with the requirements of Government Code Section 66000.

## **Principal Assumptions and Considerations**

In preparing this report, Staff reviewed the 2017 Development Impact Mitigation Fee Nexus Study and the opinions and recommendations by the City of Redding and NBS included therein. A number of principal assumptions and considerations with regard to financial matters, population, conditions, and events that may occur in the future as well as materials wholly prepared by the City. These assumptions, considerations, and materials, including the City's budgets, planning information, and technical direction from City staff, were provided by sources we believe to be reliable.

The contents and calculations presented in this report are the results of efforts by Community Services Department staff and Bob Spencer, principal of Urban Economics.

# **Appendix A – Park, Trail and Regional Benefit Facility Inventories**

## 2018 City of Redding Parks Inventory

Park Type	Park Name	Street Address	Acres Developed	Regional Benefit Facility	Total LOS Acres
<b>Small N'hood Parks</b>	Amethyst Park	2950 Amethyst Way	0.57		0.57
	Blossom Park Site	1325 Montclair DR	0.00		0.00
	Bob White Park	931 Springer Drive	0.41		0.41
	Carnelian Park	2487 Lake Redding Drive	0.52		0.52
	Clover Creek Park	2555 Clover Creek Street	0.60		0.60
	Country Heights Park	2899 Howard Drive	1.75		1.75
	Copper Creek Site	4950 Shasta View Drive	0.00		0.00
	Creekside Park	6596 Creekside Street	0.87		0.87
	East Oak Park	1399 Arizona Street	2.60		2.60
	Foothill Park	1160 Hillcrest Place	0.50		0.50
	Foxtail Park	1460 Foxtail Court	0.79		0.79
	Hawn Park (aka Rotary Park)	2703 Hawn Avenue	0.34		0.34
	Indian Hills Park	3575 Auburn Drive	0.75		0.75
	Magnolia Park	1614 Magnolia Ave	1.70		1.70
	Martin Luther King Jr. Park	1815 Sheridan Street	3.08	0.14	2.94
	Meadow Creek Park	6510 Hemlock Street	0.50		0.50
	Minder Park	1210 Minder Drive	1.00		1.00
	Northridge Gardens Park	960 Hillsdale Court	0.75		0.75
	Parkview Green	2855 Lanning Avenue	0.59		0.59
	Peppertree Park	500 Peppertree Lane	1.21		1.21
	Ravenwood Park	2001 Charade Way	0.76		0.76
	Ridgeview Park	2150 Cumberland Drive	1.83		1.83
	River Ridge Terrace Site	1325 Spinnaker Drive	0.00		0.00
	Rolling Hills Park	3890 Oro Street	1.26		1.26
	Rosetree Site	1505 Imperial Drive	0.00		0.00
	Stillwater Heights Park	4525 Lynbrook Loop	1.85		1.85
	T.R. Woods Memorial Park	955 Royal Oaks Drive	2.00		2.00
	Valley Ridge Park	5414 Valley Ridge Drive	0.50		0.50
	Vista Ridge Park	555 Whet Owl Way	0.92		0.92
	Waverly Park	2550 Central Waverly	0.75		0.75
	Western Oaks Park	2370 Western Oak Drive	1.71		1.71
	<b>31 SMALL N'HOOD PARK SITES</b>	<b>SUBTOTAL ACRES</b>	<b>30.11</b>		<b>29.97</b>
<b>Large N'hood Parks</b>	Alta Mesa Park	3600 Scorpius Way	5.83		5.83
	Churn Creek Site	2013 E. Cypress Avenue	0.00		0.00
	Gregory Lake	118 Oak Mesa Ln.	0.00		0.00
	Highland Park	555 Mill Valley Parkway	7.07		7.07
	Lake Redding Park	2225 Benton Drive	10.00		10.00
	Mountain View School Park Site	685 Shasta View Dr	0.00		0.00

	Panorama Park	900, 950 Lake Boulevard	0.00		0.00
	Rivercrest Park	4325 Chinook Drive	3.85		3.85
	Shastina Ranch	8500 Shasta View Dr	0.00		0.00
	Sulphur Creek Park Site	1547 Nancy Ct	0.00		0.00
	<b>10 LARGE N'HOOD PARK SITES</b>	<b>SUBTOTAL ACRES</b>	<b>26.75</b>		<b>26.75</b>
<b>Community Parks</b>	Buckeye Park	3500 Hiatt Drive	9.25		9.25
	Buenaventura Fields	3881 Placer Rd			
	Caldwell East	971 N Market St			
	Cascade Park	2975 Girvan Road	4.00		4.00
	South City Park / Tiger Field	955 Parkview Avenue	17.75		17.75
	Twin View Site	901 College View Drive			
	<b>6 COMMUNITY PARK SITES</b>	<b>SUBTOTAL ACRES</b>	<b>31.00</b>		<b>31.00</b>
<b>Regional Parks</b>	Caldwell Park	58 Quartz Hill Road	63.84	5.21	58.63
	Enterprise Park	1755 El Vista Street	25.00	0.05	24.95
	<b>2 REGIONAL PARK SITES</b>	<b>SUBTOTAL ACRES</b>	<b>88.84</b>		<b>83.58</b>
<b>Natural Area Parks</b>	Buckeye Natural Area Park	3500 Hiatt Drive	17.84		17.84
	Clover Creek Preserve	3705 Shasta View Drive	106.00	0.01	105.99
	Mary Lake Park	1696 Lakeside Drive	29.59		29.59
	Peppertree Natural Area Park	515 Peppertree Lane	26.46		26.46
	<b>4 NATURAL AREA PARK SITES</b>	<b>SUBTOTAL ACRES</b>	<b>179.89</b>		<b>179.88</b>
<b>Regional Benefit Facilities</b>	John Reginato River Access	3855 South Bonnyview Road	4.00	2.00	2.00
	Redding Soccer Park	9800 Old Oregon Trail	25.00	25.00	
	Big League Dreams	20155 Viking Way	35.00	35.00	
	Rodeo Grounds (Posse Grounds)	715 Auditorium Drive	12.00	12.00	
	Sculpture Park at City Hall	777 Cypress Avenue	2.50	2.50	
	Senior Citizens Hall	2290 Benton Drive	2.56	2.56	
	Turtle Bay Boat Launch	725 Auditorium Drive	2.00	2.00	
	<b>7 REGIONAL BENEFIT FACILITIES</b>		<b>83.06</b>		2.00
<b>Special Purpose Parks</b>	Benton Dog Park	1700 Airpark Drive	2.30		2.30
	Carnegie Park	1552 Placer Street	0.63		0.63
	Civic Center Grounds	777 Cypress Avenue	3.29		3.29
	Community Gardens	1550 Riverside Drive	3.60		3.60
	Civic Auditorium Grounds	700 Auditorium Drive	10.00		10.00
	Graham Park	955 Hartnell Avenue	0.20		0.20
	Old City Hall	1313 Market Street	0.16		0.16
	Riverfront Park	800 Sundial Bridge Drive	1.90		1.90
	Softball Park (S. City Park)	900 Parkview Avenue	0.00		0.00
	Stillwater Plant Site	6383 Airport Road			
	<b>10 SPECIAL PURPOSE SITES</b>	<b>SUBTOTAL ACRES</b>	<b>22.08</b>		<b>22.08</b>
			<b>Developed Acres</b>	<b>Regional Benefit Acres</b>	<b>Total Parkland Acres</b>
<b>70 Total Sites</b>		<b>TOTAL ACRES</b>	<b>461.73</b>	<b>86.47</b>	<b>375.26</b>

## City of Redding Trails in LOS Calculation

Trail System - Name	Agency	Surface	To	From	Miles
<b>Blue Gravel</b>					
Blue Gravel Mine Trail	COR	Paved	Placer St.	Canyon Creek Rd.	1.74
Canyon Creek Trail	COR	Paved	Blazingwood Dr.	Buenaventura Blvd.	0.49
Teton Trail	COR	Paved	Crescent Moon Dr.	Blue Gravel Mine Trl	0.32
<b>Gregory Lake</b>					
Gregory Lake Loop	COR	Gravel	Internal Loop	Internal Loop	0.49
<b>Henderson</b>					
Henderson Area Trail	COR	Natural	Internal Loop	Internal Loop	1.10
<b>John Reginato River Access</b>					
J Reginato River Access	COR	Concrete	S. Bonnyview Rd.	Nicolet Ln.	0.08
J Reginato River Access	COR	Natural	S. Bonnyview Rd.	Nicolet Ln.	0.93
<b>Parkview Riverfront Park</b>					
Parkview Riverfront Park Trail	COR	Concrete	Internal Loop	Internal Loop	0.51
<b>Polk Open Space</b>					
Polk Open Space Trail	COR	Natural	Polk St	Polk St	0.10
<b>Sacramento River Trail</b>					
Buenaventura (10 Bridges)	COR	Natural	Sunflower Drive	Sac River Trail	0.71
Carter Creek Trail	COR	Paved	Sac River Trail	Sac River Trail	0.06
Hilltop	COR	Concrete	Hilltop Ext.	Hilltop Dr.	0.25
Hilltop Extension	COR	Paved	Arboretum Loop	Hilltop Dr.	0.50
Dana to Downtown Bikeway <sup>1</sup>	COR	Concrete	Dana Dr.	Sundial Bridge Area	0.00
Lake Redding Connector	COR	Paved	Sac River Trail	Lake Redding	0.08
Overhill Extension	COR	Paved	Mary St.	Overhill Dr.	0.12
Palatine Trail	COR	Natural	Palatine Ct.	Sac River Trail	0.47
Palisades	COR	Concrete	Palisades Ave.	Dana To Downtown	0.13
Palisades	COR	Gravel	Palisades Ave.	Dana To Downtown	0.27
River to Mora Ct.	COR	Paved	Mora Ct.	Sac River Trail	0.06
River to Overhill Dr.	COR	Paved	Overhill Dr.	Sac River Trail	0.14
North River Trail	COR	Paved	Stress Ribbon Bridge	Sundial Bridge Area	3.58
South River Trail	COR	Paved	Diestelhorst Parking	Keswick Dam Rd.	4.29
Stanford Hills Trail	COR	Paved	Sutro Mine Rd	Sac River Trail	0.86
Sundial Bridge Area	COR	Concrete	Dana to Downtown	River Trail	0.29
Turtle Bay East Connector <sup>1</sup>	COR	Concrete	Dana to Downtown	Turtle Bay East	0.00
View Trail	COR	Paved	East Palisades Ave	Dana To Downtown	0.16
<b>Sulphur Creek</b>					
Old 99	PRIV	Gravel	Lake Blvd.	North Market St.	0.71
Sulphur Creek Trail	COR	Natural	North Market St.	UPRR	0.37
<b>Turtle Bay East</b>					
Turtle Bay East - North Trails	COR	Natural	Internal Loop	Internal Loop	0.36

Turtle Bay East - South Trails	COR	Natural	Internal Loop	Internal Loop	1.02
<b>West Redding</b>					
Buenaventura	COR	Concrete	Lakeside Dr.	Sunflower Dr.	0.45
Knolls Trail	COR	Paved	Foothill Blvd.	Eureka Way	0.19
<b>West Side Trails</b>					
Kilkee Trail	COR	Concrete	Kilkee Ct	Westside Trails	0.09
West Side Trail (Inside COR limits)	COR	Natural	Kilkee Trail	Westside Trails	0.08
				<b>Total Natural Trails</b>	<b>6.61</b>
				<b>Total Asphalt Trails</b>	<b>12.59</b>
				<b>Total Concrete Trails</b>	<b>1.80</b>
				<b>Total Trail Mileage</b>	<b>21.00</b>

<sup>1</sup> CalTrans Facilities, not included in Level of Service

## Regional Benefit Facilities Inventory

Facility	Unit	Qty	Facility Acreage
Big League Dreams	EA	1	35.00
Caldwell Recreation Center	SF	8,660	0.25
Caldwell Skate Park	SF	21,228	0.49
Carter House	SF	2,004	0.05
Clover Creek Preserve Clubhouse	SF	4,252	0.01
Enterprise Community Room	SF	2,148	0.05
Lake Redding Boat Launch	EA	1	1.35
MLK Center	SF	4,512	0.14
Redding Aquatic Center	EA	1	3.00
Redding Aquatic Center Change House	SF	3,219	0.00
Redding Soccer Park	EA	1	25.00
Reginato River Access	EA	1	2.00
Rodeo Grounds	EA	1	12.00
Sculpture Park	EA	1	2.50
Senior Citizens Hall	SF	13,104	2.56
Teen Center	SF	2,004	0.07
Turtle Bay Boat Launch	EA	1	2.00
<b>Total Acres</b>			<b>86.47</b>

# **Appendix B - Large Neighborhood Park Construction Model**

Item Description	Quantity	Unit	Unit Cost	Total Cost
Clearing and Grading	5.5	Acre	\$26,690.90	\$146,799.95
Playground Equipment, 5-11 years, with Installation	1	LS	\$115,000.00	\$115,000.00
Engineered wood safety surface for playground equipment	500	CY	\$26.50	\$13,250.00
Full-court basketball, (50' x 84' court and 4 foot trim)	1	LS	\$84,342.92	\$84,342.92
Additional Amenities (bocce court, backstops, wall ball)	1	LS	\$44,348.54	\$44,348.54
Trash Receptacles, 55 gal, aggregate stone	6	Each	\$805.00	\$4,830.00
Concrete Benches, 6 ft. flat	6	Each	\$640.00	\$3,840.00
Concrete Picnic Shelter, 600 sq. ft., concrete floor	1	LS	\$80,000.00	\$80,000.00
Concrete Picnic Tables, 66 in. dia. round	8	Each	\$845.00	\$6,760.00
ADA Compliant Picnic Tables, 8 ft., concrete	4	Each	\$735.00	\$2,940.00
Drinking Fountains	2	Each	\$9,500.00	\$19,000.00
Bike Racks, 7 bike wave rack	2	Each	\$1,155.33	\$2,310.66
BBQ Grill, 300 sq. in enameled cooking surface	4	Each	\$550.00	\$2,200.00
Concrete Sidewalk (6 ft. wide)	6,818	SF	\$6.55	\$44,657.90
Asphalt Interior Trail	5,492	SF	\$6.05	\$33,226.60
Concrete Flatwork	8,656	SF	\$7.80	\$67,516.80
Decomposed Granite Trail Circuit, 4 ft. wide, perimeter	4,175	SF	\$2.50	\$10,437.50
12' Mow Strip, surrounding planting beds	400	LF	\$5.00	\$2,000.00
Irrigated Multi-Purpose Turf, 2 @ 200' x 300' minimum, each	127,970	Sq. Ft.	\$1.38	\$176,598.60
Ornamental Planting	8,000	Sq. Ft.	\$7.50	\$60,000.00
Other Ground / Slope Cover	45,000	Sq. Ft.	\$1.25	\$56,250.00
Monument Entry Sign / Kiosk	1	LS	\$4,500.00	\$4,500.00
Amended Soil Base, turf, planting beds and misc. ground	127,970	Sq. Ft.	\$0.49	\$62,705.30
Shade Trees, 15 gallons	75	Each	\$175.00	\$13,125.00
Permanent Rest Rooms (unisex)	1	Each	\$74,120.87	\$74,120.87
Water Supply	1	LS	\$23,088.00	\$23,088.00
Sewer Line	1	LS	\$10,296.00	\$10,296.00
Drainage	1	LS	\$16,432.00	\$16,432.00
Fencing	850	LF	\$36.17	\$30,744.50
Electrical	1	LS	\$10,400.00	\$10,400.00
Parking Lot (3" AC / 6" AB) Appx. 20 spaces	5,990	SF	\$11.50	\$68,885.00
Signage (Park Rules, Playground Rules, etc.)	6	Each	\$700.00	\$4,200.00
Mobilization (5 percent)	1	LS	\$65,000.00	\$65,000.00
<b>Total Construction (5.5 Acre Park)</b>				<b>\$1,359,806.14</b>
Utilities Fees @ 2% (Utility use, permits, connection fees)				\$27,196.12
Contingency @ 10%				\$135,980.61
Engineering / Design @ 11.5%				\$156,377.71
CM & Inspection @ 13%				\$176,774.80
City Administration @ 2.5%				\$33,995.15
Environmental @ 3%				\$40,794.18
Water Meter	1	LS	\$34,444.50	\$34,444.50
<b>Total Non-Construction (Soft Costs)</b>				<b>\$605,563.08</b>
<b>TOTAL COSTS (5.5 Acre Park)</b>				<b>\$1,965,369.22</b>
<b>TOTAL PARK DEVELOPMENT COST (By Acre)</b>				<b>\$357,339.86</b>

# **Appendix C - Trail Construction Cost Estimates**

**CITY OF REDDING**

**PRELIMINARY PROJECT COST ESTIMATE**

<b>PROJECT NAME</b>	Typical AC Trail	<b>ALTERNATE NO.</b>		<b>DATE:</b>	04/24/18
---------------------	------------------	----------------------	--	--------------	----------

<b>PROJECT DESCRIPTION:</b>
This project involves the construction of a typical asphalt concrete trail per the City of Redding Construction Standards and assumes a 1 mile length. Per CORCS Pg 635.00 in conjunction with Pg 111.00, assume an 10' wide path with a section of 2.5" AC/9" AB

<b>CLIENT:</b>	Parks and Recreation
----------------	----------------------

<b>QUANTITIES BY:</b>	CV
<b>QTY CHECKED BY:</b>	CV
<b>UNIT PRICES BY:</b>	CV

<b>JOB ORDER NO:</b>	
----------------------	--

CONTRACT ITEMS		UNIT	QUANTITY	PRICE	AMOUNT
1	Water Pollution Control	LS	1	5,000	5,000
2	Clear and Grub	AC	1.5	15,000	22,500
3	Excavation (Unclassified)	CY	2347	55	103,268
4	Aggregate Base	CY	1565	75	117,375
5	Asphalt Concrete	Ton	781	105	82,005
6	Shoulder Backing	LF	10560	3	31,680
7	Bollard (Folding)	EA	4	1,500	6,000
8	Miscellaneous Items -10%	LS	1	36,783	36,783
9	Drainage Improvements - 15%	LS	1	55,174	55,174
<b>SUBTOTAL (CONTRACT ITEMS)</b>					\$ 459,785.00
<b>CONTINGENCY 10%</b>					\$ 45,978.50
<b>CONSTRUCTION SUBTOTAL</b>					\$ 505,763.50
<b>(Environmental, Design, Plan Review, Permits, Surveys) PRELIMINARY ENGINEERING 20%</b>					\$ 91,957.00
<b>(Contract Admin., Inspecting, Testing, Staking) CONSTRUCTION ENGINEERING 15%</b>					\$ 68,967.75
<b>TOTAL</b>					\$ 666,688.25

**CITY OF REDDING**

**PRELIMINARY PROJECT COST ESTIMATE**

<b>PROJECT NAME</b>	Typical Natural Surface Trail	<b>ALTERNATE NO.</b>		<b>DATE:</b>	04/17/18
---------------------	-------------------------------	----------------------	--	--------------	----------

<b>PROJECT DESCRIPTION:</b>
This project involves the construction of a typical natural surface trail and assumes a 1 mile length. Per CORCS Pg 635.00, assume an 8' wide path with a section of 4" Decomposed Granite/6" AB

<b>CLIENT:</b>	Parks and Recreation
----------------	----------------------

<b>QUANTITIES BY:</b>	CV
<b>QTY CHECKED BY:</b>	CV
<b>UNIT PRICES BY:</b>	CV

<b>JOB ORDER NO:</b>	
----------------------	--

	<b>CONTRACT ITEMS</b>	<b>UNIT</b>	<b>QUANTITY</b>	<b>PRICE</b>	<b>AMOUNT</b>
1	Water Pollution Control	LS	1	5,000	5,000
2	Clear and Grub	AC	1.5	15,000	22,500
3	Excavation (Unclassified)	CY	1630	55	89,650
4	Aggregate Base	CY	782	75	43,988
5	Decomposed Granite	CY	521	115	44,936
6	Shoulder Backing	LF	10560	3	31,680
7	Bollard (Folding)	EA	4	1,500	6,000
8	Miscellaneous Items -10%	LS	1	24,375	24,375
9	Drainage Improvements - 15%	LS	1	36,563	36,563
<b>SUBTOTAL (CONTRACT ITEMS)</b>					\$ 304,692.19
<b>CONTINGENCY 10%</b>					\$ 30,469.22
<b>CONSTRUCTION SUBTOTAL</b>					\$ 335,161.41
<b>(Environmental, Design, Plan Review, Permits, Surveys) PRELIMINARY ENGINEERING 20%</b>					\$ 60,938.44
<b>(Contract Admin., Inspecting, Testing, Staking) CONSTRUCTION ENGINEERING 15%</b>					\$ 45,703.83
<b>TOTAL</b>					\$ 441,803.67

**CITY OF REDDING**

**PRELIMINARY PROJECT COST ESTIMATE**

<b>PROJECT NAME</b>	Typical Concrete Trail	<b>ALTERNATE NO.</b>		<b>DATE:</b>	04/24/18
---------------------	------------------------	----------------------	--	--------------	----------

<b>PROJECT DESCRIPTION:</b>
This project involves the construction of a typical concrete trail per the City of Redding Construction Standards and assumes a 1 mile length. Per CORCS Pg 635.00, assume a 12' wide path with a section of 6" PCC/3" CL2 AB

<b>CLIENT:</b>	Parks and Recreation
----------------	----------------------

<b>JOB ORDER NO:</b>	
----------------------	--

<b>QUANTITIES BY:</b>	CV
<b>QTY CHECKED BY:</b>	CV
<b>UNIT PRICES BY:</b>	CV

	<b>CONTRACT ITEMS</b>	<b>UNIT</b>	<b>QTY</b>	<b>PRICE</b>	<b>AMOUNT</b>
1	Water Pollution Control	LS	1	5,000	5,000
2	Clear and Grub	AC	1.5	15,000	22,500
3	Excavation (Unclassified)	CY	2053	55	112,915
4	Aggregate Base	CY	587	75	44,025
5	Concrete (6")	SF	63360	13	823,680
6	Shoulder Backing	LF	10560	3	31,680
7	Bollard (Folding)	EA	4	1,500	6,000
8	Miscellaneous Items -10%	LS	1	104,580	104,580
9	Drainage Improvements - 15%	LS	1	156,870	156,870
<b>SUBTOTAL (CONTRACT ITEMS)</b>					\$ 1,307,250.00
<b>CONTINGENCY 10%</b>					\$ 130,725.00
<b>CONSTRUCTION SUBTOTAL</b>					\$ 1,437,975.00
<b>(Environmental, Design, Plan Review, Permits, Surveys) PRELIMINARY ENGINEERING 20%</b>					\$ 261,450.00
<b>(Contract Admin., Inspecting, Testing, Staking) CONSTRUCTION ENGINEERING 15%</b>					\$ 196,087.50
<b>TOTAL</b>					\$ 1,895,512.50

**CITY OF REDDING  
PRELIMINARY PROJECT COST ESTIMATE**

<b>PROJECT NAME</b>	Typical Parking Lot	<b>ALTERNATE NO.</b>		<b>DATE:</b>	04/19/18
---------------------	---------------------	----------------------	--	--------------	----------

**PROJECT DESCRIPTION:**  
 This project involves construction of a typical parking area at a trailhead along with some of the typical amenities. Assume the surface is 2.5" AC / 9" AB. The cost per SF of Parking Lot is \$29,037/ 12,000 SF = \$24.20/SF

**CLIENT:** Parks and Recreation

<b>QUANTITIES BY:</b>	CV
<b>QTY CHECKED BY:</b>	CV
<b>UNIT PRICES BY:</b>	CV

**JOB ORDER NO:**

	<b>CONTRACT ITEMS</b>	<b>UNIT</b>	<b>QUANTITY</b>	<b>PRICE</b>	<b>AMOUNT</b>
1	Water Pollution Control	LS	1	5,000	5,000
2	Clear and Grub	AC	1	15,000	15,000
3	Excavation (Unclassified)	CY	463	55	25,465
4	Aggregate Base	CY	333	75	24,975
5	Asphalt Concrete	Tons	185	105	19,425
6	Shoulder Backing (1/2" minus)	CY	40	115	4,600
7	Traffic Stripe (Paint)	LF	580	3	1,740
8	Bollard (Folding)	EA	3	1,500	4,500
9	Gazebo	LS	1	100,000	0
10	Parking Lot Light Standard and Luminaire	EA	5	10,000	50,000
11	Drinking Fountain and Water Service	EA	1	9,500	9,500
12	Miscellaneous Items -10%	LS	1	16,021	16,021
13	Drainage Improvements - 15%	LS	1	24,031	24,031
<b>SUBTOTAL (CONTRACT ITEMS)</b>					\$ 200,256.25
<b>CONTINGENCY 10%</b>					\$ 20,025.63
<b>CONSTRUCTION SUBTOTAL</b>					\$ 220,281.88
<b>(Environmental, Design, Plan Review, Permits, Surveys) PRELIMINARY ENGINEERING 20%</b>					\$ 40,051.25
<b>(Contract Admin., Inspecting, Testing, Staking) CONSTRUCTION ENGINEERING 15%</b>					\$ 30,038.44
<b>TOTAL</b>					\$ 290,371.56