Development Impact Fee Calculation Nexus Report

For the
City of Ontario, California

July 15, 2022

Revenue & Cost Specialists

Serving Local Governments Since 1980

July 15, 2022

Honorable Mayor and City Council
Via Scott Ochoa, City Manager
City of Ontario
303 East "B" Street
Ontario, CA 91764

RE: Recalculation to the City's Development Impact Fee (DIF) Calculation and Nexus Report

Honorable Mayor, Council Members, and City Manager Ochoa:

The City's Development Impact Fee (DIF) Schedule, originally calculated in 2003, has been updated ten times over the 18-year period, nearly every two years since its first adoption. Those necessary updates were generally limited to changes in project costs based upon an appropriate cost index to keep the impact fees financially relevant. Most of the projects were updated by an appropriate cost inflation index but a number of projects were changed in complexity and/or fully recalculated. The land-use database originally used in 2012 Report was pursuant to The Ontario Plan (TOP) 2010 Update, and has not been updated since the adoption of the 2012 Report. Subsequently, this update differs in that the land-use database was updated to reflect the changes in potential development from vacant or underutilized to developed parcels based on the TOP 2050 Update. The City is to be congratulated for this commitment and the efforts of the many it took to do so.

Generally, this Report is a complete update of the City's previous update iterations of the City's "*Development Impact Fee Calculation and Nexus Report*". The nexus and logic within the Report has not changed however, every aspect of the original Report and subsequent updates has been updated. The Report indicates that the City has completed roughly 20% of the projects identified in original Report. That is not to say that the quality of data has not been improved. State-of-the-art and more sophisticated GIS data gathering abilities have increased the quality of data. The major modifications and/or types of modifications included in the 2021-22 update are as follows:

- The Land-use Database was fully recalculated using the City's existing advanced GIS data. This data has not been updated since the 2012 Report which was based upon the then "shape files" available at the time of preparation of the 2012 Report.

- Given the recalculation of the land-use database, this action necessitated an update to the City's Police and Fire/Rescue calls-for-service, also using the GIS based dispatch calls-for-service data. This data is not only more current but given the link between the City's Land-Use Parcel GIS data and the address-based calls-for-service, the resulting data is far more precise than the effort performed in 2012.

- Changes were made to the Fire Suppression/Rescue facility needs by adding a fourth bay to the four remaining stations to be constructed in the Ontario Ranch area. However, these fourth bays are intended for storage of all secondary, or reserve vehicles used in emergency operations throughout Ontario, thus the cost is spread over the entire City, including existing calls-for-service.

- In numerous infrastructure categories, the individual project cost amounts have been escalated by application of the change in an applicable cost index;

- In the Fire category, as well as the hard infrastructure categories (Circulation, Storm Drainage, Water and Sewer Utilities), numerous individual project cost estimates have been adjusted to reflect updated engineering estimates and/or actual costs;

- The per square foot construction cost of Quality of Life structures (pool buildings, community centers and libraries) were changed from estimates to the actual cost per square foot based upon the final costs for the construction of the Anthony Munoz Community Center.

- The cost per acre for Parks construction has been increased from $500,000 to $560,200;

- The cost per acre for land acquisition has been increased from $585,000 to $700,000;

- Outstanding credits (available) developer held "DIF Credits" in each infrastructure category were added as continued costs for projects that have not necessarily been constructed and/or paid for by the City. To assist in the creation of much needed infrastructure in the Ontario Ranch area, individual developers, many of whom constructed or acquired infrastructure capacity-increasing improvements, are eligible to receive DIF Credits (or payment) against future impact fees for any portion of the infrastructure that was above and beyond what would have been

their maximum calculated impact fee obligation. In short, numerous projects were financed or constructed by individual developers and they will ultimately expect repayment for that over-build via the DIF Credits that have been issued by the City. Pursuant to the City's DIF Program Policies, DIF Credits are available for use at permit issuance to off-set (reduce) the fee in the respective infrastructure category for which the DIF Credit was issued. The availability of credits decreases the amount of DIF revenue that the City will ultimately collect. Therefore, any outstanding DIF Credit amount that has been included in this Report's calculations within the DIF calculation methodology, was done so to establish the appropriate DIF fee schedule necessary to finance both the remaining infrastructure costs and total developer's DIF Credits at General Plan build-out. The incorporation of the outstanding DIF credits assists the City in recuperating additional DIF revenues in order to eliminate any City subsidy from the General Fund (or utility operating fund) for the long-term development of the Ontario Ranch area.

Revenue & Cost Specialists, L.L.C staff are ready to assist the City in any way that may be beneficial to the adoption of the new fees necessary to insure that the City can accommodate the private development of its many vacant acres at no cost to the existing community, either in actual costs-out-of-pocket or in the diminution of existing levels of service.

Sincerely,

Scott Thorpe
Senior Vice President

CITY OF ONTARIO
DEVELOPMENT IMPACT FEE CALCULATION AND NEXUS REPORT

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter 1 - Background and Introduction 1

Chapter 2 - Demographics and Findings 11
Proposed Development Impact Fees/Summary Schedules 25-28

Chapter 3 - Law Enforcement Facilities, Vehicles and Equipment 29

Chapter 4 - Fire Suppression Facilities, Vehicles and Equipment 39

Chapter 5 - Circulation (Streets, Signals and Bridges) System 54

Chapter 6 - Storm Drainage Collection Facilities 75

Chapter 7 - Water Source, Storage and Distribution System 90

Chapter 8 - Sewer Collection System 107

Chapter 9 - Refuse Collection Facilities and Equipment 119

Chapter 10 - General Facilities, Vehicles and Equipment 129

Chapter 11 - Library Facilities and Collection 137

Chapter 12 - Public Use (Community Center) Facilities 142

Chapter 13 - Aquatics Center Facilities 147

Chapter 14 - Park Land Acquisition and Facilities Development 151

Chapter 15 - Ontario Ranch Open Space Land Acquisition 161

Chapter 16 - Fiber Optic Telecommunication System 173

Appendix A - Summary of Recommendations 181

Appendix B - Expanded Land-use Database 184

Appendix C - City Yard Improvements Cost Estimates and Distribution 187

Appendix D - Regional/Local Adjacent DIF Distribution Worksheets 189

Appendix E - Major Four, Hard Infrastructure Costing Adjustments 209

Appendix F - AB-602 Considerations 223

Chapter 1
Background and Introduction

In 2000 the City of Ontario retained Revenue & Cost Specialists to undertake a comprehensive cost calculation of the City's development impact costs for two areas of the City. The two areas consisted of the more developed *General City (GC)* area and the largely undeveloped former dairy farm area referred to as *Ontario Ranch (OR)*. *Ontario Ranch* had been referred to as *New Model Colony* in previous reports but it was amended to *Ontario Ranch* in this 2017 update at the request of the Ontario Ranch Builders.

The development impact cost calculations are intended to identify the cost of accommodating continued development in both areas in such a fashion as to not decrease the levels of service currently enjoyed by the City's existing residents and businesses. The development impact cost calculations were then formalized as a set of Development Impact Fees (henceforth referred to as DIF) schedules by City Council. A periodic review and adjustment of the City's DIFs is appropriate and warranted in order to continue to ensure that the City collects sufficient monies to construct the additional infrastructure needed to accommodate the anticipated growth of new residents and businesses expected to be developed in the City. The resulting DIF schedules have been reviewed and amended periodically as estimated costs and capital needs have changed. As a result of this diligence, the DIF schedules have served the City well for many years. However, after twelve years of cumulative changes, the most significant being a General Plan amendment has resulting in greater OR densities, requires a full update of all development assumptions, estimated demands and capital project costs was prudent. For this and other reasons, the City has entered into the exhaustive effort to recalculate the amount of the existing and new DIFs.

This *Development Impact Fee Calculation and Nexus Report* effort remains consistent with the original 2002-03 Report's intent to include a significant amount of detail such as a complete list of all remaining 316 projects to be financed by the DIF schedules, by infrastructure. Each project has a corresponding detail page in the supporting *Master Facilities Plan,* which in turn tells the reader where additional information can be found regarding that project. Just over 59% of the projects identified in the City's *Master Facilities Plan* are supported by an infrastructure Master Plan (i.e. Water Master Plan). The remaining 41% of the *Master Facilities Plan* projects are either broader (i.e. total acres of parks to be constructed) or are based upon in-house studies or calculations by the City's infrastructure staff experts (i.e. fire station sizes/locations).

The *Master Facilities Plan* is a separate document which includes an expanded amount of information about each project for anyone wishing it, while allowing the *Development Impact Fee Calculation and Nexus Report* to remain more focused on the allocation and distribution of capital costs to the remaining new development. A *Master Facilities Plan* with this level of detail is generally not offered by other DIF consultants and the City is to be commended for recognizing the importance of this information to the reader and committed the effort in generating it. The combined *Development Impact Fee Calculation and Nexus Report* and the *Master Facilities Plan* offer greater information for the Council to make policy decisions, greater understanding by the development community, and an easier tracking (and updating) system for the staff.

The *Master Facilities Plan* also serves to inform the users that collected DIFs are committed per §66000 of the Government Code. The DIF receipts that are collected over five years (and kept in fund balances during that period) may not necessarily reach the level necessary to construct a needed project per the *Master Facilities Plan.* This does not mean the projects are no longer needed. The inclusion of those projects in the *Master Facilities Plan* indicates the continued importance of that project over time, certainly over a five year period.

The Importance of Capital Infrastructure. The Levels of Service (LOS) of any one City infrastructure is based (or limited) upon the capacity of that infrastructure to support the users, residents or businesses. The design of any municipal project has a finite capacity, such as a four lane road, a 30" storm drainage pipe or a 10,000 square foot library. Each is designed to meet the needs of a defined number of users. A street segment can only handle so many vehicles per hour, especially at a speed that makes it worth using for driving over longer distances. A storm drainage pipe that is 30" cannot handle storm flows twice its capacity. A library can hold just so many collection items and serve only so many residents, all the librarians in the world cannot make up for limited library space. A municipality with 0.40 square feet per resident of library space will be able to serve more residents than a municipality with only a 0.10 square feet standard per resident of library space. The following is a more precise example using law enforcement.

Consider the labor intensive service of law enforcement, regardless of the quality and capabilities of the City's sworn police officers, the Department remains highly dependent upon its infrastructure capacity. A police station of 7,500 square feet will have capacity to support roughly thirty sworn police officers at about 250 square feet per officer. If the station size remains the same at 7,500 square feet but the sworn compliment doubles to sixty police officers, the station will become exceedingly dysfunctional. The same holds true for police response vehicles and law enforcement specialty equipment. If a City adds thirty additional officers but cannot add station space, vehicles and specialty equipment, the City has dealt with only half of the service equation. They have achieved little.

Further, if you add 30 police officers:

- But do not add police response vehicles, the calls-for-services responses will be very poor.
- But no additional station space, the calls-for-services responses will be dysfunctional, and unpredictable.
- But do not provide the sworn officers with the required personal and specialty equipment; the calls-for-services responses will be dangerous, certainly for the police officer.

On the opposite side, if you add all of the above capital needs, but do not add additional sworn officers, the result would probably be limited to a minor improvement in response times.

Good municipal service takes a balance of staff and infrastructure. Of course, the DIFs can only be used for the capital acquisitions, the ongoing labor staffing costs will need to come from other sources.

PROPORTIONAL ANALYSIS

A helpful component of this Report is the proportional analysis of the infrastructure needs required to accommodate continued development of the City as compared to the existing infrastructure that has been generated through years of taxes and other contributions and currently serves the existing community. This proportional analysis is intended to recognize and reconcile the difference between the City's desired level of service required of new development, per statements in the various General Plan elements, with that of the *de-facto* or actual level of service provided to the existing community. The inclusion of the proportional analysis will assist the City Council in adopting a DIF structure that recognizes inter-generational equity and assists the Council in making the difficult policy decisions regarding the required capital additions needed to accommodate new development by increasing the lay-person's understanding of *fairness.*

The proportional analysis is important, if for no other reason, than for community inter-generational equity, i.e., fairness in the infrastructure investment that has been made by existing residents and businesses with those of new residents and businesses that wish to use the existing infrastructure. As an example, new development will be required to expand the number of arterial and collector lane miles in the City but new development also benefits from the immediate use of Euclid Avenue constructed so many years ago just as an existing citizen can use a newly constructed arterial street segment. In short, previous generations of businesses and residents have contributed to the development of the City infrastructure and this fact should be recognized by future residents and businesses by contributing a similar amount of capacity towards completing the various infrastructure systems.

It is one thing to identify the many public improvement projects needed through build-out. It is an entirely different thing to assume that all of the identified improvements are required to meet the demands of the new development. Clearly, some projects will be *replacements* of the existing infrastructure while others will be *capacity increasing* projects. Within the category of the latter, they may also be further classified into two categories;

1. Projects dealing with existing deficiencies, i.e., projects required regardless of whether there is additional development or not. An example would be a traffic intersection currently controlled by stop signs that currently meets traffic warrants for a traffic signal.

2. Projects required as a result of the need to accommodate future development. An example of this would be a signal that is currently controlled quite adequately by stop signs, but because of development in the near and *downstream* areas will ultimately need to be signalized.

This Report provides the documentation of the City's costs which serve as the basis for calculating DIFs. The updated DIF Schedules and related information can be found in Chapters 3 through 16 and Appendices A, B, C, D, E and F of this Report.

RCS staff has worked with Administrative Services, Police, Fire, I.T., Community Services, Development Services, Community and Public Services and the Utilities Department staff to

generate and review the supporting data which forms the calculation of Development Impact Fee schedules. The results of this review can be found on the schedules located at the end of each Chapter.

Development Impact Fee Structure. The General Plan provides a range of potential densities for residential development, as such, the DIFs for residential uses need to be calculated on a per dwelling unit basis to reflect more accurately the impacts from a specific development. For example, a property zoned as detached dwelling residential development may contain from three to six units per acre. If fees are calculated on an acreage basis, the developer proposing three units per acre will pay the same amount as a developer constructing six units per acre. Similarly, fees are calculated on a square footage basis for business (retail/service, office and industrial, etc.) parcels to reflect the impacts of different building intensities for these types of development. Some of the infrastructures have optional fee structure recommended for unusual developments, such as a parking structure, which in itself does not create demand beyond additional storm drainage run-off, where the structure required the additional parking does.

A second reason for the proposed DIF fee structure recommended in this Report involves the issue of building expansion or intensification of retail, office and industrial areas. For example, if a property owner of commercial or industrial property proposes an expansion to his building, the question exists about how to charge this proposed expansion for its impact on the City's streets, storm drainage system, and other infrastructures. A fee calculated on a building square footage basis simplifies this calculation.

CALCULATION OF DEVELOPMENT IMPACT FEES

In California, State legislation sets certain legal and procedural parameters for the charging of these fees. This legislation was passed as AB1600 by the California Legislature and is now codified as California Government Code Sections 66000 through 66009. This State law went into effect on January 1, 1989.

Government Code §66000 requires documentation of projects to be financed by Development Impact Fees prior to their levy and collection, and that the monies collected actually be committed within five years to a project of direct benefit to the development which paid the fees. Many states have such controlling statutes. Specifically, Government Code §66000 requires the following process:

1. Delineation of the **PURPOSE** of the fee.

2. Determination of the **USE** of the fee.

3. Determination of the **RELATIONSHIP** between the use of the fee and the type of development paying the fee.

4. Determination of the relationship between the **NEED** for the facility and the type of development project. **NOTE**: **Numbers 2 & 4 will be reversed throughout the**

chapters in this Report because it is apparent that *need* should be identified before *use*.

5. Determination of the relationship between the **AMOUNT** of the fee and the **COST** of the portion of the facility attributed to the specific development project.

This Report, with some additions, utilizes the basic methodology consistent with the above requirements of Government Code §66000. Briefly, the following steps were undertaken in the calculation of DIFs for the City:

1. Define the level of service desired within the General Plan area for each project or acquisition identified as necessary. In some areas, certain statistical measures are commonly used to measure or define an acceptable level of service for a category of infrastructure. Street intersections, for instance, are commonly rated based on a Level of Service scale of "A" to "F" developed by transportation engineers. Most agencies adopt a LOS of "C".

2. Review the Land use map and determine the existing mix of land uses and amount of undeveloped and developed land. The magnitude of growth and its impacts can thus be determined by considering this land use data when planning needed infrastructure. This inventory can be found in Table 2-1 in Chapter 2 and Appendix B.

3. Identify all additions to the capital facilities or equipment inventory necessary to maintain the identified levels of service in the area. Then, determine the cost of those additions. An infrastructure *Master Plan* is the highest form of data.

4. Identify a level of responsibility, identifying, as termed in this Report, the relative need (or as referred to in the accompanying schedules as "PERCENT NEED") for the facility or equipment necessary to accommodate "growth" as defined, and as opposed to current needs.

5. Distribute the costs identified as a result of development growth on a basis of land use. Costs are distributed between each land use based on their relative use, or *nexus,* of the capital system. For example, future street costs were distributed to each land use based on their trip generation characteristics.

OTHER ASSUMPTIONS OF THE REPORT

In addition to the land use assumptions contained in the next Chapter of this Report, other important assumptions of this study include the following:

"Normal" Subdivision Improvements Omitted. "Local" public improvements generally associated with and identified as being the sole responsibility of the developer through the subdivision or development review process are not included in either of the project lists or consequent calculations. This type of "on site" and immediately adjacent improvement would include all such capital construction within the boundaries of any development, such as street lights, curb, gutter, sidewalks, neighborhood streets and all local utility pipes. These improvements would continue to be the direct responsibility of the developer, with or without the addition of DIFs.

Land Acquisition Costs. Land acquisition cost estimates have been developed after discussions with City officials over recent acquisitions or current negotiations. Arguments for higher or lower costs can be made; however, the herein contained per acre amounts appear to be the most appropriate current figure for the purposes of this study. Land costs for parks, the largest land acquisition effort in this report, have not been altered from the last (2010) update. However, City finance staff has indicated that land acquisition costs will be reviewed annually to adjust for the marked swings that can occur to land acquisition costs, as opposed to the more historically predictable construction costs.

Exclusion/Rejection of Any Type of "Credit" for Undeveloped Land. It has been argued by some that a credit for capital-related revenues, such as gas taxes, should be made against the DIFs calculated or imposed by a city. Using the state gas tax as an example, proponents of a DIF credit argue that a city will receive increased annual gas taxes because of the additional population generated by future residential development. It is therefore argued that a developer should receive a credit for any associated gas tax revenues collected as a result of the residents or businesses that occupy the new dwellings against any Circulation DIF imposed by the City based on either of two separate arguments.

The first argument for a gas tax credit supposes that the additional gas taxes created by residential development are used to pay for the maintenance of existing streets, which is the responsibility of existing development. Since the new streets constructed via DIFs will not require rehabilitation or reconstruction for another 10 to 20 years, the gas tax generated by new development is therefore a windfall to the City and should be credited against the DIF. What this argument fails to consider is that any new resident or business to the City will begin to contribute immediately to the use and deterioration of all City streets. A cursory review of City finances will reveal that the portion of the State gas tax received by cities falls far short of meeting the City's needed street improvements and repairs in any given year. The gas taxes *generated* by new development simply cannot meet the maintenance costs of either the new streets associated with the development or the existing streets which the new resident uses on a daily basis.

The second argument proposes that the developer pays his full share of constructing new roads when he pays the City's Circulation System Development Impact Fee and that the gas taxes generated by the additional residents in a development are unfairly used to make improvements to the existing street system. It is most cities experience that gas taxes are barely adequate to meet streets-related operational costs, and if they are sufficient to meet these costs, the remainder is used for capital-related maintenance projects.

For these reasons, credits of existing operational revenues are not considered for Circulation System DIFs in this Report. A similar discussion can be made for the other fees considered herein, and therefore no credits against any such fees are included in this calculation of development impact costs.

Appropriate Expansion. Debt service is a reasonable cost of construction of many, but not necessarily all, public facilities and infrastructure. The following example illustrates this. DIFs are collected in incremental amounts, but facilities are not expanded in those same incremental amounts. As an example, a community center fee, based upon a standard of 1.2 square feet per detached dwelling residence, may be collected for each residential dwelling in the City, but after collecting the fee for a 100-unit subdivision, it would be impractical to expand the community center 120 square feet. Fees are collected, placed in a separate fund, generating interest until such a time that a 2,000 to 3,000 square foot expansion is possible. During that build-up time, the community center will experience some temporary overcrowding as the standard drops from 1.2 S.F./dwelling to about 0.9 S.F./dwelling. This "temporary overcapacity" clearly may be an inconvenience, bringing about some crowding and an increased unavailability for rental or reservation until enough DIFs have been collected for a practical expansion to bring the community center facility back up to the original standard. In short, a development of 120 residences may be brought "on-line" (occupancy permit) and bring about a temporary reduction in community center facility standards without endangering the citizen's health and safety.

However, such a *temporary overcapacity* in storm water collection is not possible without the potential for damage to both private and public property. Capacity for the collection/removal of storm water must be available prior to the construction that increases the impervious surface (and thus storm water run-off) of the parcel. If the local storm collection line is currently at capacity (peak or otherwise), no additional units may be brought on line until additional collection capacity can be created. Again, there is a practical size of an addition to construct and it is not likely practical for developers to wait until there is enough added demand (and fees) to pay for the facility addition. As a result, financing through some type of debt instrument may be the only alternative. Circumstances vary from city to city as to what facility expansions are critical and which can absorb temporary overcapacity for limited periods of time.

Financing Costs. Since financing costs reflect an actual, and generally significant, outlay of funds for an agency, they would be included in the project costs where debt financing was required due to the immediacy of the need for the facility or infrastructure to show the full costs of such facility or infrastructure and insure that new development also pays its "fair share" of these costs. These costs, if any, would be referenced in the *Master Facilities Plan* project detail page. Financing should only be included for facilities where, based upon staff's estimate, the immediacy of need for the facility requires debt financing. Or in the alternative, should financing be entered into on a facility, the impact fees should be recalculated to reflect those actual costs. In such cases, the debt service payments would be discounted to today's cost to account for the diminishing value of the dollar and would be in keeping with the cost methodology used in this study to show projects in current costs. To consider the face value of bond payments when determining costs, on the other hand, would be inaccurate as it would treat the value of a dollar today the same as the value of a dollar twenty years from now. Such an approach would tend

to overvalue the costs of debt service requirements and therefore cause an agency to overcharge on its DIFs. However, no project within this DIF Report contains debt service.

OTHER ISSUES

There are those who claim that the addition of DIFs unfairly creates an inflated resale price for existing residences. The argument is that if the public agency adopts a $20,000 to $25,000 development impact fee per detached dwelling, then the price for an existing dwelling is *artificially* increased by the same amount. We will use the example of a detached dwelling detached unit that cost the developer $200,000 to construct and complete to a point that the occupancy permit is approved.

Full Cost of a Residential Dwelling. The $200,000 represents only the above ground costs. The true and actual cost of a new dwelling is the cost of acquiring the parcel, necessary government approvals and permits, construction supplies, labor, debt service on the above, on-site [1] public improvements, and the cost of extending public services to that dwelling.

These public service extension costs include (but are not limited to:

- The addition of law enforcement personnel requiring the expansion of the police station, response vehicles and specialty equipment.
- Additional fire stations, response vehicles and specialty rescue equipment.
- Widening of road segment of traffic arterials, collectors, bridge and additional signals.
- Additional capacity in downstream storm drainage collection pipes and the treatment of storm water.
- Additions to water delivery capability, including source, treatment, storage and delivery.
- Additions to the sewage capability, including collection, treatment and disposal.
- Additions to the maintenance capabilities (i.e., municipal corporation yard and maintenance vehicles) necessary to maintain the above added infrastructure.
- Additional library, aquatics center, public meeting and developed park space for recreational/social purposes.

Thus while the cost of constructing the above ground portion of a detached dwelling unit may be $200,000, the previously identified "downstream" costs may be in the area of $20,000 to $25,000 per detached dwelling unit or in the area of 10% to 12% of the above ground cost.

[1] On-site improvements include local streets and medians, curbs and gutters, sewer lines, water lines, street lights, storm gutter or drainage pipes, electrical power lines and all of the other requirements of the City's development code on privately-held developments, hence the reference of "On-site".

If this argument is not clear, picture a 2,800 square foot detached dwelling, costing $200,000 to construct the above ground structure, located in the middle of an empty square mile, no roads, no utility service, no public safety response, no flood control and no recreational facilities. What is the market value of this detached dwelling? Probably not even the $200,000 that it cost to construct the structure. All of a sudden, the $20,000 impact fee for the infrastructure needed to support that one residential unit and this seems like a bargain. In short, new development needs an existing system of municipal infrastructure to hook up to.

Thus, the true and complete *cost* of a new detached dwelling unit is the cost of constructing the structure and the cost of extending the municipal services to the dwelling regardless of who pays for the actual costs of extending those services. To some degree these service-related infrastructure costs have been recognized, the only question remaining is who should for pay them, existing or new residents?

Effect on Market Price. Again, let us assume that a cumulative $20,000 to $25,000 impact fee imposed upon *new* detached dwelling construction increases the market price of an *existing* detached dwelling unit. Wouldn't this just be the recognition that the existing detached dwelling already has those physical links to the municipal services? A slightly different way of looking at this argument is that the existing family residences each have a "share" in a municipal corporation[2] and the share is valued at the cost of the connection to the various municipal utilities, transportation system, flood protection and public safety. It is a logical step then to require any newly constructed detached dwelling to purchase a "share" at an equal cost.

CHAPTER ORGANIZATION

Within each "hard infrastructure" Chapter (Chapters Three through Eight and Ten) there will be a minimum of three and a maximum of four cost/fee tables. They will be:

The first schedule, the ***Allocation of Project Cost Estimates*** identifies the projects, their costs and the relationship, in an allocation percentage, to future development. These schedules will begin with the number x.1 as in 3.1, 4.1, 5.1 etc.).

GC – Minimum Needs-based Impact Fee - This schedule will calculate the DIF schedule that would need to be adopted to meet the minimal capital needs identified in the Report (on the second schedule at the end of the Chapter, i.e., 3.2, 4.2, 5.2 etc.) for that infrastructure but limited to the General City needs. Strictly speaking this schedule is a calculation of the development impact **costs**, suitable to be adopted as development impact **fees**, by the legislative body, in this case the Ontario City Council

With adoption of this level of DIFs, one could claim that new development is occurring without any additional cost to the existing residents and businesses. You could not, however, necessarily claim that new development is paying its fair share.

2 Not unlike a private corporation.

Existing Community Financial Commitment Comparison This schedule, while not an impact fee calculation, identifies the cost (in current nominal dollar value) of the existing infrastructure, including land, physical improvements and capital equipment. The distribution of this replacement value equity total over the existing developed community is the average amount that has been invested by the current community of residents and businesses and is a good indication, or comparison, with what could be imposed upon new development. This financial commitment will be expressed in terms of the cost to construct or acquire the assets at current replacement costs. Significant differences between this schedule and the GC Minimum Needs-based DIF rate schedule would certainly be worth additional analysis. These Schedules would be numbered 3.3, 4.3, 5.3, etc.

If the average equity (for a detached dwelling for example) on this *Existing Commitment Financial Commitment Comparison* Table is greater than the average cost on the previous *Minimum Needs-based* Table, then that infrastructure system is front-ended with more of the system, say 80% of it has been constructed while only at 50% of General Plan build-out and it likely has excess capacity at that point in time. The excess capacity is the result of earlier residents and businesses of the community having put more of the system into place than will be necessary by the remaining un-built portions of the community. The existing community has advanced money to build capacity into the infrastructure system to meet the needs of residents and businesses not yet there. This table is intended to be instructive rather than legal.

OR Minimum Needs-based Impact Fee - This schedule will identify the DIFs that would need to be adopted to meet the basic capital needs identified in the Report for that infrastructure but limited to the Ontario Ranch needs. Given the nearly complete vacancy of the existing parcels in the area and that new private development will install or pay for all required public improvements, one could claim that new development is indeed paying its *fair share.*

Distribution of Existing Impact Fee Fund Balance. The existing City-wide DIFs have a combined Fund Balance of $76.3 million (reserved separately by infrastructure and by the GC/OR areas) and each was created to finance various infrastructure needed as new residents and businesses locate in newly created residential dwellings and buildings. Some of the DIF funds have a positive balance and some a negative balance. There are no specific restrictions on the monies, beyond the restriction that they be used on improvements within the Fund title and committed within a five-year time frame. The *Master Facilities Plan,* when adopted, suffices for that commitment.

Use of Textual Acronyms. *Development Impact Fees* will henceforth often be referred to as **DIFs.** *General City* will often be referred to as **GC** and *Ontario Ranch* will often be referred to as **OR.** The *Master Facilities Plan* will often be referred to as the **MFP**.

END OF CHAPTER TEXT

Chapter 2
Demographics and Findings

This Chapter represents the beginning and end of the DIF calculation process. It begins with an inventory of fully developed, undeveloped and under-developed units and acreage within the City and concludes with a summary of recommended DIF schedules with detailed infrastructure explanations in the following chapters of this Report. This 2021-22 update includes a significant GIS-based recalculation of the Land Use Database (Table 2-1) on page 14. This had not been undertaken in over 10 years and has had an effect on the anticipated demands and project costs.

LAND USE ASSUMPTIONS

This Report contains an inventory of fully developed, undeveloped and underdeveloped land within the City limits of Ontario and is based upon the City's most recent General Plan update. The *Undeveloped* and the *Underdeveloped* delta land inventory, identified as *Potential Development,* combine to form the base for the distribution of the estimated costs of the service-expanding capital projects necessary to accommodate that same anticipated development. Without the expansion projects, the City would be unable to accommodate that new development, effectively halting it. The *developed* land inventory forms the base for distributing the replacement cost of the existing infrastructure. This action provides the basis for comparison with the proposed DIF schedules and for the *de facto* identification of the many existing Levels of Service (LOS) currently provided by the City's existing infrastructure which is conservatively valued at between $2.0 and $3.0 billion.

In January 2010, the City Council adopted The Ontario Plan (TOP), a General Plan update setting forth a new vision for the City over the next 30 years. The vision included the densification and intensification of existing land uses in key growth areas of the City, focusing in the I-10 corridor and the Ontario Ranch. The vision incorporated modifications that effect the Development Impact Fee formulation including, but not limited to, the following:

1. Several land use categories were combined into one category and/or were eliminated (Airport Industrial, East Holt Study Area, Planned Commercial, Planned Industrial, etc.);

2. New land use categories were introduced with TOP adoption, including High Density Residential and Business Park;

3. Residential densities were increased in the growth areas. Previously, the highest density allowed was up to 25 units per acre for the majority of areas, with a few small areas achieving 60 units per acre (downtown apartments). TOP provides a new density range for High Density Residential up to 45 dwelling units per acre and, in the Mixed Use designation, densities up to 125 dwelling units per acre; and

4. Floor Area Ratios (FAR) were increased in commercial, office and industrial categories.

Table 2-1, is the resulting inventory of all private land uses contained within the current City limits split by what are referred to as General City and Ontario Ranch (essentially the area of the City that is south of Riverside Drive) and are based on the General Plan's land use inventory, a staff analysis of privately held parcels in both of the General City area and the Ontario Ranch area.

Table 2-1 consists of three horizontal blocks of information from the top to the bottom, they are:

Total - Land-use Database – General City and Ontario Ranch - This block of information identifies the amount of developed and undeveloped land in terms of acres and units for the City's entire City limits and is the sum of the two areas identified following.

Land-use Database within the City's General City Area - Net This block of information identifies the existing development and development opportunities within the General City area of the City in terms of acres and appropriate units. The information in the *Existing Development* column will be used to identify the current investment to compare the proportionality of the proposed DIFs as previously described in Chapter One. The *Potential Development* column will be used to distribute the cost of infrastructure improvements needed to accommodate development in the General City area to those generating the need for those same improvements. The area is the sum of three General City Sub-areas (detailed in Appendix B). The three sub areas include, *GC-Existing Vacant*, *GC–Demolition* and *GC–Redeveloped* with the final two representing the demolition of existing private structure and the rebuilding of new private structure with a net increased amount of units or square feet.

40% Redevelopment. Extensive development has taken place in the GC over the past 30 years. Based on the previously adopted general plans, development was capped at a lower intensity/density than envisioned by TOP. As a result, many properties are considered underutilized by today's standards. In order to achieve ultimate build-out identified in TOP, many of the industrial sites would have to be razed and re-built to current FAR levels. Given the building life cycles, financing, and investments made to date, that level of recycling is not practical for the foreseeable future. As a result, staff has reviewed the information and considered 40% redevelopment as a reasonable factor for the planning period.

Land-use Database within the City's Ontario Ranch Area - The Undeveloped column will be used to distribute the cost of infrastructure improvements needed to accommodate development in the Ontario Ranch area of the City to those generating the need for (and benefitting from) those same improvements. There will be no proportionality analysis for Ontario Ranch area due to the special circumstance based upon its annexation in November 1999 to the City for purposes of accommodating development of this eight to nine square mile area.

Since it is a matter of merely accommodating the private development of vacant land, the City has little if any reason to create any additional deficiencies in its GC infrastructure by expending already limited City revenue resources on new infrastructure. Additionally, there

may be some higher LOS standards applied to the Ontario Ranch area than the existing General City area, due to more current technologies, and only the Ontario Ranch development community will accrue the benefit of those higher standards. An example would be the recycled water efforts.

OR Expanded Units. As mentioned previously, the adoption of The Ontario Plan introduced the densification and intensification of land uses in the OR. Previously, the General Plan estimated 54,428 residential units with an average maximum density of 17.1 dwelling units per acre. TOP approval increased the density up to 23 dwelling units per acre in the Medium Density Residential category and provided densities up to 30 dwelling units per acre in the High Density /Mixed Use categories. The Ontario Ranch area will generate approximately 71.4% (or 179,426) of the anticipated 251,302 additional residents at General Plan Build-out.

A greater level of land use database detail is available in Appendix B – Expanded Land-use Database.

[This space required to place the entire Table 2-1 on one page]

Table 2-1
Detailed Land Use Inventory

Total - Land-use Database General City & Ontario Ranch	Existing Development		Potential Development		Total General Plan Build-out	
	Acres	# of Units	Acres	# of Units	Acres	# of Units
Detached Dwellings	6,328	31,997	1,685	12,793	8,013	44,790
Attached Dwellings	722	13,097	1,499	32,372	2,221	45,469
High Density Dwellings	193	4,812	1,037	34,889	1,230	39,701
Mobile Home Dwellings	204	2,097	14	95	218	2,192
Commercial Lodging Units	143	5,810	12	546	155	6,356
Retail/Service Uses	487	18,522,286	1,271	13,916,010	1,758	32,438,296
Office Uses	310	9,959,192	936	23,565,934	1,246	33,525,126
Business Park Uses	777	10,271,628	769	16,922,869	1,546	27,194,497
Industrial Uses	6,890	112,134,057	1,110	47,631,804	8,000	159,765,861
Private Institutional Use	419	2,318,711	52	1,132,560	471	3,451,271
Total - City Limits	**16,473**		**8,385**		**24,858**	
Private Residences	**7,447**	**52,003**	**4,235**	**80,149**	**11,682**	**132,152**
Commercial Lodging Rooms	**143**	**5,810**	**12**	**546**	**155**	**6,356**
Business Square Feet	**8,883**	**153,205,874**	**4,138**	**103,169,177**	**13,021**	**256,375,051**

Land-use Database within City's General City Area - Net	Existing Development		Potential Development		Total General Plan Build-out	
	Acres	# of Units	Acres	# of Units	Acres	# of Units
Detached Dwellings	4,733	27,449	262	1,131	4,995	28,580
Attached Dwellings	641	12,050	183	2,688	824	14,738
High Density Dwellings	193	4,812	598	21,807	791	26,619
Mobile Home Dwellings	204	2,097	14	95	218	2,192
Commercial Lodging Units	143	5,810	3	150	146	5,960
Retail/Service Uses	477	18,418,611	992	8,164,415	1,469	26,583,026
Office Uses	310	9,959,192	822	20,895,746	1,132	30,854,938
Business Park Uses	741	9,587,138	341	6,969,626	1,082	16,556,764
Industrial Uses	6,610	106,400,598	441	30,650,125	7,051	137,050,723
Private Institutional Use	419	2,318,711	2	43,560	421	2,362,271
Sub-total - General City	**14,471**		**3,658**		**18,129**	

Land-use Database within City's Ontario Ranch Area	Existing Development		Potential Development		Total General Plan Build-out	
	Acres	# of Units	Acres	# of Units	Acres	# of Units
Detached Dwellings	1,595	4,548	1,423	11,662	3,018	16,210
Attached Dwellings	81	1,047	1,316	29,684	1,397	30,731
High Density Dwellings	-	0	439	13,082	439	13,082
Mobile Home Dwellings	-	0	-	0	-	0
Commercial Lodging Units	-	0	9	396	9	396
Retail/Service Uses	10	103,675	279	5,751,595	289	5,855,270
Office Uses	-	0	114	2,670,188	114	2,670,188
Business Park Uses	36	684,490	428	9,953,243	464	10,637,733
Industrial Uses	280	5,733,459	669	16,981,679	949	22,715,138
Private Institutional Use	-	0	50	1,089,000	50	1,089,000
Sub-total - Ontario Ranch	**2,002**		**4,727**		**6,729**	

DIF Land-use Types Definitions. This Report classifies private development into one of four residential *DIF Land-use Types* or one of six different business-based *DIF Land-use Types.* For purposes of the Report, the term *DIF Land-use Type* will refer to one of the ten broad types under which the City's specifically defined zoning code *land-uses* will fall into. These *DIF Land-use Types* are defined following:

Residential Land Uses:

- **Detached Dwelling Units** - This DIF Land-use Type is generally defined as a detached unit and corresponds to an allowable use within the City's land-use designation of ***Rural Residential (RR), Low Density Residential (LDR)*** and limited amounts of ***Low/Medium Density Residential (LMDR)***. This category would include the construction of the unusual detached condominium or detached townhome and a manufactured unit on an individual lot.

- **Attached Dwelling Units** – This larger category consists of apartments, townhomes, condominiums or any other living unit that is attached to any other unit. It generally corresponds to an allowable land-use designation of ***Low-Medium Density Residential (LMDR)*** and ***Medium Density Residential (MDR)***. Some of the residential units proposed within ***Mixed Use (MU)*** development could be expected in this DIF Land-use Type.

- **High Density Residential Units** - Corresponds to the City's land-use designations of ***High Density Residential (HDR)***. This is a new DIF Land-use Type from the 2001 Report and was included due to rising increase in construction of such units typically around 25 to 30 units per acre. Some of the residential units proposed within ***Mixed Use (MU)*** development could be expected in this DIF Land-use Type.

- **Mobile Home Dwelling Residential Units** - This DIF Land-use Type encompasses portions of ***Medium Density Residential*** land-use designation in the Zoning Code. No applications for this type is anticipated, but given the number of existing mobile home parks, the calculation was included for purposes of the proportional analysis.

  It is important to note that the removal of one existing manufactured unit (or existing mobile home dwelling) and the replacement with a similar dwelling does not constitute a DIF imposition event, it is merely a replacement of existing demand. The construction of the mobile unit pad is the DIF imposition event. No such units are expected in the City's OR area so no such category was calculated.

Business/Commerce Land Uses:

- **Commercial Lodging** (keyed) **Units** - This *DIF Land-use Type* corresponds to a limited portion (as an allowable use) generally within some business use

designations such as ***Mixed Use (MU)***, ***General Commercial (GC)***, ***Office Commercial (OC)*** and completely within the ***Hospitality (HOS)*** designation.

- **Retail/Service Uses** - As utilized in this Report, Commercial uses include the general type of retail services and thus includes outlets ranging from restaurants to auto repair shops to shopping centers. This category includes the ***Neighborhood Commercial (NC)***, ***General Commercial (GC)*** and the ***Office Commercial (OC)*** zones and in some cases the ***Hospitality (HOS)*** designation.

- **Office Uses** - As utilized in this Report, Office uses would include the general category of professional and medical office. This category includes the ***General Commercial (GC)***, ***Office Commercial (OC)*** and ***Business Park (BP)*** zone.

- **Business Park Uses** - This *DIF Land-use Type* is largely limited to the single ***Business Park (BP)*** land-use zone.

- **Industrial/Manufacturing Uses** - This *DIF Land-use Type* contains all businesses engaged in heavy manufacturing or industrial development in the single ***Industrial (IND)*** zone.

- **Institutional Uses** - This *DIF Land-use Type*, based upon the specific use, may be approved in just about any of the City's previously mentioned zones. It consists of private schools, private meeting places, places of worship and similar private facilities

Definitions of DIF Application Categories Status. For each of the DIF land-use categories detailed above and on Table 2-2, acreage is categorized as either *Existing Development* or *Potential Development*. Definitions regarding the status of each land use are as follows:

Existing Development Acres/Units – This column title reference identifies land in the City which is developed or land which has received a building permit but may not yet be constructed. Acreage in this category may include non-conforming use areas of the City which contain extensive development prior to an annexation or before changes to the General Plan were made.

Development Opportunities Acres/Units - Refers to all non-public vacant acreage located within the City. This category also includes any vacant parcel and 40% of those anticipated to be redeveloped and upsized in the long-term future or any large parcels with some development on it with subdivision opportunities. Table 2-2, following, is a summary of Appendix B.

Table 2-2 provides a summary of the detailed land use inventory, limited to privately held property, provided on Table 2-1. Staff's land use inventory reveals that there are presently 16,473 acres of privately-held developed land within the City's current City boundaries. Conversely, there remain 8,385 acres of vacant or substantially undeveloped land in the City, with most of it, some 4,727 acres, in Ontario Ranch. Acreage designated for Detached Dwelling development constitutes the greatest amount (17.0%) of vacant acreage of all the land uses.

Table 2-2
City of Ontario's General City and Ontario Ranch Areas
Summary of Developed and Potential Development Acreage

DIF Land-use Type	Existing Developed Parcels	% of Total Private Acres	Development Opportunity Parcels	% of Total Private Acres	Total Private Acres
Detached Dwelling Units	6,328	25.5%	1,685	6.7%	8,013
Attached Dwelling Units	722	2.9%	1,499	6.0%	2,221
High Density Dwelling Units	193	0.8%	1,037	4.2%	1,230
Mobile Home Dwelling Units	204	0.8%	14	0.1%	218
Commercial Lodging Units	143	0.6%	12	0.0%	155
Retail/Service Uses	487	2.0%	1,271	5.1%	1,758
Office Uses	310	1.2%	936	3.8%	1,246
Business Park Uses	777	3.1%	769	3.1%	1,546
Industrial Uses	6,890	27.7%	1,110	4.5%	8,000
Institutional Uses	419	1.7%	52	0.2%	471
Total Acres	16.473	66.3%	8,385	33.7%	24,858

POPULATION PROJECTIONS

A second component in determining the magnitude of impact of future development and the necessary facilities needed to mitigate that impact is a realistic assessment of the build-out population of the City. Many of the facilities contained in this Report are sized according to either the estimated population at theoretical "build-out" or upon service levels which are based in part upon an estimation of the population to be served. Library facilities, parks and recreation facilities and community center facilities and equipment are examples of cost areas which rely heavily on population projections to determine space and facility needs. Park standards are usually stated in terms of the number of acres of park land per 1,000 persons, for instance.

There are at least two generally accepted methods for projecting future population levels in a City: (A) past growth trends projected forward and (B) population holding capacity based on the General Plan land-use element. Each of these methods can be useful even though both possess certain limitations.

There are several serious flaws in projecting the build-out population of a community using the past growth trends methodology. While this method is relatively simple and therefore easy for the general public to understand, it does not give consideration to when an area is actually built out. Eventually there comes a point in time where the amount of available land to build on is negligible. This technique does not help explain when that point is reached.

Also, the past growth trends approach is not sensitive to policy changes made by Council or land use issues contained in the City's General Plan. For these reasons, this technique is more

useful in projecting short-term population levels and should not be used to forecast the built-out population of an area.

This Report relies on the methodology of ***holding-capacity*** (described in the following section) to project future service levels and facility requirements.

Holding Capacity Analysis. The methodology used in this Report to forecast the built-out population of Ontario is the current holding capacity approach. This method calculates the sum of existing development and potential development allowable under current land use regulations, using average densities found in the City.

The first step in projecting the City's population using the holding capacity approach is to inventory the remaining undeveloped acres within the City limits, which was previously accomplished in Tables 2-1 and 2-2 of this Chapter. The next step is to estimate the potential dwelling units allowed per acre and then multiply the potential number of units by the average number of residents per unit.

The number of persons per unit for new residential units is based on the 2000 U.S. Census and ranges from 3.806 and 3.373 persons for detached dwellings and attached dwelling respectively High density dwelling units have 2.669 persons per unit and there are 3.175 persons in each mobile home dwelling unit. The 2000 Census data was selected over the recently released 2010 Census due to a change in reporting the data, eliminating the same calculation and some conflicting data. Additionally, the results of the 2010 census were impacted by the economic factors of the time which appears to have increased dwelling density data temporarily higher.

Based on these 2000 Census dwelling density data, future residential development can be expected to generate somewhere from 240,519 to 251,302 additional residents (3) to the City of Ontario, joining the 182,004 citizens already living in City, resulting in a total estimated population at build-out (based upon the inclusion of existing City limits) of approximately 427,915 residents. The higher number is based upon full occupancy of all new dwelling units and the lower figure is based upon the historical occupancy levels at the time of the census count. The 427,915 is the average of the two.

Table 2-4 following uses the additional housing projected in the Land-use Database and estimates the additional potential population for the City of Ontario through build-out for both Old and Ontario Ranch. The number of potential new dwelling units was calculated by multiplying the amount of vacant acreage for each land use zone by the average densities (i.e., number of units allowed per acre) indicated in the City's General Plan.

The estimated General Plan build-out population of 427,915 (average between high and low) or more residents using this holding capacity approach is typically lower than the population forecasts based on the mathematical models described previously. This implies that either the City's period of residential build-out will actually take 25 to 30 years or that the City's growth rate will increase from recent historical levels. Given that the Ontario Ranch area has some 4,727 net acres to develop, this latter scenario is probably more likely to occur. As the residentially

[3] Depending upon the vacancy factor based upon the average of 96.4% for all residences.

zoned land remaining to be developed continues to be built on during the next thirty years, the City is likely to see the number of new dwelling units developed decrease each year.

[This space left vacant to place the following table on a single page].

Table 2-3
City of Ontario
Average Dwelling Occupancy, by Type
(2000 United States Census Data)

Existing Residential	Total Units	Vacant Units	Occupied Units	Total Number of Occupants	Average Occupancy	Percentage Occupied
Detached Dwelling Units						
Detached Dwellings	26,739	617	26,122	99,423	3.806	97.69%
Attached Dwelling Units						
Attached Dwelling Units	3,628	260	3,368	12,382	3.676	92.83%
Duplex to Quadplex Units	3,955	123	3,832	14,038	3.663	96.89%
Five to Forty-nine Units	5,904	429	5,475	16,338	2.984	92.73%
Average	13,487	812	12,675	42,758	3.373	93.98%
High Density Dwelling Units						
Fifty or More Units	3,104	102	3,002	8,012	2.669	96.71%
Mobile Home Dwelling Units						
Mobile Home/Trailer	1,989	125	1,864	5,918	3.175	93.72%
Other Dwelling Units						
Other Dwelling Units	75	15	60	110	1.833	80.00%
Existing - State Department of Finance 01/01/21 Population, (2022 not available)						**182,004**

G.P. Build-out Population At Historic Occupancy Rates	*Anticipated Units*	*Occupancy Rate*	*Probable Occupancy*	*Dwelling Density*	*Anticipated Population*	
Potential Detached Dwellings	12,793	97.69%	12,497	3.806	47,564	
Potential Attached Dwellings	32,372	93.98%	30,423	3.373	102,617	
Potential High Density Dwellings	34,889	96.71%	33,741	2.669	90,055	
Potential Mobile Home Dwellings	95	93.72%	89	3.175	283	
Population to be Added Via Development at Historic Occupancy Rates					240,519	240,519
Current State of California Department of Finance Population						182,004
Potential "Build-out" Population, at Historic Vacancy Rates.						422,523

G.P. Build-out Population At 100% Occupancy Rate	*Anticipated Units*	*Occupancy Rate*	*Probable Occupancy*	*Dwelling Density*	*Anticipated Population*	
Potential Detached Dwellings	12,793	100.00%	12,793	3.806	48,690	
Potential Attached Dwellings	32,372	100.00%	32,372	3.373	109,191	
Potential High Density Dwellings	34,889	100.00%	34,889	2.669	93,119	
Potential Mobile Home Dwellings	95	100.00%	95	3.175	302	
Population to be Added Via Development at 100% Occupancy					251,302	251,302
Existing - State Department of Finance 01/01/21 Population, (2022 not available)						182,004
Potential Maximum "Build-out" Population.						433,306

Population at General Plan Build-out @ Low per Dwelling Resident Densities	422,523
Population at General Plan Build-out @ High per Dwelling Resident Densities	433,306
Average Population at General Plan Build-out	427,915

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

City staff and RCS have identified over $3.91 billion in needed and master planned capital improvement projects required through the City's General Plan build-out of both GC and OR, including both projects related to existing deficiencies and those needed solely to support future growth. Roughly 76.1% or about $2.97 billion of the total project list is required as the result of accommodating development. Due to a significant amount of outstanding developers credits and negative fund balance, less than 1% of the identified development-generated capital projects can be funded by an existing balance in the various existing DIF receipts (or fund balance). Table 2-4 indicates the capital project costs by area.

Table 2-4
Total City-wide General Plan Build-out
Capital Requirements
(rounded)

Infrastructure Type	General City	Ontario Ranch	Total - All Projects
Law Enforcement	$31,084,134	$42,020,603	$73,104,737
Fire Suppression	$27,776,396	$76,845,342	$104,621,738
Circulation System	$173,321,022	$346,386,801	$519,707,823
Storm Drainage	$68,710,652	$138,667,242	$207,377,894
Water System	$98,736,620	$359,056,789	$457,793,409
Sewer System	$26,364,639	$77,500,028	$103,864,567
Refuse Collection	$24,033,932	$40,922,641	$64,956,573
General Government	$9,972,635	$13,603,355	$23,575,970
Library Expansion	$26,049,081	$67,278,476	$94,227,557
Public Meeting Space	$37,614,782	$93,905,435	$131,520,217
Aquatics Facilities	$2,342,353	$5,847,691	$8,190,044
Park Land Development	$294,033,194	$734,054,897	$1,028,088,091
Land Use Settlement	$0	$27,225,956	$24,124,064
Fiber Optic System	$0	$128,350,091	$128,350,091
Sub-total DIF Related	$820,939,340	$2,151,665,327	$2,972,604,667
Non-DIF Related Projects			$935,161,545
Total - Projects (rounded)			$3,907,766,212

The adoption of the recommended DIF schedule amounts supported by the calculations in this Report (Schedule 2.1) would finance a great deal of this areas development-generated capital facilities by raising upwards to $2.9 billion in new DIF revenues (to be combined with the existing DIF fund balance/Outstanding Credits of $38.5 million) available to fund growth-related capital projects or not place an unnecessary draw on other City revenues such as utility rate receipts.

DIFs for the City's General City Area. Based on these costs and the schedules found at the end of each of the remaining chapters of this Report, costs attributable to future development were derived on a per unit basis for residential land uses and on a per square foot of pad basis for business land uses. Schedule 2.1, found at the end of this Chapter, provides a summary of the recommended GC DIF schedules for each type of infrastructure and land use category. The total recommended maximum DIFs for each of the ten DIF Land Use Types within General City are summarized following.

Table 2-5
Summary of Proposed Development Impact Fees
for the City's General City Area

DIF Land Use Type	Recommended Development Impact Fees
Detached Dwelling Unit	$29,293/Unit
Attached Dwelling Unit	$23,365/Unit
High Density Dwelling Unit	$18,140/Unit
Mobile Home Dwelling Unit	$23,053/Unit
Commercial Lodging Keyed Unit	$4,069/Unit
Retail/Service Uses Square Foot	$8.806/S.F.
Office Uses Square Foot	$5.026/S.F.
Business Park Uses Square Foot	$5.150/S.F.
Industrial Uses square Foot	$2.994/S.F.
Institutional Use Square Foot	$7.698/S.F.

Specific DIF schedule rates for each land use can be found at the end of each chapter relating to each infrastructure. Schedule 2.1 at the end of this Chapter also identifies the probable development impact fee revenue, the estimated capital cost total and the difference, by individual infrastructure type (e.g. fire).

DIFs for the City's Ontario Ranch Area. Based on these costs and the schedules found at the end of each of the remaining chapters of this Report, costs attributable to future development were derived on a per unit basis for residential land uses and on a per square foot of pad basis for business land uses. Schedule 2.2, found at the end of this Chapter, provides a summary of the recommended OR DIF schedules for each type of infrastructure and land use category. The total recommended maximum DIFs for each of the nine DIF Land Use Types within Ontario Ranch are summarized following.

Table 2-6
Summary of Proposed Development Impact Fees
for the City's Ontario Ranch Area

DIF Land Use Type	Recommended Development Impact Fees
Detached Dwelling Units	$44,213/Unit
Attached Dwelling Units	$32,690/Unit
High Density Dwelling Units	$24,392/Unit
Commercial Lodging Units	$12,124/Unit
Retail/Service Uses	$19,524/Unit
Office Uses	$14.802/S.F.
Business Park Uses	$12.066/S.F.
Industrial Uses	$8.758/S.F.
Institutional Uses	$14.547/S.F.

Specific DIF schedule rates for each land use can be found at the end of each chapter relating to each infrastructure. Schedule 2.2 at the end of this Chapter also identifies the probable impact fee revenue, the capital cost total and the difference, by individual infrastructure type (e.g. fire).

Schedules 2.1 and 2.2 each require two pages to summarize the many infrastructures, identify the individual Infrastructure DIFs and combined DIFs by DIF Land-use Type and provide a calculation of the potential collection through build-out at the proposed *Minimum-Needs*-based *DIF* schedules and the cost of the total infrastructure needs.

FORMAT OF THIS REPORT

The following chapters of this Report contain the detailed information relative to the calculation of DIFs recommended by RCS for the entire City. Appropriate textual explanations are contained in each chapter with a chapter devoted to each of the fourteen sets of cost schedules, (twelve sets for General City) listed following, and four appendices, one of which contains a summary of DIF recommendations.

CHAPTER 3 - Law Enforcement Facilities, Vehicles, and Equipment
CHAPTER 4 - Fire Suppression Facilities, Vehicles, and Equipment
CHAPTER 5 - Circulation (Streets, Signals and Bridges) System
CHAPTER 6 - Storm Drainage Collection System Facilities
CHAPTER 7 - Water Source, Storage and Distribution System

CHAPTER 8 - Sewer Collection System
CHAPTER 9 - Refuse Collection Facilities and Fleet
CHAPTER 10 - General Facilities, Vehicles and Equipment
CHAPTER 11 - Library Facilities and Collection Items
CHAPTER 12 - Public Use (Community Center) Facilities
CHAPTER 13 - Aquatics Facilities
CHAPTER 14 - Park Land Acquisition and Park Facilities Development
CHAPTER 15 - Ontario Ranch Open Space Land Acquisition
CHAPTER 16 - Fiber Optics Communication System

APPENDIX A - Summary of Recommendations.
APPENDIX B - Expanded Land-use Database.
APPENDIX C - Distribution of Common City Yard Improvement Costs and City Yard Reserve Transfer Percentages.
APPENDIX D - New and General City Development Impact Fee Policies
APPENDIX E - Major Four Hard Infrastructure Costing Adjustments
APPENDIX F - AB-602 Considerations

NOTE REGARDING TEXTUAL MATHEMATICS: It is important to note that the use of a computer provides for calculations to a large number of decimal points. Such data, when included in text and supporting textual tables, has often been rounded to usually no more than two or three decimals for clarity and thus may not be replicated to the necessary degree of accuracy as the spreadsheet schedules at the end of each chapter. If questions arise between the tables and schedules, the schedules at the end of the chapter will prevail as the more accurate. The schedules at the end of the Chapter are instructive as to recommendations. The tables within the chapter texts are summaries of the schedule at the end of the chapter and are illustrative.

END OF CHAPTER TEXT

Schedule 2.1

City of Ontario, General City, at General Plan Maintenance Costs, Reflecting 2021-22 Amendments
Summary of Development Impact Fees By Type of Fee (continued on next page)
(Costs/Fees per Residential Type Dwelling Unit, or Business Type Square Foot)

Land-use Category	Law Enforcement Facilities	Fire Protection Facilities	Streets, Signals and Bridges	Storm Drainage Facilities	Water Distribution Facilities	Sewer Collection Facilities	Refuse Collection Equipment	General Government Facilities
	Schedule 3.2	Schedule 4.2	Schedule 5.2	Schedule 6.3	Schedule 7.2	Schedule 8.2	Schedule 9.1	Schedule 10.2
Calculated Development Impact Costs								
Detached Dwellings	$613	$728	$2,224	$2,563	$3,113	$577	$704	$303
Attached Dwellings	$641	$693	$1,485	$826	$2,130	$505	$609	$107
High Density Dwellings	$641	$693	$919	$692	$1,437	$433	$305	$68
Mobile Home Dwellings	$596	$817	$1,159	$1,492	$2,129	$505	$609	$340
Commercial Lodging Units	$567	$462	$1,173	$425	$859	$336	$196	$51
Retail/Service Uses	$0.865	$0.518	$4.494	$0.447	$1.531	$0.263	$0.478	$0.210
Office Uses	$0.279	$0.319	$2.568	$0.537	$0.766	$0.284	$0.181	$0.092
Business Park Uses	$0.044	$0.036	$2.672	$1.297	$0.617	$0.141	$0.238	$0.105
Industrial Uses	$0.044	$0.036	$1.377	$1.132	$0.165	$0.055	$0.131	$0.054
Private Institutional Use	$0.300	$0.114	$2.934	$3.292	$0.579	$0.164	$0.209	$0.106
Potential Collection with Recommended Impact Fee Schedule								
Detached Dwellings	$693,303	$823,368	$2,515,344	$2,898,753	$3,520,803	$652,587	$796,224	$342,693
Attached Dwellings	$1,723,008	$1,862,784	$3,991,680	$2,220,288	$5,725,440	$1,357,440	$1,636,992	$287,616
High Density Dwellings	$13,978,287	$15,112,251	$20,040,633	$15,090,444	$31,336,659	$9,442,431	$6,651,135	$1,482,876
Mobile Home Dwellings	$56,620	$77,615	$110,105	$141,740	$202,255	$47,975	$57,855	$32,300
Commercial Lodging Units	$85,050	$69,300	$175,950	$63,750	$128,850	$50,400	$29,400	$7,650
Retail/Service Uses	$7,062,219	$4,229,167	$36,690,881	$3,649,494	$12,499,719	$2,147,241	$3,902,590	$1,714,527
Office Uses	$5,829,913	$6,665,743	$53,660,276	$11,221,016	$16,006,141	$5,934,392	$3,782,130	$1,922,409
Business Park Uses	$306,664	$250,907	$18,622,841	$9,039,605	$4,300,259	$982,717	$1,658,771	$731,811
Industrial Uses	$1,348,606	$1,103,405	$42,205,222	$34,695,942	$5,057,271	$1,685,757	$4,015,166	$1,655,107
Private Institutional Use	$13,068	$4,966	$127,805	$143,400	$25,221	$7,144	$9,104	$4,617
Total	$31,096,738	$30,199,506	$178,140,737	$79,164,432	$78,802,618	$22,308,084	$22,539,367	$8,181,606
Potential GC DIF Receipts	$31,096,738	$30,199,506	$178,140,737	$79,164,432	$78,802,618	$22,308,084	$22,539,367	$8,181,606
Fund Balance and Credits (+/-)	$1,441,855	($12,052,680)	($35,947,387)	($12,003,508)	($23,702,856)	($238,423)	$4,530,466	$4,255,805
Potential OR DIF Receipts (2.2)	$42,018,293	$86,496,785	$377,510,870	$157,718,003	$407,068,001	$81,773,471	$38,408,869	$11,150,574
Required Capital Total	$77,797,592	$143,431,375	$1,065,494,324	$299,014,967	$676,417,676	$137,148,406	$64,956,573	$25,903,340
Over/(Under) Collection or Unfunded	-$3,240,706	-$38,787,764	-$545,790,104	-$74,136,040	-$214,249,913	-$33,305,274	$522,129	-$2,315,355

Schedule 2.1

City of Ontario, General City, at General Plan Maintenance Costs, Reflecting 2021-22 Amendments
Summary of Development Impact Fees By Type of Fee
(Costs/Fees per Residential Type Dwelling Unit, or Business Type Square Foot)

Land-use Category	Library Expansion Facilities	Public Meeting Facilities	Aquatics Center Facilities	Parkland Facilities Development	Open Space Agreement (Non-DIF)	Fiber Optic System (1)	Development Impact Fee Total Per Unit or Square Feet
	Schedule 11.1	Schedule 12.1	Schedule 13.1	Schedule 14.1	Schedule 15.1	Schedule 16.1	
Calculated Development Impact Costs							
Detached Dwellings	$1,302	$1,856	$112	$15,198	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	$29,293 per Unit
Attached Dwellings	$1,154	$1,645	$100	$13,470	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	$23,365 per Unit
High Density Dwellings	$913	$1,302	$79	$10,658	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	$18,140 per Unit
Mobile Home Dwellings	$1,086	$1,548	$94	$12,678	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	$23,053 per Unit
Commercial Lodging Units	No Fee	No Fee	No Fee	No Fee	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	$4,069 per Unit
Retail/Service Uses	No Fee	No Fee	No Fee	No Fee	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	$8.806 per S.F.
Office Uses	No Fee	No Fee	No Fee	No Fee	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	$5.026 per S.F.
Business Park Uses	No Fee	No Fee	No Fee	No Fee	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	$5.150 per S.F.
Industrial Uses	No Fee	No Fee	No Fee	No Fee	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	$2.994 per S.F.
Private Institutional Use	No Fee	No Fee	No Fee	No Fee	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	$7.698 per S.F.
Potential Collection with Recommended Impact Fee Schedule							
Detached Dwellings	$1,472,562	$2,099,136	$126,672	$17,188,938	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	$33,130,383
Attached Dwellings	$3,101,952	$4,421,760	$268,800	$36,207,360	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	$62,805,120
High Density Dwellings	$19,909,791	$28,392,714	$1,722,753	$232,419,006	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	$395,578,980
Mobile Home Dwellings	$103,170	$147,060	$8,930	$1,204,410	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	$2,190,035
Commercial Lodging Units	No Fee	No Fee	No Fee	No Fee	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	$610,350
Retail/Service Uses	No Fee	No Fee	No Fee	No Fee	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	$71,895,838
Office Uses	No Fee	No Fee	No Fee	No Fee	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	$105,022,020
Business Park Uses	No Fee	No Fee	No Fee	No Fee	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	$35,893,575
Industrial Uses	No Fee	No Fee	No Fee	No Fee	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	$91,766,476
Private Institutional Use	No Fee	No Fee	No Fee	No Fee	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	$335,325
Total	$24,587,475	$35,060,670	$2,127,155	$287,019,714	$0	$0	$799,228,102
Probable GC DIF Receipts	$24,587,475	$35,060,670	$2,127,155	$287,019,714	$0	$0	$799,228,102
Fund Balance/Other Revenues	$8,256,956	$8,951,931	$754,867	$24,564,313	$6,805,316	($14,101,895)	-$38,485,240
Potential OR DIF Receipts (2.2)	$61,383,126	$87,507,616	$5,308,022	$716,510,512	$20,433,860	$153,072,535	$2,246,360,537
Required Capital Total	$94,227,557	$131,520,217	$8,190,044	$1,028,088,091	$27,225,956	$128,350,091	$3,907,766,209
Over or (Under) Collection	$0	$0	$0	$6,448	$13,220	$10,620,549	-$900,662,810

Schedule 2.2

City of Ontario, Ontario Ranch, at General Plan Maintenance Costs, Reflecting 2021-22 Amendments
Summary of Development Impact Fees By Type of Fee (continued on next page)
(Costs/Fees per Residential Type Dwelling Unit, or Business Type Square Foot)

Land-use Category	Law Enforcement Facilities	Fire Protection Facilities	Streets, Signals and Bridges	Storm Drainage Facilities	Water Distribution Facilities	Sewer Collection Facilities	Refuse Collection Equipment	General Government Facilities
	Schedule 3.2	Schedule 4.4	Schedule 5.4	Schedule 6.5	Schedule 7.4	Schedule 8.4	Schedule 9.1	Schedule 10.2
Calculated Development Impact Costs/Fees								
Detached Dwellings	$613	$1,458	$4,986	$3,744	$9,711	$1,642	$704	$303
Attached Dwellings	$641	$1,386	$3,329	$1,422	$5,332	$1,246	$609	$107
High Density Dwellings	$641	$1,386	$2,060	$1,196	$2,829	$753	$305	$68
Commercial Lodging Units	$567	$924	$2,629	$810	$4,080	$958	$196	$51
Retail/Service Uses	$0.865	$1.037	$10.075	$1.728	$3.188	$0.299	$0.478	$0.210
Office Uses	$0.279	$0.637	$5.758	$1.521	$2.882	$0.877	$0.181	$0.092
Business Park Uses	$0.044	$0.072	$5.991	$1.490	$2.483	$0.353	$0.238	$0.105
Industrial Uses	$0.044	$0.072	$3.088	$1.482	$2.569	$0.431	$0.131	$0.054
Private Institutional Use	$0.300	$0.229	$6.579	$1.727	$2.339	$0.472	$0.209	$0.106
Potential Collection with Recommended Impact Fee Schedule								
Detached Dwellings	$7,148,806	$17,003,196	$58,146,732	$43,662,528	$113,249,682	$19,149,004	$8,210,048	$3,533,586
Attached Dwellings	$19,027,444	$41,142,024	$98,818,036	$42,210,648	$158,275,088	$36,986,264	$18,077,556	$3,176,188
High Density Dwellings	$8,385,562	$18,131,652	$26,948,920	$15,646,072	$37,008,978	$9,850,746	$3,990,010	$889,576
Mobile Home Dwellings	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0
Commercial Lodging Units	$224,532	$365,904	$1,041,084	$320,760	$1,615,680	$379,368	$77,616	$20,196
Retail/Service Uses	$4,975,130	$5,964,404	$57,947,320	$9,938,756	$18,336,085	$1,719,727	$2,749,262	$1,207,835
Office Uses	$744,982	$1,700,910	$15,374,943	$4,061,356	$7,695,482	$2,341,755	$483,304	$245,657
Business Park Uses	$437,943	$716,633	$59,629,879	$14,830,332	$24,713,902	$3,513,495	$2,368,872	$1,045,091
Industrial Uses	$747,194	$1,222,681	$52,439,425	$25,166,848	$43,625,933	$7,319,104	$2,224,600	$917,011
Private Institutional Use	$326,700	$249,381	$7,164,531	$1,880,703	$2,547,171	$514,008	$227,601	$115,434
Total	$42,018,293	$86,496,785	$377,510,870	$157,718,003	$407,068,001	$81,773,471	$38,408,869	$11,150,574
Potential OR DIF Collection	$42,018,293	$86,496,785	$377,510,870	$157,718,003	$407,068,001	$81,773,471	$38,408,869	$11,150,574
Existing Fund Balance/Other	$1,441,855	($12,052,680)	($35,947,387)	($12,003,508)	($23,702,856)	($238,423)	$4,530,466	$4,255,805
Potential GC DIF Collection (2.1)	$31,096,738	$30,199,506	$178,140,737	$79,164,432	$78,802,618	$22,308,084	$22,539,367	$8,181,606
Required Capital Total	$77,797,592	$143,431,375	$1,065,494,324	$299,014,967	$676,417,676	$137,148,406	$64,956,573	$25,903,340
Over/(Under) Collection or Unfunded	-$3,240,706	-$38,787,764	-$545,790,104	-$74,136,040	-$214,249,913	-$33,305,274	$522,129	-$2,315,355

Schedule 2.2

City of Ontario, Ontario Ranch, at General Plan Maintenance Costs, Reflecting 2021-22 Amendments
Summary of Development Impact Fees By Type of Fee
(Costs/Fees per Residential Type Dwelling Unit, or Business Type Square Foot)

Land-use Category	Library Expansion Facilities	Public Meeting Facilities	Aquatics Center Facilities	Parkland Facilities Development	Open Space Agreement (Non-DIF)	Fiber Optic System	Development Impact Cost Per Dwelling Unit or Business Square Feet
	Schedule 11.1	Schedule 12.1	Schedule 13.1	Schedule 14.1	Schedule 15.1	Schedule 16.2	
Calculated Development Impact Costs/Fees							
Detached Dwellings	$1,302	$1,856	$112	$15,198	$527	$2,057	$44,213 per Unit
Attached Dwellings	$1,154	$1,645	$100	$13,470	$192	$2,057	$32,690 per Unit
High Density Dwellings	$913	$1,302	$79	$10,658	$145	$2,057	$24,392 per Unit
Commercial Lodging Units	No Fee	No Fee	No Fee	No Fee	$98	$1,811	$12,124 per Unit
Retail/Service Uses	No Fee	No Fee	No Fee	No Fee	$0.210	$1.434	$19.524 per S.F.
Office Uses	No Fee	No Fee	No Fee	No Fee	$0.184	$2.391	$14.802 per S.F.
Business Park Uses	No Fee	No Fee	No Fee	No Fee	$0.186	$1.104	$12.066 per S.F.
Industrial Uses	No Fee	No Fee	No Fee	No Fee	$0.170	$0.717	$8.758 per S.F.
Private Institutional Use	No Fee	No Fee	No Fee	No Fee	$0.198	$2.388	$14.547 per S.F.
Potential Collection with Recommended Impact Fee Schedule							
Detached Dwellings	$15,183,924	$21,644,672	$1,306,144	$177,239,076	$6,145,874	$23,988,734	$515,612,006
Attached Dwellings	$34,255,336	$48,830,180	$2,968,400	$399,843,480	$5,699,328	$61,059,988	$970,369,960
High Density Dwellings	$11,943,866	$17,032,764	$1,033,478	$139,427,956	$1,896,890	$26,909,674	$319,096,144
Mobile Home Dwellings	No Fee	No Fee	No Fee	No Fee	$0	$0	$0
Commercial Lodging Units	No Fee	No Fee	No Fee	No Fee	$38,808	$717,156	$4,801,104
Retail/Service Uses	No Fee	No Fee	No Fee	No Fee	$1,207,835	$8,247,787	$112,294,141
Office Uses	No Fee	No Fee	No Fee	No Fee	$491,315	$6,384,420	$39,524,124
Business Park Uses	No Fee	No Fee	No Fee	No Fee	$1,851,303	$10,988,380	$120,095,830
Industrial Uses	No Fee	No Fee	No Fee	No Fee	$2,886,885	$12,175,864	$148,725,545
Private Institutional Use	$0	$0	$0	$0	$215,622	$2,600,532	$15,841,683
Total	$61,383,126	$87,507,616	$5,308,022	$716,510,512	$20,433,860	$153,072,535	$2,246,360,537
Potential OR DIF Collection	$61,383,126	$87,507,616	$5,308,022	$716,510,512	$20,433,860	$153,072,535	$2,246,360,537
Existing Fund Balance/Other	$8,256,956	$8,951,931	$754,867	$24,564,313	$6,805,316	($14,101,895)	-$38,485,240
Potential GC DIF Collection (2.1)	$24,587,475	$35,060,670	$2,127,155	$287,019,714	$0	$0	$799,228,102
Required Capital Total	$94,227,557	$131,520,217	$8,190,044	$1,028,088,091	$27,225,956	$128,350,091	$3,907,766,209
Over or (Under) Collection	$0	$0	$0	$6,448	$13,220	$10,620,549	-$900,662,810

Chapter 3
Law Enforcement Facilities, Vehicles, and Equipment

The Existing System of Law Enforcement Assets or infrastructure. The Ontario Police Department currently operates out of a largely unfinished 175,000 square foot facility on roughly 20 acres at 2500 South Archibald Avenue. The building was specifically purchased due to its excess space capacity and, with appropriate interior improvements, its ability to absorb many additional sworn officers as significant development occurs. The interior of the facility is roughly 45% improved leaving 55% to be improved over time as the City approaches General Plan build-out.

The Department also has a significant inventory of:

- Vehicles (official and undercover) some with various added extra equipment;
- Assigned officer equipment such as various leathers, armament, clothing, and safety apparel;
- Communications equipment;
- Specialty and computer equipment; and,
- Helicopter program and related equipment.

Demand Upon Infrastructure Created by the Development of Underdeveloped or Vacant Parcels. Residents and businesses benefit from law enforcement services in three ways: directly, indirectly and through standby availability. Direct services are those where a resident or business owner requires a direct response, usually as a result of being the victim of a crime. Direct service results in the form of a law enforcement officer contacting the victim. Indirect benefits, such as crime prevention programs, free patrol time and other law enforcement services that serve all businesses, citizens and visitors, are impossible to calculate for a specific beneficiary. An example of indirect benefit would be the apprehension of a burglar in your neighbor's residence yesterday. Had that burglar not been arrested he/she may have broken into your residence or business tomorrow. Most residents and businesses may go for many years before ever requiring a call-for-service. However, these fortunate residents and businesses still benefit from law enforcement services, if in no other way than that a law enforcement officer is available, through adequate planned stand-by, to respond if required.

The addition of new residential units and new businesses will increase the demand upon the law enforcement service level by creating more direct calls-for-service, more areas requiring preventive patrol, and in general, more opportunities for crimes to be committed.

The continuous development of vacant or underutilized parcels into residential or business units will also generate more calls. The residents and business owners occupying those residences and businesses will create the increase in law enforcement calls-for-service. More residences and businesses will mean more responses to the burglaries, domestic disputes, noise complaints, shoplifting and miscellaneous incidents that will occur in the new residences and businesses. If the law enforcement force capabilities (the base) are not expanded, then the increasing number of calls-for-service (the rate) will reduce the amount of "free" hours available for preventative patrol. This inability to expand the capabilities would ultimately drive the Department into a reactionary mode. The additional calls-for-service would limit the amount of time for training, planning, pro-active crime prevention and other non-direct services.

The **Purpose** of the Fee. Additional law enforcement calls-for-service are expected, and the cost of adding sworn officers necessary to respond to those calls can be determined. Those new costs can be translated to a fee, or an amount, necessary to be collected to offset the added costs of the required additional staffing. These costs include equipping and housing the additional officers. Providing that the fee is adopted and imposed, new development will finance its proportional capital costs of expansion of the Law Enforcement facility. The continued costs of the annual salary and benefits for those additional officers will need to come from increases in general taxes (primarily property and sales taxes) generated by the new residences and businesses and their occupants.

The **Use** of the Fee. The revenues raised from a properly calculated and legally-supported Law Enforcement Impact Fee would be limited to capital costs related to that growth. The fees would be used to complete the interior improvements within the law enforcement station, increase the number of response and investigator's vehicles, and properly equip additional officers. Conversely, the Law Enforcement DIF receipts cannot be used to replace existing vehicles, or replace normal vacancies. Rehabilitation of the former large retail building created additional space at a cost less than the new construction of space. Other projects and capital acquisitions include:

LE-001, Police Station Purchase and Interior Improvements Prior to Occupancy – The project consists of the acquisition costs and full completion of the 175,000 square foot facility on Archibald Avenue just south of the SR-60. The facility was selected and acquired in order to serve the existing community and also house the additional officers needed to serve future development with law enforcement services. The full cost of $10.3 million is split proportionally between the existing calls-for-service (45.28%) and the calls-for-service generated by new development at General Plan build-out (54.72%). The facility space demands are based upon a minimum standard of 350 square feet per officer.

LE-002, Remaining Interior Improvements @ 55% of Police Station. Complete the interior improvements to roughly 96,250 square feet of the under-utilized portion of the Police Station. The building improvements are progressing with the interior improvements in a manner consistent with the addition of police calls-for-service and sworn officers (see LW-001 previous).

LE-003, Additional Patrol/Detectives/Specialty/Staff Vehicles – This project is the acquisition of 284 assorted law enforcement vehicles in order to maintain the existing 1.04 vehicles per officer standard.

LE-004, Additional Police Officer Assigned Equipment – Officers in the field will require personally assigned equipment of leathers, handgun, helmet, and assorted protection. The costs include the recruitment cost of a medical exam, polygraph, fingerprinting, psychological exam and back-ground check for successful candidates. The costs are included at $18,246 per officer the anticipated 272 additionally required officers.

LE-005, Additional Specialty Equipment – This project is the acquisition of specialty equipment such as laptop computers, servers, specialty printers. It also includes special weapons and tactics equipment, bicycles, body cameras and other specialty equipment.

LE-006, Building Appurtenances Equipment – This project represents items that support use of the building such as phone systems, alarms, security systems and the like.

LE-007, Communications Equipment – This project includes any type of communications device and mostly consists of hand-held radios and batteries, battery chargers cells phones.

LE-008, Advanced Technology Software and Equipment – This project is the acquisition of specialty equipment such as linked database systems and other cooperative law enforcement sharing systems.

LE-009, Additional Helicopter Capacity – The City's helicopter program capacity will be overwhelmed with the proposed addition of 80,149 dwelling units, over 500 hotel/motel keyed-rooms and 103.2 million square feet of business use space. The capacity of an additional helicopter will be required to maintain the existing level of service.

LE-010, Share of Common City Yard Improvements – The City maintenance yard is the front line for maintenance and repair of all of the City's capital acquisitions and infrastructure. The existing facility has adequate space but will need additional facility improvements in order to maintain the additional law enforcement vehicles and the police station itself. The $2,365,388 is law enforcement's portion of the $44.5 million in improvements required at the maintenance yard (see Chapter 10 for greater detail).

The Relationship Between the Need for *The Fee* and *The Type* of Development Project. Department records were used to demonstrate that differing land uses generate differing numbers of calls. Police staff provided extremely accurate calls-for-service data by over-laying the Department's computerized response records with the City's zoning map thus allowing 100% of the calls-for-service to be categorized. Table 3-1, following, summarizes an analysis of the calls-for-service received by the Police Department over a recent twelve month period. The breakdown of calls into the land uses that generated them, divided by the number of developed units (during the same period) generated a *calls-for-service* ratio, factor or nexus.

Newly Calculated Calls-for-Service data. This impact fee update includes a recalculation of law enforcement calls-for-service by land-use. The previous calls-for-service data was based upon data that was over 12 years old and was calculated with the then state-of-art "shape files", the best data available at the time. This update is based upon a more GIS-based data set of all law enforcement calls-for-service coupled with the City's GIS-based land-use database. This provide for a more accurate data driven calculation

[This space left vacant in order to place the following table on a single page].

Table 3-1
Law Enforcement Calls-for-Service Generated by DIF Land-use Type
(Over a 12 Month Period)

DIF Land-use Type	Developed Dwellings or Square Feet	Actual Calls For Service Over 12 Months	Total Calls per Dwelling or 1,000 SF (KSF)
Detached Dwelling Units	31,997	31,149	0.973/Unit
Attached Dwelling Units	13,097	13,340	1.019/Unit
High Density Dwellings	4,812	4,901	1.019/Unit
Mobile Home Dwelling Units	2,097	1,983	0.946/Unit
Commercial Lodging Units	5,810	5,236	0.901/Unit
Retail/Service Uses	18,552,286	25,456	1.374/KSF
Office Uses	9,959,192	4,408	0.443/KSF
Business Park Uses	10,271,628	715	0.070/KSF
Industrial Uses	112,134,057	7,808	0.070/KSF
Institutional Uses	2,318,711	1,106	0.477/KSF

As an example, there were approximately 31,149 calls-for-service that generated a response to one of the 31,997 detached dwelling units in the City. The result indicates that, on average, each dwelling will generate just over 0.973 calls per year. The same analysis was undertaken for the other land uses, with the limited exception that attached dwelling units and high density dwelling units were combined. Since these calls-for-service by land use are an empirical average, they were then used to project the number of additional future calls that could be expected at TOP build-out by multiplying the calls per residential unit or business acre by the number of anticipated number of new residential dwellings or business acres. To determine the number of additional officers necessary to meet this increase from future developments, the number of increased calls resulting from new development was then divided by the average number of calls that an existing officer currently responds to.

These calls-for-service rates are then applied to (multiplied by) the undeveloped land-use database anticipated units to determine the number of calls-for-service in the future. The additional calls-for-service, in this case 116,135, were then divided by the number of calls-for-service that a single officer currently absorbs.

The existing complement of 225 sworn officers currently absorbs the 96,102 annual calls by responding to just over 427 calls-for-service each to privately-owned and developed parcels annually. Based upon the addition of 116,135 calls-for-service, the City will need to successfully recruit 272 additional officers to maintain the same response capabilities that are currently provided by the existing 225 officers now. This is not to imply that the existing level of services or the ratio of officers to calls-for-service is the *desired* level of service, it merely is the *current or existing* level of service. To adequately mobilize the 272 new sworn officers, the City will need to add 284 response vehicles at a total cost of $19,837,400 to maintain the existing ratio of 1.04

vehicles per sworn officer (284 vehicles divided by 272 officers) and for the personnel recruitment and equipment at a combined cost of $4,962,912 (272 officers X $18,246 in assigned equipment costs).

The Relationship Between the *Use of the Fee* and the *Type of Development* Paying the Fee. Again, *use of the fee* is a similar argument to the *need for the fee*. As the development occurs, the impact is generated and the impact fee would be collected as the development occurs. The collected DIF receipts would be put to use to acquire equipment for additional officers, vehicles and additional building space necessary to respond to those additional calls, *without reducing the capability of responding to calls from the existing community.*

The Relationship Between the *Amount of the Fee* and the *Cost of the Portion* of the Facility Attributed to the Development Project. The building size at 175,000 square will meet the needs for operations space (and location) through General Plan build-out. The build-out complement of 497 sworn officers, (225 current and 272 projected) will maintain an adequate and sufficient 350 square foot per officer current average.

Basic Needs-based Fees. Table 3-2, following, summarizes the resulting DIFs (from Schedule 3.2) for development to contribute $73,104,737 towards the expansion of the Law Enforcement capabilities of the City in order to allow the City to extend the same level of service to the City's newest citizens and businesses.

Table 3-2
Minimum Needs-based Law Enforcement Facilities, Vehicles and Equipment Development Impact Costs by DIF Land-use Type

DIF land-use Type	Allocation of Development Costs	Development Impact Cost Per Unit or Square Foot
Detached Dwelling Units	$7,839,552	$613/Unit
Attached Dwelling Units	$20,755,866	$641/Unit
High Density Dwelling Units	$22,369,225	$641/Unit
Mobile Home Units	$56,653	$596/Unit
Commercial Lodging Units	$309,704	$567/Unit
Retail/Service Uses	$12,038,818	$0.865/S.F.
Office Uses	$6,565,483	$0.279/S.F.
Business Park Uses	$741,528	$0.044/S.F.
Industrial Uses	$2,087,987	$0.044/S.F.
Institutional Uses	$339,920	$0.300/S.F.

Existing Financial Commitment Comparison Costs. The City invested about $24.9 million in the outright purchase and the remodeling to date, (about 45% of the floor space) of the new facility, a large former retail building on Archibald Avenue. One of the reasons the facility was selected

was that it could meet development need and its long range capacity for additional calls-for-service resulting from new development. The Department staff uses 235 assorted vehicles with various added extra equipment costing a total of $16,415,145 for an average cost of about $69,850 per vehicle. The inventory of 235 vehicles consists of standard response vehicles and staff/specialty vehicles. The existing 225 sworn officers each have assigned equipment such as various leathers, armament, clothing and safety apparel costing some $18,246 per sworn officer or a combined $4,105,350. Specialty equipment amounts to a cumulative $2,785,632. Existing hand-held communications equipment has a replacement cost of approximately $675,075. The helicopter program has assets with a replacement cost of approximately $3,206,810. Lastly, there is $1,747,445 invested in land-based communications equipment, specialty equipment and computer workstations. Combined, the City has invested, at current dollars, some $63,727,177 into the law enforcement services including the negative $1,441,855 existing Law Enforcement Impact Fee Fund balance.

When this combined replacement financial commitment cost figure is distributed over the entire current community (via Table 3-3 following and Schedule 3.3), we find that the existing financial commitment is quite large (at 105%) to that of the calculated Law Enforcement Basic DIFs (or cost), indicating that the existing community has invested more than would have been required from future development.

Table 3-3
Existing Law Enforcement Community
Financial Commitment Comparison Data

DIF Land-use Type	Allocation of Development Costs	Development Impact Cost Per Unit or Square Foot
Detached Dwelling Units	$20,655,531	$646/Unit
Attached Dwelling Units	$8,846,023	$675/Unit
High Density Dwelling Units	$3,249,952	$675/Unit
Mobile Home Dwelling Units	$1,314,967	$627/Unit
Commercial Lodging Units	$3,472,097	$598/Unit
Retail/Service Uses	$16,880,388	$0.911/S.F.
Office Uses	$2,923,034	$0.294/S.F.
Business Park Uses	$474,131	$0.046/S.F.
Industrial Uses	$5,177,642	$0.046/S.F.
Institutional Uses	$733,411	$0.316/S.F.

[This space left vacant in order to place the Chapter recommendations on a single page].

RECOMMENDED DEVELOPMENT IMPACT FEES

Since the *Minimum Needs-based Impact Costs (*necessary for expansion indicating the City's investment in Police capabilities) are less than the *Existing Community Financial Commitment Comparison*, the Minimum *Needs-based Development Impact Fee* schedule identified in Table 3-2 and Schedule 3.2 would be the most equitable DIF schedule to adopt. The DIF schedule would be the same for both of the City's Ontario Ranch area and the undeveloped parcels of General City area.

RECAP OF RECOMMENDED LAW ENFORCEMENT DEVELOPMENT IMPACT FEES

- **General City** - Adopt Schedule 3.2.
- **Ontario Ranch** - Adopt (same) Schedule 3.2.

END OF CHAPTER TEXT

Schedule 3.1

City of Ontario
2021-22 Development Impact Cost Calculation Update
Allocation of Project Cost Estimates
Law Enforcement Facilities, Vehicles and Equipment

Line #	Project Title	Estimated Cost	Construction Needs Supported by Other Resources: Percent Need	Construction Needs Supported by Other Resources: Apportioned Dollar Cost	Construction Needs Generated by New Development in GC/OR: Percent Need	Construction Needs Generated by New Development in GC/OR: Apportioned Dollar Cost
LE-001	Police Station Purchase and Roof Improvements Prior to Occupancy	$10,363,962	45.28%	$4,692,855	54.72%	$5,671,107
LE-002	Complete Remaining Interior Improvements @ 55% of Building Space	$29,656,550	0.00%	$0	100.00%	$29,656,550
LE-003	Additional Patrol/Detective/Specialty/Staff Vehicles	$19,837,400	0.00%	$0	100.00%	$19,837,400
LE-004	Additional Officer Assigned Equipment	$4,962,912	0.00%	$0	100.00%	$4,962,912
LE-005	Additional Specialty Equipment	$3,367,360	0.00%	$0	100.00%	$3,367,360
LE-006	Building Appurtenances Equipment	$962,880	0.00%	$0	100.00%	$962,880
LE-007	Communications Equipment	$816,000	0.00%	$0	100.00%	$816,000
LE-008	Advanced Technology Hardware and Software	$2,113,440	0.00%	$0	100.00%	$2,113,440
LE-009	Additional Helicopter Capacity	$3,351,700	0.00%	$0	100.00%	$3,351,700
LE-010	Share of Specific/Common City Yard Improvements	$2,365,388	0.00%	$0	100.00%	$2,365,388
	Sub-Total General Plan Total New Project Costs	$77,797,592	6.03%	$4,692,855	93.97%	$73,104,737
	FINANCIAL ADJUSTMENTS:					
	Total Fund Balance/Outstanding Credits	($1,441,855)	100.00%	($1,441,855)	0.00%	$0
	Total General Plan Total New Project Costs	$76,355,737	4.26%	$3,251,000	95.74%	$73,104,737
					Forward to Schedule 3.2	

NOTES:

(1). All developer-held "credits" under FINANCIAL ADJUSTMENTS will appear as a positive indicating an additional Infrastructure Fund obligation that will be redeemed (in lieu of a DIF payment) at some point in the future.

(2). A negative figure under FINANCIAL ADJUSTMENTS indicates a positive Fund Balance mitigating the project total. A positive figure indicates an amount that needs to be recovered by DIFs.

(3). Costs distributed based upon recent actual twelve month Police Department "Calls-for-Service" statistics.

Schedule 3.2

City of Ontario
2021-22 Development Impact Cost Calculation Update
Entire City - Minimal Needs-based Impact Costs
Law Enforcement Facilities, Vehicles and Equipment

DIF Land-use Type	Undeveloped Acres	Undeveloped Units	Call Generation Rate	Expected New Calls for Service	Percentage of Additional Service Calls	Allocation of Expansion Costs	Cost Distribution Per Acre	Average Units or Square Feet/Acre	Development Impact Fee per Unit or Square Foot
Detached Dwellings	1,685	12,793	0.973	12,454	10.72%	$7,839,552	$4,653	7.59	***$613 per Unit***
Attached Dwellings	1,499	32,372	1.019	32,973	28.39%	$20,755,866	$13,846	21.60	***$641 per Unit***
High Density Dwellings	1,037	34,889	1.019	35,536	30.60%	$22,369,225	$21,571	33.64	***$641 per Unit***
Mobile Home Dwellings	14	95	0.946	90	0.08%	$56,653	$4,047	6.79	***$596 per Unit***
Commercial Lodging Units	12	546	0.901	492	0.42%	$309,704	$25,809	45.50	***$567 per Unit***
Retail/Service Uses	1,271	13,916,010	1.374	19,125	16.47%	$12,038,818	$9,472	10,949	***$0.865 per S.F.***
Office Uses	936	23,565,934	0.443	10,430	8.98%	$6,565,483	$7,014	25,177	***$0.279 per S.F.***
Business Park Uses	769	16,922,869	0.070	1,178	1.01%	$741,528	$964	22,006	***$0.044 per S.F.***
Industrial Uses	1,110	47,631,804	0.070	3,317	2.86%	$2,087,987	$1,881	42,912	***$0.044 per S.F.***
Private Institutional Use	52	1,132,560	0.477	540	0.46%	$339,920	$6,537	21,780	***$0.300 per S.F.***
TOTAL	**8,385**	--	--	**116,135**	**100.00%**	**$73,104,737 in Total Equity in Current Law Enforcement Assets**			

Schedule 3.3

City of Ontario
2021-22 Development Impact Cost Calculation Update
Existing Community Financial Commitment Comparison
Law Enforcement Facilities, Vehicles and Equipment

DIF Land-use Type	Developed Acres	Developed Units	Call Generation Rate	Existing Calls for Service	Percentage of Existing Service Calls	Allocation of Infrastructure "Equity"	Distribution of "Equity" per Acre	Average Units or Square Feet/Acre	Current Financial Commitment per Unit or Square Foot
Detached Dwellings	6,328	31,997	0.973	31,149	32.41%	$20,655,531	$3,264	5.06	*$646 per Unit*
Attached Dwellings	722	13,097	1.019	13,340	13.88%	$8,846,023	$12,252	18.14	*$675 per Unit*
High Density Dwellings	193	4,812	1.019	4,901	5.10%	$3,249,952	$16,839	24.93	*$675 per Unit*
Mobile Home Dwellings	204	2,097	0.946	1,983	2.06%	$1,314,967	$6,446	10.28	*$627 per Unit*
Commercial Lodging Units	143	5,810	0.901	5,236	5.45%	$3,472,097	$24,280	40.63	*$598 per Unit*
Retail/Service Uses	487	18,522,286	1.374	25,456	26.49%	$16,880,388	$34,662	38,033	*$0.911 per S.F.*
Office Uses	310	9,959,192	0.443	4,408	4.59%	$2,923,034	$9,429	32,126	*$0.294 per S.F.*
Business Park Uses	777	10,271,628	0.070	715	0.74%	$474,131	$610	13,220	*$0.046 per S.F.*
Industrial Uses	6,890	112,134,057	0.070	7,808	8.12%	$5,177,642	$751	16,275	*$0.046 per S.F.*
Private Institutional Use	419	2,318,711	0.477	1,106	1.15%	$733,411	$1,750	5,534	*$0.316 per S.F.*
TOTAL	16,473	--	--	96,102	100.00%	$63,727,177	Total Law Enforcement System Capital Assets		

$35,437,500	in Law Enforcement Facility Assets
$4,105,350	in Law Enforcement Officer Equipment Assets
$16,415,145	in Law Enforcement Vehicles Assets
$2,785,632	in Specialty Equipment
$675,075	in Personal Communications Equipment Assets
$796,075	in Building Support Equipment
$1,747,445	in Advanced technology
$3,206,810	in Helicopter Program Equipment/Assets.
($1,441,855)	in Existing Law Enforcement DIF Fund Balance

Similar Land Use	Total Square Feet	Percent of Total SF	Percent of Calls-for-Service
Business Park Uses	10,271,628	8.39%	715
Industrial Uses	112,134,057	91.61%	7,808
	122,405,685	100.00%	8,523

Similar Land Use	Total Square Feet	Percent of Total SF	Percent of Calls-for-Service
Attached Dwellings	13,097	73.13%	13,340
High Density Dwellings	4,812	26.87%	4,901
	17,909	100.00%	18,241

Chapter 4
Fire Suppression Facilities, Vehicles, and Equipment

Separate DIF Application Areas. Because of distinctly differing capital needs there will be a separate DIF schedule for the Ontario Ranch area of the City. This action is necessary to ensure that new development in the General City area of the City is not required to subsidize the significant development costs of the Ontario Ranch area, with its significant public construction demands. This process will also be applied to the next four infrastructure Chapters consisting of Circulation System, Storm Drainage Collection, Water Distribution and Sewer Collection. General City DIF calculations and explanations will be at the beginning of the chapter with Ontario Ranch calculations and textual explanations following towards the end of the Chapter.

The Existing System. The City has invested in an extensive system of fire facilities, response vehicles and specialty equipment. The Fire Department responds to calls-for-service from ten (10) existing stations (includes the specialty station at the airport) and trains at a facility consisting of classrooms, offices and support areas with specialty situation training mock-up implements. Three of the fire facilities are designated for special operations. The fire facilities are detailed as follows:

Fire Station #1/Headquarters is 42,951 square feet and is located on a 39,900 square foot parcel at 425 East B Street (and portions of the Annex facility). This station houses the Bomb Squad unit and specialty trailer. This station also houses the mobile command unit. The water tender, brush engine and various reserve apparatus are distributed throughout the ten stations and are subject to reallocation depending upon operational needs and vehicle maintenance.

The Fire Station #1 specific facilities consist of:

Administrative Offices - 20,172 square feet,
Emergency Operations Center - 8,179 square feet,
Storage Bays - 2,400; and,
Station Living Quarters and Bays - 12,200 square feet.

Fire Station #2 is a 4,000 square foot residential style on a 30,000 square foot parcel at 544 West Francis Street.

Fire Station #3 is a 5,600 square foot facility located on a 20,000 square foot parcel located at 1408 East Francis Street.

Fire Station #4 is a 5,200 square foot facility located on a 20,000 square foot facility located at 1005 North Mountain Avenue.

Fire Station #5 is a 5,200 square foot facility on a 35,000 square foot parcel located at 1530 East 4th Street.

Fire Station #6 is an 11,125 square foot facility located on a 41,000 square foot parcel located at 2931 East Philadelphia Street. Stations #6, #7 and #8 are based upon a similar floor plan.

Fire Station #7, is an 11,125 square foot facility located on a 41,000 square foot parcel located at 4901 E. Vanderbilt Avenue.

Fire Station #8 is an 11,125 square foot station on a 42,000 square foot parcel located at 3429 East Shelby Street. Station #8 houses the Technical Rescue Team and its response unit.

Station #9 was recently constructed at 2661 East Grand Park and consists of a 10,476 square foot facility constructed on a roughly 60,000+ square foot parcel. This station will be the primarily response facility to calls-for-service in the Ontario Ranch area. Station #9 houses the HazMat Team and response unit.

Station #10 is located at 1230 Tower Way on Ontario Airport property and is owned by the Ontario Airport Authority as opposed to the City and thus has been excluded from any calculations in this Report.

The **Training Center** is located at 1408 East Francis adjacent to Station #3 on a 154,240 square foot parcel and consists of a combined 10,400 square feet of classrooms, offices and apparatus/storage bays and numerous training exercise implements and props.

The land and replacement construction costs of the existing stations and training facilities is approximately $137.3 million. Not surprisingly, the City also has a sizable fleet of equipped City-owned response and prevention units consisting of:

- Four tractor drawn, tiller assisted aerial apparatus;
- Fifteen fire engines, one brush engine and one water tender;
- Eleven SUV type staff vehicles;
- Ten sedan type staff vehicles;
- Seven utility or flatbed trucks;
- One Bomb Squad, one Hazmat Squad, one Technical Rescue Squad, and one Mobile Command Post; and,
- Two Bomb Investigation trailers, one EOD truck, and one Fire Safety House trailer.

General City Replacement Assets. The total investment in the vehicle compliment in the is about $34.0 million. State or County vehicles and equipment are not included in the financial commitment figure. The City's fire-fighter assigned equipment and successful psychological and back-ground checks, at $17,108 per fire-fighter, is approximately $3.2 million investment total for the existing staff of one hundred and eighty-six fire fighters (figure excludes non-hires). There is also $3,045,500 in specialty equipment (typically in the station but not part of vehicle inventory). Lastly, the Fire Suppression Facility, Vehicle and Equipment Impact Fee has a negative fund balance of $2,412,140 creating a net investment of $175.2 million.

The current financial commitment or investment, in fire stations, training facilities, response fleet with specialty equipment and fund balance is a sizable $175,163,942. This figure represents what it would cost to establish the existing Department response capability to the General City at current vehicle, equipment, land acquisition and construction costs. The relevance of this figure will be established later in this Chapter.

Demand Upon Infrastructure Created by the Development of Underdeveloped or Vacant Parcels. While it can be said that numerous factors are considered when determining the number and location of fire stations in any city, it can be stated without fear of contradiction that all new private development in the City will have an effect on the City's current ability to respond to fire, rescue and emergency calls-for-service. The affect, simplified but not trivialized, is twofold. Initially, each new residential and business development will create, on average, more calls-for-service increasing the likelihood of simultaneous (and thus competing) calls-for-service. Additionally, as development spreads further from any existing station or stations, as large-scale development is often likely to do, the distances (and thus response times) will increase, taking the existing fire companies out-of-service for greater periods of time.

The capacity of any fire station is finite and will reach practical limits (through call *frequency* and *total time*). When that capacity is exceeded, the level of service afforded to existing development will be greatly reduced. Or stated in another way, if development continues without the addition of fire stations, the existing stations could be overwhelmed in terms of calls-for-service, making a timely response for emergency service a virtual coin flip. That is, will the existing fire companies be available to respond to your needs or will they most likely be out-of-service on a call in a different part of the community?

The **Purpose** of the Fee. In order to continue to be able to respond to an ever-increasing number of expected calls, the City staff has determined the need for the addition of four stations and the relocation of two existing stations to maximize coverage. Having the right type, size and number of fire stations in the right locations will enable policy makers, the Chief and City Council to house fire fighters, apparatus, and equipment in a rational way for maximum use of capital resources at the lowest annual operations cost. Conversely, the penalties are high and extremely visible for poor fire station location or a lack of one. Adverse effects are felt by the City staff, the council, and possibly by the existing taxpayers. With poor location or no additional locations, response times via great distance or out-of-service due to a previous call can become excessive, and if a tragedy occurs, the incident would be well publicized.

Often, response time is mistakenly referred to for only the first-in unit, and this can be a grave error. Instead, response time must consider *all* the forces necessary to place the incident under control. If the first unit arrives within five minutes but cannot provide the necessary water flow, or perform the needed functions due to a lack of staffing, the five minute response becomes insignificant and irrelevant. Thus an increase in the number and type of response vehicles is also necessary to match and equip the needed additional staff. The following sections identify the manner in which the City plans to meet the demands of additional calls-for-service.

The **Use** of the Fee. The revenues generated from a properly calculated and legally-supported Fire Suppression Facilities and Equipment Impact Fee would be limited to capital costs related to that growth. The fees would be used to construct new stations or expand existing stations (to increase the response capacity of that station) and increase the number of emergency response vehicles. Conversely, the Fire Suppression Facilities DIF receipts would not be used to repair any existing fire stations or replace any existing emergency response vehicles. Additional facilities are planned to come on-line, as needed, as development creates additional demands beyond the capability (volume or calls and distance) of the existing stations. The capital expansions include:

FS-001 and FS-002, Projects Completed or No Longer Needed.

FS-003, FS-005, FS-007 and FS-009 - Land acquisition and construction of four new 11,200 square foot stations, each of which would be located in the Ontario Ranch area of the City where approximately 54,428 detached, attached and high density dwelling units and 39.6 million square feet of retail/service, office and business park, industrial and institutional uses and 396 commercial lodging rooms are expected to be constructed. The four stations would be three bays wide by two bays deep at approximately 11,200 square feet each (see next group of projects). These stations are largely needed to serve the Ontario Ranch area. Each has an estimated land acquisition/construction cost of approximately $13.5 million.

FS-003A, FS-005A, FS-007A and FS-009A - Land acquisition and construction of four additional storage bays at 1,400 square foot, all four of which would be located in the Ontario Ranch area at the corresponding station listed previously. This would increase the capacity of each of those four stations described above to a four bay wide by two vehicles deep facility (4X2). However, these additional "4th bay" facilities are intended to store City-wide equipment such as back-up engines, tillers and other specialty fleet and thus the cost of these facilities are spread over the entire community including the existing community.

FS-004, FS-006, FS-008, FS-010 - Each of the previously referenced stations would need a fully-equipped basic response engine at $1,019,530. FS-004 also includes a fully-equipped aerial apparatus at $3,103,352.

FS-011 consists of the **Two Reserve Response Engines** needed to maintain the Department's one reserve engine per three active engines standard.

FS-012, Project Completed or No Longer Needed.

FS-013, Battalion Chief Response Vehicle - The Ontario Ranch's five stations will generate the need for a second battalion Chief who will need a fully equipped response vehicle.

FS-014, Fire Fighter Assigned Equipment - The additional 89 fire-fighters will be needed for the Ontario Ranch area and will require personally assigned equipment.

FS-015, Fire Administrative Headquarters Relocation - The project consists of constructing a $31.6 million, 30,000 square foot facility west of Euclid and north of Holt Avenue. The existing 17,000 Headquarters station has become inadequate in terms of space required for meetings, training and vehicles.

FS-016, Training Center Expansion - The current training facility will no longer be able to serve the anticipated additional staff and will need to be enlarged at approximately $9.8 million.

FS-017, City Emergency Operation Center - This $4.0 million project is the completion of the extremely important EOC facilities, the center for management for all large scale emergencies in the City.

FS-018, Special Operations Support Vehicle - The project consist of the addition of a support vehicle that is a rolling warehouse and canteen for long term incidents.

FS-019, Mobile Air and Support Vehicle - The support vehicle provides air-filling capability and has amiable bright lights for night-time fire and rescue incidents.

FS-020, Emergency Service Communications System - This is the companion project to LE-007 in the Law Enforcement infrastructure category.

FS-021, Share of Common City Yard Improvements - The City maintenance yard is the front line for maintenance/repair of all of the City's capital acquisitions and infrastructure. The existing facility has adequate space but will need additional facility improvements to be able to maintain the additional fire suppression vehicles and the new fire stations. The $1,404,845 is the fire suppression/rescue portion of the $44.5 million in improvements required at the maintenance yard.

FS-022, Project Completed or No Longer Necessary.

FS-023, Fire Station #1 Operations Relocation – Relocate the fire operation component of existing Station #1 along with the relocation of the Headquarters operation (see FS-015).

FS-024, Expand Station #3 (East Francis) – This is the smallest station in the City's inventory and will need to be expanded to accommodate a second company.

FS-025 has been completed.

The proposed projects and costs are identified on Schedule 4.1 and are detailed in the MFP. The total cost of completing the fire infrastructure system is a net $143,341,375. However there are outstanding credits for developer contributions in Ontario Ranch of $4,721,216. There are also negative fund balances in both the General City area ($2,412,140) and Ontario Ranch ($8,455,912). There is a planned one-time transfer of $3.5 million from the special Fund 119. The cumulative $112,052,680 acts to add to the financial obligations of the Fire Suppression Facilities, Vehicles and Equipment Impact Fee Fund moving the total cost to be recovered from impact fees from $143.3 million to $155.5 million.

The Relationship Between the Need for The Fee and The Type of Development Project. Fire service response standards extended to new development should be consistent with the fire response currently enjoyed by the City's existing citizens and business community by constructing new facilities, or else the result will be in the deterioration of the level of service (LOS) provided both to the existing residents and future citizens and businesses within the City of Ontario. It follows that it is appropriate to assess future development to contribute additional fire facilities.

To project the impact of future development on fire services, it was first necessary to quantify the current impact on services from each of the City's land uses. Then, a determination of the costs of future capital facilities necessary to meet this increased demand was made. The following section illustrates the relative impact from each land use on fire services and facilities. While the majority of these requests for service were made by Ontario citizens from their residences, a large percentage of requests were generated from new commercial and industrial uses within the City. A survey of each land use and its existing effect on requests for calls-for-

service was conducted to project the impact of future development on fire services. The calls-for-service survey was updated with current calls-forr-service data in a similar manner and concurrently with the process used to determine law enforcement demand (specifically described in Chapter 3, Law Enforcement et al.). Only requests for fire and rescue services to privately held property were counted. Requests for service to public property, such as City parks and public right-of-way or intersections, were excluded thus distributing these calls pro-rata through the requests for service from privately held property. This is based upon the argument that all public land serves privately held land in some manner.

Table 4-1, following, identifies the number of calls-for-service received by the Fire Department during the past calendar year by the previously identified DIF categories. The number of requests for service received by the Department during the year was then divided by either the developed (1,000) square feet, the existing number of dwelling units to determine the number of requests generated per business square foot, per dwelling unit or commercial lodging unit.

Table 4-1
Fire Suppression Existing Calls-for-Service Generated by Land Use
(Over a 12 Month Period Responses to the General City Area)

DIF Land-use Type	Developed Dwellings or Square Feet	Actual Calls For Service Over 12 Months	Total Calls per Dwelling or 1,000 SF (KSF)
Detached Dwelling Units	27,449	7,211	0.263/Unit
Attached Dwelling Units	12,050	3,011	0.250/Unit
High Density Dwelling Units	4,812	1,202	0.250/Unit
Mobile Home Dwelling Units	2,097	611	0.291/Unit
Commercial Lodging Units	5,810	970	0.167/Unit
Retail/Service Uses	18,418,611	3,438	0.187/KSF
Office Uses	9,595,912	1,141	0.115/KSF
Business Park Uses	9,587,138	128	0.013/KSF
Industrial Uses	106,400,598	1,417	0.013/KSF
Institutional Uses	2,318,711	95	0.041/KSF

Of residential land uses, a detached dwelling unit is just slightly more likely to require an emergency fire service response at 0.263 annual responses per unit than an attached dwelling unit at 0.250 annual responses per unit. Retail/Service use development is shown to generate the highest business use demand at 0.187 responses per 1,000 square foot of building space, while industrial development generates the least demand of 0.013 calls per 1,000 square feet. The lower demand by industrial uses should be expected given the greater density of employees and patrons in an office use establishment when compared to an industrial business of similar square feet. However, it should be noted that while there are fewer calls for industrial properties, significant training is required to be prepared for industrial responses, (i.e., trenching response and hazardous materials training).

Based upon these calls-for-service and the anticipated development, future demands in General City will increase from the 19,224 annual calls-for-service to private development by 10,895 to 30,119 calls-for-service per year. Continued development will benefit from the existence of the current eight stations and the fact that they have some existing capacity.

Resulting General City Area DIF Schedule. The collection of the resulting DIFs through build-out would allow the City to acquire or construct almost all of the proposed General City expansions and required equipment. This generally indicates that the City's expansion of the Fire capital has maintained pace with the increases in calls-for-service from new development and that there are very few if any deficiencies in the infrastructure dedicated to fire suppression/medic services. Table 4-2, on the following page, indicates the impact fee necessary to finance the cost to the additional stations, response equipment and fire-fighter equipment.

Table 4-2
City of Ontario's General City Area
Basic Needs-based Fire Suppression Facilities, Vehicles and Equipment Development Impact Costs by DIF Land-use Type

DIF Land-use Type	Allocation of Development Costs	Development Impact Cost Per Unit or Square Foot
Detached Dwelling Units (1)	$822,962	$728/Unit
Attached Dwelling Units	$1,862,055	$693/Unit
High Density Dwelling Units	$15,107,034	$693/Unit
Mobile Home Units	$77,586	$817/Unit
Commercial Lodging Units	$69,273	$462/Unit
Retail/Service Uses	$4,231,189	$0.518/S.F.
Office Uses	$6,658,511	$0.319/S.F.
Business Park Uses	$252,153	$0.036/S.F.
Industrial Uses	$1,102,825	$0.036/S.F.
Institutional Uses	$4,949	$0.014/S.F.

The Relationship Between the Use of the Fee and the Type of Development Paying the Fee. The *use of the fee* is equivalent to the *need for the fee*. The DIF would be collected as the development occurs (generally at building permit or some predetermined point in the process). As the development occurs, the impact is generated. The collected DIF receipts would be put to use to acquire additional fire-fighters assigned and specialty equipment, emergency response vehicles and an additional fire station necessary to respond to those additional calls-for-service, without reducing the capability of responding to calls from the existing community.

The Relationship Between the Amount of the Fee and the Cost of the Portion of the Facility Attributed to the Development Project. The new land, facilities, vehicles and equipment for the Ontario Ranch area are fully attributed to new development in that area. Station completion and relocations in the General City are also fully attributed to the General City area development. For projects that benefit both areas, the calls-for-service data was used to distribute responsibility. As an example, projects FS-015, FS-017, FS-018 and FS-019 will benefit both existing and all future residents and businesses, thus calls-for-service for the existing community (43.96%), OR (33.00%) and GC (23.04%), or the percentage that each represents of the total General Plan build-out calls-for-service. Detail regarding the full acquisition cost of the existing project is outlined in the *Master Facilities Project* detail page. The relationship for each project is identified on the individual detail project pages in the *MFP*.

The current community's commitment has been to establish the existing eight-station and training facility capability paid for via past General Fund receipts. To allow future residents to benefit by use of all of the capital needs without contributing additional assets, would be clearly unfair to the existing residents and would reduce their current level of service. Table 4-3, following, summarizes the distribution of the $175,163,942 in replacement costs to the existing residents and business owners (Schedule 4.3 details this distribution).

The replacement value of the existing fire infrastructure (stations, response fleet and related safety equipment) of $175,163,942 represents the current equity investment or *financial commitment* towards fire suppression capability by the existing community. When this figure is distributed over the existing community in the same manner as the future costs, by the land use demands, an investment, or financial "commitment" (or equity for that matter) per unit can be determined. As an example, each attached dwelling unit has invested about $2,394 into fire suppression capital while the proposed DIF is nearly one third as much at $728 per attached dwelling.

[This space left vacant in order to place the following table on a single page].

Table 4-3
Existing Fire Suppression Community
Financial Commitment Comparison Data

DIF Land-use Type	Allocation of Development Costs	Asset/Equity Investment Per Unit or Square Foot
Detached Dwelling Units	$65,704,702	$2,394/Unit
Attached Dwelling Units	$27,435,426	$2,276/Unit
High Density Dwelling Units	$10,952,302	$2,276/Unit
Mobile Home Dwelling Units	$5,567,268	$2,655/Unit
Commercial Lodging Units	$8,838,380	$1,521/Unit
Retail/Service Uses	$31,326,136	$1.701/S.F.
Office Uses	$10,396,487	$1.044/S.F.
Business Park Uses	$1,166,302	$0.122/S.F.
Industrial Uses	$12,911,325	$0.121/S.F.
Institutional Uses	$865,615	$0.373/S.F.

Resulting Ontario Ranch Area Development Impact Fee Schedule. The Ontario Ranch area will need to acquire five parcels and construct five stations to serve the 54,428 residential dwellings, 396 commercial lodging units and 36.4 million square feet of business use space which will generate nearly 15,603 annual calls-for-service to privately-held property in that area. In addition, the department will need to acquire additional response equipment, additional training capacity and maintenance capacity. This will cost $76,845,342 to complete the Ontario Ranch footprint fire capital needs. Negative fund balances and outstanding developer credits amount to an additional $13,177,128 in this impact fee fund obligations. This amount is mitigated by a one-time transfer of $3,536,588 from Fund 119 creating a net total amount to be supported by future impact fees to $86,485,882.

When these costs are distributed over the OR land-use database using the calls-for-service nexus rates, the proposed fees are as follows in Table 4-4 (as summarized from Schedule 4.2)

[This space left vacant in order to place the following table on a single page].

Table 4-4
The City's Ontario Ranch Area
Basic Needs-based Fire Suppression Facilities,
Vehicles and Equipment Development Impact Costs
by DIF Land-use Type

DIF Land-use Type	Allocation of Development Costs	Development Impact Cost Per Unit or Square Foot
Detached Dwelling Units	$17,000,077	$1,458/Unit
Attached Dwelling Units	$41,133,867	$1,386/Unit
High Density Dwelling Units	$18,130,829	$1,386/Unit
Commercial Lodging Units	$365,831	$924/Unit
Retail/Service Uses	$5,964,161	$1.037/S.F.
Office Uses	$1,701,671	$0.637/S.F.
Business Park Uses	$715,034	$0.072/S.F.
Industrial Uses	$1,224,981	$0.072/S.F.
Institutional Uses	$249,431	$0.229/S.F.

RECOMMENDED IMPACT FEES

The Existing Community Financial Commitment Comparison (Schedule 4.3) is far greater than the GC Minimum Needs-based Impact Costs (Schedule 4.2), which are necessary and sufficient to maintain the established fire suppressions system in that area. The OR Minimum Needs-based Impact Costs (Schedule 4.4) are necessary and sufficient to establish a fire suppressions system in that area. Schedules 4.2 and 4.4 would be the most equitable fee schedules to adopt for the GC and OR areas respectively.

OTHER NOTES AND ISSUES

1. Newly constructed industrial developments, initially charged the lower industrial use impact fee, often end up being retail/service uses and generate greater demands those of the industrial land uses. If this trend is left unrecognized, the Department, as well as other City services, will be faced with the greater demand from commercial uses, but will be left only with the collection of the lower industrial impact fee rates. To avoid this under-collection, the City should impose an impact fee representing the difference between the retail/service DIF and the previously paid industrial land-use impact fee when a CUP is approved and tenant improvement plans are submitted indicating a commercial use in an industrial zone.

RECAP OF RECOMMENDED FIRE SUPPRESSION IMPACT FEES

- **General City Area**- Adopt Schedule 4.2.
- **Ontario Ranch Area** - Adopt Schedule 4.4.

END OF CHAPTER TEXT

Schedule 4.1

City of Ontario
2021-22 Development Impact Cost Calculation Update
Allocation of Project Cost Estimates
Fire Suppression Facilities, Vehicles and Equipment

Line #	Project Title	Estimated Cost	Construction Needs Supported by Other Resources: Percent Need	Construction Needs Supported by Other Resources: Apportioned Dollar Cost	Construction Needs Generated by New Development in OR: Percent Need	Construction Needs Generated by New Development in OR: Apportioned Dollar Cost	Construction Needs Generated by New Development in G'nl City: Percent Need	Construction Needs Generated by New Development in G'nl City: Apportioned Dollar Cost
FS-001	Project Completed or No Longer Needed	$0	0.00%	$0	100.00%	$0	0.00%	$0
FS-002	Project Completed or No Longer Needed	$0	0.00%	$0	100.00%	$0	0.00%	$0
FS-003	Fire Station #11 Land Acquisition And Construction	$13,494,050	13.12%	$1,770,419	80.00%	$10,795,240	6.88%	$928,391
FS-003A	Fire Station #11 Vehicle Storage Bay	$1,667,090	43.96%	$732,853	33.00%	$550,140	23.04%	$384,098
FS-004	Fire Station #11 Response Engine and Aerial	$3,103,532	13.12%	$407,183	80.00%	$2,482,826	6.88%	$213,523
FS-005	Fire Station #12 Land Acquisition And Construction	$13,494,050	13.12%	$1,770,419	80.00%	$10,795,240	6.88%	$928,391
FS-005A	Fire Station #12 Vehicle Storage Bay	$1,667,090	43.96%	$732,853	33.00%	$550,140	23.04%	$384,098
FS-006	Fire Station #12 Response Engines	$1,019,530	13.12%	$133,762	80.00%	$815,624	6.88%	$70,144
FS-007	Fire Station #13 Land Acquisition And Construction	$13,494,050	13.12%	$1,770,419	80.00%	$10,795,240	6.88%	$928,391
FS-007A	Fire Station #13 Vehicle Storage Bay	$1,667,090	43.96%	$732,853	33.00%	$550,140	23.04%	$384,098
FS-008	Fire Station #13 Response Engine	$1,019,530	13.12%	$133,762	80.00%	$815,624	6.88%	$70,144
FS-009	Fire Station #14 Land Acquisition And Construction	$13,494,050	13.12%	$1,770,419	80.00%	$10,795,240	6.88%	$928,391
FS-009A	Fire Station #14 Vehicle Storage Bay	$1,667,090	43.96%	$732,853	33.00%	$550,140	23.04%	$384,098
FS-010	Fire Station #14 Response Engine	$1,019,530	13.12%	$133,762	80.00%	$815,624	6.88%	$70,144
FS-011	Reserve Response Engines	$2,039,060	13.12%	$267,525	80.00%	$1,631,248	6.88%	$140,287
FS-012	Project Completed or No Longer Needed	$0	0.00%	$0	0.00%	$0	0.00%	$0
FS-013	Battalion Chief Response Vehicle	$180,000	13.12%	$23,616	80.00%	$144,000	6.88%	$12,384
FS-014	Fire Fighter Assigned Equipment	$1,522,612	13.12%	$199,767	80.00%	$1,218,090	6.88%	$104,756
FS-015	Fire Administration Headquarters Relocation	$31,618,000	43.96%	$13,899,273	33.00%	$10,433,940	23.04%	$7,284,787
FS-016	Emergency Training Center Expansion	$9,777,441	0.00%	$0	58.88%	$5,757,364	41.12%	$4,020,077
FS-017	City Emergency Operations Center	$3,979,166	43.96%	$1,749,241	33.00%	$1,313,125	23.04%	$916,800
FS-018	Special Operations Support Vehicle	$137,500	43.96%	$60,445	33.00%	$45,375	23.04%	$31,680
FS-019	Mobile Air And Lighting Support Vehicle	$574,750	43.96%	$252,660	33.00%	$189,668	23.04%	$132,422
FS-020	Emergency Services Communication System	$3,244,780	13.12%	$425,715	80.00%	$2,595,824	6.88%	$223,241
FS-021	Share of Specific/Common City Yard Improvements	$1,404,845	0.00%	$0	58.88%	$827,231	41.12%	$577,614
FS-022	Project Completed or No Longer Needed	$0	0.00%	$0	0.00%	$0	0.00%	$0
FS-023	Fire Station Operations #1 Relocation	$17,092,056	65.00%	$11,109,836	8.00%	$1,367,364	27.00%	$4,614,855
FS-024	Expand Station #3 (East Francis)	$5,054,483	0.00%	$0	20.00%	$1,010,897	80.00%	$4,043,586
FS-025	Project Completed or No Longer Needed	$0	0.00%	$0	0.00%	$0	0.00%	$0
	Sub-Total General Plan Total Remaining Project Costs	$143,431,375	27.06%	$38,809,637	53.58%	$76,845,342	19.37%	$27,776,396
	FINANCIAL ADJUSTMENTS:							
	Ontario Ranch - Fire Suppression et. al. Outstanding Credits	$4,721,216	0.00%	$0	100.00%	$4,721,216	0.00%	$0
	Ontario Ranch - Development Impact Fee Fund Balance	$8,455,912	0.00%	$0	100.00%	$8,455,912	0.00%	$0
	Internal Fund Balance Transfer – Fund 119	($3,536,588)	0.00%	$0	100.00%	($3,536,588)	0.00%	$0
	General City - Development Impact Fee Fund Balance	$2,412,140	0.00%	$0	0.00%	$0	100.00%	$2,412,140
	Total Fund Balance/Outstanding Credits	$12,052,680	100.00%	$0	0.00%	$9,640,540	0.00%	$2,412,140
	Total General Plan Total New Project Costs	$155,484,055	24.96%	$38,809,637	55.62%	$86,485,882	19.42%	$30,188,536
					Forward to Schedule 4.4		Forward to Schedule 4.2	

(1). All developer-held "credits" under FINANCIAL ADJUSTMENTS will appear as a positive indicating an additional Infrastructure Fund obligation that will be redeemed (in lieu of a DIF payment) at some point in the future.
(2). A negative figure under FINANCIAL ADJUSTMENTS indicates a positive Fund Balance mitigating the project total. A positive figure indicates an amount that needs to be recovered by DIFs.
(3). Costs distributed based upon recent actual twelve month Police Department "Calls-for-Service" statistics.

Schedule 4.2

City of Ontario
2021-22 Development Impact Cost Calculation Update
General City (GC) - Minimum Capital Needs-based Impact Costs
Fire Suppression Facilities, Vehicles and Equipment

Proposed Land Use	Undeveloped Acres	Undeveloped Units	Call Generation Rate	Anticipated New Calls for Service	Percentage of Additional Service Calls	Allocation of Expansion Costs	Cost Distribution Per Acre	Average Units or Square Feet/Acre	Development Impact Fee per Unit or Square Foot
Detached Dwellings	262	1,131	0.263	297	2.73%	$822,962	$3,141	4.32	***$728 per Unit***
Attached Dwellings	183	2,688	0.250	672	6.17%	$1,862,055	$10,175	14.69	***$693 per Unit***
High Density Dwellings	598	21,807	0.250	5,452	50.04%	$15,107,034	$25,263	36.47	***$693 per Unit***
Mobile Home Dwellings	14	95	0.291	28	0.26%	$77,586	$5,542	6.79	***$817 per Unit***
Commercial Lodging Units	3	150	0.167	25	0.23%	$69,273	$23,091	50.00	***$462 per Unit***
Retail/Service Uses	992	8,164,415	0.187	1,527	14.02%	$4,231,189	$4,265	8,230	***$0.518 per S.F.***
Office Uses	822	20,895,746	0.115	2,403	22.06%	$6,658,511	$8,100	25,421	***$0.319 per S.F.***
Business Park Uses	341	6,969,626	0.013	91	0.84%	$252,153	$739	20,439	***$0.036 per S.F.***
Industrial Uses	441	30,650,125	0.013	398	3.65%	$1,102,825	$2,501	69,501	***$0.036 per S.F.***
Private Institutional Use	2	43,560	0.041	2	0.02%	$4,949	$2,474	21,780	***$0.114 per S.F.***
TOTAL	**3,658**	--	--	**10,895**	**100.00%**	**$30,188,536**	**in Total Equity in General City Area Capital Needs**		

Schedule 4.3

City of Ontario
2021-22 Development Impact Cost Calculation Update
Existing Community Financial Commitment Comparison
(Limited to Old Model Colony Assets)
Fire Suppression Facilities, Vehicles and Equipment

Proposed Land Use	Developed Acres	Developed Units	Call Generation Rate	Existing Calls for Service	Percentage of Existing Service Calls	Allocation of Infrastructure "Equity"	Distribution of "Equity" per Acre	Average Units or Square Feet/Acre	Current Financial Commitment per Unit or Square Foot
Detached Dwellings	4,733	27,449	0.263	7,211	37.51%	$65,704,702	$13,882	5.80	***$2,394 per Unit***
Attached Dwellings	641	12,050	0.250	3,011	15.66%	$27,435,426	$42,801	18.80	***$2,276 per Unit***
High Density Dwellings	193	4,812	0.250	1,202	6.25%	$10,952,302	$56,748	24.93	***$2,276 per Unit***
Mobile Home Dwellings	204	2,097	0.291	611	3.18%	$5,567,268	$27,291	10.28	***$2,655 per Unit***
Commercial Lodging Units	143	5,810	0.167	970	5.05%	$8,838,380	$61,807	40.63	***$1,521 per Unit***
Retail/Service Uses	477	18,418,611	0.187	3,438	17.88%	$31,326,136	$65,673	38,613	***$1.701 per S.F.***
Office Uses	310	9,959,192	0.115	1,141	5.94%	$10,396,487	$33,537	32,126	***$1.044 per S.F.***
Business Park Uses	741	9,587,138	0.013	128	0.67%	$1,166,302	$1,574	12,938	***$0.122 per S.F.***
Industrial Uses	6,610	106,400,598	0.013	1,417	7.37%	$12,911,325	$1,953	16,097	***$0.121 per S.F.***
Private Institutional Use	419	2,318,711	0.041	95	0.49%	$865,615	$2,066	5,534	***$0.373 per S.F.***
TOTAL	**14,471**	--	--	**19,224**	**100.00%**	**$175,163,942**	**Total Existing Fire Suppression System Assets**		
						$137,321,300	**in Fire Suppression Facilities Assets**		
						$34,027,260	**in Fire Suppression Vehicles Assets**		
						$3,182,022	**in Fire Fighter Assigned Equipment Assets**		
						$3,045,500	**Fire Specialty Equipment Assets**		
						($2,412,140)	**in Fire Suppression GC DIF Fund Balance**		

Land Use	Units or Acres	Percent of Total	Annual Calls Per Unit
Attached Dwellings	**12,050**	**71.5%**	**3,011.0**
High Density Dwellings	**4,812**	**28.5%**	**1,202.0**
Average Calls-for-Service	**16,862**	**100.0%**	**4,213.0**

Land Use	Units or Acres	Calls for Service	Annual Calls Per Unit
Business Park Uses	**9,587,138**	**8.3%**	**128.0**
Industrial Uses	**106,400,598**	**91.7%**	**1,417.0**
Average Calls-for-Service	**115,987,736**	**100.0%**	**1,545.0**

Schedule 4.4

2021-22 Development Impact Cost Calculation Update
Allocation of Project Cost Estimates
Ontario Ranch (OR) - Minimum Capital Needs-based Impact Costs
Fire Suppression Facilities, Vehicles and Equipment

Proposed Land Use	Undeveloped Acres	Undeveloped Units	Call Generation Rate	Anticipated New Calls for Service	Percentage of Additional Service Calls	Allocation of Expansion Costs	Cost Distribution Per Acre	Average Units or Square Feet/Acre	Development Impact Fee per Unit or Square Foot
Detached Dwellings	1,423	11,662	0.263	3,067	19.66%	$17,000,077	$11,947	8.20	***$1,458 per Unit***
Attached Dwellings	1,316	29,684	0.250	7,421	47.56%	$41,133,867	$31,257	22.56	***$1,386 per Unit***
High Density Dwellings	439	13,082	0.250	3,271	20.96%	$18,130,829	$41,300	29.80	***$1,386 per Unit***
Commercial Lodging Units	9	396	0.167	66	0.42%	$365,831	$40,648	44.00	***$924 per Unit***
Retail/Service Uses	279	5,751,595	0.187	1,076	6.90%	$5,964,161	$21,377	20,615	***$1.037 per S.F.***
Office Uses	114	2,670,188	0.115	307	1.97%	$1,701,671	$14,927	23,423	***$0.637 per S.F.***
Business Park Uses	428	9,953,243	0.013	129	0.83%	$715,034	$1,671	23,255	***$0.072 per S.F.***
Industrial Uses	669	16,981,679	0.013	221	1.42%	$1,224,981	$1,831	25,384	***$0.072 per S.F.***
Private Institutional Use	50	1,089,000	0.041	45	0.29%	$249,431	$4,989	21,780	***$0.229 per S.F.***
TOTAL	**4,727**	--	--	**15,603**	**100.00%**	**$86,485,882**	**in Total Equity in Ontario Ranch Area Capital Needs**		

Chapter 5
Circulation (Streets, Signals and Bridges) System

The following Chapter will discuss the Circulation System capital improvements consisting of major street segments, traffic signals and bridges required for the City through build-out of the existing City General Plan as identified in the Land-use Database Table in Chapter 2. Initially, RCS recommends continuation of the calculation of a comprehensive DIF schedule covering all components of the circulation system within the GC (General City) and OR (Ontario Ranch) areas, those three components consisting of major street segments, signals and bridge improvements. The reasons are practical in that combining this infrastructure will provide greater flexibility in establishing priorities in what is essentially a singular transportation issue with a common nexus, a combination of trip-end [(4)] generation and average trip distance. It is not uncommon that a single circulation capital project involves both a street segment improvement and traffic signal improvement.

The Existing System. The City currently has and maintains an extensive system of roadways available for transportation of goods and services, as well as for educational, recreational, and social purposes. Streets that fall under the jurisdiction of the City of Ontario are classified as one of four types of roadways for the purposes of this Report. The types of roadways are defined in The Ontario Plan Mobility Element.

Other Principal Arterial – This type of roadway typically has a 14' to 36' raised median that separates anywhere from four to eight lanes of traffic. This type of roadway may also have multi-purpose trails. The Other *Principal Arterial* contains the greatest portion of through-travel use and includes all higher-volume streets except those serving short trips.

Minor Arterial – Unlike the Other *Principal Arterial*, a *Minor Arterial* usually does not have a raised landscaped median. This type of roadway can accommodate four to six lanes of traffic and usually serves local and long distance trips with moderate mobility and considerable land access and connects less concentrated traffic generating areas such as schools, neighborhoods, and shopping centers.

Collector Street – A *collector street* does not have a raised landscaped median and can accommodate two to four lanes of traffic. This type of roadway serves mixed trips and provides service to abutting land and collects traffic from local streets.

Local Street – *Local streets* service residential areas and provide little long distance mobility. They are typically not striped but accommodate one lane of traffic in each direction. The curb-to-curb roadway width ranges from 36' to 48'. In general,

4 A *trip* is defined as a series of one or more trip-ends. A trip-end is a single stop in a trip. As an example, a drive from home to work is a trip. Each individual stop along the way along the way to drop children off at a school, buy gas, get a lunch, drop off laundry and the ultimate arrival at work or home is a trip-end. The term *trip* has no effect on the calculation and only means *a drive*.

construction of these streets is the responsibility of the developer, who then dedicates the completed street to the City. The City will accept the street improvements and the responsibility to maintain them if they meet City's requirements. For these reasons, the cost of all "local" streets has not been included in the Circulation System financial commitment calculation or the proportionality test.

GENERAL CITY DEVELOPMENT IMPACT FEES

Demand Upon Infrastructure Created by the Development of Undeveloped Parcels. Undeveloped parcels create few trip-ends beyond an occasional visit to the site for weed abatement purposes, planning purposes or to consider a sale or development of the vacant parcel. None of these trip-ends are not on a routine basis. However, a developed parcel will generate a statistically predictable amount of trip-ends and trip-miles, depending upon the specific land use of the development. Thus it can be stated that a vacant parcel, when developed into a specific use, i.e., residential or business, will generate more traffic than it did when it was vacant. Similarly, a change in the use of the property may increase or decrease the number of trip-ends, i.e., the demolition of a low trip-generating insurance office into reconstruction as a new a high trip generating fast-food restaurant.

All new development contributes to cumulative traffic impacts, which are difficult to measure and mitigate on a project-by-project basis but which have significant and widespread cumulative impacts on the City's existing road system. Factors that will increase the competition for existing major street segment lane miles existing in General City area include the following:

- The construction of 66.7 million square feet of private business uses on the net 2,598 under or undeveloped acres will generate 2.36 million additional daily trip-miles or about 84.9% of the total new trip-miles expected at GC General Plan build-out. This figure could vary significantly depending upon the type of commercial uses constructed and possible zoning changes or conditional use permits issued.

- An increase in the City's GC full-time population through the construction of about 25,721 additional dwelling units contributing approximately 414,498 new (net) daily trip-miles or just over 15.0% of the newly expected daily trip-miles.

- The addition of about 150 commercial lodging units will generate about 2,736 trip-miles, or about three tenths of one percent of the total new trip-miles.

When all (or most) of the available vacant land in the General City is developed, the City can expect an additional 2,770,597 daily trip-miles. For perspective, the City currently experiences an estimated 5,908,482 daily trip-miles from/to the existing residences and businesses. The roughly 2,770,597 newly anticipated trip-miles represent about a 46.9% increase over the current 5,908,482 daily trip-miles.

The **Purpose** of the Fee. In General City, most of the planned arterials and collectors exist in some form, perhaps not yet fully widened to allow for the full number of lanes. Stated another way, there are few if any opportunities to construct any completely new arterial/collectors. Thus

the collection of Circulation System DIFs become very imperative as a revenue source to finish off these existing, but, limited or incomplete, or not yet maximized roads. The same can be said for bridges, a number of them are included on the list to be completed to their maximum planned width, again maximizing the carrying capacity. Additionally, the fees would be used to complete the system of signals that insures the smooth movement of vehicles through intersections. Efficient signalization (i.e. turn pockets and fully actuated left-turn signals) are also important to keep vehicular traffic moving at the optimum efficiency through major intersections.

Included are transportation projects needed to alter existing arterials, connectors or collectors that currently exist, but due to additional trip-ends are becoming ineffective at moving vehicles.

Again, given the magnitude of growth projected in this Report, numerous intersection improvements and construction of new traffic signals will also be needed to avoid congestion and gridlock in the future. Traffic planners have long known that the most critical constraint in a typical roadway network would be the intersections. While the street capacity may be theoretically adequate to carry traffic volumes at build-out, motorists may experience congestion and even gridlock at the intersections of the street. While the City will certainly undertake numerous major street widening projects, an equally important component of traffic circulation is the installation of traffic signals and lane reconfiguration at critical intersections in the City.

The importance of traffic signals is two-fold. First, the City can build only so many major collector/arterial streets and there are limits as to how many extra lanes they will have. Second, north-south collectors will, by definition, intersect with east-west collectors assuring that *someone* will have to stop, either at a stop sign or a traffic signal. The traffic carrying capacity of each collector can only be maximized by assuring orderly flow of traffic by signalizing those intersecting collectors.

The collection of Circulation System DIFs is not intended to eliminate the time-honored practice of the developer constructing the full width roadway and being reimbursed for the portion greater than would otherwise be required of the developer. This impact fee calculation and resulting fee collection would simply improve the reimbursement capability.

The City's total MFP Circulation System infrastructure section identifies 106 remaining circulation-related projects covering both the General City and Ontario Ranch areas of the City. They have an estimated cost of $1,065,494,324. Approximately 16.27% of this amount or $173,321,022 has been identified as the responsibility of GC development as these projects will increase the capacity of the GC circulation system. Approximately 32.51% or $346,386,801 of the total project amount has been identified as the responsibility of OR Development. The remainder, 51.22% or $545,786,503 are projects that are not development-generated and will require non-DIF revenue sources. Most of this latter amount, about $212.5 million, is necessary for the remaining six planned but very costly grade separations under or over the Alhambra and Los Angeles rail-lines and $185.3 million for two remaining I-10 interchange improvements. The eight grade separations will not be fully financed by DIFs. An additional $27.9 million that is necessary for the pavement rehabilitation system projects will also not be financed from DIFs since they represent maintenance. The individual projects and costs are identified on Schedule 5.1 at the end of the Chapter and detailed in the MFP.

The **Use** of the Fee. The collection of Circulation System DIF schedule receipts would be used to construct the projects (or portions of projects) identified in Schedule 5.1 at the conclusion of this Chapter's text. The collected fees will be used to create additional lane miles, bridge lanes and signals with which to accommodate the additional 2,770,597 daily trip-miles expected from further development of General City.

The Relationship Between the Need for the Fee and The Type of Development Project. Schedule 5.1 identifies the additional traffic to be generated by new development, by type of development. The technical volume, *Trip Generation (Manual)* 7th Edition, produced by the Institute of Traffic Engineers, has been used to identify the *nexus*, or relationship between the type of development and the projected number of trips that development will generate.

A 900-unit detached dwelling specific plan would generate about 31,130 daily trip-miles and a twenty-acre retail/service development would generate 111,504 daily trip-miles. Each would pay its proportionate share of the total 2,770,597 newly created General City trip-miles expected at General Plan build-out. In the case of the detached dwelling residential development, the daily trip-miles generated by the 900 new residences represents about 1.2% of the total 2,770,597 new trip-miles anticipated at build-out, thus they would be required to pay or construct projects on the list to an amount equal to 1.2% of the total development-related project costs. The 20 acre retail/service development would finance 4.0% of the capital project list.

Circulation System Cost Distribution by Average Land-use Trip Frequency/Distance

New Trip Adjustment for *Pass-by* or *Diverted* Trips. Schedule 5.2 contains a sub-schedule that identifies adjustments to new total ***trip-ends***. As an example, an acre of general retail/service use would be expected, on average, to generate about 412 trip-ends daily. However, approximately 15% of those trip-ends, or about 62 trip-ends per day, are ***pass-by trip-ends.*** The ***trip-end*** is not truly an ***end*** but is actually one in a series of stops, i.e. at various commercial establishments, with a different location such as a residence as the final ***trip-end*** or destination of the series of ***trip-ends***. In order to be considered a pass-by trip, the location of the stop must be contiguous to the ***generator*** route [5], i.e. the route that would have been used even if the temporary stop had not been made. The Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) indicates that:

> Thus when forecasted trips based upon the trip generation rates are distributed to the adjacent streets, some reduction is made to account for those trips already there that will be attracted to the proposed development. [6]

Pass-by trip-ends are fully adjusted (reduced at 100%) from the average trip-ends (per day) generated by the eight land uses identified in Schedules 5.2 and 5.3.

5 An example of a diverted trip-end would be a single trip-end where along the way from work, a motorists evening drive deviates from the normal route taken home at perhaps a preferred grocery store, mail drop, or to pick up a child from a piano lesson before continuing home. Each of these three stops would be considered *diverted* trip-ends.
6 Trip generation, Institute of Transportation Engineers, 1099 14th Street, Suite 300 West, Washington D.C. 20005-3438. Definition of terms, page 147.

A *diverted* trip is similar to a *pass-by* trip-end in that it is an extra stop between, as an example, a motorists' work site and his or her residence. The *diverted* trip differs slightly from the *pass-by* trip in that it requires a minor deviation from the normal ***generator*** route and the temporary stop. In short, a *diverted* trip creates a separate side trip using additional (and different) lane miles from that of the normal route from the motorist's place of employment and his or her residence[6]. These trips increase the traffic volume from the generator route, but only for brief distances. The ITE states that diverted trips:

> are produced from traffic volume on roadways within the vicinity of the generator (route) and require a diversion from that roadway to another roadway with access to the site. These roadways could include streets or freeways adjacent to the generator but without access to the generator [(7)].

These *diverted* trips will be adjusted (reduced at 50%) from the full trip count for each of the land uses identified in Chapter 2. In this case the diverted trip ends result in a further reduction of 82 trip-ends daily of the full impact. Thus the original 412 daily trip miles resulting from the one acre of commercial use nets to a lower 268 additional trip ends per day.

Again, the sub-schedule at the bottom of Schedule 5.2 indicates the total trip-ends and the reduction due to the number pass-by trips (at 100%) and diverted trips (at 50%). The trip pass-by and diversion percentages were generated and are supported by a study conducted by the San Diego Association of Governments (SANDAG) in conjunction with various U.S. and California government agencies [(8)].

Additionally, the same SANDAG data schedule referenced above provides information for a trip distance factor component to the nexus. Based upon that data, a trip to an industrial work-site has the greatest distance at 9.0 miles. A trip to an office averages 8.8 miles, residential trips average 7.9 miles, a trip from a hotel or motel (once in residence) averages 7.6 miles, and an average trip to a retail/service site is the shortest at 4.3 miles. This indicates that drivers generally appear willing travel further distances to work and for treatment at medical offices than they are to shop. Both frequency (trip-ends) and distance (average miles per trip) have been combined into the nexus by multiplying average trip frequency by average trip distance. Tri-mile rates have been calculated for the ten DIF land-use categories. They are demonstrated at the bottom of schedule 5.2 at the end of the Chapter.

The Relationship Between the Use of the Fee and the Type of Development Paying the Fee. There is very little difference between this and the above category. The fee collected will be based on the projected number of trip-ends the proposed development will generate in relationship to the total 2,770,597 additional projected trip-miles at build-out. Any amount imposed as a Circulation System DIF will be placed in a separate fund (collecting interest), and is to be used only on the projects identified on Schedule 5.1 as development-related.

---

7 Institute of Transportation Engineers, 1099 14th Street NW, Suite 300 west, Washington D.C. 2005-3438, Definition of Terms, page 146.

8 *Traffic Generators*, San Diego Association of Governments, 401 B Street, Suite 800, San Diego, CA 92101. Brief Guide to Traffic Generators Rates. Compiled in conjunction with the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development. U.S. Department of Transportation, The California Department of Transportation and the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, July 1995.

From time to time the City may require an applicant for a private project to construct a street or signal improvement (or portion thereof) that is on the list of required improvements at the end of this Chapter. This method is often undertaken to expedite the project at the request of the applicant/developer. The developer should receive a credit for any monies expended on this required improvement against their Circulation System DIF.

The Relationship Between the Amount of the Fee and the Cost of the Portion of the Facility Attributed to the Development Project. The calculation of the Circulation System DIFs is based upon the recognition that differing types of developments generate differing amounts of trip-miles. The fee is based upon the projected number of trips generated by the proposed private development project. Circulation DIF receipts will be accumulated until they reach the amount that could construct a meaningful project to alleviate or mitigate the demands of those new developments. Table 5-1 (summarized from Schedule 5.2) on the following page identifies the Minimal Needs-based Circulation System DIF schedule for General City.

Table 5-1
City of Ontario's General City Area
Basic Needs-based Circulation System
Development Impact Costs
by DIF Land-use Type

DIF Land-use Type	Allocation of Development Costs	Development Impact Cost Per Unit or Square Foot
Detached Dwelling Units (1)	$2,515,209	$2,224/Unit
Attached Dwelling Units	$3,991,517	$1,485/Unit
High Density Dwelling Units	$20,033,840	$919/Unit
Mobile Home Units	$110,140	$1,159/Unit
Commercial Lodging Units	$175,915	$1,173/Unit
Retail/Service Uses	$36,687,107	$4.494/S.F.
Office Uses	$53,665,521	$2.568/S.F.
Business Park Uses	$18,622,728	$2.672/S.F.
Industrial Uses	$42,209,456	$1.377/S.F.
Institutional Uses	$127,821	$2.934/S.F.

(1). Detached Dwelling Units indicates a negative due a reduction in those units in GC

This set of proposed fees would generate the Minimum needs amount of revenue necessary to construct the needed street, signal and bridge construction projects. These figures then need to be compared to the financial commitment demonstrated by the existing community.

Alternative Cost Methodology. A more precise calculation of costs for specific types of land uses (i.e., banks, hospitals, convalescent residences, etc.) can be determined by multiplying the average cost per trip of $64.30 by the applicable daily trip-mile rate. An example of this calculation can be found at the bottom of Schedule 5.2 and applied to Table 5-2, following.

These tables list trip rates and costs for various residential, resort, industrial and commercial developments. A fee system based on a lengthy schedule of trip rates theoretically provides more accuracy and therefore financial commitment in determining specific uses' impact on the City's circulation system, but at the same time may increase the City's costs to administer the fee. A more extensive listing of traffic generators by land use is available in *Trip Generation* as published by the Institute of Transportation Engineers, New York, NY.

[This space left vacant to place the following table on a single page].

Table 5-2
Detail of Circulation System Basic Needs-based Development (rounded) Impact Fees for Specific General City Area Commercial/Office Uses

Land Use Category	Adjusted Trip-ends	Average Distance	Trip-end to Trip	Additional Trip-miles	Cost per Trip-mile	Cost per 1,000 Square Feet or Dwelling Unit
RESIDENTIAL LAND USES (per Unit):						
Detached Dwelling Unit	8.76	7.9	0.5	34.60	$64.30	$2,224 /Unit
Apartment	5.85	7.9	0.5	23.1	$64.30	$1,484 /Unit
Condominium/Townhome	5.36	7.9	0.5	21.2	$64.30	$1,363 /Unit
High Density Dwelling	3.61	7.9	0.5	14.3	$64.30	$918 /Unit
Mobile Home Dwelling	4.57	7.9	0.5	18.1	$64.30	$1,185 /Unit
RESORT/TOURIST (per Unit or Entry Door):						
Hotel (multi-story)	6.29	7.6	0.5	23.9	$64.30	$1,537 /Room
All Suites Hotel	3.77	7.6	0.5	14.3	$64.30	$919 /Room
Motel	4.34	7.6	0.5	16.5	$64.30	$1,061 /Room
INDUSTRIAL (per 1,000 SF):						
General Light Industrial	6.17	9.0	0.5	27.8	$64.30	$1,788 /KSF
Heavy Industrial	5.97	9.0	0.5	26.9	$64.30	$1,730 /KSF
Manufacturing	2.73	9.0	0.5	12.3	$64.30	$791 /KSF
Warehousing	4.39	9.0	0.5	19.8	$64.30	$1,273 /KSF
MISCELLANEOUS BUSINESS USES (per 1,000 SF):						
Office Park	9.08	8.8	0.5	40.0	$64.30	$2,572 /KSF
Research Park	7.18	8.8	0.5	31.6	$64.30	$2,032 /KSF
Business Park (Specific)	11.29	8.8	0.5	49.7	$64.30	$3,196 /KSF
RETAIL/SERVICE USES (per 1,000 SF):						
Building Material Store	29.35	4.3	0.5	63.1	$64.30	$4,057 /KSF
Garden Center	23.45	4.3	0.5	50.4	$64.30	$3,241 /KSF
Movie Theater	2.47	4.3	0.5	5.3	$64.30	$341 /KSF
Church	5.92	4.3	0.5	12.7	$64.30	$817 /KSF
Medical-Dental Office	22.21	8.8	0.5	97.7	$64.30	$6,282 /KSF
General Office Building	7.16	8.8	0.5	31.5	$64.30	$2,025 /KSF
Shopping Center	30.20	4.3	0.5	64.9	$64.30	$4,173 /KSF
Hospital	11.42	4.3	0.5	24.6	$64.30	$1,582 /KSF
Discount Center	62.93	4.3	0.5	135.3	$64.30	$8,700 /KSF
High-Turnover Restaurant	8.90	4.3	0.5	19.1	$64.30	$1,228 /KSF
Convenience Market	43.57	4.3	0.5	93.7	$64.30	$6,025 /KSF
Walk-in Bank	13.97	4.3	0.5	30.0	$64.30	$1,929 /KSF
Other: (not available "per KSF")						
Cemetary (per acre)	3.07	4.3	0.5	6.6	$64.30	$424.38 /Acre
Service Station/Market (avg	107.69	4.3	0.5	231.5	$64.30	$14,885.45 /FP/Day
Service Station/Car Wash	99.35	4.3	0.5	213.6	$64.30	$13,734.48 /FP/Day

Table 5-3 following, (and summarized from Schedule 5.3) identifies the assets of the existing system (at current construction and acquisition costs). The $910,371,218 consists of the existing circulation plan arterial and collector lanes (along with curb, gutter and sidewalks) at $497,485,472, major streets rights-of-way at $218,103,708, street lights with a replacement value of $40,367,100 plus signalized intersections valued at $66,141,600. There are numerous existing bridges over creeks/washes with an estimated replacement value of $63,790,000. The existing railroad grade separations have a replacement value of approximately $26,500,000 and a fleet of vehicles costing some $2,801,570. There is also an existing GC negative fund balance of which acts as a negative asset and reduces the total Circulation assets by $4,818,232. When the resulting net $910,371,218 is distributed over the existing community, using the same nexus factor (e.g. trip-miles) used for distribution of future costs, the existing community has contributed the following, on average, by land use:

Table 5-3
Existing Circulation System Community
Financial Commitment Comparison Data

DIF Land-use Category	Allocation of Development Costs	Development Impact Cost Per Unit or Square Foot
Detached Dwelling Units	$146,284,782	$5,329/Unit
Attached Dwelling Units	$42,879,331	$3,558/Unit
High Density Dwelling Units	$10,593,681	$2,202/Unit
Mobile Home Units	$5,827,256	$2,779/Unit
Commercial Lodging Units	$16,327,257	$2,810/Unit
Retail/Service Uses	$198,335,956	$10.768/S.F.
Office Uses	$61,294,047	$6.155/S.F.
Business Park Uses	$61,387,419	$6.403/S.F.
Industrial Uses	$351,138,113	$3.300/S.F.
Institutional Uses	$16,303,375	$7.031/S.F.

It should be noted that the existing community has contributed, on average, much more than would be required of future development to meet the minimum needs for build-out and all users. While there is clearly excess capacity in the existing system, it is usually the result of the existing community absorbing the initial street construction costs including the costly right-of-way acquisition, the later part of the community often finances only the smaller segment length widening's which maximize the street segments capacity.

Recommended GC Circulation System DIF Schedule. The adoption of Schedule 5.2 at the end of the chapter (and as summarized in Table 5-1), as the GC Circulation System DIF Schedule would generate enough capital to construct the facilities needed by the new development. In addition, the City should adopt the application of the *per trip-mile fee* from the bottom of Schedule 5.2 and multiplied by the specific use Table 5-2 or the listing of traffic generation by

land use available in *Trip Generation* as published by the Institute of Transportation Engineers, New York, N.Y.

ONTARIO RANCH AREA CIRCULATION SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT IMPACT FEES

The Ontario Ranch has its own major street segment, signal and bridge needs. The increased standards are due to greater understanding of vehicular movement and state-of-the-art traffic planning. Were the transportation needs of The Ontario Plan to be included in a single Ontario City DIF, the GC area would unfairly have to subsidize the OR area, something that the current residents and businesses in GC would not care to undertake. Indeed, RCS was given the direction that there is every expectation that the OR area would, at a minimum, pay their own way and where appropriate, pay their fair share.

The Use of The Fee. This fee will be primarily used to construct additional or "extra" lane miles. "Extra" lane miles are defined as the outside two lanes of a four-lane road, the outside four lanes on a six lane arterial, or the outside six lanes on an eight lane arterial. This calculation is intended to create greater equity among privately owned parcels with differing contiguous lane configurations. Consider that some private parcels will be contiguous to six lane streets and could be exacted to build one half of the six lanes, while other private parcels may be contiguous to a planned two lane avenue and would only be exacted to construct one half of the two lanes, or two lanes with a reimbursement for one of the lanes when the parcel on the opposite side is developed. The inequity is obvious; those contiguous to the larger capacity-carrying road types quite often pay a greater amount.

Construction Responsibility vs. DIF Payment. This DIF assumes that each developer, contiguous to a planned Major Street would:

- Dedicate the needed right-of-way and would be responsible for last lane of asphalt concrete or PCC and the median area (approximately 40 feet wide);
- Construct the parkway landscaping; and,
- Construct the curb, gutter, sidewalk, striping and street lights.

However, construction of the extra lanes would be financed by the Circulation System DIF, contributed to by all development within the OR area, thereby leveling the playing field between privately held parcels contiguous to a six lane collector as opposed to those privately held parcels contiguous to a two lane minor arterial. A given developer may undertake the actual construction of the *extra* lanes at the same time that they construct the *first* lane, but they would receive a reimbursement for construction of those *extra* lanes.

The City staff, through various documents, studies and agreements with other governmental agencies has identified a net $346,386,801 in necessary streets (in "extra" lane miles), signals bridges and other circulation system projects necessary to accommodate the 2,618,742 additional trip-miles in the OR are of the City. Included in these costs are a number of projects identified by other agencies such as SANBAG and CALTRANS. This figure is increased by $31,129,155 via a combination of owed outstanding developer credits and negative fund

balances to a total of $377,515,956 to be recovered from future DIF collections. This calculates to approximately $144.16 per daily trip-mile.

The DIF Adoption Ordinance should contain the necessary language for identifying the process for calculating the reimbursement amount for the construction of *extra* lanes. Table 5-4, following and summarized from Schedule 5.4, identifies the DIFs necessary to collect in order to foster the construction of the transportation system within the confines of the Ontario Ranch area. These are recommended for adoption.

Table 5-4
City of Ontario's Ontario Ranch Area
Basic Needs-based Circulation System
Development Impact Costs
by DIF Land-use Type

DIF Land Use Type	Allocation of Development Costs	Development Impact Cost per Unit or Square Foot
Detached Dwelling Units	$58,149,528	$4,986/Unit
Attached Dwelling Units	$98,828,970	$3,329/Unit
High Density Dwelling Units	$26,946,252	$2,060/Unit
Commercial Lodging Units	$1,041,262	$2,629/Unit
Retail/Service Uses	$57,947,273	$10.075/S.F.
Office Uses	$15,375,740	$5.758/S.F.
Business Park Uses	$59,268,746	$5.991/S.F.
Industrial Uses	$52,434,189	$3.088/S.F.
Institutional Uses	$7,163,995	$6.579/S.F.

ONTARIO RANCH CIRCULATION SYSTEM DIF SCHEDULE RECOMMENDATION

The DIFs for the nine broad land uses, as identified in Table 5-5 and Schedule 5.4 are recommended as the required set of fees with the option for the staff to apply the *per trip fee* calculated at $144.16 per trip-end from Schedule 5.4 multiplied by the specific use on Table 5-5 or the more extensive listing of traffic generation by land use available in *Trip Generation* as published by the Institute of Transportation Engineers, New York, N.Y.

[This space left blank to place the following table on one page].

Table 5-5
Detail of Circulation System Basic Needs-based DIFs (rounded) for Specific Ontario Ranch Area Business Uses

Land Use Category	Adjusted Trip-ends	Average Distance	Trip-end to Trip	Additional Trip-miles	Cost per Trip-mile	Cost per 1,000 Square Feet or Dwelling Unit
RESIDENTIAL LAND USES (per Unit):						
Detached Dwelling Unit	8.76	7.9	0.5	34.60	$144.16	$4,987 /Unit
Apartment	5.85	7.9	0.5	23.1	$144.16	$3,329 /Unit
Condominium/Townhome	5.36	7.9	0.5	21.2	$144.16	$3,056 /Unit
High Density Dwelling	3.61	7.9	0.5	14.3	$144.16	$2,060 /Unit
Mobile Home Dwelling	4.57	7.9	0.5	18.1	$144.16	$2,630 /Unit
RESORT/TOURIST (per Unit or Entry Door):						
Hotel (multi-story)	6.29	7.6	0.5	23.9	$144.16	$3,445 /Room
All Suites Hotel	3.77	7.6	0.5	14.3	$144.16	$2,061 /Room
Motel	4.34	7.6	0.5	16.5	$144.16	$2,379 /Room
INDUSTRIAL (per 1,000 SF):						
General Light Industrial	6.17	9.0	0.5	27.8	$144.16	$4,008 /KSF
Heavy Industrial	5.97	9.0	0.5	26.9	$144.16	$3,878 /KSF
Manufacturing	2.73	9.0	0.5	12.3	$144.16	$1,773 /KSF
Warehousing	4.39	9.0	0.5	19.8	$144.16	$2,854 /KSF
MISCELLANEOUS BUSINESS USES (per 1,000 SF):						
Office Park	9.08	8.8	0.5	40.0	$144.16	$5,766 /KSF
Research Park	7.18	8.8	0.5	31.6	$144.16	$4,555 /KSF
Business Park (Specific)	11.29	8.8	0.5	49.7	$144.16	$7,165 /KSF
RETAIL/SERVICE USES (per 1,000 SF):						
Building Material Store	29.35	4.3	0.5	63.1	$144.16	$9,096 /KSF
Garden Center	23.45	4.3	0.5	50.4	$144.16	$7,266 /KSF
Movie Theater	2.47	4.3	0.5	5.3	$144.16	$764 /KSF
Church	5.92	4.3	0.5	12.7	$144.16	$1,831 /KSF
Medical-Dental Office	22.21	8.8	0.5	97.7	$144.16	$14,084 /KSF
General Office Building	7.16	8.8	0.5	31.5	$144.16	$4,541 /KSF
Shopping Center	30.20	4.3	0.5	64.9	$144.16	$9,356 /KSF
Hospital	11.42	4.3	0.5	24.6	$144.16	$3,546 /KSF
Discount Center	62.93	4.3	0.5	135.3	$144.16	$19,505 /KSF
High-Turnover Restaurant	8.90	4.3	0.5	19.1	$144.16	$2,753 /KSF
Convenience Market	43.57	4.3	0.5	93.7	$144.16	$13,508 /KSF
Walk-in Bank	13.97	4.3	0.5	30.0	$144.16	$4,325 /KSF
Other: (not available "per KSF")						
Cemetary (per acre)	3.07	4.3	0.5	6.6	$144.16	$951.45 /Acre
Service Station/Market (avg	107.69	4.3	0.5	231.5	$144.16	$33,372.87 /FP/Day
Service Station/Car Wash	99.35	4.3	0.5	213.6	$144.16	$30,792.42 /FP/Day

RECAP OF RECOMMENDED CIRCULATION SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT IMPACT FEES

- **General City Area** - Adopt Schedule 5.2 for most land-uses and the per trip-end rate on Schedule 5.2 to be used in conjunction with the most current edition of ITE manual (and the trip length figures (via SANDAG) at the bottom of Schedule 5.2) for unusual land-uses (e.g. an amusement park).

- **Ontario Ranch Area** - Adopt Schedule 5.4 for most land-uses and the per trip-end rate on Schedule 5.4 to be used in conjunction with the most current edition of ITE manual (and the trip length figures (via SANDAG) at the bottom of Schedule 5.2) for unusual land-uses (e.g. an amusement park).

END OF CHAPTER TEXT

Schedule 5.1

City of Ontario
2021-22 Development Impact Cost Calculation Update
Allocation of Project Cost Estimates
Circulation (Streets, Signals and Bridges) System

Line #	Project Title	Estimated Cost	Construction Needs Supported by Other Resources		Construction Needs Generated by New Development in OR		Construction Needs Generated by New Development in GC	
			Percent Need	Apportioned Dollar Cost	Percent Need	Apportioned Dollar Cost	Percent Need	Apportioned Dollar Cost
ST-001	Archibald Avenue From Riverside to Edison (P)	$276,976	0.00%	$0	100.00%	$276,976	0.00%	$0
ST-002	Archibald Avenue From Edison To South City Limit (P)	$321,849	0.00%	$0	100.00%	$321,849	0.00%	$0
ST-003	Bellegrave Avenue From Archibald To Milliken (P)	$1,709,677	0.00%	$0	100.00%	$1,709,677	0.00%	$0
ST-004	Campus Avenue From Riverside To Merrill	$5,125,449	0.00%	$0	100.00%	$5,125,449	0.00%	$0
ST-005	Chino Avenue From Euclid To Milliken	$7,955,573	0.00%	$0	100.00%	$7,955,573	0.00%	$0
ST-006	Mill Creek Avenue From Riverside To Bellegrave (P)	$2,924,646	0.00%	$0	100.00%	$2,924,646	0.00%	$0
ST-007	Edison Avenue From Euclid To Walker	$11,315,002	0.00%	$0	100.00%	$11,315,002	0.00%	$0
ST-008	Edison Avenue From Walker To Vineyard	$3,336,357	0.00%	$0	100.00%	$3,336,357	0.00%	$0
ST-009	Edison Avenue From Vineyard To Mill Creek	$7,492,465	0.00%	$0	100.00%	$7,492,465	0.00%	$0
ST-010	Edison Avenue From Mill Creek to Milliken (P)	$809,769	0.00%	$0	100.00%	$809,769	0.00%	$0
ST-011	Eucalyptus Avenue From Euclid To Milliken	$8,764,717	0.00%	$0	100.00%	$8,764,717	0.00%	$0
ST-012	Euclid Avenue From Riverside To Merrill	$11,910,586	0.00%	$0	100.00%	$11,910,586	0.00%	$0
ST-013	Grove Avenue From Riverside To Merrill	$8,293,822	0.00%	$0	100.00%	$8,293,822	0.00%	$0
ST-014	Haven Avenue From Riverside To Bellegrave (P)	$5,301,689	0.00%	$0	100.00%	$5,301,689	0.00%	$0
ST-015	Merrill Avenue From Euclid To Archibald	$5,753,226	0.00%	$0	100.00%	$5,753,226	0.00%	$0
ST-016	Milliken Avenue From Riverside To Edison	$4,703,562	0.00%	$0	100.00%	$4,703,562	0.00%	$0
ST-017	Milliken Avenue From Edison To Bellegrave	$2,406,049	0.00%	$0	100.00%	$2,406,049	0.00%	$0
ST-018	Hellman Avenue From Riverside To Merrill	$3,916,058	0.00%	$0	100.00%	$3,916,058	0.00%	$0
ST-019	Riverside Drive From Euclid To Milliken (P)	$4,567,977	0.00%	$0	100.00%	$4,567,977	0.00%	$0
ST-020	Schaefer Avenue From Euclid To Haven	$6,470,318	0.00%	$0	100.00%	$6,470,318	0.00%	$0
ST-021	Turner Avenue From Riverside To Schaefer	$314,257	0.00%	$0	100.00%	$314,257	0.00%	$0
ST-022	Vineyard Avenue From Riverside To Merrill	$11,505,904	0.00%	$0	100.00%	$11,505,904	0.00%	$0
ST-023	Walker Avenue From Riverside To Merrill	$3,915,292	0.00%	$0	100.00%	$3,915,292	0.00%	$0
ST-024	Ontario Ranch Traffic Control System (P)	$25,812,097	0.00%	$0	100.00%	$25,812,097	0.00%	$0
ST-025	Non-Dev. ROW, Frontage Imps. & SCE Pole Relocations	$51,368,402	0.00%	$0	100.00%	$51,368,402	0.00%	$0
ST-026	Additional SCE Pole Relocations	$664,000	0.00%	$0	100.00%	$664,000	0.00%	$0
ST-027	Project Completed or No Longer Needed	$0	0.00%	$0	0.00%	$0	0.00%	$0
ST-028	Project Completed or No Longer Needed	$0	0.00%	$0	0.00%	$0	0.00%	$0
ST-029	OR Offsite Cantu Galleano Widening I-15 To Milliken	$2,343,127	0.00%	$0	100.00%	$2,343,127	0.00%	$0
ST-030	OR Offsite Euclid Avenue Improvements, Merrill To US-71	$6,487,700	0.00%	$0	100.00%	$6,487,700	0.00%	$0
ST-031	OR Offsite Archibald Avenue Bridge Over Santa Ana River	$265,561	0.00%	$0	100.00%	$265,561	0.00%	$0

Schedule 5.1

City of Ontario
2021-22 Development Impact Cost Calculation Update
Allocation of Project Cost Estimates
Circulation (Streets, Signals and Bridges) System

			Construction Needs Supported by Other Resources		Construction Needs Generated by New Development in OR		Construction Needs Generated by New Development in GC	
Line #	Project Title	Estimated Cost	Percent Need	Apportioned Dollar Cost	Percent Need	Apportioned Dollar Cost	Percent Need	Apportioned Dollar Cost
ST-032	OR Offsite Hamner Avenue Bridge Over The Santa Ana River	$614,318	0.00%	$0	100.00%	$614,318	0.00%	$0
ST-033	General City Street Lights (P)	$3,449,315	0.00%	$0	0.00%	$0	100.00%	$3,449,315
ST-034	General City Traffic Signals	$16,587,656	0.00%	$0	0.00%	$0	100.00%	$16,587,656
ST-035	Benson Avenue From Mission To Philadelphia	$898,664	56.00%	$503,252	0.00%	$0	44.00%	$395,412
ST-036	Mountain Avenue From Sixth To Holt (P)	$2,630,159	56.00%	$1,472,889	0.00%	$0	44.00%	$1,157,270
ST-037	Project Completed or No Longer Needed	$0	0.00%	$0	0.00%	$0	0.00%	$0
ST-038	Bon View Avenue From Holt to Mission	$1,172,758	56.00%	$656,744	0.00%	$0	44.00%	$516,014
ST-039	Bon View Avenue From Mission To Belmont	$659,505	56.00%	$369,323	0.00%	$0	44.00%	$290,182
ST-040	Project Completed or No Longer Needed	$0	0.00%	$0	0.00%	$0	0.00%	$0
ST-041	Project Completed or No Longer Needed	$0	0.00%	$0	0.00%	$0	0.00%	$0
ST-042	Grove Avenue From Fourth Street to Airport Drive	$37,893,616	56.00%	$21,220,425	0.00%	$0	44.00%	$16,673,191
ST-043	Turner Avenue, From Inland Empire Boulevard To Fourth	$740,915	56.00%	$414,912	0.00%	$0	44.00%	$326,003
ST-044	Archibald Avenue from Fourth To Guasti Park Entrance	$1,993,436	56.00%	$1,116,324	0.00%	$0	44.00%	$877,112
ST-045	Milliken Avenue From SR-60 To Riverside	$395,257	56.00%	$221,344	0.00%	$0	44.00%	$173,913
ST-046	Project Completed or No Longer Needed	$0	0.00%	$0	0.00%	$0	0.00%	$0
ST-047	Etiwanda Avenue At Airport Drive	$8,732,855	82.27%	$7,184,339	0.00%	$0	17.73%	$1,548,516
ST-048	Eight Street From West Cucamonga Creek To Grove	$161,637	56.00%	$90,517	0.00%	$0	44.00%	$71,120
ST-049	Project Completed or No Longer Needed	$0	0.00%	$0	0.00%	$0	0.00%	$0
ST-050	Fourth Street From Palmetto To San Antonio	$1,224,737	56.00%	$685,853	0.00%	$0	44.00%	$538,884
ST-051	Fourth Street From Campus To Cucamonga	$1,015,343	56.00%	$568,592	0.00%	$0	44.00%	$446,751
ST-052	Fourth Street From Vineyard To Archibald	$654,975	0.00%	$0	0.00%	$0	100.00%	$654,975
ST-053	Holt Boulevard From Benson To Vineyard	$50,897,689	56.00%	$28,502,706	0.00%	$0	44.00%	$22,394,983
ST-054	Guasti Road From Holt To Archibald	$966,772	56.00%	$541,392	0.00%	$0	44.00%	$425,380
ST-055	State Street From Benson To Grove	$4,795,686	56.00%	$2,685,584	0.00%	$0	44.00%	$2,110,102
ST-056	Airport Drive Under The I-15 Freeway	$3,004,539	56.00%	$1,682,542	0.00%	$0	44.00%	$1,321,997
ST-057	Project Completed or No Longer Needed	$0	0.00%	$0	0.00%	$0	0.00%	$0
ST-058	Mission Boulevard From Cypress To Grove	$5,492,817	56.00%	$3,075,978	0.00%	$0	44.00%	$2,416,839
ST-059	Mission Boulevard From Grove To Milliken (P)	$10,828,222	56.00%	$6,063,804	0.00%	$0	44.00%	$4,764,418
ST-060	Phillips Street From Benson To Mountain	$556,398	56.00%	$311,583	0.00%	$0	44.00%	$244,815
ST-061	Project Completed or No Longer Needed	$0	0.00%	$0	0.00%	$0	0.00%	$0
ST-062	Acacia Street From Baker To Vineyard	$72,662	56.00%	$40,691	0.00%	$0	44.00%	$31,971

Schedule 5.1

City of Ontario
2021-22 Development Impact Cost Calculation Update
Allocation of Project Cost Estimates
Circulation (Streets, Signals and Bridges) System

			Construction Needs Supported by Other Resources		Construction Needs Generated by New Development in OR		Construction Needs Generated by New Development in GC	
Line #	Project Title	Estimated Cost	Percent Need	Apportioned Dollar Cost	Percent Need	Apportioned Dollar Cost	Percent Need	Apportioned Dollar Cost
ST-063	Francis Street From Benson To Campus	$4,496,927	56.00%	$2,518,279	0.00%	$0	44.00%	$1,978,648
ST-064	Jurupa Street From Archibald To East Of Turner	$762,141	56.00%	$426,799	0.00%	$0	44.00%	$335,342
ST-065	Philadelphia Street From Campus To Grove	$847,658	56.00%	$474,688	0.00%	$0	44.00%	$372,970
ST-066	Philadelphia From E/O Vineyard to Cucamonga Creek	$523,338	56.00%	$293,069	0.00%	$0	44.00%	$230,269
ST-067	Project Completed or No Longer Needed	$0	0.00%	$0	0.00%	$0	0.00%	$0
ST-068	Project Completed or No Longer Needed	$0	0.00%	$0	0.00%	$0	0.00%	$0
ST-069	Grove Avenue Bridge Over West Cucamonga Creek	$940,937	56.00%	$526,925	0.00%	$0	44.00%	$414,012
ST-070	Project Completed or No Longer Needed	$0	0.00%	$0	0.00%	$0	0.00%	$0
ST-071	Holt Boulevard Bridge Over West Cucamonga Creek	$249,936	56.00%	$139,964	0.00%	$0	44.00%	$109,972
ST-072	Mission Boulevard Bridge Over West Cucamonga Creek	$699,821	56.00%	$391,900	0.00%	$0	44.00%	$307,921
ST-073	Project Completed or No Longer Needed	$0	0.00%	$0	0.00%	$0	0.00%	$0
ST-074	Francis Street Bridge Over West Cucamonga Creek	$224,942	56.00%	$125,968	0.00%	$0	44.00%	$98,974
ST-075	Eighth Street Bridge Over Cucamonga Creek	$1,924,510	56.00%	$1,077,726	0.00%	$0	44.00%	$846,784
ST-076	Sixth Street Bridge Over Cucamonga Creek	$1,536,373	56.00%	$860,369	0.00%	$0	44.00%	$676,004
ST-077	Fourth Street Bridge Over Cucamonga Creek	$790,240	0.00%	$0	0.00%	$0	100.00%	$790,240
ST-078	Project Completed or No Longer Needed	$0	0.00%	$0	0.00%	$0	0.00%	$0
ST-079	Holt Boulevard Bridge Over Cucamonga Creek	$2,793,405	56.00%	$1,564,307	0.00%	$0	44.00%	$1,229,098
ST-080	Project Completed or No Longer Needed	$0	0.00%	$0	0.00%	$0	0.00%	$0
ST-081	Mission Boulevard Bridge Over Cucamonga Creek	$2,049,478	56.00%	$1,147,708	0.00%	$0	44.00%	$901,770
ST-082	Francis Street Bridge Over Cucamonga Creek	$1,874,522	56.00%	$1,049,732	0.00%	$0	44.00%	$824,790
ST-083	Philadelphia Street Bridge Over Cucamonga Creek	$222,963	56.00%	$124,859	0.00%	$0	44.00%	$98,104
ST-084	Riverside Drive Bridge Over Cucamonga Creek	$1,093,633	56.00%	$612,434	0.00%	$0	44.00%	$481,199
ST-085	Archibald Avenue Bridge Over Upper Deer Creek	$1,257,032	56.00%	$703,938	0.00%	$0	44.00%	$553,094
ST-086	Archibald Avenue Bridge Over Upper Deer Creek Spillway	$1,759,846	56.00%	$985,514	0.00%	$0	44.00%	$774,332
ST-087	Project Completed or No Longer Needed	$0	0.00%	$0	0.00%	$0	100.00%	$0
ST-088	Project Completed or No Longer Needed	$0	0.00%	$0	0.00%	$0	0.00%	$0
ST-089	Archibald Avenue Bridge Over Lower Deer Creek	$371,964	0.00%	$0	100.00%	$371,964	0.00%	$0
ST-090	Project Completed or No Longer Needed	$0	0.00%	$0	0.00%	$0	0.00%	$0
ST-091	Grove Avenue Grade Separation Under UPRR/Alhambra	$11,034,119	56.00%	$6,179,107	0.00%	$0	44.00%	$4,855,012
ST-092	Milliken (N) Grade Separation Under UPRR/Alhambra	$26,735,802	99.28%	$26,542,127	0.00%	$0	0.72%	$193,675
ST-093	Project Completed or No Longer Needed	$0	100.00%	$0	0.00%	$0	0.00%	$0

Schedule 5.1

City of Ontario
2021-22 Development Impact Cost Calculation Update
Allocation of Project Cost Estimates
Circulation (Streets, Signals and Bridges) System

Line #	Project Title	Estimated Cost	Construction Needs Supported by Other Resources		Construction Needs Generated by New Development in OR		Construction Needs Generated by New Development in GC	
			Percent Need	Apportioned Dollar Cost	Percent Need	Apportioned Dollar Cost	Percent Need	Apportioned Dollar Cost
ST-094	Project Completed or No Longer Needed	$0	66.89%	$0	4.54%	$0	28.57%	$0
ST-095	Archibald (S) Grade Separation Over UPRR/LA	$59,529,194	74.80%	$44,530,086	0.00%	$0	25.20%	$14,999,108
ST-096	San Antonio (S) Grade Separation Under UPRR/Alhambra	$24,904,800	56.00%	$13,946,688	0.00%	$0	44.00%	$10,958,112
ST-097	Campus (S) Grade Separation Under UPRR/Alhambra	$24,904,800	56.00%	$13,946,688	0.00%	$0	44.00%	$10,958,112
ST-098	Project Completed or No Longer Needed	$0	0.00%	$0	0.00%	$0	0.00%	$0
ST-099	Vine (S) Grade Separation Under UPRR/LA Line	$21,791,700	100.00%	$21,791,700	0.00%	$0	0.00%	$0
ST-100	Sultana (S) Grade Separation Under UPRR/LA Line	$21,791,700	80.00%	$17,433,360	0.00%	$0	20.00%	$4,358,340
ST-101	Bon View (S) Grade Separation Under UPRR/LA Line	$21,791,700	100.00%	$21,791,700	0.00%	$0	0.00%	$0
ST-102	Pavement Management System Rehabilitation Program	$27,863,941	100.00%	$27,863,941	0.00%	$0	0.00%	$0
ST-103	Circulation System Maintenance Vehicles	$3,595,574	0.00%	$0	48.59%	$1,747,131	51.41%	$1,848,443
ST-104	Great Park Bridge Over Archibald Avenue	$5,177,843	0.00%	$0	100.00%	$5,177,843	0.00%	$0
ST-105	SR-60 At Vineyard Interchange Reconstruction/Expansion	$52,725,537	43.70%	$23,041,060	56.30%	$29,684,477	0.00%	$0
ST-106	SR-60 At Archibald Interchange Reconstruction/Expansion	$12,990,458	64.06%	$8,322,155	35.94%	$4,668,303	0.00%	$0
ST-107	SR-60 At Euclid Interchange Reconstruction/Expansion (P)	$5,915,683	74.60%	$4,413,100	25.40%	$1,502,583	0.00%	$0
ST-108	SR-60 At Grove Interchange Reconstruction/Expansion	$52,435,737	52.30%	$27,423,890	47.70%	$25,011,847	0.00%	$0
ST-109	SR-60 At Mountain Interchange Reconstruction/Expansion	$15,565,500	76.70%	$11,938,739	23.30%	$3,626,762	0.00%	$0
ST-110	Project Completed or No Longer Needed	$0	0.00%	$0	0.00%	$0	0.00%	$0
ST-111	I-10 Freeway at Grove/Fourth	$182,545,236	89.10%	$162,647,805	0.00%	$0	10.90%	$19,897,431
ST-112	Traffic Signal System Control and Operations Center (P)	$2,281,811	0.00%	$0	50.00%	$1,140,906	50.00%	$1,140,906
ST-113	General City Backbone Signal Interconnect	$2,698,020	80.00%	$2,158,416	0.00%	$0	20.00%	$539,604
ST-114	I-10 At Euclid Avenue Eastbound On Ramp (P)	$9,243,354	93.00%	$8,596,319	0.00%	$0	7.00%	$647,035
ST-115	Project Completed or No Longer Needed	$0	0.00%	$0	0.00%	$0	0.00%	$0
ST-116	I-10 At Vineyard Interchange Reconstruction/Expansion (P)	$2,738,474	60.00%	$1,643,084	0.00%	$0	40.00%	$1,095,390
ST-117	Ontario Ranch Road/Trail Separation	$2,328,050	0.00%	$0	100.00%	$2,328,050	0.00%	$0
ST-118	Hellman Avenue Bridge Over Cucamonga Creek	$2,183,267	0.00%	$0	0.00%	$0	100.00%	$2,183,267
ST-119	Project Completed or No Longer Needed	$0	0.00%	$0	100.00%	$0	0.00%	$0
ST-120	Project Completed or No Longer Needed	$0	0.00%	$0	100.00%	$0	0.00%	$0
ST-121	Schaefer Avenue Bridge Over Cucamonga Creek	$6,946,758	0.00%	$0	100.00%	$6,946,758	0.00%	$0
ST-122	Schaefer Avenue Over Cucamonga Creek Spillway	$12,349,792	0.00%	$0	100.00%	$12,349,792	0.00%	$0
ST-123	Edison Avenue Bridge Over Cucamonga Creek	$17,995,412	0.00%	$0	100.00%	$17,995,412	0.00%	$0
ST-124	Eucalyptus Avenue Bridge Over Cucamonga Creek	$11,000,000	0.00%	$0	100.00%	$11,000,000	0.00%	$0

Schedule 5.1

City of Ontario
2021-22 Development Impact Cost Calculation Update
Allocation of Project Cost Estimates
Circulation (Streets, Signals and Bridges) System

Line #	Project Title	Estimated Cost	Construction Needs Supported by Other Resources: Percent Need	Construction Needs Supported by Other Resources: Apportioned Dollar Cost	Construction Needs Generated by New Development in OR: Percent Need	Construction Needs Generated by New Development in OR: Apportioned Dollar Cost	Construction Needs Generated by New Development in GC: Percent Need	Construction Needs Generated by New Development in GC: Apportioned Dollar Cost
ST-125	Merrill Avenue Bridge Over Cucamonga Creek	$11,000,000	0.00%	$0	100.00%	$11,000,000	0.00%	$0
ST-126	Share of Specific/Common City Yard Improvements	$1,915,576	0.00%	$0	48.59%	$930,800	51.41%	$984,776
ST-127	Ontario Ranch Bus Stop Shelters	$3,088,824	0.00%	$0	100.00%	$3,088,824	0.00%	$0
ST-128	Ontario Ranch Street Design Studies	$1,074,109	0.00%	$0	100.00%	$1,074,109	0.00%	$0
ST-129	Fourth Street Under The I-10 Freeway	$20,757,659	53.68%	$11,143,565	0.00%	$0	46.32%	$9,614,094
ST-130	Guasti Road Extension From 1,530' E/O Of Haven Easterly 310'	$607,375	0.00%	$0	0.00%	$0	100.00%	$607,375
ST-131	Ontario Ranch Traffic Study	$94,815	0.00%	$0	100.00%	$94,815	0.00%	$0
	Sub-Total General Plan Total New Projects	$1,065,494,324	51.22%	$545,786,503	32.51%	$346,386,801	16.27%	$173,321,022
	FINANCIAL ADJUSTMENTS:							
	Ontario Ranch - Local Streets Outstanding Credits	$25,950,213	0.00%	$0	100.00%	$25,950,213	0.00%	$0
	Ontario Ranch - Regional Streets Outstanding Credits	$3,898,143	0.00%	$0	100.00%	$3,898,143	0.00%	$0
	Ontario Ranch - Development Impact Fee Fund Balance	$1,280,799	0.00%	$0	100.00%	$1,280,799	0.00%	$0
	General City - Development Impact Fee Fund Balance	$4,818,232	0.00%	$0	0.00%	$0	100.00%	$4,818,232
	Total Fund Balance/Outstanding Credits	$35,947,387	0.00%	$0	86.60%	$31,129,155	13.40%	$4,818,232
	Total Net General Plan Project Costs	$1,101,441,711	49.55%	$545,786,503	34.27%	$377,515,956	16.17%	$178,139,254
					Forward to Schedule 5.4		**Forward to Schedule 5.2**	

NOTES:

(1). All developer-held "credits" under FINANCIAL ADJUSTMENTS will appear as a positive indicating an additional Infrastructure Fund obligation that will be redeemed (in lieu of a DIF payment) at some point in the future.

(2). A negative figure under FINANCIAL ADJUSTMENTS indicates a positive Fund Balance mitigating the project total. A positive figure indicates an amount that needs to be recovered by DIFs.

(3). Costs distribution based upon a frequency and distance factor.

Schedule 5.2

City of Ontario
2021-22 Development Impact Cost Calculation Update
General City (GC) - Minimum Capital Needs-based Impact Costs
Circulation (Streets, Signals and Bridges) System

Proposed Land Use	Undeveloped Acres	Undeveloped Units	Trip-end and Length Factor	Total GC Additional Trip-miles	Percentage of Additional Trip-miles	Allocation of Expansion Costs	Cost Distribution Per Acre	Average Units or Square Feet/Acre	Development Impact Fee per Unit or Square Foot
Detached Dwellings	262	1,131	34.588	39,119	1.41%	$2,515,209	$9,600	4.32	*$2,224 per Unit*
Attached Dwellings	183	2,688	23.095	62,080	2.24%	$3,991,517	$21,812	14.69	*$1,485 per Unit*
High Density Dwellings	598	21,807	14.288	311,586	11.25%	$20,033,840	$33,501	36.47	*$919 per Unit*
Mobile Home Dwellings	14	95	18.035	1,713	0.06%	$110,140	$7,867	6.79	*$1,159 per Unit*
Commercial Lodging Units	3	150	18.239	2,736	0.10%	$175,915	$58,638	50.00	*$1,173 per Unit*
Retail/Service Uses	992	8,164,415	69.888	570,594	20.59%	$36,687,107	$36,983	8,230	*$4.494 per S.F.*
Office Uses	822	20,895,746	39.944	834,659	30.13%	$53,665,521	$65,287	25,421	*$2.568 per S.F.*
Business Park Uses	341	6,969,626	41.557	289,639	10.45%	$18,622,728	$54,612	20,439	*$2.672 per S.F.*
Industrial Uses	441	30,650,125	21.419	656,483	23.69%	$42,209,456	$95,713	69,501	*$1.377 per S.F.*
Private Institutional Use	2	43,560	45.634	1,988	0.07%	$127,821	$63,911	21,780	*$2.934 per S.F.*
TOTAL	**3,658**	–	–	**2,770,597**	**100.00%**	**$178,139,254**	**in Total GC Circulation General Plan Projects**		
ALTERNATIVE FEE METHODOLOGY				***2,770,597***		***$178,139,254***	***$64.30 per Daily Trip-mile***		

Trip-ends Adjustment Calculation Land Use Title	Daily Total Trip-ends	Percent of Diverted Trips	Diverted Trip-end % Adjustment	Diverted Trip-end Percent	Percent of Pass-by Trips	Combined Diverted and Pass-by	Remaining Trip % as Adjustment %	Adjusted Trip Rate, Adjustment % X Total trips	*Average Trip Length*	*Trip-ends X Length X 50%*
Detached Dwellings	9.57	11	0.50	5.5	3.0	**8.5**	**91.5%**	8.76	***7.9***	***34.6***
Attached Dwellings	6.39	11	0.50	5.5	3.0	**8.5**	**91.5%**	5.85	***7.9***	***23.1***
High Density Dwellings	3.95	11	0.50	5.5	3.0	**8.5**	**91.5%**	3.62	***7.9***	***14.3***
Mobile Home Dwellings	4.99	11	0.50	5.5	3.0	**8.5**	**91.5%**	4.57	***7.9***	***18.0***
Commercial Lodging Units	6.23	38	0.50	19.0	4.0	**23.0**	**77.0%**	4.80	***7.6***	***18.2***
Retail/Service Uses	50.01	40	0.50	20.0	15.0	**35.0**	**65.0%**	32.51	***4.3***	***69.9***
Office Uses	10.50	19	0.50	9.5	4.0	**13.5**	**86.5%**	9.08	***8.8***	***39.9***
Business Park Uses	10.44	19	0.50	9.5	2.0	**11.5**	**88.5%**	9.23	***9.0***	***41.6***
Industrial Uses	5.38	19	0.50	9.5	2.0	**11.5**	**88.5%**	4.76	***9.0***	***21.4***
Private Institutional Use	11.99	19	0.50	9.5	4.0	**13.5**	**86.5%**	10.37	***8.8***	***45.6***

Schedule 5.3

City of Ontario
2021-22 Development Impact Cost Calculation Update
Existing Community Financial Commitment Comparison
Circulation (Streets, Signals and Bridges) System

Proposed Land Use	Undeveloped Acres	Undeveloped Units	Trip-end and Length Factor	Existing GC Trip-miles	Percentage of Additional Trip-miles	Allocation of Expansion Costs	Cost Distribution Per Acre	Average Units or Square Feet/Acre	Development Impact Fee per Unit or Square Foot
Detached Dwellings	4,733.0	27,449	34.588	949,416	16.07%	$146,284,782	$30,907	5.80	*$5,329 per Unit*
Attached Dwellings	641.0	12,050	23.095	278,295	4.71%	$42,879,331	$66,894	18.80	*$3,558 per Unit*
High Density Dwellings	193.0	4,812	14.288	68,755	1.16%	$10,593,681	$54,890	24.93	*$2,202 per Unit*
Mobile Home Dwellings	204.0	2,097	18.035	37,820	0.64%	$5,827,256	$28,565	10.28	*$2,779 per Unit*
Commercial Lodging Units	143.0	5,810	18.239	105,967	1.79%	$16,327,257	$114,177	40.63	*$2,810 per Unit*
Retail/Service Uses	477.0	18,418,611	69.888	1,287,238	21.79%	$198,335,956	$415,799	38,613	*$10.768 per S.F.*
Office Uses	310.0	9,959,192	39.944	397,810	6.73%	$61,294,047	$197,723	32,126	*$6.155 per S.F.*
Business Park Uses	741.0	9,587,138	41.557	398,416	6.74%	$61,387,419	$82,844	12,938	*$6.403 per S.F.*
Industrial Uses	6,610.0	106,400,598	21.419	2,278,953	38.57%	$351,138,113	$53,122	16,097	*$3.300 per S.F.*
Private Institutional Use	419.0	2,318,711	45.634	105,812	1.79%	$16,303,375	$38,910	5,534	*$7.031 per S.F.*
TOTAL	**14,471.0**	--	--	**5,908,482**	**100.00%**	**$910,371,218**	**Total Circulation System Capital Assets**		
						$497,485,472	**in General Plan Major Streets Assets (full width)**		
						$218,103,708	**in General Plan Streets Rights of Way Assets**		
						$63,790,000	**in General Plan Bridges Assets**		
						$26,500,000	**in General Plan Grade Separation Assets**		
						$66,141,600	**in General Plan Signal/Intersection Assets**		
						$2,801,570	**in Street Maintenance Vehicle Assets**		
						$40,367,100	**in Street Light Assets**		
						($4,818,232)	**in Circulation System DIF Fund Balance**		

Schedule 5.4

City of Ontario
2021-22 Development Impact Cost Calculation Update
Ontario Ranch (OR) - Minimum Capital Needs-based Impact Costs
Circulation (Streets, Signals and Bridges) System

Proposed Land Use	Undeveloped Acres	Undeveloped Units	Trip-end and Length Factor	Total OR Additional Trip-miles	*Percentage of Additional Trip-miles*	Allocation of Expansion Costs	Cost Distribution Per Acre	Average Units or Square Feet/Acre	*Development Impact Fee per Unit or Square Foot*
Detached Dwellings	1,423	11,662	34.588	403,370	15.40%	$58,149,528	$40,864	8.20	*$4,986 per Unit*
Attached Dwellings	1,316	29,684	23.095	685,554	26.18%	$98,828,970	$75,098	22.56	*$3,329 per Unit*
High Density Dwellings	439	13,082	14.288	186,920	7.14%	$26,946,252	$61,381	29.80	*$2,060 per Unit*
Commercial Lodging Units	9	396	18.239	7,223	0.28%	$1,041,262	$115,696	44.00	*$2,629 per Unit*
Retail/Service Uses	279	5,751,595	69.888	401,967	15.35%	$57,947,273	$207,696	20,615	*$10.075 per S.F.*
Office Uses	114	2,670,188	39.944	106,658	4.07%	$15,375,740	$134,875	23,423	*$5.758 per S.F.*
Business Park Uses	428	9,953,243	41.557	413,631	15.80%	$59,628,746	$139,320	23,255	*$5.991 per S.F.*
Industrial Uses	669	16,981,679	21.419	363,724	13.89%	$52,434,189	$78,377	25,384	*$3.088 per S.F.*
Private Institutional Use	50	1,089,000	45.634	49,695	1.90%	$7,163,995	$143,280	21,780	*$6.579 per S.F.*
TOTAL	4,727	--	--	2,618,742	100.00%	$377,515,956	**in Total OR Circulation General Plan Projects**		
			ALTERNATIVE FEE METHODOLOGY	***2,618,742***		***$377,515,956***	***$144.16 per Daily Trip-mile***		

Chapter 6
Storm Drainage Collection System Facilities

Storm Drainage collection system is an infrastructure that will also consist of two DIF schedules, one for each of the GC (General City) and OR (Ontario Ranch) areas of the City. Again this is due to significantly differing capital needs of the two areas. The first part of this chapter will be directed at explaining the nexus and the specific GC Storm drainage DIFs. The remainder of the Chapter will address the OR area needs and the resulting OR DIF schedule.

GENERAL CITY STORM DRAINAGE FACILITIES IMPACT FEES

The Existing GC System. The City's existing storm drainage network is composed of street gutter facilities, inlets and a network of storm drain pipe-lines which convey run-off to larger pipelines, washes and creeks located throughout the City ultimately leading into the Santa Ana River. However, as the City continues to develop vacant parcels with rooftops, parking lots and driveways, the existing City-owned storm drainage lines will reach capacity and the ability of the existing drainage lines to collect additional run-off from developing areas will diminish regardless of the availability of a good system of wash channels. Additionally, there are areas in the City, such as near safety facilities such as the Police Station (existing and future) and numerous fire stations that require storm drainage improvements to insure adequate safety response times to a few large vacant areas to be developed.

City records indicate that the existing GC storm drainage system has about 426,568 linear feet of reinforced concrete pipe sized averaging about 50", requiring 1,103 inlet boxes/manholes, 427 junction boxes and 1,706 inlets. The City also has 14,726 linear feet of concrete channel.

Property-based Benefit Reasoning. Initially, the use of separate zones was reconsidered for each drainage basin within the City because each area has its own capital needs for storm-water collection. Storm-water run-off from south of SR-60 may not directly impact the homeowner north of Mission Avenue; similarly, a small debris detention basin near Auto Center Drive required to handle run-off from the businesses in that area may provide little direct benefit to a business in the downtown area of the City. In each case, there can be some distinct property-related areas of benefit for each drainage basin. However, the owners and users of all developed and undeveloped parcels benefit, directly and indirectly, from all City-wide existing and future storm drainage improvements. As the various systems within the greater community of the City of Ontario develop, concurrent with development of private property, the benefits are generally recognized as:

1. Proposed development projects can only be approved by the City when precautions, generally in the form of infrastructure improvements, have been made that assure that developed and undeveloped downstream parcels will not be adversely affected (i.e., inundated, flooded, cut off from access in and out), by storm water from the project being proposed. The avoidance of downstream or down-zone damage from the development of an upstream parcel may not be a major concern to a developer, but the City must concern itself with such issues when approving private development proposals.

2. The private development being assessed a DIF will receive the same storm-water protection from other development projects upstream or up-zone from its own development.

3. Storm water must be adequately controlled and removed to large scale flood control channels or creeks to assure access by public safety vehicles to all parts of the City, regardless of which zone a call-for-service is in. Fire and other rescue calls, as well as law enforcement and public works responses, cannot wait during heavy rainstorms. To the contrary, emergency calls-for-service probably increase during such storm events and the City's public safety and maintenance units must be able to respond, ***to all zones***.

4. The City of Ontario's citizens and business owners/employees must also be able to travel safely (and send/receive goods and services) in heavy rain through one zone to another. An adequate and sufficient storm drainage system will provide such protection.

5. Storm drainage collection pipes protect the integrity of the road bed of the very important arterials and collectors.

RCS recommends continuation the single zone storm drainage fee for GC. Storm water will leave one part of the City and pass through other portions the Santa Ana River riverbed area.

Demand Upon Infrastructure Created by the Development of Underdeveloped or Undeveloped Parcels. The construction of flood control and storm drainage facilities is essential to the preservation of private property, public streets, curbs and other facilities. The county or a regional level of government is generally responsible for *flood control* [(9)], and cities are generally responsible for *storm drainage*. The building of new residences and businesses on presently undeveloped land will increase the amount of *runoff* and thus accelerate the need for additional storm drainage facilities to handle increased *runoff* from these developing areas. As the vacant land is developed and bare dirt or turf is replaced with impervious rooftop, parking lots, driveways, pools, and sidewalks, greater rainfall amounts *run off* of the developed parcel.

The amount of the run-off varies with differing types of development (i.e. land-use) and the varying amounts are referred to as the *run-off coefficients*. Approximately 0.775 (or 77.5%) of rainfall that falls on a parcel developed with detached dwelling residences, is not absorbed by that parcel and for the most part exits that developed parcel. The rate for an attached dwelling run-off is not much higher than a detached dwelling at 0.810 (81.0%). Most business uses such as lodging, retail/service, office, industrial and institutional have a run-off coefficient in excess of 0.900 or 90.0% with the exception of Business Park at a slightly lesser 0.875 or 87.5%.

Clearly, rainfall run-off increases with development. The cumulative effects of additional run-off must be managed with the appropriate capital facilities. These costs of the new storm drainage

[9] Projects of major importance generally involving the control of large quantities of flood water through numerous cities and unincorporated areas.

(and flood control revenue shortages) will be distributed by the coefficients of drainage, i.e., the percentage of property that will end up with impervious coverage such as asphalt or cement-based concrete drives or parking lots, rooftop, pools and any other hard surface that does not allow any absorption into the soil.

The **Purpose** of the Fee. The costs of extending the same level of storm drainage protection to the newly developing residences and businesses as is provided to the existing community (that has largely paid for the existing system) can be calculated, a fee imposed and collected. The Fee revenues can then be used to expand the storm drainage facilities necessary to extend that same level of services. The City staff has identified a total of $299,014,967 in storm drainage projects required to fully complete the City's network of pipes and small channels. Development within the General City area is responsible for $68,710,652 of that project estimate amount. The existing General City area Storm Drainage DIF Fund balance of $9,726,169 acts to reduce that figure while credits to developers that have constructed some portions of the GC storm drainage system increases the project totals by $2,694,792 netting to a reduced final figure of $61,679,275. That figure has been identified as Category "A" projects in the Master Plan of Drainage, which include mainline storm drain facilities that will relieve flooding in areas within GC without any current storm drain facilities.

Category C projects (Ontario Ranch), consisting of projects to service future development, mostly within the OR, include $138,667,242 in OR Storm Drainage DIF projects. Category C projects have combined outstanding credits (a negative that must be collected) total of $29,649,054 while there is a positive fund balance of $10,614,169 for a net increase to the $138,667,242 of $19,034,885 to $157,702,127. This will be discussed later in the Report.

The Use of the Fee. The construction of flood and storm drainage facilities in the City of Ontario is essential to the preservation of public and private property. The San Bernardino County Flood Control District (SBCFCD) is the agency responsible for planning, construction, operation and maintenance of regional flood control facilities for this region. The SBCFCD will consider taking responsibility for storm drain facilities that convey storm water run-off greater than 750 cfs or from drainage areas that are greater than 640 acres. The City is typically responsible for the collection of local storm water run-off below those thresholds.

The building of new residences and businesses on presently undeveloped land will require the installation of additional storm drains of sufficient capacity with an adequate number of inlets to handle increased rainwater run-off from these areas where development reduces natural absorption opportunities. This Chapter reviews the costs of storm drainage and flood control facilities needed to serve future development.

The revenues raised from a properly calculated and supported Storm Drainage Collection Facilities DIF would be limited to the capitalized costs related to that growth. The fees would be used to construct the additional or parallel storm drainage lines necessary to increase the drainage capacity of the system to accommodate the additional rainwater run-off generated by the continued development. Conversely, the Storm Drainage Collection System DIF receipts would not be used to repair, replace or rehabilitate any existing storm drainage lines. The limited

exceptions would be if the replacement or rehabilitation project creates additional capacity, in which case that proportional amount of additional capacity could be included as a DIF cost.

The Relationship Between the Need for The Fee and The Type of Development Project. Upon the identification of the costs of storm drainage facilities generated by future development, costs must be further distributed for each of the land uses (i.e., business and residential uses) based on their estimated rainwater run-off. Residential detached dwelling development leaves the greatest remaining turf percentage per parcel and thus the greatest percolation, and conversely the least run-off of rainwater. As such, the detached dwelling residential land use should not bear the same cost as the institutional or industrial development, which generally have little or no turf area (or stated another way, a higher percentage of impervious area) and therefore generates a higher amount of rainwater run-off. For this Report, costs were distributed between land uses on established run-off coefficients. A listing of these run-off coefficients is provided in Table 6-1[10] following.

Table 6-1
Storm Drainage Run-off Coefficients
(By Acre)

DIF Land-use Type	Run-off Coefficient
Detached Dwelling Units	0.775
Attached Dwelling Units	0.810
High Density Dwelling Units	0.900
Mobile Home Dwelling Units (GC)	0.800
Commercial Lodging (keyed) Units	0.900
Retail/Service Uses	0.900
Office Uses	0.900
Business Park Uses	0.875
Industrial Uses	0.950
Institutional Uses	0.950

As stated earlier, the General City area requires $61,679,275 in *Category A* storm drainage projects. Table 6-2, following, demonstrates the DIF schedule that would need to be imposed to fully fund the completion of the *Category A* storm drainage system's collection of pipes and channels identified in the Master Plan of Drainage necessary for the GC area of the City. It would not be unreasonable to require development, those generating greater amounts of rainwater run-off, to finance some portion of the identified storm drainage needs providing there is no violation of the proportionality requirement. Table 6-2 indicates the resulting fees required

10 *San Bernardino Hydrology Manual* (1986). Williamson and Schmidt, Irvine, CA , Figure C-4.

to fully fund the *Category A* (General City) projects. Please note that the DIF, by land use, is in terms of *units* such as residential dwellings or business square feet of building pad (adjusted for multiple floors).

Table 6-2
City of Ontario's General City Area
Minimal Needs-based Storm Drainage System
Development Impact Costs
by DIF Land-use Type

DIF Land-use Type	Allocation of Development Costs	Development Impact Cost Per Unit or Square Foot
Detached Dwelling Units	$3,847,370	$3,402/Unit
Attached Dwelling Units	$2,808,646	$1,045/Unit
High Density Dwelling Units	$10,197,756	$468/Unit
Mobile Home Units	$212,216	$2,234/Unit
Commercial Lodging Units	$51,159	$341/Unit
Retail/Service Uses	$16,916,679	$2.072/S.F.
Office Uses	$14,017,651	$0.671/S.F.
Business Park Uses	$5,653,577	$0.811/S.F.
Industrial Uses	$7,938,220	$0.259/S.F.
Institutional Uses	$36,001	$0.856/S.F.

The Relationship Between the Use of the Fee and the Type of Development Paying the Fee. The Storm Drainage DIFs that are imposed and collected will be used to mitigate the storm water run-off generated by the type of development. If the development is a commercial or industrial property generating a significant amount of run-off, the fee collected will be proportionally higher and will be enough to construct the required additions to the storm drainage system downstream from this development.

From time to time the City may require an applicant of a private project to construct an improvement (or portion thereof) that is on the list of required improvements at the end of this Chapter. This is often done to expedite the project for the applicant/developer. The developer should receive a credit for any money expended on this required improvement against their calculated storm drainage impact fee.

The Relationship Between the Amount of the Fee and the Cost of the Portion of the Facility Attributed to the Development Project. Similar to the section above, the relationship is based upon the projected amount of storm water that will need to be collected and safely transported to flood control channels or rivers. The downstream collection lines (lines further down from the proposed project but prior to the outfall into a river/flood control channel) need to be sized to

handle all of the storm-water collected upstream. Storm-water that is collected in one location accumulates feeder lines along the way and thus the downstream system must be built increasingly higher the farther from the water source.

Table 6-3, following, distributes the total equity replacement value of the existing storm drainage system at $245,985,006 over the existing GC developed community. The total consists of the actual existing storm drainage pipe and channel systems at $235,890,545, the existing storm drainage maintenance vehicle allocation of $368,292 and existing GC Storm Drainage Collection System DIF fund balance of $9,726,169. There remains a developer credit of $2,694,792 that acts as a debit to the existing value of the system, in effect it is owed to the developers holding those credits. The combined $243,290,214 development impact cost investment, represents the long term financial commitment contributed by the existing community through dedications (from the developers of these established developments) and tax contributions.

Table 6-3
Existing Storm Drainage Community
Financial Commitment Comparison Data

DIF Land-use Type	Allocation of Development Costs	Development Impact Cost Per Unit or Square Foot
Detached Dwelling Units	$70,339,640	$2,563/Unit
Attached Dwelling Units	$9,956,461	$826/Unit
High Density Dwelling Units	$3,330,901	$692/Unit
Mobile Home Units	$3,129,551	$1,492/Unit
Commercial Lodging Units	$2,467,973	$425/Unit
Retail/Service Uses	$8,232,331	$0.447/S.F.
Office Uses	$5,350,152	$0.537/S.F.
Business Park Uses	$12,433,351	$1.297/S.F.
Industrial Uses	$120,416,777	$1.132/S.F.
Institutional Uses	$7,633,076	$3.292/S.F.

Of note is the fact that in Table 6-3, the investment "equity" of the current community is less than that of the previously exhibited Minimum Needs-based DIFs identified in Table 6-2, indicating that proportionality between the existing community and the future community does not exist. As such, it would not be appropriate to require the undeveloped parcels to finance (via Table 6-3 and Schedule 6.3) the remainder of the Storm Water Collection System needs for the General City area of the City.

Recommended General City Storm Drainage Development Impact Fee Schedule. The adoption of Schedule 6.3 and summarized in Table 6-3 as the Storm Drainage Collection System DIF schedule would generate capital to construct the storm drainage collection facilities needed by the new development in the GC.

ONTARIO RANCH IMPACT FEE CALCULATION

Storm drainage projects related to the construction of private land within Ontario Ranch will be one of the more costly infrastructures necessary for the area at just over a net $157.7 million for the entire system. These projects, identified on Schedule 6.1 listed under the *Construction Needs Generated by New Development in OR* column, are also detailed in the *Master Plan of Drainage.*

Most of the projects fall clearly within the boundaries of the Ontario Ranch area and serve only that area, while others have some shared responsibility with General City. The shared projects include:

- SD-032 - Mill Creek, Chino to County Line Channel,
- SD-069 - Storm Drainage Maintenance Vehicles,
- SD-075 - Storm Drain Master Plan; and,
- SD-103 - Share of Common City Yard Improvements.

Again, as with Circulation System, the City had no desire to annex an area as large as the OR area of Ontario, and then be forced to subsidize the cost of accommodating the storm drainage needs generated by development in that area at the cost of existing residents and businesses. Those that choose to develop vacant parcels in the Ontario Ranch area will need to bear the full costs of the infrastructure required to serve or accommodate that development. Accordingly, all efforts have been made to insure that no projects benefitting new development in the General City have been included in the net $157,702,127 in OR storm drainage capital needs. This cost would be distributed over the 4,727.0 additional acres of impervious surface from OR developments.

Table 6-4, following and summarized from Schedule 6.5, identifies the fee schedule necessary to be applied to the combination of proposed development of the varying land-uses in Ontario Ranch. The costs have been distributed using the same nexus identified earlier in this Chapter as Table 6-1 *Storm Drainage Run-off Coefficients*. The proposed DIFs are as follows:

[This space left vacant in order to place the following table on a singe page].

Table 6-4
Ontario's Ontario Ranch Area Storm Drainage Collection System
Development Impact Fee
by DIF Land Use Type

DIF Land Use Type	Allocation of Development Costs	Development Impact Cost per Unit Or Square Foot
Detached Dwelling Units	$43,662,462	$3,744/Unit
Attached Dwelling Units	$42,202,923	$1,422/Unit
High Density Dwelling Units	$15,642,590	$1,196/Unit
Commercial Lodging Units	$320,691	$810/Unit
Retail/Service Uses	$9,941,418	$1.782/S.F.
Office Uses	$4,062,085	$1.521/S.F.
Business Park Uses	$14,827,005	$1.490/S.F.
Industrial Uses	$25,162,358	$1.482/S.F.
Institutional Uses	$1,880,595	$1.727/S.F.

RECAP OF RECOMMENDED STORM DRAINAGE IMPROVEMENTS DIFS

- **General City** - Adopt Schedule 6.3 for the ten land-uses and the *Cost Distribution per Acre* figure (from the third column from the right side of the Schedule 6.3) for developments that do not involve a building pad, (e.g. additional asphalt parking area).

- **Ontario Ranch** - Adopt Schedule 6.4 for the nine land-uses and the *Cost Distribution per Acre* figure (from the third column from the right side of Schedule 6.4) for developments that do not involve a building pad, (e.g. additional asphalt parking area) or cases where the unit density varies significantly from Schedule 6.4

END OF CHAPTER TEXT

Schedule 6.1

City of Ontario
2021-22 Development Impact Cost Calculation Update
Allocation of Project Cost Estimates
Storm Drainage Collection System Facilities

			Construction Needs Supported by Other Resources		Construction Needs Generated by New Development in OR		Construction Needs Generated by New Development in GC	
Line #	Project Title	Estimated Cost	Percent Need	Apportioned Dollar Cost	Percent Need	Apportioned Dollar Cost	Percent Need	Apportioned Dollar Cost
SD-001	Euclid Avenue, Riverside To Merrill	$9,631,342	0.00%	$0	100.00%	$9,631,342	0.00%	$0
SD-002	Grove Avenue, Grove Basin To Merrill	$12,233,373	0.00%	$0	100.00%	$12,233,373	0.00%	$0
SD-003	Project Completed or No Longer Needed	$0	0.00%	$0	0.00%	$0	0.00%	$0
SD-004	Project Completed or No Longer Needed	$0	0.00%	$0	100.00%	$0	0.00%	$0
SD-005	Merrill Avenue, Euclid To Bon View	$7,046,489	0.00%	$0	100.00%	$7,046,489	0.00%	$0
SD-006	Campus Avenue, 920' N/O Eucalyptus To Merrill	$1,607,718	0.00%	$0	100.00%	$1,607,718	0.00%	$0
SD-007	Bon View, 1,320' N/O Chino To Merrill	$8,511,617	0.00%	$0	100.00%	$8,511,617	0.00%	$0
SD-008	Euclid Avenue Laterals	$6,659,804	0.00%	$0	100.00%	$6,659,804	0.00%	$0
SD-009	Project Completed or No Longer Needed	$0	0.00%	$0	0.00%	$0	0.00%	$0
SD-010	Project Completed or No Longer Needed	$0	0.00%	$0	0.00%	$0	0.00%	$0
SD-011	Project Completed or No Longer Needed	$0	0.00%	$0	0.00%	$0	0.00%	$0
SD-012	Project Completed or No Longer Needed	$0	0.00%	$0	0.00%	$0	0.00%	$0
SD-013	Walker Avenue, Merrill To Chino	$7,125,547	0.00%	$0	100.00%	$7,125,547	0.00%	$0
SD-014	Merrill Avenue, Vineyard to 1420' W/O Walker	$7,114,980	0.00%	$0	100.00%	$7,114,980	0.00%	$0
SD-015	Ontario Ranch Road, Walker to 880' E/O Walker	$1,180,896	0.00%	$0	100.00%	$1,180,896	0.00%	$0
SD-016	Schaefer Avenue, Walker To 1,950' E/O Walker	$1,193,236	0.00%	$0	100.00%	$1,193,236	0.00%	$0
SD-017	Project Completed or No Longer Needed	$0	0.00%	$0	0.00%	$0	0.00%	$0
SD-018	Project Completed or No Longer Needed	$0	0.00%	$0	0.00%	$0	0.00%	$0
SD-019	Project Completed or No Longer Needed	$0	0.00%	$0	0.00%	$0	0.00%	$0
SD-020	Hellman Avenue, Chino Avenue To 1,500' N/O Chino	$577,059	0.00%	$0	100.00%	$577,059	0.00%	$0
SD-021	Project Completed or No Longer Needed	$0	0.00%	$0	100.00%	$0	0.00%	$0
SD-022	Eucalyptus Avenue, Archibald To 1,300' E/O Archibald (P)	$1,010,627	0.00%	$0	100.00%	$1,010,627	0.00%	$0
SD-023	Project Completed or No Longer Needed	$0	0.00%	$0	100.00%	$0	0.00%	$0
SD-024	Project Completed or No Longer Needed	$0	0.00%	$0	0.00%	$0	0.00%	$0
SD-025	Turner Avenue, Riverside To County Line Channel (P)	$1,635,875	0.00%	$0	100.00%	$1,635,875	0.00%	$0
SD-026	Turner Avenue Laterals	$1,263,485	0.00%	$0	100.00%	$1,263,485	0.00%	$0
SD-027	Haven Avenue, Riverside To County Line Channel (P)	$2,788,957	0.00%	$0	100.00%	$2,788,957	0.00%	$0
SD-028	Ontario Ranch Road, Between Haven And Mill Creek (P)	$332,068	0.00%	$0	100.00%	$332,068	0.00%	$0
SD-029	Haven Avenue Laterals E/O Haven And N/O Schaefer	$2,180,511	0.00%	$0	100.00%	$2,180,511	0.00%	$0
SD-030	Haven Avenue Laterals	$339,199	0.00%	$0	100.00%	$339,199	0.00%	$0
SD-031	Project Completed or No Longer Needed	$0	0.00%	$0	0.00%	$0	0.00%	$0

Schedule 6.1

City of Ontario
2021-22 Development Impact Cost Calculation Update
Allocation of Project Cost Estimates
Storm Drainage Collection System Facilities

			Construction Needs Supported by Other Resources		Construction Needs Generated by New Development in OR		Construction Needs Generated by New Development in GC	
Line #	Project Title	Estimated Cost	Percent Need	Apportioned Dollar Cost	Percent Need	Apportioned Dollar Cost	Percent Need	Apportioned Dollar Cost
SD-032	Mill Creek, Chino To County Line Channel (P)	$9,556,477	0.00%	$0	94.00%	$8,983,088	6.00%	$573,389
SD-033	Eucalyptus Avenue Between Mill Creek And Milliken	$388,556	0.00%	$0	100.00%	$388,556	0.00%	$0
SD-034	Eucalyptus Avenue Between Haven And Mill Creek	$693,363	0.00%	$0	100.00%	$693,363	0.00%	$0
SD-035	Project Completed or No Longer Needed	$0	0.00%	$0	100.00%	$0	0.00%	$0
SD-036	Schaefer Avenue Between Mill Creek And Milliken	$1,818,996	0.00%	$0	100.00%	$1,818,996	0.00%	$0
SD-037	Hellman Avenue, Schaefer To Ontario Ranch Road And Laterals	$4,986,124	0.00%	$0	100.00%	$4,986,124	0.00%	$0
SD-038	Project Completed or No Longer Needed	$0	0.00%	$0	0.00%	$0	0.00%	$0
SD-039	Ontario Ranch-Hellman/Vineyard, Hellman-OR/Merrill To C. Creek	$4,889,904	0.00%	$0	100.00%	$4,889,904	0.00%	$0
SD-040	Eucalyptus Avenue, Hellman To Cucamonga Channel	$1,232,619	0.00%	$0	100.00%	$1,232,619	0.00%	$0
SD-041	Merrill Avenue, Cucamonga Channel To Walker	$14,553,658	0.00%	$0	100.00%	$14,553,658	0.00%	$0
SD-042	Project Completed or No Longer Needed	$0	0.00%	$0	0.00%	$0	0.00%	$0
SD-043	Project Completed or No Longer Needed	$0	0.00%	$0	0.00%	$0	0.00%	$0
SD-044	Project Completed or No Longer Needed	$0	0.00%	$0	0.00%	$0	0.00%	$0
SD-045	Eucalyptus Avenue, Cucamonga Channel To W/O Archibald	$724,868	0.00%	$0	100.00%	$724,868	0.00%	$0
SD-046	Ontario Ranch Road Laterals E/O Cucamonga Channel	$1,144,929	0.00%	$0	100.00%	$1,144,929	0.00%	$0
SD-047	Project Completed or No Longer Needed	$0	0.00%	$0	0.00%	$0	0.00%	$0
SD-048	Chino Avenue, Cucamonga Channel To N/O Chino	$595,564	0.00%	$0	100.00%	$595,564	0.00%	$0
SD-049	Milliken Avenue, Riverside To County Line Channel (P)	$2,517,255	0.00%	$0	100.00%	$2,517,255	0.00%	$0
SD-050	Offsite Euclid Avenue Storm Drain	$21,110,125	0.00%	$0	100.00%	$21,110,125	0.00%	$0
SD-051	Project Completed or No Longer Needed	$0	0.00%	$0	0.00%	$0	0.00%	$0
SD-052	Project Completed or No Longer Needed	$0	100.00%	$0	0.00%	$0	0.00%	$0
SD-053	Project Completed or No Longer Needed	$0	0.00%	$0	0.00%	$0	100.00%	$0
SD-054	Project Completed or No Longer Needed	$0	0.00%	$0	0.00%	$0	100.00%	$0
SD-055	Project Completed or No Longer Needed	$0	0.00%	$0	0.00%	$0	100.00%	$0
SD-056	Sixth Street, Glenn To Cucamonga Channel	$7,780,102	0.00%	$0	0.00%	$0	100.00%	$7,780,102
SD-057	G Street, Berlyn to West Cucamonga Channel & Various Streets	$6,732,172	0.00%	$0	0.00%	$0	100.00%	$6,732,172
SD-058	Grove Avenue, 60 Freeway To Riverside Drive	$2,205,860	0.00%	$0	0.00%	$0	100.00%	$2,205,860
SD-059	Campus Avenue, Cedar To Riverside	$3,681,523	0.00%	$0	0.00%	$0	100.00%	$3,681,523
SD-060	D and I Streets, Grove To West Cucamonga Channel	$1,432,227	100.00%	$1,432,227	0.00%	$0	0.00%	$0
SD-061	Inland Empire Blvd., Vineyard To Cucamonga Channel	$704,711	0.00%	$0	0.00%	$0	100.00%	$704,711
SD-062	Sultana Avenue, Phillips To Philadelphia	$4,342,519	0.00%	$0	0.00%	$0	100.00%	$4,342,519

Schedule 6.1

City of Ontario
2021-22 Development Impact Cost Calculation Update
Allocation of Project Cost Estimates
Storm Drainage Collection System Facilities

			Construction Needs Supported by Other Resources		Construction Needs Generated by New Development in OR		Construction Needs Generated by New Development in GC	
Line #	Project Title	Estimated Cost	Percent Need	Apportioned Dollar Cost	Percent Need	Apportioned Dollar Cost	Percent Need	Apportioned Dollar Cost
SD-063	Fourth Street, El Dorado To Cucamonga Creek	$2,489,751	0.00%	$0	0.00%	$0	100.00%	$2,489,751
SD-064	Baker, Vineyard, Carlos, Hellman - Acacia to Philadelphia	$2,730,804	100.00%	$2,730,804	0.00%	$0	0.00%	$0
SD-065	Bon View Avenue, 60 Freeway To Riverside (P)	$2,572,056	0.00%	$0	0.00%	$0	100.00%	$2,572,056
SD-066	Cucamonga Avenue, 60 Freeway To Riverside	$2,482,871	0.00%	$0	0.00%	$0	100.00%	$2,482,871
SD-067	Bon View Avenue, Mission To Francis	$3,678,744	100.00%	$3,678,744	0.00%	$0	0.00%	$0
SD-068	Cucamonga Avenue, Phillips To Francis	$2,273,929	100.00%	$2,273,929	0.00%	$0	0.00%	$0
SD-069	Storm Drainage Maintenance Vehicles	$578,539	0.00%	$0	55.03%	$318,364	44.97%	$260,175
SD-070	Boulder Avenue, I Street To State	$12,939,211	100.00%	$12,939,211	0.00%	$0	0.00%	$0
SD-071	Benson Avenue, State To I Street	$4,090,142	100.00%	$4,090,142	0.00%	$0	0.00%	$0
SD-072	Mountain Avenue, Philadelphia To Phillips	$7,791,496	0.00%	$0	0.00%	$0	100.00%	$7,791,496
SD-073	San Antonio Avenue, Francis To Cypress Channel	$10,490,213	0.00%	$0	0.00%	$0	100.00%	$10,490,213
SD-074	San Sevaine Channel	$1,875,549	0.00%	$0	0.00%	$0	100.00%	$1,875,549
SD-075	Storm Drain Master Plan (P)	$484,000	0.00%	$0	55.03%	$266,340	44.97%	$217,660
SD-076	Project Completed or No Longer Needed	$0	0.00%	$0	0.00%	$0	0.00%	$0
SD-077	Campus Avenue, State to Francis (Phase 2 Of SD-053)	$4,291,433	0.00%	$0	0.00%	$0	100.00%	$4,291,433
SD-078	Parco Avenue, Philadelphia to 60 Freeway (Phase 2 Of SD-055)	$921,951	100.00%	$921,951	0.00%	$0	0.00%	$0
SD-079	Grove Avenue, Francis to 60 Freeway (Phase 2 Of SD-058)	$1,423,685	100.00%	$1,423,685	0.00%	$0	0.00%	$0
SD-080	Sultana Avenue, State to Phillips (Phase 2 Of SD-062)	$3,436,111	100.00%	$3,436,111	0.00%	$0	0.00%	$0
SD-081	Bon View Avenue, 60 Freeway To Francis (Phase 2 Of SD-065)	$1,613,962	100.00%	$1,613,962	0.00%	$0	0.00%	$0
SD-082	Cucamonga Avenue, Francis to 60 FWY (Phase 2 Of SD-066)	$1,278,352	100.00%	$1,278,352	0.00%	$0	0.00%	$0
SD-083	Mountain & Boulder, I-10 to I Street (Phase 2 Of SD-070)	$5,899,391	100.00%	$5,899,391	0.00%	$0	0.00%	$0
SD-084	Benson Avenue Laterals (Phase 2 Of SD-071)	$4,406,951	100.00%	$4,406,951	0.00%	$0	0.00%	$0
SD-085	Mountain Avenue, State to Phillips (Phase 2 Of SD-072)	$2,230,596	100.00%	$2,230,596	0.00%	$0	0.00%	$0
SD-086	San Antonio & Phillips, Euclid to Francis (Phase 2, SD-073)	$5,762,052	0.00%	$0	0.00%	$0	100.00%	$5,762,052
SD-087	Oakland Avenue, State to Phillips (Phase 2 Of SD-074)	$7,214,086	100.00%	$7,214,086	0.00%	$0	0.00%	$0
SD-088	Walker Avenue, 60 Freeway To Riverside And Lateral	$1,933,241	100.00%	$1,933,241	0.00%	$0	0.00%	$0
SD-089	Baker Avenue And Riverside Drive, S/O 60 Freeway	$2,731,268	100.00%	$2,731,268	0.00%	$0	0.00%	$0
SD-090	G Street, Corona To Del Norte	$2,854,437	100.00%	$2,854,437	0.00%	$0	0.00%	$0
SD-091	Del Norte and Imperial Avenues From I Street To G Street	$1,259,756	100.00%	$1,259,756	0.00%	$0	0.00%	$0
SD-092	Vine Avenue, G Street To State	$3,760,467	100.00%	$3,760,467	0.00%	$0	0.00%	$0
SD-093	Vine Avenue, Sixth To G Street	$3,951,911	100.00%	$3,951,911	0.00%	$0	0.00%	$0

Schedule 6.1

City of Ontario
2021-22 Development Impact Cost Calculation Update
Allocation of Project Cost Estimates
Storm Drainage Collection System Facilities

Line #	Project Title	Estimated Cost	Construction Needs Supported by Other Resources: Percent Need	Construction Needs Supported by Other Resources: Apportioned Dollar Cost	Construction Needs Generated by New Development in OR: Percent Need	Construction Needs Generated by New Development in OR: Apportioned Dollar Cost	Construction Needs Generated by New Development in GC: Percent Need	Construction Needs Generated by New Development in GC: Apportioned Dollar Cost
SD-094	Sultana Avenue, Fifth To Holt	$6,755,724	100.00%	$6,755,724	0.00%	$0	0.00%	$0
SD-095	Benson Avenue And Laterals	$2,268,234	100.00%	$2,268,234	0.00%	$0	0.00%	$0
SD-096	Benson Avenue, Francis To Philadelphia	$3,010,954	100.00%	$3,010,954	0.00%	$0	0.00%	$0
SD-097	Mission, Benson, Phillips & Oaks, W/O Magnolia	$4,834,304	100.00%	$4,834,304	0.00%	$0	0.00%	$0
SD-098	Holt Boulevard, Convention Center To Cucamonga Channel	$1,120,942	100.00%	$1,120,942	0.00%	$0	0.00%	$0
SD-099	Mission Boulevard, Proforma To Turner	$1,039,219	100.00%	$1,039,219	0.00%	$0	0.00%	$0
SD-100	6th Street, West Cucamonga Creek To Grove	$546,474	100.00%	$546,474	0.00%	$0	0.00%	$0
SD-101	Archibald Avenue, Inland Empire To Airport Drive	$2,250,187	0.00%	$0	0.00%	$0	100.00%	$2,250,187
SD-102	Fifth Street, Balboa To Cucamonga Channel	$1,424,679	0.00%	$0	0.00%	$0	100.00%	$1,424,679
SD-103	Share of Specific/Common City Yard Improvements	$1,739,460	0.00%	$0	55.03%	$957,206	44.97%	$782,254
SD-104	Project Completed or No Longer Needed	$0	0.00%	$0	100.00%	$0	0.00%	$0
SD-105	Ontario Ranch Storm Drain Study	$1,053,500	0.00%	$0	100.00%	$1,053,500	0.00%	$0
	Sub-Total General Plan Total New Projects	$299,014,967	30.65%	$91,637,073	46.37%	$138,667,242	22.98%	$68,710,652
	FINANCIAL ADJUSTMENTS:							
	Ontario Ranch - Local Storm Drainage Outstanding Credits	$10,219,358	0.00%	$0	100.00%	$10,219,358	0.00%	$0
	Ontario Ranch - Regional Storm Drainage Outstanding Credits	$19,429,696	0.00%	$0	100.00%	$19,429,696	0.00%	$0
	Ontario Ranch - Development Impact Fee Fund Balance	($10,614,169)	0.00%	$0	100.00%	($10,614,169)	0.00%	$0
	General City - Storm Drainage Outstanding Credits	$2,694,792	0.00%	$0	0.00%	$0	100.00%	$2,694,792
	General City - Development Impact Fee Fund Balance	($9,726,169)	0.00%	$0	0.00%	$0	100.00%	($9,726,169)
	Total Fund Balance/Outstanding Credits	$12,003,508	0.00%	$0	158.58%	$19,034,885	-58.58%	($7,031,377)
	Total Net General Plan Project Costs	$311,018,475	29.46%	$91,637,073	50.71%	$157,702,127	19.83%	$61,679,275
					Forward to Schedule 6.4		Forward to Schedule 6.2	

NOTES:
(1). All developer-held "credits" under FINANCIAL ADJUSTMENTS will appear as a positive indicating an additional Infrastructure Fund obligation that will be redeemed (in lieu of a DIF payment) at some point in the future.
(2). A negative figure under FINANCIAL ADJUSTMENTS indicates a positive Fund Balance mitigating the project total. A positive figure indicates an amount that needs to be recovered by DIFs.
(3). Costs distribution based upon Coefficient of Drainage statistics.

Schedule 6.2

City of Ontario
2021-22 Development Impact Cost Calculation Update
General City (GC) - Minimum Capital Needs-based Impact Costs
Storm Drainage Collection System Facilities

Proposed Land Use	Undeveloped Acres	Undeveloped Units	Run-off Coefficient Index Rate	Total Added Impervious Acres	Run-off Coefficient Percentage	Allocation of Expansion Costs	Cost Distribution Per Acre	Average Units or Square Feet/Acre	Development Impact Fee per Unit or Square Foot
Detached Dwellings	262	1,131	0.775	203.05	6.24%	$3,847,370	$14,685	4.32	*$3,402 per Unit*
Attached Dwellings	183	2,688	0.810	148.23	4.55%	$2,808,646	$15,348	14.69	*$1,045 per Unit*
High Density Dwellings	598	21,807	0.900	538.20	16.53%	$10,197,756	$17,053	36.47	*$468 per Unit*
Mobile Home Dwellings	14	95	0.800	11.20	0.34%	$212,216	$15,158	6.79	*$2,234 per Unit*
Commercial Lodging Units	3	150	0.900	2.70	0.08%	$51,159	$17,053	50.00	*$341 per Unit*
Retail/Service Uses	992	8,164,415	0.900	892.80	27.43%	$16,916,679	$17,053	8,230	*$2.072 per S.F.*
Office Uses	822	20,895,746	0.900	739.80	22.73%	$14,017,651	$17,053	25,421	*$0.671 per S.F.*
Business Park Uses	341	6,969,626	0.875	298.38	9.17%	$5,653,577	$16,579	20,439	*$0.811 per S.F.*
Industrial Uses	441	30,650,125	0.950	418.95	12.87%	$7,938,220	$18,000	69,501	*$0.259 per S.F.*
Private Institutional Use	2	43,560	0.950	1.90	0.06%	$36,001	$18,000	21,780	*$0.826 per S.F.*
TOTAL	**3,658**	--	--	**3,255.21**	**100.00%**	**$61,679,275**	**in Total GC Storm Drainage General Plan Projects**		

Schedule 6.3

City of Ontario
2021-22 Development Impact Cost Calculation Update
Existing Community Financial Commitment Comparison
Storm Drainage Collection System Facilities

Proposed Land Use	Developed Acres	Developed Units	Run-off Coefficient Index Rate	Total Existing Impervious Acres	Run-off Coefficient Percentage	Allocation of Expansion Costs	Cost Distribution Per Acre	Average Units or Square Feet/Acre	Development Impact Fee per Unit or Square Foot
Detached Dwellings	4,733.0	27,449	0.775	3,668.08	28.91%	$70,339,640	$14,862	5.80	***$2,563 per Unit***
Attached Dwellings	641.0	12,050	0.810	519.21	4.09%	$9,956,461	$15,533	18.80	***$826 per Unit***
High Density Dwellings	193.0	4,812	0.900	173.70	1.37%	$3,330,901	$17,259	24.93	***$692 per Unit***
Mobile Home Dwellings	204.0	2,097	0.800	163.20	1.29%	$3,129,551	$15,341	10.28	***$1,492 per Unit***
Commercial Lodging Units	143.0	5,810	0.900	128.70	1.01%	$2,467,973	$17,259	40.63	***$425 per Unit***
Retail/Service Uses	477.0	18,418,611	0.900	429.30	3.38%	$8,232,331	$17,259	38,613	***$0.447 per S.F.***
Office Uses	310.0	9,959,192	0.900	279.00	2.20%	$5,350,152	$17,259	32,126	***$0.537 per S.F.***
Business Park Uses	741.0	9,587,138	0.875	648.38	5.11%	$12,433,351	$16,779	12,938	***$1.297 per S.F.***
Industrial Uses	6,610.0	106,400,598	0.950	6,279.50	49.50%	$120,416,777	$18,217	16,097	***$1.132 per S.F.***
Private Institutional Use	419.0	2,318,711	0.950	398.05	3.14%	$7,633,076	$18,217	5,534	***$3.292 per S.F.***
TOTAL	**14,471.0**	--	--	**12,687.11**	**100.00%**	**$243,290,214**	**Total Storm Drainage Existing Assets**		
						$235,890,545	**in General Plan Storm Drainage System Pipe Assets**		
						$368,292	**in Storm Drainage Maintenance Vehicle Assets**		
						$9,726,169	**in GC Storm Drainage System DIF Fund Balance**		
						($2,694,792)	**in GC Storm Drainage System Developer Credits**		

Schedule 6.4

City of Ontario
2021-22 Development Impact Cost Calculation Update
Ontario Ranch (OR) - Minimum Capital Needs-based Impact Costs
Storm Drainage Collection System Facilities

Proposed Land Use	Undeveloped Acres	Undeveloped Units	Run-off Coefficient Index Rate	Total Added Impervious Acres	Run-off Coefficient Percentage	Allocation of Expansion Costs	Cost Distribution Per Acre	Average Units or Square Feet/Acre	Development Impact Fee per Unit or Square Foot
Detached Dwellings	1,423	11,662	0.775	1,102.83	27.69%	$43,662,462	$30,683	8.20	*$3,744 per Unit*
Attached Dwellings	1,316	29,684	0.810	1,065.96	26.76%	$42,202,923	$32,069	22.56	*$1,422 per Unit*
High Density Dwellings	439	13,082	0.900	395.10	9.92%	$15,642,590	$35,632	29.80	*$1,196 per Unit*
Commercial Lodging	9	396	0.900	8.10	0.20%	$320,691	$35,632	44.00	*$810 per Unit*
Retail/Service Uses	279	5,751,595	0.900	251.10	6.30%	$9,941,418	$35,632	20,615	*$1.728 per S.F.*
Office Uses	114	2,670,188	0.900	102.60	2.58%	$4,062,085	$35,632	23,423	*$1.521 per S.F.*
Business Park Uses	428	9,953,243	0.875	374.50	9.40%	$14,827,005	$34,643	23,255	*$1.490 per S.F.*
Industrial Uses	669	16,981,679	0.950	635.55	15.96%	$25,162,358	$37,612	25,384	*$1.482 per S.F.*
Institutional Use	50	1,089,000	0.950	47.50	1.19%	$1,880,595	$37,612	21,780	*$1.727 per S.F.*
TOTAL	4,727	--	--	3,983.24	100.00%	$157,702,127	**in Total OR Storm Drainage General Plan Projects**		

Chapter 7
Water Source, Storage and Distribution Facilities

Assuming that an adequate water supply with appropriate treatment facilities is available, the next critical component needed to accommodate development is an adequate water storage and distribution system. The City's water source, as presently constituted, cannot be expected to completely support the City's existing and future population, especially the near doubling of demand from the Ontario Ranch's over 5,500 acres of private development. In order to meet all future water demands, the City will need to collect sufficient monies for an adequate water supply as well as the construction of new storage reservoirs and distribution lines needed over the short and long term from the development community in order to continue to allow development.

Existing GC System. In addition to the City's distribution system with a replacement value of $496,870,839, the City has well capacities with a replacement value of $115,078,345 and reservoirs at $100,315,860. The City owns Water Facility Authority (WFA) and San Antonio water shares valued at roughly $19,172,187. The system also has PRV stations ($9,403,160), booster stations ($8,159,250), treatment facilities ($17,103,834), altitude valves ($624,668) and a share of the utility maintenance vehicles ($2,678,630). There is also a GC DIF fund balance of $19,923,578. The total assets are $789,330,351. Some of these assets will benefit the Ontario Ranch and the cost will be recovered from development within Ontario Ranch. This recovery will be discussed later.

GC Water Demands, by Land Use. Water use, for residential users was calculated (and planned for) on either a gallon per dwelling unit per day (GPD) basis for residential uses or gallons acre per day (GPAD) basis for business uses in the City's most recent Water Master Plan. Table 7-1 following, indicates the DIF Land-use Type averages that were used as the nexus in the DIF distribution model. Since the City does not have a regional recycled water program in the GC area for the watering of common areas, the capital-needs costs will be distributed over new development based upon potable water demands at the meter and will not include any distributed recycled water demands. The following GC water demands are from the 2012 Water Master Plan.

[This space left vacant to place the following table on a single page].

Table 7-1
General City Water Demand by DIF Land Use Type
Demand in GPD or GPAD

DIF Land-use Type	Gallons (per Unit) per Day	Gallons per Acre per Day
Detached Dwelling Units	544	
Attached Dwelling Units	372	
High Density Dwelling Units	251	
Mobile Residences Dwelling Units	372	
Commercial Lodging Units	150	
Retail/Service Uses		2,200
Office Uses		3,400
Business Park Uses		2,200
Industrial Uses		2,000
Institutional Uses		2,200

Based upon Table 7-2 and the land-use database, the City's water system currently has the capacity (on average) deliver about 40.1 million gallons/day to GC users. This does not include the water demands from public institutions, other non-private uses and system loss. Obviously this is an annual average and seasonal factors could be expected to affect use. Table 7-2, on the following page, indicates the demand for water (on average) for existing development within the City's GC boundaries.

[This space left vacant to place the following table on a single page].

Table 7-2
Existing Community GC Water Demand
in Gallons per Day (rounded)

DIF Land-use Type	Existing Residential Units	Potential Business Acres	Water Demand in GPD or GPAD	Projected GPD Water Demand
Detached Dwellings	27,449		544/Unit	14,932,256
Attached Dwellings	12,050		372/Unit	4,482,600
High Density Dwellings	4,812		251/Unit	1,207,812
Mobile Residences Dwellings	2,097		372/Unit	780,084
Commercial Lodging Units	5,810		150/Unit	871,500
Retail/Service Uses		477	2,200/Acre	1,049,400
Office Uses		310	3,400/Acre	1,054,000
Business Park Uses		741	2,200/Acre	1,630,200
Industrial Uses		6,610	2,000/Acre	13,220,000
Institutional Uses		419	2,200/Acre	921,800
Total Gallons per Day	---	---	---	**40,149,652**

Again using the GPD demand data from Table 7-1 and the land-use database, the City will be asked to deliver an additional net 13.8 million gallons per day (average) to new GC users. Table 7-3, following, indicates the demand for water (on average) for future development within the City's GC boundaries. The 13.8 million gallons daily figure results in a slightly lower actual daily total water demand due to the use of Master Plan land-use demand averages applied to the narrower ten DIF Land-use Types as opposed to the actual broad variety of business uses. This will hold true for Tables 7-2, 7-3 and 7-4. Each of these tables **Total Gallons per Day** will be slightly understated when compared to the Master Plan totals.

[This space required to place the following table on a single page].

Table 7-3
GC Development-generated Additional Water Demand in Gallons per Day (rounded)

DIF land-use Type	Potential Residential Units	Potential Business Acres	Water Demand in GPD of GPAD	Projected GPD Water Demand
Detached Dwellings	544		544/Unit	615,254
Attached Dwellings	372		372/Unit	999,936
High Density Dwellings	251		251/Unit	5,473,557
Mobile Residences Dwellings	372		372/Unit	35,340
Commercial Lodging Units	150		150/Unit	22,500
Retail/Service Uses		992	2,200/Acre	2,182,400
Office Uses		822	3,400/Acre	2,794,800
Business Park Uses		341	2,200/Acre	750,200
Industrial Uses		441	2,000/Acre	882,000
Institutional Uses		2	2,200/Acre	4,400
Total Gallons per Day	---	---	---	**13,760,397**

The total average daily need (existing and future) water demand is as follows:

Table 7-4
Total General Plan GC Average Day Water Demand at General Plan Build-out (rounded) in Gallons per Day (rounded)

DIF Land-use Type	Potential Residential Units	Potential Business Acres	Water Demand in GPD or GPAD	Projected GPD Water Demand
Detached Dwellings	28,580		544/Unit	15,547,520
Attached Dwellings	14,378		372/Unit	5,482,536
High Density Dwellings	26,619		251/Unit	6,681,369
Mobile Residences Dwellings	2,192		372/Unit	815,424
Commercial Lodging Units	5,960		150/Unit	894,000
Retail/Service Uses		1,469	2,200/Acre	3,231,800
Office Uses		1,132	3,400/Acre	3,848,800
Business Park Uses		1,082	2,200/Acre	2,380,400
Industrial Uses		7,051	2,000/Acre	14,120,000
Institutional Uses		421	2,200/Acre	926,200
Total Gallons per Day	---	---	---	**53,910,049**

The total projected average daily demand from all GC Ontario privately held acreage at General Plan build-out is about 53.9 million gallons daily. However, build-out of all undeveloped property within the water basin may create water demands a little greater than the existing capacity. The expected increase in average daily demand may require the City to locate additional sources of water beyond the existing annual acre feet capacity or mandate water conservation efforts, including water recycling.

PROJECTS NEEDED FOR PROPER WATER DISTRIBUTION

Utility infrastructure such as water is unique among all City infrastructures. Water demand simply cannot be ignored for long period of times as can be police, fire, streets and park levels of service (LOS). Residents could be asked to allow the number of officers to remain static, or wait a little longer for fire fighters, or even put up with the more congested traffic or more crowded parks. However, a delivered water supply must be in evidence to even *consider* additional growth. Even though Table 7-4 (which does not even consider the significant needs of OR) applies average daily use rates and creates a total demand difficult to imagine, it is apparent that additional water distribution capability is necessary to allow for additional growth. Without adequate water distribution capabilities, development will grind to a stop. It is a prerequisite system.

Since a water distribution system is a prerequisite to development (i.e. there is no development without water), it tends to be a somewhat "front-ended" system, that is, the system develops earlier and the existing community tends to have built more of the system at any point in time than does the remainder of development. That is precisely the case with Ontario's water utility, the GC water system appears to have been front-ended by the existing community.

Schedule 7.1 identifies the water distribution system improvements needed to insure the continued adequate flow of water as needed to proposed development projects. There are 23 remaining water system related capital projects necessary for extending service to new development in GC and OR or maintaining service to existing GC water users with a total of just over $457,793,409 million. Staff has identified fifteen projects (or portions thereof) totaling some $98.7 million for funding by the existing GC water users as either replacements or benefitting only existing users. This figure will not be included in any impact fee calculation.

There is approximately $98.9 million in projects identified as benefitting new development in GC area of the City. This figure is reduced to $78.8 million when the positive fund balance of $19.9 is applied as mitigation factor and was used to calculate the GC DIF schedule.

Approximately $359.1 million in new projects have been identified as benefitting only OR. Added to this OR figure is $4,375,000 in reimbursements for past water system expenses borne by GC water users but benefitting the OR area for a total of $363..5 million. The $4.4 million in reimbursement expenses relate to the proportionate cost borne by the existing water users on the existing system which provides supplemental water supply to the OR under maximum day demand. The water system will have to absorb approximately $46.0 in outstanding developer credits that have been issued when individual developers have constructed projects that were identified on Schedule 7.1. Additionally there is a positive fund balance of $2.3 million in

collection from previous OR DIF payments mitigating the total. The above estimates factors result in a net $407.1 million in projects yet to be completed in the OR area.

CALCULATION OF IMPACT COSTS

This Report identifies two methods of calculating potable and OR recycled water system delivery DIFs and imposing said fees. They are:

- *Standard (Average) DIF Land-use Type DIFs, similar to the other fees in this Report.*
- *An impact fee based upon the meter size needed to serve a development, if needed.*

Standard Use Category DIFs. Table 7-5, following, lists the ten major land uses based upon average water usage statistics, (see Schedule 7.2). Some $485.9 million in new water capital expansion is required in the GC and OR portions of the City. Approximately $78,813,042 of this cost has been identified for GC DIF funding. The $78.8 million is distributed pro-rata over the remaining under-built and totally vacant acreage in the City's General City area as demonstrated in Table 7-5 following.

Table 7-5
City of Ontario's General City Area
Basic Needs-based Water Distribution System
Development Impact Costs
by DIF Land-use Type

DIF Land-use Type	Allocation of Development Costs	Development Impact Cost Per Unit or Square Foot
Detached Dwelling Units	$3,523,941	$3,113/Unit
Attached Dwelling Units	$5,727,160	$2,130/Unit
High Density Dwelling Units	$31,349,944	$1,437/Unit
Mobile Home Dwelling Units	$202,411	$2,129/Unit
Commercial Lodging Units	$128,869	$859/Unit
Retail/Service Uses	$12,499,754	$1.531/S.F.
Office Uses	$16,007,292	$0.766/S.F.
Business Park Uses	$4,296,791	$0.617/S.F.
Industrial Uses	$5,051,679	$0.165/S.F.
Institutional Uses	$25,201	$0.579/S.F.

Cost and Financing of the Existing System. Typically a water system is the oldest service provided by any City. The City's engineering staff has identified the cost of the existing "spine" system, consisting of distribution pipe, wells, valves, reservoirs and shares of water rights to be

$789,330,351. This figure does not include local (tract) lines and connections, estimated conservatively to be in the area of an additional $350.0 million. The system has been constructed from four sources, water user rates (more commonly known as monthly water bills), exactions, DIFs, and requirements of development approval. A portion of that nearly $789.3 million figure is the existing fund balance in the Water System DIF Fund of $19,923,578.

When this nearly $789.3 million in equity is distributed to the existing community based upon the same nexus used to distribute future costs by land use, (see Schedule 7.3) the results indicate that a detached dwelling has contributed, on average, an astounding $10,694 towards the water system. This distributed equity is clearly greater than the distributed *GC – Minimum Needs-based Impact Costs* exemplified in Table 7-5 (and Schedule 7.2) indicating there are no proportionality issues. Table 7-6 following demonstrates the distribution of existing assets.

Table 7-6
City of Ontario's General City Area
Existing Circulation System Community
Financial Commitment Comparison Data
(Not updated in 2017)

DIF Land-use Type	Allocation of Development Costs	Development Impact Cost Per Unit or Square Foot
Detached Dwelling Units	$293,563,762	$10,694/Unit
Attached Dwelling Units	$88,126,598	$7,313/Unit
High Density Dwelling Units	$23,745,229	$4,935/Unit
Mobile Home Units	$15,336,222	$7,313/Unit
Commercial Lodging Units	$17,133,434	$2,949/Unit
Retail/Service Uses	$20,630,895	$1.120/S.F.
Office Uses	$20,721,330	$2.081/S.F.
Business Park Uses	$32,049,253	$3.343/S.F.
Industrial Uses	$259,901,312	$2.443/S.F.
Institutional Uses	$18,122,317	$7.816/S.F.

Necessity of DIF Financing. DIFs are necessary for the construction of the remainder of the water system for one significant reason. Initially, the storage and delivery of water has, for many years, been recognized by most public agencies as a utility. Utilities differ from general tax-supported services in that they are similar to private sector utility businesses. Potable water rates are elastic, within reason, and can be set to meet water delivery costs whereas taxes cannot. Therefore, general taxes must be protected and reserved for services that do not have any such an elastic revenue source such as public safety, park maintenance, storm drainage, and others.

The use of water (consumer benefit) can be measured, unlike many of the City's services. Water rates can, and should be, set to meet the Council's priorities and policies in terms of water use. As a result of the above, the use of general taxes, where no relationship between the rate of taxation and benefit exists, in support of any utility service would be inappropriate.

Recommended GC DIF Schedule. The adoption of Table 7-5, based upon Schedule 7.2 at the end of the chapter, as the water distribution DIFs would generate enough capital to construct the facilities needed by the new development. The DIFs contained on Schedule 7.2 also contain amounts less than the *Existing Community Financial Commitment Comparison* identified in Schedule 7.3 thus do not violate any proportionate requirements.

CREDITS AGAINST DEVELOPMENT IMPACT FEES

The City does not charge *stand-by* water rates. Vacant parcels are not charged water rates and therefore they have not contributed to the capital development of the water system. As a result there can be no credit for previous contributions to capital from vacant parcels, simply because there were none made. Additionally, there have been no General Fund expenditures on water projects.

Credit for Developer Constructed Improvements. Similar to roadway and storm drainage construction, it will likely be advantageous to have the developer construct certain public improvements contiguous to the private development. The adoption of the DIF schedules encourages such agreements. It is recommended that the City continue the process of agreeing to allow developers to construct water system capital improvements, identified within the City's Capital Financing Plan and part of the DIF calculation and then calculating a credit for that project contribution amount. The net DIF would be the amount per the adopted schedules less the credit for the capital constructed by the developer.

ALTERNATIVE GC DEVELOPMENT IMPACT FEE METHODOLOGIES

There are two alternatives to the ten basic GC area DIF categories. They are primarily applicable to the more specific demands by the multitude of differing business uses.

Equivalent EDU Based on Meter Size. The standard detached dwelling residence has a 3/4" meter at 15 gallons per minute normal (minimum-maximum) flow [11] which is defined as the **E**quivalent **D**welling **U**nit, or EDU. Schedule 7.2 indicates that the smallest meter size, 3/4", would cost $3,113 per connection, at the Minimum Needs based DIF schedule rate. The following Table 7-7 indicates the cost for larger meters based upon the normal flow demands, with again, the detached dwelling (detached) residence as the standard. A one inch meter is rated at 25 gallons per minute, which is 1.67 times larger than the 15 gallons per minute than is afforded by a 3/4" meter. Thus the one inch meter fee would be 1.67 times higher ($5,189) than the $3,113 for the 3/4" meter. Other meter sizes are as follows:

11 *Meter Flow Ranges,* based upon *Minimum Maximum Continuous Flow Rates*, American Water Works Association.

Table 7-7
Equivalent Water Meter Size Calculation
Based upon Minimum Needs-based Impact Fees

Water Meter Size	Normal Water Flow (GPM)	Water Demand Factor	Cost per E.D.U (3/4" Meter)	DIF Cost per Meter Size
¾" Meter	15	1.000	$3,113	$3,113
1' Meter	25	1.667	$3,113	$5,189
1 & ½" Meter	50	3.333	$3,113	$10,376
2" Meter	80	5.333	$3,113	$16,602
3" Meter	240	16.000	$3,113	$49,808
4" Meter	420	28.000	$3,113	$87,164
6" Meter	920	61.333	$3,113	$190,930
8" Meter	1,600	106.667	$3,113	$332,054
10" Meter	2,500	166.667	$3,113	$518,834
12" Meter	3,300	220.000	$3,113	$684,860

ONTARIO RANCH WATER SYSTEM IMPACT FEE CALCULATION

Ontario Ranch will need a significant amount of water system improvements in order to accommodate the large scale development planned for the area. Initially, capital requirements consist of $359,056,789 in new wells, reservoirs, transmission mains and other general improvements needed. In addition, there is $4,375,000 in reimbursement to GC water users for system costs previously borne by General City water rate payers for system-wide improvements for which OR users will benefit. There are a total of $45,960,877 in outstanding developer credits to developers for in effect, "overbuilding" beyond their calculated financial responsibility has they simply paid their impact fees. Lastly, there is a small but positive fund balance of $2,344,443. Combined the total of $407,058,223 in costs will be spread over users generating demands of 29,928,527 gallons per day.

OR Water Demands, by Land Use. The 29.9 million gallons per day demand estimate for OR General Plan build-out water use was based upon (and planned for) a gallon per dwelling (GPD) unit per day basis for residential uses or gallons per acre per day (GPAD) basis for business uses per the City's most recent Water Master Plan. Table 7-8 following indicates the DIF Land-use Type averages that were used in the DIF distribution model. The demand rates are based upon the combined potable water required on-site (meter) and the recycled water used for common parkways, parks, neighborhood edges and other suitable uses. It is important to note that while all efforts are being undertaken by the various developers to limit the demand for potable water by residential dwellings and business uses, the amount of recycled water cannot be ignored in the per unit nexus. Those efforts are demonstrated in the "Potable Water Demands" column in Table 7-8 following. However, to meet the potable water needs, the

Master Plan also identified OR projects necessary to maximize that potable use by expanding opportunities to use the recycled water in as many locations as possible. As a result the nexus distribution in Schedule 7.4 is based upon the combined potable and recycled water demand. Table 7-8 follows.

Table 7-8
Ontario Ranch Water Demand by Land Use
Demand in GPD or GPAD

DIF Land-use Type	Potable Water Demands	Recycled Water Demands	Total Gallons per Day (per Unit)	Total Gallons per Acre per Day
Detached Dwelling Units	526	188	714	
Attached Dwelling Units	323	69	392	
High Density Dwelling Units	152	56	208	
Commercial Lodging Units	150	150	300	
Retail/Service Uses	2,200	2,632		4,832
Office Uses	3,400	1,563		4,963
Business Park Uses	2,200	2,045		4,245
Industrial Uses	2,000	2,795		4,795
Institutional Uses	2,200	1,545		3,745

The results are detailed in Schedule 7.4 and (identified in Table 7-9) following and are recommended as the OR Water Source, Storage and Distribution System DIF schedule.

[This space left vacant in order to place the following table on a single page].

Table 7-9
City of Ontario's Ontario Ranch Area
Basic Needs-based Water Distribution System
Development Impact Costs by DIF Land-use Type

DIF Land-use Type	Allocation of Development Costs	Development Impact Cost Per Unit or Square Foot
Detached Dwelling Units	$113,251,103	$9,711/Unit
Attached Dwelling Units	$158,263,104	$5,332/Unit
High Density Dwelling Units	$37,009,112	$2,829/Unit
Commercial Lodging Units	$1,615,800	$4,080/Unit
Retail/Service Uses	$18,335,904	$3.188/S.F.
Office Uses	$7,695,207	$2.882/S.F.
Business Park Uses	$24,711,133	$2.483/S.F.
Industrial Uses	$43,630,071	$2.569/S.F.
Institutional Uses	$2,546,789	$2.339/S.F.

ALTERNATIVE OR DEVELOPMENT IMPACT FEE METHODOLOGIES

There are two alternatives to the nine basic OR area DIF categories. They are primarily applicable to the more specific demands by the multitude of differing business uses.

Equivalent EDU Based on Meter Size. The standard detached dwelling residence has a 3/4" meter at 15 gallons per minute normal (minimum-maximum) flow [12] which is defined as the **E**quivalent **D**welling **U**nit, or EDU. Schedule 7.4 indicates that the smallest meter size, 3/4", would cost $9,711 per connection, at the Minimum Needs based DIFs rate. The following Table 7-10 indicates the cost for larger meters based upon the normal flow demands, with again, the detached dwelling (detached) residence as the standard. A one inch meter is rated at 25 gallons per minute, which is 1.67 times larger than the 15 gallons per minute than is afforded by a 3/4" meter. Thus the one inch meter fee would be 1.67 times higher ($16,188 than the $9,711 for the 3/4" meter. Other meter sizes are as follows in Table 7-10:

[This space left vacant in order to place the following table on a single page].

12 *Meter Flow Ranges* based upon Minimum Maximum Continuous Flow Rates, American Water Works Association.

Table 7-10
Equivalent Water Meter Size Calculation
Based upon Minimum Needs-based Impact Fees

Water Meter Size	Normal Water Flow (GPM)	Water Demand Factor	Cost per E.D.U (3/4" Meter)	DIF Cost per Meter Size
¾" Meter	15	1.000	$9,711	$9,711
1' Meter	25	1.667	$9,711	$16,188
1 & ½" Meter	50	3.333	$9,711	$32,367
2" Meter	80	5.333	$9,711	$51,789
3" Meter	240	16.000	$9,711	$155,376
4" Meter	420	28.000	$9,711	$271,908
6" Meter	920	61.333	$9,711	$595,605
8" Meter	1,600	106.667	$9,711	$1,035,843
10" Meter	2,500	166.667	$9,711	$1,618,503
12" Meter	3,300	220.000	$9,711	$2,136,420

RECAP OF RECOMMENDED WATER SYSTEM IMPROVEMENTS IMPACT FEES

- **General City** – Adopt:
  A. Schedule 7.2 for the ten basic DIF categories,
  B. Table 7-7, Equivalent Water Meter Size Calculation Based upon *Minimum Needs-based Development Impact Fees*, and:

- **Ontario Ranch** – Adopt:
  A. Schedule 7.4 for the nine basic DIF categories,
  B. Table 7-10, Equivalent Water Meter Size Calculation Based upon *Minimum Needs-based Development Impact Fees*, and:

END OF CHAPTER TEXT

Schedule 7.1

City of Ontario
2021-22 Development Impact Cost Calculation Update
Allocation of Project Cost Estimates
Water Source, Storage and Distribution Facilities

			Construction Needs Supported by Other Resources		Construction Needs Generated by New Development in OR		Construction Needs Generated by New Development in GC	
Line #	Project Title	Remaining Project Cost Estimate	Percent Need	Apportioned Dollar Cost	Percent Need	Apportioned Dollar Cost	Percent Need	Apportioned Dollar Cost
WT-001	Phillips Street 1010' Zone Well	$764,470	0.00%	$0	0.00%	$0	100.00%	$764,470
WT-002	Eighth Street 1212' Zone Wells	$14,638,349	0.00%	$0	42.09%	$6,161,281	57.91%	$8,477,068
WT-003	Project Completed or No Longer Needed	$0	0.00%	$0	0.00%	$0	0.00%	$0
WT-004	Eighth Street 1212' Zone Transmission Lines	$51,199,636	25.00%	$12,799,909	0.00%	$0	75.00%	$38,399,727
WT-005	Eighth Street 1212' Zone Reservoir Site Purchase	$4,800,000	25.00%	$1,200,000	0.00%	$0	75.00%	$3,600,000
WT-006	Eighth Street 1212' Zone Reservoir Construction	$34,239,271	25.00%	$8,559,818	0.00%	$0	75.00%	$25,679,453
WT-007	Francis Street 925' Zone Wells	$54,967,749	0.00%	$0	100.00%	$54,967,749	0.00%	$0
WT-008	Phillips Street 1010' Zone Wells	$5,536,808	0.00%	$0	100.00%	$5,536,808	0.00%	$0
WT-009	Phillips Street 1010' Zone Extension Mains Extension	$10,367,176	9.65%	$1,000,432	83.56%	$8,662,812	6.79%	$703,931
WT-010	Francis Street 925' Zone Transmission Lines	$26,110,371	0.00%	$0	100.00%	$26,110,371	0.00%	$0
WT-011	Francis Street 925' Zone Distribution Mains	$35,243,908	0.00%	$0	100.00%	$35,243,908	0.00%	$0
WT-012	Francis Street 925' Zone Well Collection System	$11,944,714	0.00%	$0	100.00%	$11,944,714	0.00%	$0
WT-013	Pressure Reducing Station, Potable Water System (1010' - 925')	$1,830,000	0.00%	$0	100.00%	$1,830,000	0.00%	$0
WT-014	Francis Street 925' Zone Reservoirs	$49,151,462	0.00%	$0	100.00%	$49,151,462	0.00%	$0
WT-015	Phillips Street 1010' Zone Reservoirs	$3,747,521	0.00%	$0	100.00%	$3,747,521	0.00%	$0
WT-016	Recycled Water System	$67,414,419	0.00%	$0	86.35%	$58,212,351	13.65%	$9,202,068
WT-017	Back-Up Power Supply	$3,475,262	65.23%	$2,266,913	27.52%	$956,392	7.25%	$251,956
WT-018	Reservoir 1010' (2B) Landscaping	$248,268	0.00%	$0	0.00%	$0	100.00%	$248,268
WT-019	Project Completed or No Longer Needed	$0	0.00%	$0	0.00%	$0	0.00%	$0
WT-020	Project Completed or No Longer Needed	$0	0.00%	$0	0.00%	$0	0.00%	$0
WT-021	Distribution System Pressure, Size And Age Improvements	$146,132,182	100.00%	$146,132,182	0.00%	$0	0.00%	$0
WT-022	Miscellaneous Up-Sized Facilities	$5,307,264	0.00%	$0	0.00%	$0	100.00%	$5,307,264
WT-023	Abandon Existing General City Wells	$525,052	100.00%	$525,052	0.00%	$0	0.00%	$0
WT-024	Project Completed or No Longer Needed	$0	0.00%	$0	0.00%	$0	0.00%	$0
WT-025	Decommission Galvin Treatment Plant/Abandon 1212-3 Reservoir	$2,474,310	100.00%	$2,474,310	0.00%	$0	0.00%	$0
WT-026	Seismic Upgrades And Replacements	$13,848,736	100.00%	$13,848,736	0.00%	$0	0.00%	$0
WT-027	Water Master Plan Updates	$1,564,143	0.00%	$0	82.87%	$1,296,205	17.13%	$267,938
WT-028	Water System Maintenance Vehicle/Equipment Fleet	$1,367,350	0.00%	$0	82.87%	$1,133,123	17.13%	$234,227
WT-029	Project Completed or No Longer Needed	$0	0.00%	$0	100.00%	$0	0.00%	$0
WT-030	Project Completed or No Longer Needed	$0	0.00%	$0	100.00%	$0	0.00%	$0
WT-031	JCSD/Ontario Reservoir (Phillips Street 1010" Zone)	$431,798	40.00%	$172,719	50.00%	$215,899	10.00%	$43,180
WT-032	Water Treatment	$52,190,676	47.46%	$24,769,695	52.54%	$27,420,981	0.00%	$0
WT-033	Project Completed or No Longer Needed	$0	100.00%	$0	0.00%	$0	0.00%	$0
WT-034	Water Source Supply	$62,549,323	0.00%	$0	93.71%	$58,614,971	6.29%	$3,934,352
WT-035	General System Reliability Improvements	$1,863,936	100.00%	$1,863,936	0.00%	$0	0.00%	$0

Schedule 7.1

City of Ontario
2021-22 Development Impact Cost Calculation Update
Allocation of Project Cost Estimates
Water Source, Storage and Distribution Facilities

Line #	Project Title	Remaining Project Cost Estimate	Construction Needs Supported by Other Resources: Percent Need	Construction Needs Supported by Other Resources: Apportioned Dollar Cost	Construction Needs Generated by New Development in OR: Percent Need	Construction Needs Generated by New Development in OR: Apportioned Dollar Cost	Construction Needs Generated by New Development in GC: Percent Need	Construction Needs Generated by New Development in GC: Apportioned Dollar Cost
WT-036	Fourth Street 1074' Zone Transmission Improvements	$3,010,563	100.00%	$3,010,563	0.00%	$0	0.00%	$0
WT-037	Share of Specific/Common City Yard Improvements	$9,472,959	0.00%	$0	82.87%	$7,850,241	17.13%	$1,622,718
WT-038	Project Completed or No Longer Needed	$0	100.00%	$0	0.00%	$0	0.00%	$0
	Sub-Total General Plan Total New Projects	$676,417,676	32.32%	$218,624,265	53.08%	$359,056,789	14.60%	$98,736,620
	OR Reimbursement for Water System	$4,375,000	0.00%	$0	100.00%	$4,375,000	0.00%	$0
	Less: OR Reimbursement for Previous GC Expenses	-$4,375,000	100%	$ (4,375,000)	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	$0
	FINANCIAL ADJUSTMENTS:							
	Ontario Ranch - Local Water Outstanding Credits	$8,026,039	0.00%	$0	100.00%	$8,026,039	0.00%	$0
	Ontario Ranch - Regional Water Outstanding Credits	$37,934,838	0.00%	$0	100.00%	$37,934,838	0.00%	$0
	Ontario Ranch - Development Impact Fee Fund Balance	($2,334,443)	0.00%	$0	100.00%	-$2,334,443	0.00%	$0
	General City Development Impact Fee Fund Balance	($19,923,578)	0.00%	$0	0.00%	$0	100.00%	-$19,923,578
	Total Fund Balance/OutstandingCredits	$23,702,856	0.00%	$0	184.06%	$43,626,434	-84.06%	-$19,923,578
	Total Net General Plan Project Costs	$700,120,532	30.60%	$214,249,265	58.14%	$407,058,223	11.26%	$78,813,042
					Forward to Schedule 7.4		**Forward to Schedule 7.2**	

NOTES:

(1). All developer-held "credits" under FINANCIAL ADJUSTMENTS will appear as a positive indicating an additional Infrastructure Fund obligation that will be redeemed (in lieu of a DIF payment) at some point in the future.

(2). A negative figure under FINANCIAL ADJUSTMENTS indicates a positive Fund Balance mitigating the project total. A positive figure indicates an amount that needs to be recovered by DIFs.

(3). Costs distribution based upon the water allocation factors from the Water Master Plan.

Schedule 7.2

City of Ontario
2021-22 Development Impact Cost Calculation Update
General City (GC) - Minimum Capital Needs-based Impact Costs
Water Source, Storage and Distribution Facilities

Proposed Land Use	*Undeveloped*		*GC Water Allocation Rate GPD (1)*	*Cumulative New Water Allocation*	*Percentage of Added Water Allocation*	*Allocation of Expansion Costs*	*Cost Distribution Per Acre*	*Average Units or Square Feet/Acre*	*Development Impact Fee per Unit or Square Foot*
	Acres	*Units*							
Detached Dwellings	262	1,131	544	615,264	4.47%	$3,523,941	$13,450	4.32	*$3,113 per Unit*
Attached Dwellings	183	2,688	372	999,936	7.27%	$5,727,160	$31,296	14.69	*$2,130 per Unit*
High Density Dwellings	598	21,807	251	5,473,557	39.78%	$31,349,944	$52,425	36.47	*$1,437 per Unit*
Mobile Home Dwellings	14	95	372	35,340	0.26%	$202,411	$14,458	6.79	*$2,129 per Unit*
Commercial Lodging Units	3	150	150	22,500	0.16%	$128,869	$42,956	50.00	*$859 per Unit*
Retail/Service Uses	992	8,164,415	2,200	2,182,400	15.86%	$12,499,754	$12,601	8,230	*$1.531 per S.F.*
Office Uses	822	20,895,746	3,400	2,794,800	20.31%	$16,007,292	$19,474	25,421	*$0.766 per S.F.*
Business Park Uses	341	6,969,626	2,200	750,200	5.45%	$4,296,791	$12,601	20,439	*$0.617 per S.F.*
Industrial Uses	441	30,650,125	2,000	882,000	6.41%	$5,051,679	$11,455	69,501	*$0.165 per S.F.*
Private Institutional Use	2	43,560	2,200	4,400	0.03%	$25,201	$12,601	21,780	*$0.579 per S.F.*
TOTAL	**3,658**	--	--	**13,760,397**	**100.00%**	**$78,813,042**	**in Total GC Water System General Plan Projects**		
ALTERNATE FEE METHODOLOGY				**13,760,397**		**$78,813,042**	**$5.728**	**Per Gallon Demand**	

Schedule 7.3

City of Ontario
2021-22 Development Impact Cost Calculation Update
Existing Community Financial Commitment Comparison
Water Source, Storage and Distribution Facilities

Proposed Land Use	Undeveloped Acres	Undeveloped Units	GC Water Allocation Rate GPD (1)	Cumulative Existing Water Allocation	Percentage of Existing Water Allocation	Allocation of ExistingSystem Costs	Cost Distribution Per Acre	Average Units or Square Feet/Acre	Development Impact Fee per Unit or Square Foot
Detached Dwellings	4,733	27,449	544	14,932,256	37.19%	$293,563,762	$62,025	5.80	***$10,694 per Unit***
Attached Dwellings	641	12,050	372	4,482,600	11.16%	$88,126,598	$137,483	18.80	***$7,313 per Unit***
High Density Dwellings	193	4,812	251	1,207,812	3.01%	$23,745,229	$123,032	24.93	***$4,935 per Unit***
Mobile Home Dwellings	204	2,097	372	780,084	1.94%	$15,336,222	$75,178	10.28	***$7,313 per Unit***
Commercial Lodging Units	143	5,810	150	871,500	2.17%	$17,133,434	$119,814	40.63	***$2,949 per Unit***
Retail/Service Uses	477	18,418,611	2,200	1,049,400	2.61%	$20,630,895	$43,251	38,613	***$1.120 per S.F.***
Office Uses	310	9,959,192	3,400	1,054,000	2.63%	$20,721,330	$66,843	32,126	***$2.081 per S.F.***
Business Park Uses	741	9,587,138	2,200	1,630,200	4.06%	$32,049,253	$43,251	12,938	***$3.343 per S.F.***
Industrial Uses	6,610	106,400,598	2,000	13,220,000	32.93%	$259,901,312	$39,319	16,097	***$2.443 per S.F.***
Private Institutional Use	419	2,318,711	2,200	921,800	2.30%	$18,122,317	$43,251	5,534	***$7.816 per S.F.***
TOTAL	**14,471**	--	--	**40,149,652**	**100.00%**	**$789,330,351**	**Total Existing Water System Inventory**		
						$496,870,839	**in Water Distribution System Assets**		
						$100,315,860	**in Water Storage Reservoir Assets**		
						$115,078,345	**In Water Well Assets**		
						$19,172,187	**in Water Shares Assets**		
						$9,403,160	**in Pressure Reducing Stations (PRVs) Assets**		
						$8,159,250	**In Booster Station Assets**		
						$17,103,834	**in Treatment Facilities Assets**		
						$2,678,630	**in Water Maintenance Vehicles/Equipment Assets**		
						$624,668	**in Altitude Valve Assets**		
						$19,923,578	**in Water System DIF Fund Balance**		

Schedule 7.4

City of Ontario
2021-22 Development Impact Cost Calculation Update
Ontario Ranch (OR) - Minimum Capital Needs-based Impact Costs
Water Source, Storage and Distribution Facilities

Proposed Land Use	Undeveloped Acres	Undeveloped Units	OR Water Allocation Rate (1)	Cumulative New Water Allocation	Percentage of Added Water Allocation	Allocation of Expansion Costs	Cost Distribution Per Acre	Average Units or Square Feet/Acre	Development Impact Fee per Unit or Square Foot
Detached Dwellings	1,423	11,662	714	8,326,668	27.82%	$113,251,103	$79,586	8.20	*$9,711 per Unit*
Attached Dwellings	1,316	29,684	392	11,636,128	38.88%	$158,263,104	$120,261	22.56	*$5,332 per Unit*
High Density Dwellings	439	13,082	208	2,721,056	9.09%	$37,009,112	$84,303	29.80	*$2,829 per Unit*
Commercial Lodging	9	396	300	118,800	0.40%	$1,615,800	$179,533	44.00	*$4,080 per Unit*
Retail/Service Uses	279	5,751,595	4,832	1,348,128	4.50%	$18,335,904	$65,720	20,615	*$3.188 per S.F.*
Office Uses	114	2,670,188	4,963	565,782	1.89%	$7,695,207	$67,502	23,423	*$2.882 per S.F.*
Business Park Uses	428	9,953,243	4,245	1,816,860	6.07%	$24,711,133	$57,736	23,255	*$2.483 per S.F.*
Industrial Uses	669	16,981,679	4,795	3,207,855	10.72%	$43,630,071	$65,217	25,384	*$2.569 per S.F.*
Institutional Use	50	1,089,000	3,745	187,250	0.63%	$2,546,789	$50,936	21,780	*$2.339 per S.F.*
TOTAL	4,727	--	--	29,928,527	100.00%	$407,058,223	**in Total OR Water System General Plan Projects**		
ALTERNATE FEE METHODOLOGY				**29,928,527**		**$407,058,223**	**$13.601 Per Gallon Demand**		

Chapter 8
Sewer Collection Facilities

As was mentioned in the prior chapter and will be reiterated here, a city or public agency experiencing dramatic growth may put off the construction of needed parks, roads storm drainage projects and the like and still function, perhaps minimally. However, nothing stops development in its tracks any faster than the lack of a water distribution system and a sewage collection system. These two systems were some of the earliest calculated DIFs, although they were generally called "hook up" fees [13]. In short, a residence or business cannot exist without these important connections.

Growth will continue to impact City services in two ways. The first is development within areas already served by the sewer collection system which, if not properly sized at construction, could overwhelm the existing capacity of the pipe. Such is the case with GC. The second way growth impacts the City is by development proposals in areas where the system improvements do not yet exist as with the OR area. A properly undertaken Master Plan will eliminate the first problem, but it will take money to construct the additionally needed lines. It is a commonly accepted principle in both water and sewer expansion that DIF receipts can finance the expansions as needed and required. If a development wanted to connect and there were no close-by lines, the developer would finance the expansion with perhaps a reimbursement agreement if appropriate.

The principle remains the same with these DIFs. This Chapter will calculate a fee schedule that represents the proportional expense per unit of growth by DIF Land-use Type, i.e., a detached dwelling unit, a commercial lodging unit or 1,000 square feet of business space.

Similar to the circulation, storm drainage and water DIFs, sewer collection infrastructure will require separate DIF schedules for GC and OR in order to insure that existing GC users are not placed in the position of subsidizing OR area development. The GC DIF calculation and general sewer collection discussion will be in the beginning of the Chapter and the OR calculation will follow at the end of the chapter.

EXISTING SEWER GC COLLECTION SYSTEM

The City's major line sewer collection system currently consists of an identified 468,723 linear feet of various sized (10" to 48") reinforced concrete pipe, over 1,875 manholes and various backfill, road base and asphalt. The current cost of duplicating the entire system of laterals, locals and collectors, would be approximately $346,761,523. There are also a number of pump stations with a replacement value $750,000. There is $1,610,053 in specialty equipment and vehicles dedicated to sewer collection system maintenance. There is an existing negative GC DIF fund balance of $4,052,853. These individual assets create sewer collection system investment of $345,068,723.

[13] Not to be confused with a "connection" fee which is a reimbursement for the actual costs of having a city-worker either set the water meter or connect the privately owned sewer pipe from the home to the City's later sewer pipe.

GENERAL CITY SEWER COLLECTION SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT IMPACT FEES

Schedule 8.1 identifies 38 sewer collection capital projects, (after fourteen of the original 52 have been completed and removed from the total), necessary to accommodate the remaining growth in the GC part of the City and also maintain the existing system. GC development will be responsible for some portion of 25 of the remaining 38 projects. OR had some (or all) of the responsibility for 14 of the projects. Twenty-two of the projects have some portion (or all) of the costs related to maintenance of the existing system and thus these portions are not allocated to development. Combined, they will cost an estimated $137,148,405 to design, construct and inspect, or acquire. The combined GC and OR DIF positive fund balances of $5,184,412 and reduce that figure the $5,422,835 in outstanding developer credits slightly increases the total $137,386,829.

The Schedule 8.1 projects were identified by the City's Engineering Staff, and they were based upon the *General City and Ontario Ranch Sewer Master Plan of 2012*.

The project costs related to GC growth needs were then distributed to the development categories within GC by the system design flows, or gallons per day/acre flow rates (GPAD) for business development or gallons per day (GPD) for residential construction. The OR sewer design flow rates are based upon the previously mentioned Sewer Master Plan and are as follows in Table 8-1:

Table 8-1
General City Sewer Flow Rate
Demand by Land Use
Demand in GPD or GPAD

DIF Land-use Type	Gallons (per Unit) per Day	Gallons per Acre per Day
Detached Dwelling Units	240	
Attached Dwelling Units	210	
High Density Dwelling Units	180	
Mobile Residences Dwelling Units	210	
Commercial Lodging Units	140	
Retail/Service Uses		900
Office Uses		3,000
Business Park Uses		1,200
Industrial Uses		1,600
Institutional Uses		1,500

DISTRIBUTION OF CAPTAL COSTS

Table 8-2, following, is extracted from Schedule 8.2 and demonstrates the results of distributing the $26,077,681 in GC sewer system expansion costs over the remaining undeveloped parcels in GC.

Table 8-2
City of Ontario's General City Area
Basic Needs-based Sewer Collection System
Development Impact Costs
by DIF Land-use Type

DIF Land-use Type	Allocation of Development Costs	Development Impact Cost Per Unit or Square Foot
Detached Dwelling Units	$652,617	$577/Unit
Attached Dwelling Units	$1,357,443	$505/Unit
High Density Dwelling Units	$9,438,736	$433/Unit
Mobile Home Units	$47,970	$505/Unit
Commercial Lodging Units	$50,424	$336/Unit
Retail/Service Uses	$2,146,830	$0.263/S.F.
Office Uses	$5,929,777	$0.284/S.F.
Business Park Uses	$983,945	$0.141/S.F.
Industrial Uses	$1,696,581	$0.055/S.F.
Institutional Uses	$7,140	$0.164/S.F.

The results indicate that the varying types of residential dwellings will need to contribute anywhere from a low of $433 for a high density dwelling unit to a high of $577 for a detached dwelling unit in either DIF payments or in contributed capital in the form of off-site sewer lines (to the same amount).

Existing Contribution. Table 8-3, on the following page, distributes the current replacement cost, or long-term investment of the existing system distributed over those who have contributed to the existing sewer system, the current users and rate payers. This has been done in the same manner as the future costs were distributed against the future users, by the same average demand statistics used for modeling master plans. The results indicate that the average high density dwelling unit has contributed $2,516 per unit and a detached dwelling unit has contributed about $3,354 per unit.

[This space left vacant to place the following table on a single page].

Table 8-3
Existing Sewer Collection System Community
Financial Commitment Comparison Data

DIF Land-use Type	Allocation of Development Costs	Development Impact Cost Per Unit or Square Foot
Detached Dwelling Units	$92,067,786	$3,354/Unit
Attached Dwelling Units	$35,366,093	$2,935/Unit
High Density Dwelling Units	$12,105,011	$2,516/Unit
Mobile Home Units	$6,156,026	$2,936/Unit
Commercial Lodging Units	$11,366,564	$1,956/Unit
Retail/Service Uses	$6,000,745	$0.326/S.F.
Office Uses	$12,998,739	$1.305/S.F.
Business Park Uses	$12,425,925	$1.296/S.F.
Industrial Uses	$147,803,286	$1.389/S.F.
Institutional Uses	$8,781,999	$3.787/S.F.

PROPORTIONATE SHARE ANALYSIS

Necessity for DIFs. DIFs are necessary and appropriate for the construction of the remainder of the sewer collection system for one significant reason. Similar to the distribution of water, the collection and treatment of sewage has long since been recognized by most public agencies as a utility. Utilities differ from general tax-supported services in that they are similar to private sector utility businesses and are financed by utility rates. Sewer collection rates are relatively elastic, within reason, and can be set to meet sewage collection costs whereas taxes for general municipal services cannot. As a result, general taxes must be protected and reserved for services that do not have any such an elastic revenue source such as public safety, park maintenance, storm drainage, and others. Additionally, as long as the existing sewer users have an adequate system for their needs, they would have little interest in having sewer rates rise for any reason other than operating costs as opposed to meeting the cost of adding new users. Clearly, the cost of adding to the system infrastructure to accommodate additional private development demands should be imposed upon that same private development.

The contribution to the sewer collection system (benefit) can be measured, unlike many of the City's services. Sewer rates can, and should be, set to meet the Council's priorities and policies in terms of the sewer system use. The use of general taxes, where no relationship between the rate of taxation and benefit exists, in support of any utility service would be inappropriate.

Recommended GC Area DIF Schedule. The adoption of Schedule 8.2 at the end of the Chapter text (as summarized in table 8-2), as the Sewer Collection Facilities DIF schedule is both reasonable and would generate enough capital to construct the infrastructure facilities needed by the new development. The DIFs contained in Schedules 8.2 also contain amounts lesser than the financial commitment fees identified in Schedule 8.3 thus Schedule 8.2 does not violate any proportionate requirements.

CREDITS AGAINST DEVELOPMENT IMPACT FEES

Like the water utility, there are no *stand-by* sewer collection rates. Vacant parcels are not charged sewer rates and therefore they have not contributed to the capital development of the sewer system. As a result there can be no allowance for previous contributions to capital from vacant parcels, simply because there were none. Additionally, there have been no General Fund expenditures on sewer projects.

Credit for Developer Constructed Improvements Contained Within the City's MFP and Impact Fee Calculation. Similar to other infrastructure construction, it may be advantageous to have the developer construct certain public improvements contiguous to the private development. The adoption of DIFs should not preclude such agreements. Thus it is recommended that the City continue the process of agreeing to allow developers to make sewer system capital improvements that are identified within the City's MFP and that are part of the impact fee calculation, and receive a credit for that constructed amount. The net DIF would be the amount per the adopted schedules less the credit for the capital constructed by the developer.

.

ONTARIO RANCH SEWER COLLECTION SYSTEM IMPACT FEE

Ontario Ranch will need a significant amount of sewer collection system improvements in order to accommodate the large scale development planned for the area. There is some $73,398,698 in remaining collection trunk mains and other general improvements. In addition, there is the $681,912 in costs for a proportional expansion of the sewer maintenance fleet and $2,858,406 as the sewer operations share of the City maintenance yard improvements. There is a $561,012 portion of a Master Plan costs. The total of all these project and financial adjustments is $77,500,028. There is a net negative $4,291,276 in a combination of positive developer credits (increases total) and a positive Fund Balance (decreases total) will be spread over users developing on 4,727 vacant acres generating demands of 11,947,928 gallons per day. The project costs related to OR growth needs were then distributed to the development categories within OR by the system design flows, or gallons per day/acre flow rates (GPAD) for business development or gallons per day (GPD) for residential construction. The OR sewer design flow rates are based upon the previously mentioned Sewer Master Plan and also reflect the OR residential water conservation efforts. They are as follows in Table 8-4:

[This space left vacant to place the following table on a single page].

Table 8-4
General City Sewer Flow Rate
Demand by Land Use
Demand in GPD or GPAD

DIF land-use Type	Gallons (per Unit) per Day	Gallons per Acre per Day
Detached Dwelling Units	240	
Attached Dwelling Units	182	
High Density Dwelling Units	110	
Commercial Lodging Units	140	
Retail/Service Uses		900
Office Uses		3,000
Business Park Uses		1,200
Industrial Uses		1,600
Institutional Uses		1,500

These distributed costs are recommended as the OR Sewer Collection System DIF Schedule per Table 8-5 (as summarized from Schedule 8.4), following:

Table 8-5
City of Ontario's Ontario Ranch Area
Basic Needs-based Sewer Collection System
Development Impact Costs
by DIF Land-use Type

DIF Land-use Type	Allocation of Development Costs	Development Impact Cost Per Unit or Square Foot
Detached Dwelling Units	$19,160,431	$1,642/Unit
Attached Dwelling Units	$36,983,574	$1,246/Unit
High Density Dwelling Units	$9,850,945	$753/Unit
Commercial Lodging Units	$379,512	$958/Unit
Retail/Service Uses	$1,719,253	$0.299/S.F.
Office Uses	$2,340,867	$0.877/S.F.
Business Park Uses	$3,516,208	$0.353/S.F.
Industrial Uses	$7,327,683	$0.431/S.F.
Institutional Uses	$513,949	$0.472/S.F.

RECAP OF RECOMMENDED SEWER SYSTEM IMPROVEMENTS IMPACT FEES

- **General City** - Adopt Schedule 8.2 for the ten basic land-uses.
- **Ontario Ranch** - Adopt Schedule 8.4 for the nine basic land-uses.

END OF CHAPTER TEXT

Schedule 8.1

City of Ontario
2021-22 Development Impact Cost Calculation Update
Allocation of Project Cost Estimates
Sewer Collection Facilities

Line #	Project Title	Estimated Remaining Cost	Construction Needs Supported by Other Resources		Construction Needs Generated by New Development in OR		Construction Needs Generated by New Development in GC	
			Percent Need	Apportioned Dollar Cost	Percent Need	Apportioned Dollar Cost	Percent Need	Apportioned Dollar Cost
SW-001	Eastern Trunk Sewer	$21,279,860	85.66%	$18,228,328	13.18%	$2,804,686	1.16%	$246,846
SW-002	Western Trunk Sewer	$36,174,154	0.00%	$0	100.00%	$36,174,154	0.00%	$0
SW-003	Eucalyptus East Trunk Sewer	$697,535	0.00%	$0	100.00%	$697,535	0.00%	$0
SW-004	Project Completed or No Longer Needed	$0	0.00%	$0	100.00%	$0	0.00%	$0
SW-005	Haven Trunk Sewer	$1,497,780	0.00%	$0	100.00%	$1,497,780	0.00%	$0
SW-006	Mill Creek Trunk Sewer	$11,064,313	0.00%	$0	100.00%	$11,064,313	0.00%	$0
SW-007	Project Completed or No Longer Needed	$0	0.00%	$0	0.00%	$0	0.00%	$0
SW-008	Walker Trunk Sewer	$986,909	0.00%	$0	100.00%	$986,909	0.00%	$0
SW-009	Grove Trunk Sewer	$4,903,394	0.00%	$0	100.00%	$4,903,394	0.00%	$0
SW-010	Bon View Trunk Sewer	$4,903,394	0.00%	$0	100.00%	$4,903,394	0.00%	$0
SW-011	Euclid Trunk Sewer	$4,903,394	0.00%	$0	100.00%	$4,903,394	0.00%	$0
SW-012	Project Completed or No Longer Needed	$0	0.00%	$0	0.00%	$0	0.00%	$0
SW-013	Project Completed or No Longer Needed	$0	0.00%	$0	0.00%	$0	0.00%	$0
SW-014	Project Completed or No Longer Needed	$0	0.00%	$0	0.00%	$0	0.00%	$0
SW-015	Plaza Serena Street, Granda Court To Vineyard Avenue	$30,097	0.00%	$0	0.00%	$0	100.00%	$30,097
SW-016	Philadelphia Between Parco And Vineyard	$6,146,285	85.00%	$5,224,342	0.00%	$0	15.00%	$921,943
SW-017	Holt Boulevard, West Of Imperial Avenue	$407,568	61.00%	$248,616	0.00%	$0	39.00%	$158,952
SW-018	Project Completed or No Longer Needed	$0	100.00%	$0	0.00%	$0	0.00%	$0
SW-019	Project Completed or No Longer Needed	$0	0.00%	$0	0.00%	$0	0.00%	$0
SW-020	Cherry Avenue, North Of G Street	$17,442	100.00%	$17,442	0.00%	$0	0.00%	$0
SW-021	Project Completed or No Longer Needed	$0	0.00%	$0	0.00%	$0	0.00%	$0
SW-022	Vineyard Avenue, South Of Cedar Et. Al.	$13,947,873	13.00%	$1,813,223	0.00%	$0	87.00%	$12,134,650
SW-023	Easement East Of Haven Street	$1,211,150	27.00%	$327,011	0.00%	$0	73.00%	$884,140
SW-024	Project Completed or No Longer Needed	$0	0.00%	$0	0.00%	$0	0.00%	$0
SW-025	Project Completed or No Longer Needed	$0	0.00%	$0	0.00%	$0	0.00%	$0
SW-026	Sewer Utility Maintenance Vehicles	$947,100	0.00%	$0	72.00%	$681,912	28.00%	$265,188
SW-027	Sewer Utility Master Plan	$779,184	0.00%	$0	72.00%	$561,012	28.00%	$218,172
SW-028	Project Completed or No Longer Needed	$0	0.00%	$0	0.00%	$0	0.00%	$0
SW-029	Carpenter Trunk Sewer	$5,463,139	0.00%	$0	100.00%	$5,463,139	0.00%	$0
SW-030	Project Completed or No Longer Needed	$0	0.00%	$0	0.00%	$0	0.00%	$0
SW-031	Easement N/O & S/O Hollowell, E/O Boulder Avenue	$102,306	100.00%	$102,306	0.00%	$0	0.00%	$0
SW-032	D Street Between Corona And Vineyard	$72,566	100.00%	$72,566	0.00%	$0	0.00%	$0
SW-033	Easement W/O Euclid From N/O J St To Easement S/O G St	$187,515	100.00%	$187,515	0.00%	$0	0.00%	$0
SW-034	Benson Avenue Between I Street and G Street	$133,473	100.00%	$133,473	0.00%	$0	0.00%	$0

Schedule 8.1

City of Ontario
2021-22 Development Impact Cost Calculation Update
Allocation of Project Cost Estimates
Sewer Collection Facilities

Line #	Project Title	Estimated Remaining Cost	Construction Needs Supported by Other Resources: Percent Need	Construction Needs Supported by Other Resources: Apportioned Dollar Cost	Construction Needs Generated by New Development in OR: Percent Need	Construction Needs Generated by New Development in OR: Apportioned Dollar Cost	Construction Needs Generated by New Development in GC: Percent Need	Construction Needs Generated by New Development in GC: Apportioned Dollar Cost
SW-035	Virginia Avenue Between D Street and Nocta Street	$58,242	26.00%	$15,143	0.00%	$0	74.00%	$43,099
SW-036	Deer Creek Loop And Laurel Tree Drive	$809,492	99.00%	$801,397	0.00%	$0	1.00%	$8,095
SW-037	Hollowell, Boulder and Holt Avenue	$250,124	0.00%	$0	0.00%	$0	100.00%	$250,124
SW-038	Easement N/O Holt Blvd, E/O Allyn Avenue	$97,051	59.00%	$57,260	0.00%	$0	41.00%	$39,791
SW-039	Riverside Drive Between Sultana And Campus Avenues	$176,978	33.00%	$58,403	0.00%	$0	67.00%	$118,575
SW-040	Vineyard S/O Airport And Easement	$6,524,301	69.00%	$4,501,768	0.00%	$0	31.00%	$2,022,533
SW-041	Mills Circle N/O Mall Drive	$132,250	66.00%	$87,285	0.00%	$0	34.00%	$44,965
SW-042	Holt Boulevard E/O Vineyard Avenue	$420,132	52.00%	$218,469	0.00%	$0	48.00%	$201,663
SW-043	Bon View Avenue N/O Francis	$197,732	0.00%	$0	0.00%	$0	100.00%	$197,732
SW-044	Acacia, Easement, Locust And Parco	$1,736,460	19.00%	$329,927	0.00%	$0	81.00%	$1,406,533
SW-045	Turner Avenue, N/O Cedar Street	$132,250	19.00%	$25,128	0.00%	$0	81.00%	$107,123
SW-046	Holt Sewer Phase A	$960,447	83.00%	$797,171	0.00%	$0	17.00%	$163,276
SW-047	Holt Sewer Phase B	$37,442	99.00%	$37,068	0.00%	$0	1.00%	$374
SW-048	Share Of Common City Yard Improvements	$3,970,009	0.00%	$0	72.00%	$2,858,406	28.00%	$1,111,603
SW-049	Project Completed or No Longer Needed	$0	0.00%	$0	100.00%	$0	0.00%	$0
SW-050	Airport Drive Main, E/O Grove	$590,977	0.00%	$0	0.00%	$0	100.00%	$590,977
SW-051	Project Completed or No Longer Needed	$0	54.00%	$0	0.00%	$0	46.00%	$0
SW-052	Piedmonte Specific Densification Mitigation in Various Streets	$5,198,088	0.00%	$0	0.00%	$0	100.00%	$5,198,088
	Sub-Total General Plan Total New Projects	$137,148,406	24.27%	$33,283,841	56.51%	$77,500,028	19.22%	$26,364,539
	FINANCIAL ADJUSTMENTS:			$34,566,208		$78,789,386		$27,736,071
	Ontario Ranch - Local Sewer Outstanding Credits	$5,421,619	0.00%	$0	100.00%	$5,421,619	0.00%	$0
	Ontario Ranch - Regional Sewer Outstanding Credits	$1,216	0.00%	$0	100.00%	$1,216	0.00%	$0
	Ontario Ranch - Development Impact Fee Fund Balance	($1,131,559)	0.00%	$0	100.00%	($1,131,559)	0.00%	$0
	General City - Development Impact Fee Fund Balance	($4,052,853)	0.00%	$0	0.00%	$0	100.00%	($4,052,853)
	Tota Fund Balance/Outstanding Credits	$238,423	0.00%	$0		$4,291,276		($4,052,853)
	Total Net General Plan Project Costs	$137,386,829	24.23%	$33,283,841	59.53%	$81,791,304	16.24%	$22,311,686
					Forward to Schedule 8.4		**Forward to Schedule 8.2**	

NOTES:

(1). All developer-held "credits" under FINANCIAL ADJUSTMENTS will appear as a positive indicating an additional Infrastructure Fund obligation that will be redeemed (in lieu of a DIF payment) at some point in the future.

(2). A negative figure under FINANCIAL ADJUSTMENTS indicates a positive Fund Balance mitigating the project total. A positive figure indicates an amount that needs to be recovered by DIFs.

(3). Costs distribution based upon the Sewer allocation factors from the Sewer Master Plan.

Schedule 8.2

City of Ontario
2021-22 Development Impact Cost Calculation Update
General City (GC) - Minimum Capital Needs-based Impact Costs
Sewer Collection Facilities

Proposed Land Use	Undeveloped Acres	Undeveloped Units	Gallons per Day Sewer Demand Rate	Cumulative New Sewer Demand	Percentage of Additional Sewer Demand	Allocation of Expansion Costs	Cost Distribution Per Acre	Average Units or Square Feet/Acre	Development Impact Fee per Unit or Square Foot
Detached Dwellings	262	1,131	240	271,440	2.93%	$652,617	$2,491	4.32	*$577 per Unit*
Attached Dwellings	183	2,688	210	564,480	6.08%	$1,357,443	$7,418	14.69	*$505 per Unit*
High Density Dwellings	598	21,807	180	3,925,260	42.30%	$9,438,736	$15,784	36.47	*$433 per Unit*
Mobile Home Dwellings	14	95	210	19,950	0.22%	$47,970	$3,426	6.79	*$505 per Unit*
Commercial Lodging Units	3	150	140	21,000	0.23%	$50,424	$16,808	50.00	*$336 per Unit*
Retail/Service Uses	992	8,164,415	900	892,800	9.62%	$2,146,830	$2,164	8,230	*$0.263 per S.F.*
Office Uses	822	20,895,746	3,000	2,466,000	26.58%	$5,929,777	$7,214	25,421	*$0.284 per S.F.*
Business Park Uses	341	6,969,626	1,200	409,200	4.41%	$983,945	$2,885	20,439	*$0.141 per S.F.*
Industrial Uses	441	30,650,125	1,600	705,600	7.60%	$1,696,581	$3,847	69,501	*$0.055 per S.F.*
Private Institutional Use	2	43,560	1,500	3,000	0.03%	$7,140	$3,570	21,780	*$0.164 per S.F.*
TOTAL	**3,658**	--	--	**9,278,730.00**	**100.00%**	**$22,311,686 in Total GC Sewer General Plan Projects**			

Schedule 8.3

City of Ontario
2021-22 Development Impact Cost Calculation Update
Existing Community Financial Commitment Comparison
Sewer Collection Facilities

Proposed Land Use	Undeveloped Acres	Undeveloped Units	Gallons per Day Sewer Demand Rate	Cumulative Existing Sewer Demand	Percentage of Existing Sewer Demand	Allocation of Expansion Costs	Cost Distribution Per Acre	Average Units or Square Feet/Acre	Development Impact Fee per Unit or Square Foot
Detached Dwellings	4,733.0	27,449	240	6,587,760	26.68%	$92,067,786	$19,452	5.80	***$3,354 per Unit***
Attached Dwellings	641.0	12,050	210	2,530,500	10.25%	$35,366,093	$55,173	18.80	***$2,935 per Unit***
High Density Dwellings	193.0	4,812	180	866,160	3.51%	$12,105,011	$62,720	24.93	***$2,516 per Unit***
Mobile Home Dwellings	204.0	2,097	210	440,370	1.78%	$6,156,026	$30,177	10.28	***$2,936 per Unit***
Commercial Lodging Units	143.0	5,810	140	813,400	3.29%	$11,366,564	$79,486	40.63	***$1,956 per Unit***
Retail/Service Uses	477.0	18,418,611	900	429,300	1.74%	$6,000,745	$12,580	38,613	***$0.326 per S.F.***
Office Uses	310.0	9,959,192	3,000	930,000	3.77%	$12,998,739	$41,931	32,126	***$1.305 per S.F.***
Business Park Uses	741.0	9,587,138	1,200	889,200	3.60%	$12,425,925	$16,769	12,938	***$1.296 per S.F.***
Industrial Uses	6,610.0	106,400,598	1,600	10,576,000	42.83%	$147,803,286	$22,361	16,097	***$1.389 per S.F.***
Private Institutional Use	419.0	2,318,711	1,500	628,500	2.55%	$8,781,999	$20,959	5,534	***$3.787 per S.F.***
TOTAL	**14,471.0**	**--**	**--**	**24,691,190**	**100.00%**	**$345,068,723**	**Total Sewer Capital Needs to Finish System**		

$346,761,523	**in Sewer Collection System Assets**
$750,000	**in Sewer Collection Pump Station Assets**
$1,610,053	**In Sewer Maintenance Vehicle Assets**
-$4,052,853	**in Sewer System DIF Fund Balance**

Schedule 8.4

City of Ontario
2021-22 Development Impact Cost Calculation Update
Ontario Ranch (OR) - Minimum Capital Needs-based Impact Costs
Sewer Collection Facilities

Proposed Land Use	Undeveloped Acres	Undeveloped Units	*Gallons per Day Sewer Demand Rate*	*Cumulative New Sewer Demand*	*Percentage of Additional Sewer Demand*	Allocation of Expansion Costs	Cost Distribution Per Acre	Average Units or Square Feet/Acre	*Development Impact Fee per Unit or Square Foot*
Detached Dwellings	1,423	11,662	240	2,798,880	23.43%	$19,160,431	$13,465	8.20	*$1,642 per Unit*
Attached Dwellings	1,316	29,684	182	5,402,488	45.22%	$36,983,574	$28,103	22.56	*$1,246 per Unit*
High Density Dwellings	439	13,082	110	1,439,020	12.04%	$9,850,945	$22,440	29.80	*$753 per Unit*
Commercial Lodging	9	396	140	55,440	0.46%	$379,512	$42,168	44.00	*$958 per Unit*
Retail/Service Uses	279	5,751,595	900	251,100	2.10%	$1,719,253	$6,162	20,615	*$0.299 per S.F.*
Office Uses	114	2,670,188	3,000	342,000	2.86%	$2,340,867	$20,534	23,423	*$0.877 per S.F.*
Business Park Uses	428	9,953,243	1,200	513,600	4.30%	$3,516,208	$8,215	23,255	*$0.353 per S.F.*
Industrial Uses	669	16,981,679	1,600	1,070,400	8.96%	$7,327,683	$10,953	25,384	*$0.431 per S.F.*
Institutional Use	50	1,089,000	1,500	75,000	0.63%	$513,649	$10,273	21,780	*$0.472 per S.F.*
TOTAL	**4,727**	--	--	**11,947,928**	**100.00%**	**$81,791,304 in Total OR Sewer General Plan Projects**			

Chapter 9
Refuse Collection Facilities and Equipment

This chapter contains a calculation of the demand from development upon the City's inventory of refuse collection equipment, storage and maintenance facilities. The existing refuse capacity is the result of existing customer rate and fee payments. The inventory is also needed to serve the existing inventory of residential and business space. New refuse customers will impact the City by requiring new refuse vehicles and various types of collection containers which in turn will increase demand upon the refuse collection system facilities and maintenance capacity.

Many cities simply include the cost of capital acquisition within their operating budget. Cities that choose to finance the expansion of their refuse fleet through monthly user charges, rather than DIFs, are in fact forcing the existing refuse customers to subsidize the costs of these new businesses and residences. However, these costs can legitimately be recovered through a DIF schedule in virtually the same manner as a circulation or sewer DIF.

The calculation of refuse collection DIFs depends on the type of service required by a particular development, be it a residential unit or a business. Schedule 9.1, sections A through G demonstrate the varying costs for the three types of refuse collection services offered by the City: side-loader, front-loader and roll-off. Tables 9-1 through 9-7 will identify the cost calculation for the direct capital acquisition costs of the collection vehicles and the collection bins required by each DIF use category.

Table 9-8 will apply the City's indirect costs of the Refuse operations share of common City Yard improvements. These costs are significant given the extraordinary demands upon fleet maintenance facilities, overnight parking and fueling of collection vehicles and bin storage. In addition the vehicles are CNG powered and thus each parking spot will require the slow fill CNG capability.

Detached Dwelling Unit Residential Side-loader service (Schedule 9.1-A) - A side-loader truck can service 700 barrels per day for five days per week for a total of 3,500 total barrels pick-up capacity. The residential side-loader truck costs $375,000 and thus it costs $107.14 to service each collection barrel.

On average, detached dwelling residential dwellings have 3.05 barrels as some (about one in twenty) have a second refuse, green waste or recycle bin. A collection barrel costs $55.31 each. The resulting cost is $495.00 (rounded) per detached dwelling unit for the 3.05 barrel collection weekly.

[This space left vacant in order to place the following table on a single page].

Table 9-1
Refuse Collection
Development Impact Fee
for Detached Dwelling Units

	Cost per Item	Items Required	Total Cost
Collection Barrels	$55.31	3.05	$168.70
Portion of Side-loader Vehicle	$107.14	3.05	$326.78
Total (rounded)			**$495.00**

Commercial Front-loader for Attached Dwellings (Schedule 9.1-B) - A single front-loader truck, which serves large attached residential developments, commercial and industrial uses, costs $375,000. This cost is divided by the estimated 800 four cubic yard bins of refuse hauled per truck per week (160 per day for 5 days each) to derive at a cost of $468.75 per four cubic yard bin pick-up.

On average, it takes two - four cubic yard refuse bins and two - four cubic yard recycle bins to serve fifteen attached dwelling units. The bins, at $1,136 each, would cost $4,544. The cost for the truck to collect the four bins would be $1,875 (4 X $312.50). The combined bin and collection cost of $6,419.00, when divided by the fifteen detached units indicates a rounded cost of $428 per dwelling.

The high density units would require the same vehicle/bin combination costs of $6,419 but would serve twice as many (30) units resulting in a rounded cost of $214 per dwelling.

Table 9-2
Refuse Collection Development Impact Fee for
Residential Attached Dwellings
and High Density Dwelling Units

	Cost per Item	Items Required	Total Cost
Front-loader Vehicle Cost/Bin	$468.75	4	$1,875
Four Cubic Yard Bins	$1,136.00	4	$4,544
Total Cost for Vehicle & Bins			$6,419
Number of Units/Acre			15
Cost per Attached Dwelling Unit			**$428.00**
Total Cost for Vehicle & Bins			$6,419
Number of Units/Acre			30
Cost/High Density Dwelling Unit			**$214.00**

Commercial Collection for Retail/Service and Business Park use Developments Schedule 9.1-C) - A typical one acre-based Retail/Service establishment with a building pad size of 10,949 square feet will have two - four cubic yard bins (one for refuse and one for recycling) picked up on average one and a half times a week. This is the same of a Business park use but that development will result in a lower FAR or average square feet per average acre. As with 9.1 - B above, one front-loader truck, which serves Retail/Service uses and Business Park uses, will cost $375,000. This cost is divided by the estimated 800 bins the truck can collect weekly to derive a cost of $703.13 per bin pick-up or $2,272, for the two bins, one and a half pick-ups per week. The bin cost is $2,272 each for a total of $3,678.25.

The total capital acquisition cost for serving the one acre of Retail/Service business is $3,678.25 based upon an average of 11,979 square feet pad yield per acre results in a $0.336/square foot cost. The total capital cost for serving the one acre of Business Park use is the same at $2,199.06 per acre but based upon a lower average of higher 22,206 square feet pad yield per acre generates a $0.167/square foot cost.

Table 9-3 following indicates the fee necessary to serve Retail/Service and Business Park establishments.

Table 9-3
Refuse Collection and Business Park
Development Impact Fee
for Retail/Service Establishments

	Cost per Item	Items Required	Total Cost
Front-loader Vehicle Cost/Bin	$703.13	2	$1,406.26
Four Cubic Yard Bins	$1,136	2	$2,272.00
Total Cost for Vehicle & Bins			$3,678.26
Retail/Service Square Feet/Acre			10,949
Cost per Square Foot			**$0.336**
Total Cost for Vehicle & Bins			$3,678.26
Business Park Square Feet/Acre			22,006
Cost per Square Foot			**$0.167**

Commercial Collection for Restaurants Units (Schedule 9.1 - D) - Restaurants differ from other retail establishments in that they require a higher frequency of collection due to the volume of food wastes and the problems that would be caused with heat over a less frequent pick-up schedule. The typical one acre-based restaurant establishment with a building pad size of 11,979 square feet will also require two - four cubic yard bins (one for refuse and one for recycling) but due to the food wastes restaurant waste bin collection is typically five days a week while the recycle bin collection is limited to twice a week. As with 9.1-B, one front-loader truck, which serves commercial retail uses, costs $375,000. When divided by the estimated 800 bins

the truck can collect weekly, a cost of $468.75 per bin per day pick-up is derived. The two combined bins will require seven bin pick-up days (five for refuse and two for recycle trash) for a capital capacity cost of $3,281.25. The two bins cost $1,136 each for a total of $272.00. The total capital cost for serving the one acre commercial restaurant business is $5,553.25. Based upon the average 11,979 square feet yield of business pad a per acre, an impact fee of $0.464 per square foot is required to acquire the capital capacity to serve that new restaurant without requiring existing customers to subsidize the expansion.

Table 9-4
Refuse Collection
Development Impact Cost
for Commercial Restaurant Establishments

	Cost per Item	Items Required	Total Cost
Front-loader Vehicle Cost/Bin	$468.75	7	$3,281.25
Four Cubic Yard Bins	$1,136.00	2	$2,272.00
Total Cost for Vehicle & Bins			$5,553.25
Restaurant Square Feet/Acre			11,979
Cost per Square Foot			**$0.464**

Commercial Collection for Commercial Lodging (hotel/motel) Units (Schedule 9.1-E) - A typical one acre can support 30 hotel/motel units and will require two - four cubic yard bins, one bin for refuse picked up three times a week and one bin for recycling picked up once a week. As with 9.1-B, one front-loader truck, which serves commercial retail uses, costs $375,000. This cost is divided by the estimated 800 bins the truck can collect weekly to derive a cost of $468.75 per bin pick-up or $1,875.00 for the four bin pick-ups per week. The two bins cost $1,136 each for a total of $2,272.00. The total capital cost required for serving the one acre of hotel/motel units is $4,147.00. There is an average of thirty commercial lodging units per acre resulting in an $138.00 cost per keyed commercial lodging unit. Table 9-5, following, indicates the fee calculation.

Table 9-5
Refuse Collection
Development Impact Fee
for Commercial Lodging Units

	Cost per Item	Number Required	Total Cost
Refuse Collection Vehicle Cost/Pick-up (4)	$468.75	4	$1,875.00
Four Cubic Yard Bin Cost	$1,136	2	$2,272.00
Total Cost for Vehicle(s) & Bin(s)			$4,147.00
Commercial Lodging Units/Acre			30
Cost/Commercial Lodging Unit			$138.00

Commercial Collection for Office and Institutional Units (Schedule 9.1-F) - A typical one acre office establishment with a building pad size of 25,177 square feet [14] and an institutional use acre will, on average, result in 21,780 square feet. Both will require two - four cubic yard bins (one for refuse and one for recycling) picked up on average once a week. As with 9.1-B, one front-loader truck, which serves commercial retail uses, costs $468.75. This cost is divided by the estimated 800 bins the truck can collect weekly to derive a cost of $468.75 per bin pick-up or $937.50 for the two required pick-ups. The two bins cost $1,136 each for a total of $2,272.00. The total capital cost for serving the one acre commercial business is $3,209.50 or $1.27 per square foot for the office use and $0.147 per square foot for institutional uses. Table 9-6, following, indicates the fee calculation:

Table 9-6
Refuse Collection
Development Impact Fee
for Office and Institutional Uses

	Cost per Item	Items Required	Total Cost
Front-loader Vehicle Cost/Bin	$468.75	2	$937.50
Four Cubic Yard Bin	$1,136.00	2	$2,272.00
Total Cost for Vehicle & Bin			$3,209.50
Office Square Feet/Acre			25,177
Cost per Square Foot			**$0.127**
Total Cost for Vehicle & Bins			$3,209.50
Institutional Square Feet/Acre			21,780
Cost per Square Foot			**$0.147**

Industrial Roll-Off Service (Schedule 9.1-G) - This service is very expensive to provide because a truck will have to make one trip to the landfill for every load picked-up, regardless of the size of the roll-off box (10, 20 or 40 cubic yards) being transported. A roll-off truck, costing some $299,724, will collect and transport approximately 50 loads per week, which generates a one-time capital cost of $5,994.48 for each load collected during the week. However, the City primarily uses 40 cubic yard boxes and finds that one 40 cubic yard box picked-up once a week can serve the needs of a five acre industrial business. A 40 cubic yard box has a cost of $12,128.

Recycling is also required of industrial uses and generally requires once a week service for a four cubic yard bin. To determine the total impact cost of a development which uses roll-off service, the cost of the roll-off vehicle is added to the purchase price for a roll-off bin. Thus, the fee for roll-off equipment for serving large industrial/manufacturing uses is calculated as follows:

14 Based upon 26,386,000 square feet on 583.65 acres.

Table 9-7
Roll-Off Refuse Collection
Development Impact Fee
for Industrial/Manufacturing Uses

	Cost per Item	Items Required	Total Cost
Front-loader Vehicle Cost/Bin	$468.75	1	$468.75
Four Cubic Yard Bin	$1,136.00	1	$1,136.00
Forty Cubic Yard Vehicle	$5,994.48	1	$5,994.48
Forty Cubic Yard Bin	$12,128.00	1	$12,128.00
Total Cost for Vehicle(s) & Bin(s)			$19,727.23
Industrial Square Feet Served/Five Acres			214,560
Cost Square Foot of Industrial Businesses			**$0.092**

Share of Common City Yard Improvements. Based upon the Table 2-1, the City refuse collection operation will need to acquire $42.4 million in various collection vehicles and bins of all sizes. This is based upon the General Plan supported Land-use Database. The Refuse Department's portion of the City Yard improvements is $17,965,667, or roughly a 9.1% surcharge on the $44.4 million City Yard capital acquisition cost, or a 42.3% addition to the basic truck, bins and barrels costs. To insure that the City can fully accommodate the refuse demands of new residents and businesses, the City needs to acquire both the direct (vehicles and bins) and indirect improvements (vehicle maintenance, parking and fueling capacity) and should do so without imposing those costs on the existing community. In short, a fleet of collection trucks without the capacity to maintain them will ultimately prove problematical. Table 9-8 following indicates the final DIF costs.

[This space left vacant in order to place the following table on a single page].

Table 9-8
Application of Refuse Collection
Share of Common City yard Improvements
as an Overhead to Direct Costs

DIF Land-use Type	Direct Refuse Collection Costs	City Yard Improvements Cost Overhead	Total Development Impact Cost
Detached Dwelling Unit	$495.00	142.31%	$704.00
Attached Dwelling Unit	$428.00	142.31%	$609.00
High Density Dwelling Unit	$214.00	142.31%	$305.00
Retail Uses by S. F.	$0.336	142.31%	$0.478
Business Park Uses by S. F.	$0.167	142.31%	$0.238
Commercial Restaurants by S.F.	$0.464	142.31%	$0.660
Commercial Lodging Unit	$138.00	142.31%	$196.00
Office Uses by S.F.	$0.127	142.31%	$0.181
Institutional Use by S.F.	$0.147	142.31%	$2.009
Industrial Uses by S.F.	$0.092	142.31%	$0.131

RECAP OF RECOMMENDED REFUSE COLLECTION DEVELOPMENT IMPACT FEES

- **General City** - Adopt Schedule 9.1 for the ten basic service collection types.
- **Ontario Ranch** -Adopt Schedule 9.1 for the ten basic service collection types.

However, the final DIF to be imposed on any given private development will be based upon the submitted design drawings. As an example, some attached dwelling units will require common bin service, but others may be better served by individual barrel collection service.

END OF CHAPTER TEXT

Schedule 9.1
2021-22 Development Impact Cost Calculation Update
City of Ontario
Refuse Collection Facilities and Vehicles

A. RESIDENTIAL SIDE-LOADER COLLECTION FOR DETACHED DWELLINGS

Daily Stops per Single Route	700	Barrel Stops per Day
Number of Days of Collection	5	Ten-hour Days per Week
Pick-up Capability of One Truck	3,500	Barrels per Week

Cost per Collection Vehicle	$375,000	per Side-Loader Truck
Pick-up Capability of One Vehicle	3,500	Barrels per Week
Cost per Barrel per Pick-up Stop	$107.14	per Barrel per Stop

	Truck Cost	Barrel Cost	Total Cost per Home
Refuse/Trash Collection Barrel	$107.14	$55.31	$162.45
Green Waste Collection Barrel	$107.14	$55.31	$162.45
Recycle Collection Barrel	$107.14	$55.31	$162.45
Average 2nd Barrel (5% of Homes)	$5.36	$2.77	$8.13
Total (rounded)	$326.78	$168.70	$495.00

B. COMMERCIAL COLLECTION FOR ATTACHED UNITS

Cost per Front-loader Truck	$375,000	per Front-loader Truck
Collection Capability of one Truck	800	Bins per Week
Cost per Bin Collection	$468.75	per Bin per Stop

	Truck Cost	Bin Cost	Total Cost
Four Cubic Yard Trash Bin	$468.75	$1,136.00	$1,604.75
Four Cubic Yard Trash Bin	$468.75	$1,136.00	$1,604.75
Four Cubic Yard Recycle Bin	$468.75	$1,136.00	$1,604.75
Four Cubic Yard Recycle Bin	$468.75	$1,136.00	$1,604.75
Total Cost per Standard Attached Acre			$6,419.00
Average Number of Attached Residential Units/Acre			15
Total Truck Cost per Attached Unit (rounded)			$428.00

Total Cost per High Density Attached Acre	$6,419.00
Average Number of High Density Residential Units/Acre	30
Total Truck Cost per High Density Unit (rounded)	$214.00

C. COLLECTION FOR RETAIL/SERVICE AND BUSINESS PARK UNITS

	Truck Cost	Bin Cost	Total Cost
Refuse Bin (1.5 Collections/Week, 4CY)	$703.13	$1,136.00	$1,839.13
Recycle Bin (1.5 Collections/Week, 4CY)	$703.13	$1,136.00	$1,839.13
Total Cost per Average General Retail/Service Acre			$3,678.25

Average Square Feet of Retail/Service Pad per Acre	10,949
Cost per Square Foot for Average Retail/Service Uses	$0.336

Average Square Feet of Business Park Pad per Acre	22,006
Cost per Square Foot for Average Business Park Uses	$0.167

Schedule 9.1
2021-22 Development Impact Cost Calculation Update
City of Ontario
Refuse Collection Facilities and Vehicles

D. COMMERCIAL COLLECTION FOR RESTAURANTS
(Five day/week mandatory collection and two day/week recycling collection)

	Truck Cost	Bin Cost	Total Cost
Restaurant Waste, Five/Week	$2,343.75	$1,136.00	$3,479.75
Restaurant Recycle, Two/Week	$937.50	$1,136.00	$2,073.50
Total Cost per Average Restaurant Commercial Acre			$5,553.25
Average Square Feet of Restaurant Pad/Acre			11,979
Square Foot Cost per Five Days a Week Collection			$0.464

E. HOTEL/MOTEL UNITS COLLECTION (assumes thrice weekly)

	Truck Cost	**Bin Cost**	**Total Cost**
Commercial - General (Three/week)	$1,406.25	$1,136.00	$2,542.25
Commercial - Recycle (One/week)	$468.75	$1,136.00	$1,604.75
Total Cost per Average Hotel/Motel Acre			$4,147.00
Average Hotel/Motel Units per Acre			30
Cost per Hotel/Motel Unit (rounded)			$138.00

F. OFFICE AND INSTITUTIONAL USES

Office and Institutional Refuse	$468.75	$1,136.00	$1,604.75
Office and Institutional Recycle	$468.75	$1,136.00	$1,604.75
Total Cost per Average Retail, Office and Institutional Acre			$3,209.50
Average Square Feet of Office Pad/Acre			25,177
Cost per Square Foot			$0.127
Average Square Feet of Institutional Pad/Acre			21,780
Cost per Square Foot			$0.147

G. INDUSTRIAL ROLL-OFF COLLECTION FOR MISCELLANEOUS UNITS

Cost of Roll-off Boxes Collection Truck	$299,724
Units per Week	50
Collection Cost per Weekly Roll-off Stop	$5,994.48
Cost of a 40 Cubic Yard Roll-off Box	$12,128.00
Cost of Once/Week Front Loader Pick-up	$468.75
Cost of Four Cubic Yard Recycle Bin and Once/Week Pick-up	$1,136.00
Total Cost of Industrial Pick-up for Five Acres	$19,727.23
Square Feet of Pad In Five Acre Parcel	214,560
Cost per square Foot of Industrial/Manufacturing Pad per Acre	$0.092

Schedule 9.1
2021-22 Development Impact Cost Calculation Update
City of Ontario
Refuse Collection Facilities and Vehicles

A. RESIDENTIAL SIDE-LOADER COLLECTION FOR DETACHED DWELLINGS				
	Detached Dwellings per Unit	$495.00	142.31%	$704
B. COMMERCIAL COLLECTION FOR ATTACHED UNITS				
	Attached Dwellings per Unit	$428.00	142.31%	$609
	High Density Dwellings per Unit	$214.00	142.31%	$305
C. COLLECTION FOR RETAIL/SERVICE AND BUSINESS PARK UNITS				
	Retail Uses, per Square Foot	$0.336	142.31%	$0.478
	Business Park Uses, per Square Foot	$0.167	142.31%	$0.238
D. COMMERCIAL COLLECTION FOR RESTAURANTS				
	Commercial Restaurants	$0.464	142.31%	$0.660
E. HOTEL/MOTEL UNITS COLLECTION (assumes thrice weekly)				
	Hotel Units, per Keyed Unit	$138.00	142.31%	$196
F. OFFICE AND INSTITUTIONAL USES				
	Office Uses, per Square Foot	$0.127	142.31%	$0.181
	Institutional Uses, per Square Foot	$0.147	142.31%	$0.209
G. INDUSTRIAL ROLL-OFF COLLECTION FOR MISCELLANEOUS UNITS				
	Industrial Roll-off Users per Square Foot	$0.092	142.31%	$0.131

H. ORGANIC FOOD WASTE COLLECTION PROGRAM (New in 2019)		
Cost per Front-loader Truck	$375,000	per Front-loader Truck
Collection Capability of one Truck	700	Bins per Week
Cost per Bin Collection	$535.71	per Bin per Stop

32 Gallon Food Waste Bin	$40
64 Gallon Food Waste Bin	$49
1.5 CY Bin Food Waste Bin	$751
3.0 CY Bin Food Waste Bin	$982

Chapter 10
General Facilities, Vehicles and Equipment

The Existing System. General Facilities are generally limited to general office or work buildings and equipment used by City staff to undertake their daily duties. The City possesses (i.e., owns outright) a significant amount of general facilities square footage. The replacement costs are as follows:

City Hall Facilities and Annex	$33,438,307
Computer and Miscellaneous Equipment	$33,109,140
General Fund Portion of City Yard & Garage	$19,358,148
General Fund (pool and some maintenance) Vehicles	$4,150,800
General Facilities Impact Fee Fund balance	$4,255,805

The combined replacement cost of the structures, land, and equipment is $94,312,200. Land costs for numerous other facilities are not included because they are included in the park calculation.

Demand Upon Infrastructure Created by the Development of Underdeveloped or Undeveloped Parcels. As the City increases in both population and additional business ventures, the City Hall will gradually become overcrowded with a growing staff, even if major efforts are made to keep the number of municipal workers to a minimum. As a result the former 38,700 square foot Police station, with some renovation, will be able to absorb the increased City operations that have little contact with the public. The same will hold true for the City Maintenance Yard which can absorb some increased demand over the short term but over the long term near doubling of the City's residents and businesses, capacity will need to be expanded.

City pool vehicles generally made available to general employees assigned with general code enforcement, intra-city mail delivery, planning and engineering field inspection projects and other issues that require on-site review, as well as other travel by employees that do not have assigned City vehicles, will be checked-out on an increasing basis requiring some fleet additions.

Lastly, the City's centralized and personal desktop computer processing capability and storage space will also be impacted with greater amounts of data necessary to manage a larger city.

The **Purpose** of the Fee. The costs of extending the same level of service to the newly developing community as is provided to the existing community that has largely paid for the existing facilities can be calculated, a fee imposed and collected, and the fee used to expand the facilities necessary to extend that same level of services.

The **Use** of the Fee. The revenues that are raised from a properly calculated and supported General Facilities and Equipment Impact Fee would be limited to capital(ized) costs related to that growth. The fees would be used to construct additional general facilities. Conversely, the General Facilities, Vehicles and Equipment DIF receipts would not be used to repair or rehabilitate any existing general building (with the exception of reconfiguring City Hall Annex,

which would be far less expensive than constructing a new building). The improvements necessary to contend with increased demand resulting from additional residents and businesses would include the following:

- City Hall and the Annex reconfiguration.
- Expansion of the administrative pool car and general maintenance fleet.
- Up-sizing of the existing centralized computer system capacity.
- Completion of the City maintenance service center by financing the General Fund portion of the *Share of Common City Yard Improvements.*

Please note that GF-004, the Animal Holding Facility, has no estimate as the City does not have any specific plans in motion to construct such a facility. The project number is now a place-holder until such time as the City defines such a facility.

The *Common City Yard Improvements* project will be discussed further. In the earlier report, the full cost of the City Yard improvements was included in the General Facilities, Vehicles and Equipment infrastructure category. This report recognizes that differing municipal services require differing amounts of improvements. Refuse, for example, will directly need paved parking space and specialty CNG fueling stations for the many new refuse collection vehicles, while the Fire vehicles need additional fleet maintenance space for the temporary times that a fire engine needs either routine or extraordinary repairs.

The existing community has purchased sufficient space thus no land or parcel acquisitions are proposed. However, significant storage and workshop space will be needed to maintain the infrastructure the City will receive through dedication, as evidenced by the nearly $1.5 billion in development-generated infrastructure included in this document alone. Add to this figure an estimated additional $1.0 billion in *local* streets, storm drainage, and water distribution and sewer collection systems improvements included within the footprint of all developments that are not included in this Report.

Public facilities within the footprint of a development specifically benefit only those residences or businesses within that footprint. These improvements are required as a condition of approval and are not distributed to any other developer as part of a DIF distribution. However, all of these improvements are ultimately dedicated, accepted by and maintained in perpetuity by the City. It must be noted that the City's corporation maintenance yard is the first line of defense of maximizing the various infrastructure improvements and without proper sizing, the City would have little ability to maximize the life of the entirety of the City's infrastructure. The City has determined continued use of the city yard improvement costs from the previous DIF calculations until such time as a full City Yard Master Plan can be conducted and estimated.

These four separate costs were distributed to the various users based upon their demands upon the City Yard (see Appendix C for greater detail). The City Yard capacity expansion costs have been distributed as follows:

City Service/infrastructure	Chapter Text	Improvement Allocation
Police Fleet Maintenance	Chapter 3	$2,365,388
Fire Fleet Maintenance	Chapter 4	$1,404,845
Circulation System Maintenance	Chapter 5	$1,915,576
Storm Drainage Maintenance	Chapter 6	$1,739,460
Water System Maintenance	Chapter 7	$9,472,959
Sewer System Maintenance	Chapter 8	$3,970,009
Refuse Collection Maintenance	Chapter 9	$17,965,667
General Facilities – Other	Chapter 10	$1,583,822
Public Use Facilities (in future)	Chapter 12	$0
Park Maintenance	Chapter 14	$4,047,273
FiberOptics System (in future)	Chapter 16	$0
Total Allocated Cost		**$44,464,999**

The Relationship Between the Need for The Fee and The Type of Development Project. The need is based upon the recognition that additional developed parcels in the City will create the need for more building space and specialty equipment, largely within the arena of overhead space, i.e., administrative management, personnel, record keeping, financial accounting, etc. The costs are distributed on an equal acreage basis as the most direct index of demand relating to central management services.

The Relationship Between the use of the fee and the Type of Development paying the Fee. General management, City-wide and General Plan issues transcend type of land use and the use of the fee, as well as the need for the fee. Distribution will be based upon an equal benefit in terms of general management of the City.

Relationship Between the Amount of the Fee and the Cost of the Portion of the Facility Attributed to the Development Project. The fee would be based upon the size of the development. A fee has been determined for individual units, either residential dwelling units or business square feet. A development of twelve residential units would have to pay a fee twelve times larger than a single unit. No developer will be required to construct any portion of any general facility as a condition of development.

Resulting DIF Schedule. Table 10-1 following, summarizes the Minimum Needs-based General Facilities DIFs. The fees identified following represent the fees necessary to construct or acquire the facilities identified on Schedule 10.1.

Table 10-1
City of Ontario's Entire City Area
Basic Needs-based General Facilities, Vehicles and Equipment
Development Impact Costs
by DIF Land-use Type

DIF Land-use Type	Allocation of Development Costs	Development Impact Cost Per Unit or Square Foot
Detached Dwelling Units	$3,882,466	$303/Unit
Attached Dwelling Units	$3,453,897	$107/Unit
High Density Dwelling Units	$2,389,387	$68/Unit
Mobile Home Units	$32,258	$340/Unit
Commercial Lodging Units	$27,650	$51/Unit
Retail/Service Uses	$2,928,555	$0.210/S.F.
Office Uses	$2,156,670	$0.092/S.F.
Business Park Uses	$1,771,879	$0.105/S.F.
Industrial Uses	$2,557,589	$0.054/S.F.
Institutional Uses	$119,815	$0.106/S.F.

It must be restated that the existing community has invested in and established the City Hall, City maintenance service center, General Fund fleet, and electronic equipment at a replacement value of $94,312,200. In short, the current community has created more than adequate staff facilities. As a result, the current community has amassed a significant equity position vis-a-vis future needs. Table 10-2, following, identifies the average "equity" position or ownership per unit or square foot.

[This space left vacant to place the following table of a single page].

Table 10-2
Existing General Facilities, Vehicles and Equipment
Community Financial Commitment Comparison

DIF Land-use Type	Allocation of Development Costs	Development Impact Cost Per Unit or Square Foot
Detached Dwelling Units	$36,229,442	$1,132/Unit
Attached Dwelling Units	$4,133,637	$316/Unit
High Density Dwelling Units	$1,104,975	$230/Unit
Mobile Home Units	$1,167,953	$557/Unit
Commercial Lodging Units	$818,712	$141/Unit
Retail/Service Uses	$2,788,201	$0.151/S.F.
Office Uses	$1,774,830	$0.178/S.F.
Business Park Uses	$4,448,527	$0.433/S.F.
Industrial Uses	$39,447,038	$0.252/S.F.
Institutional Uses	$2,398,884	$1.035/S.F.

Of importance is the fact that the existing community will have contributed over 75% of the amount City's General Facilities needed at General Plan build-out.

RECOMMENDED IMPACT FEES

The *Minimum Needs-based Impact Costs* should be adopted for the two broad land uses, per Schedule 10.2 and summarized in table 10-3. The *Existing Community Financial Commitment* indicates that the existing community has generated a great deal more infrastructure than will be asked of future development.

RECAP OF RECOMMENDED GENERAL FACILITIES ET. AL. IMPACT FEES

- **General City** - Adopt Schedule 10.3 for the ten basic land-uses.
- **Ontario Ranch** - Adopt Schedule 10.3 for the nine basic land-uses.

END OF CHAPTER TEXT

Schedule 10.1

City of Ontario
2021-22 Development Impact Cost Calculation Update
Allocation of Project Cost Estimates
General Facilities, Vehicles and Equipment

			Construction Needs Supported by Other Resources		Construction Needs Generated by New Development - GC/OR	
Line #	Project Title	Estimated Cost	Percent Need	Apportioned Dollar Cost	Percent Need	Apportioned Dollar Cost
GF-001	City Hall And Annex Reconfiguration	$11,636,848	20.00%	$2,327,370	80.00%	$9,309,478
GF-002	Expansion Of Administrative Pool Car Fleet	$585,750	0.00%	$0	100.00%	$585,750
GF-003	Electronic Specialty Equipment/Computer Hardware/Software	$12,096,920	0.00%	$0	100.00%	$12,096,920
GF-004	City Animal Holding Facility, No Specific Plans/Policy Decision for Facility	$0	0.00%	$0	100.00%	$0
GF-005	Share of Specific/Common City Yard Improvements	$1,583,822	0.00%	$0	100.00%	$1,583,822
	Sub-Total General Plan Total New Project Costs	$25,903,340	8.98%	$2,327,370	91.02%	$23,575,970
	FINANCIAL ADJUSTMENTS:					
	Development Impact Fee Fund Balance	-$4,255,805	0.00%	$0	100.00%	-$4,255,805
	Total General Plan Total New Project Costs	$21,647,535	10.75%	$2,327,370	89.25%	$19,320,165
					Forward to Schedule 10.2	

NOTES:

(1). All developer-held "credits" under FINANCIAL ADJUSTMENTS will appear as a positive indicating an additional Infrastructure Fund obligation that will be redeemed (in lieu of a DIF payment) at some point in the future.

(2). A negative figure under FINANCIAL ADJUSTMENTS indicates a positive Fund Balance mitigating the project total. A positive figure indicates an amount that needs to be recovered by DIFs.

Schedule 10.2

City of Ontario
2021-22 Development Impact Cost Calculation Update
Entire City - Minimal Needs-based Impact Costs
General Facilities, Vehicles and Equipment

Proposed Land Use	Undeveloped Acres	Undeveloped Units	Acre Distribution Factor	Acre Demand Factor	Percentage of Additional Demand	Allocation of Expansion Costs	Cost Distribution Per Acre	Average Units or Square Feet/Acre	Development Impact Fee per Unit or Square Foot
Detached Dwellings	1,685	12,793	1.000	1,685.00	20.10%	$3,882,466	$2,304	7.59	***$303 per Unit***
Attached Dwellings	1,499	32,372	1.000	1,499.00	17.88%	$3,453,897	$2,304	21.60	***$107 per Unit***
High Density Dwellings	1,037	34,889	1.000	1,037.00	12.37%	$2,389,387	$2,304	33.64	***$68 per Unit***
Mobile Home Dwellings	14	95	1.000	14.00	0.17%	$32,258	$2,304	6.79	***$340 per Unit***
Commercial Lodging Units	12	546	1.000	12.00	0.14%	$27,650	$2,304	45.50	***$51 per Unit***
Retail/Service Uses	1,271	13,916,010	1.000	1,271.00	15.16%	$2,928,555	$2,304	10,949	***$0.210 per S.F.***
Office Uses	936	23,565,934	1.000	936.00	11.16%	$2,156,670	$2,304	25,177	***$0.092 per S.F.***
Business Park Uses	769	16,922,869	1.000	769.00	9.17%	$1,771,879	$2,304	22,006	***$0.105 per S.F.***
Industrial Uses	1,110	47,631,804	1.000	1,110.00	13.24%	$2,557,589	$2,304	42,912	***$0.054 per S.F.***
Private Institutional Use	52	1,132,560	1.000	52.00	0.62%	$119,815	$2,304	21,780	***$0.106 per S.F.***
TOTAL	**8,385**	--	--	**8,385.00**	**100.00%**	**$19,320,165**	**in Total Equity in General Facilities Capital Needs**		

Schedule 10.3

City of Ontario
2021-22 Development Impact Cost Calculation Update
Existing Community Financial Commitment Comparison
General Facilities, Vehicles and Equipment

Proposed Land Use	Developed Acres	Developed Units	Acre Distribution Factor	Acre Demand Service	Percentage of Existing Service Calls	Allocation of Infrastructure "Equity"	Distribution of "Equity" per Acre	Average Units or Square Feet/Acre	Current Financial Commitment per Unit or Square Foot
Detached Dwellings	6,328	31,997	1.000	6,328.00	38.41%	$36,229,442	$5,725	5.06	***$1,132 per Unit***
Attached Dwellings	722	13,097	1.000	722.00	4.38%	$4,133,637	$5,725	18.14	***$316 per Unit***
High Density Dwellings	193	4,812	1.000	193.00	1.17%	$1,104,975	$5,725	24.93	***$230 per Unit***
Mobile Home Dwellings	204	2,097	1.000	204.00	1.24%	$1,167,953	$5,725	10.28	***$557 per Unit***
Commercial Lodging Units	143	5,810	1.000	143.00	0.87%	$818,712	$5,725	40.63	***$141 per Unit***
Retail/Service Uses	487	18,522,286	1.000	487.00	2.96%	$2,788,201	$5,725	38,033	***$0.151 per S.F.***
Office Uses	310	9,959,192	1.000	310.00	1.88%	$1,774,830	$5,725	32,126	***$0.178 per S.F.***
Business Park Uses	777	10,271,628	1.000	777.00	4.72%	$4,448,527	$5,725	13,220	***$0.433 per S.F.***
Industrial Uses	6,890	112,134,057	1.000	6,890.00	41.83%	$39,447,038	$5,725	16,275	***$0.352 per S.F.***
Private Institutional Use	419	2,318,711	1.000	419.00	2.54%	$2,398,884	$5,725	5,534	***$1.035 per S.F.***
TOTAL	16,473	--	--	16,473.00	100.00%	$94,312,200	in Total Existing General Facilities Capital Assets		

$17,063,563	in City Hall Land/Facilities
$16,374,744	In City Hall Annex land/Facilities
$19,358,148	in City Yard Facilities (General Fund Portion)
$33,109,140	in Equity in Existing Computer/Electronic Equipment
$4,150,800	in General Fund Vehicles
$4,255,805	in Existing General Facilities Impact Fee Fund Balance.

Chapter 11
Library Facilities and Collection Items

The Existing System. The City currently owns a 58,000 square foot library facility at the Civic Center and has paid for approximately 14,800 square feet of the Colony High School library which is open to the public during specific hours. The City also has approximately a net of $8,178,651, ($8,256,956 less $78,350 in outstanding redeemable development credits), in Library DIF fund balance which represents about 10,997 square feet of future library space and 46,237 collection items). When the total 83,797 square feet are divided by the current population of 182,004, a city-wide library facilities space standard of 0.460 square feet/person is established (83,797 square feet ÷182,004 residents).

Demand Upon Infrastructure Created by the Development of Underdeveloped or Undeveloped Parcels. Stated simply, the 83,797 square feet of Library space will only be able to accommodate a finite number of collection items and patrons. Additional development will increase the demand on the existing square feet of library pad and the collection.

The **Purpose** of the Fee. The purpose of the fee is to enable the City to construct additional library space and additional collection items when necessary to ensure that the City's citizens have access to and enjoyment of the library space and collection. Table 11-1, following, indicates that the remaining residential development and typical number of persons per type of residential dwelling will generate a need for an additional 115,599 square feet in order to maintain the existing library facility standard of 0.460 square feet per person.

Table 11-1
Square Feet Required to Maintain Existing Standard

Residential DIF land-use Type	Number of Units Anticipated	Persons per Dwelling	Population Generated
Detached Dwelling Units	12,793	3.806	48,690
Attached Dwelling Units	32,372	3.373	109,191
High Density Dwelling Units	34,889	2.669	93,119
Mobile Home Dwelling Units	95	3.175	302
Additional City Residents from Added Dwelling Units			251,302
Square Foot per Person Existing Standard			0.460
Square Feet of Library Space Required to Maintain Standard			**115,599**

The City also has an extensive inventory of books, tapes, subscriptions called a *collection* of volumes. The City currently has 352,336 volumes in its collection (306,099 in service and 46,237 represented in available Fund Balance). Again, divided by the existing population of 182,004, the resulting standard is 1.936 current volumes per person. Table 11-2, following, indicates the

additional number of residents to be served and the number of volumes required to maintain the existing standard. The City will need to acquire 486,521 volumes to maintain the existing 1.936 volumes per person in light of the additional 251,302, persons at General Plan build-out.

Table 11-2
Volumes Required to Maintain Existing Standard

DIF Land-use Type	Number of Units Anticipated	Persons per Dwelling	Population Generated
Detached Dwelling Units	12,793	3.806	48,690
Attached Dwelling Units	32,732	3.373	109,191
High Density Dwelling Units	34,899	2.669	93,119
Mobile Home Units	302	3.175	136
Additional City Residents from Added Dwelling Units			251,302
Collection Items per Person Existing Standard			1.936
Library Collection Items Required to Maintain Standard			**486,521**

The **Use** of the Fee. The fee, if adopted, would be imposed, collected and expended on additional library facility space and on the number of volumes in the City Library's collection.

The Relationship Between the Need for The Fee and The Type of Development Project. The development of any acreage zoned for residential uses, increases the demand on the finite amount of library space and volumes. Thus, those residential land uses that generate higher amounts of residents (i.e., detached dwelling unit) will be charged a proportionally higher amount. There is no information available demonstrating a link or nexus between library use and local businesses.

The Relationship Between the Use of the Fee and the Type of Development Paying the Fee. Additional square feet will be constructed with the fees collected from residential development and additional volumes will be acquired for the collection. The fees cannot be used for any other purpose.

The Relationship Between the Amount of the Fee and the Cost of the Portion of the Facility Attributed to the Development Project. The cost of acquiring land for additional library space and construction is about $609.61 per square foot per Schedule 11.1. The 83,797 square feet of library space, when divided by the 182,004 existing citizens creates a standard of 0.460 square feet of library space per citizen. The standard of 0.460 square foot standard multiplied by the $609.61 per square foot of pad cost of library construction results in a charge of $280.42 per additional City resident.

Table 11-4
Establishment of the Library Facilities Standard and Cost per Person to Maintain the Standard

City-owned (or generated) Library Square Feet	83,797
Current Population	182,004
Square Feet per Resident	0.460
Construction Cost of Library per Square Foot	$609.61
Space Cost per Additional Resident	**$280.42**

The cost of acquiring additional volumes, called the accession process (15) (per Schedule 11.1) is $31.90 per volume. The accession process cost has decreased greatly over the last 25 years due to contracting out this time intensive process. The 352,336 current volumes, when divided by the 182,004 existing citizens create a standard of 1.936 library collection items per City resident. The standard of 1.936 collection items multiplied by the $31.90 per volume results in a cost of $60.39 per additional City resident, in order to maintain the existing standard. Table 11-5 identifies this;

Table 11-5
Establishment of the Library Collection Standard and Cost per Person to Maintain the Standard

City-owned (or generated) Collection Items	344,533
Current Population	182,004
Collection Items per Resident	1.936
Accessions Cost per Collection Item	$31.90
Collections Cost per Additional Resident	**$61.76**

Resulting Library Space and Collection Items DIF Schedule. The combined cost per new resident is $342.18 ($280.42 for 0.460 square feet of library space and $61.76 for 1.936 additional collection items). Table 11-6, following indicates the amount required for pro-rata expansion of the library space per Schedule 11.1. If adopted and imposed on the remaining development, it would collect enough to acquire land for and construct an additional 115,599 square feet of library space and an additional 486,521 volumes.

[This space left vacant to place to following table on a single page].

15 The accession process includes: need research, ordering, receipt, preparation, entering it into the computer and actual placement on the shelves.

Table 11-6
Summary of Library Space and Collection Impact Costs

DIF Land-use Type	Residents Per Dwelling	Cost per Resident	Impact Cost per Dwelling
Detached Dwelling Units	3.806	$342.18	$1,302
Attached Dwelling Units	3.373	$342.18	$1,154
High Density Dwelling Units	2.669	$342.18	$913
Mobile Home Dwelling Units	3.175	$342.18	$1,086

RECAP OF RECOMMENDED LIBRARY AND COLLECTION VOLUMES IMPACT FEES

- **General City** - Adopt Schedule 11.1 for the four basic residential dwelling types.
- **Ontario Ranch** - Adopt Schedule 11.1 for the three basic residential dwelling types in Ontario Ranch (detached, attached and high density dwelling units).

END OF CHAPTER TEXT

Schedule 11.1

City of Ontario
2021-22 Development Impact Cost Calculation Update
Library Facilities and Collection Items

	Library Space	Collection Items	Total Resources
Ovitt Main Library	58,000	235,243	
Lewis Family Library	14,800	70,856	
Library Facilities Represented by Existing Fund Balance	10,997	46,237	
Existing Library Square Feet	83,797		
Existing Number of Collection Items		352,336	
Existing Standards:			
Current Population	182,004	182,004	
Square Foot of Library Space per Resident	0.460		
Collection Items per Resident		1.936	
Library Construction per Square Foot	$547.90		
Hardscape Improvements, @ 0.333 FAR	$13.50		
Land/Grading Cost @ 0.333 Floor Area Ratio	$48.21		
Land Acquisition and Construction per Square Foot	$609.61		
Accessions Cost per Collection Item		$31.90	
Cost per Facility Square Foot or Collection Item	$609.61	$31.90	
Existing Library Facilities and Collection Item Standard	0.460	1.936	
Library Facility Construction Cost per Resident	$280.42		
Collection Item Cost per Resident		$61.76	

Cost per Land Use Residential Dwelling Unit	Density per Dwelling Unit	Library Space	Collection Items	Total Resources
Detached Dwelling Unit	3.806	$1,067	$235	$1,302
Attached Dwelling Unit	3.373	$946	$208	$1,154
High Density Dwelling Unit	2.669	$748	$165	$913
Mobile Home Dwelling Unit	3.175	$890	$196	$1,086

FAR = Floor Area ratio

Chapter 12
Public Use (Community Centers) Facilities

This important component of the City's offerings to its citizens is generally included in the Park Acquisition and Park Improvements DIF Schedule but was split out in the 2000-01 Report as a separate impact fee for three reasons.

First, few parks contain a community public use center.

Secondly, it is difficult to insure that the cost for such a facility is properly included in the average park development cost per acre.

Lastly and perhaps most importantly, it has been the experience of RCS staff, that when the cost for community centers is included as a cost of park development, these facilities simply do not get built. This is because the park impact fee revenues get used on the costly demand for turfed park acres with sports or passive-use park improvements.

The Existing System. The City has a number of facilities currently dedicated for public use facilities. Such facilities are available to community groups for meetings and other civic functions. This category of buildings differs from General Facilities which are those used by the City staff to undertake their municipal service duties (City Hall as an example).

The City owns some facilities dedicated to a specific use, such as the gymnasium, and one available for broader uses, the De Anza Community Center. Table 12-1 shows the City's existing public meeting facilities.

Table 12-1
Inventory of Existing (Owned) Public Meeting Facilities

Public Use Meeting Facility	Square Feet
Armstrong Center	13,500
Dorothy A. Quesada Center	10,000
Civic Center Senior Center	13,964
Anthony Munoz Community Center	24,000
De Anza Community Center	23,683
City of Ontario Museum	19,478
Westwind Community Center & Gymnasium	26,260
Future Facilities S.F. in DIF Fund Balance	14,685
Total Public Use Square Feet	**145,570**

Since the last DIF Update Report update the Anthony Munoz Community Center was expanded from 5,103 square feet to 24,000 square feet. The amount of square feet represented by existing fund balance increased from 1,450 square feet to 14,685 indicating that the City is likely able to construct one or more additional public use facilities in the near future.

The City's Public Use Facilities impact fee fund balance of $8,951,931 (÷ $609.61) represents an additional 14,685 square feet but is dedicated for that purpose and cannot be used for any other purpose. As such it is an un-realized asset, yet to be constructed. The City may be waiting for an additional amount to construct a larger facility or has yet to determine what use the addition public use facility will serve.

Based upon an existing population of 182,004, the 145,570 square feet of public use facilities resources creates a standard of 0.800 square feet per resident. This standard indicates that the City maintains a substantial commitment to providing a community center or recreation space for public groups and individuals. Table 12-2, following, demonstrates the calculation establishing the square foot standard:

Table 12-2
Calculation of Public Use Facilities
Square Foot Standard

Public Meeting Space Square Feet	145,570
Current City Population	182,004
Square Foot per Resident Standard	0.800

Demand Upon Infrastructure Created by the Development of Underdeveloped or Undeveloped Parcels. Simply stated, additional residential dwelling units will increase the population, placing greater demands for use of the existing community centers. The construction of a detached dwelling unit will create, on average, 3.806 potential new community center users. The addition of a new attached dwelling will create on average 2.669 potential new users.

The **Purpose** of the Fee. The purpose of the fee is to determine the cost of expanding the community center and public-use type facilities by some 201,042 square feet to meet the added demands created by the construction of additional residential dwelling units. It should be noted that 201,042 square feet of public use facilities may not fully meet the needs of the build-out community and that square feet may be desired by the community. The reference to the 201,042 square feet indicates that is the amount of additional public use facilities square feet that could be financed by DIFs. Table 12-3, following, demonstrates the calculation of the number of additional square feet required to maintain the existing Public Use facilities standard:

[This space left vacant in order to place the following table on a single page].

Table 12-3
Square Feet of Community Center Space
Required to Maintain Existing Standard

Residential DIF land-use Type	Number of Units Anticipated	Persons per Dwelling	Population Generated
Detached Dwelling Units	12,793	3.806	48,690
Attached Dwelling Units	32,372	3.373	109,191
High Density Dwelling Units	34,889	2.669	93,119
Mobile Home Units	95	3.175	302
Additional City Residents from Added Dwelling Units			251,302
Square Foot per Person Existing Standard			0.800
Community Center Space (SF) Required to Maintain Standard			**201,042**

The **Use** of the Fee. The fee, if adopted, would be imposed, collected, and spent on the construction of additional community center space that benefits City of Ontario residents, not rehabilitation of any existing public use facility.

The Relationship Between the Need for The Fee and The Type of Development Project. Different types of residential dwellings generally have differing amounts of people dwelling in them. Census data indicates the following occupancy statistics for the City:

Detached Dwelling Units.....3.806 Persons/Unit
Attached Dwelling Units.....3.373 Persons/Unit
High Density Dwelling Units.....2.669 Persons/Unit
Mobile Home Family Dwelling Units.....3.175 Persons/Unit

The Relationship Between the Use of the Fee and the Type of Development Paying the Fee. The fee will be used to expand the amount of community center square feet in proportions consistent with the average persons per dwelling. Community centers would be expanded in the following amounts following, by type of residential dwelling:

Detached Dwelling Unit..... 3.806 Persons per Unit X 0.800 Square Feet = 3.045 Square Feet
Attached Dwelling Unit..... 3.373 Persons per Unit X 0.800 Square Feet = 2.698 Square Feet
High Density Dwelling Unit..... 2.669 Persons per Unit X 0.800 Square Feet = 2.135 Square Feet
Mobile Home Dwelling Unit..... 3.175 Persons per Unit X 0.800 Square Feet = 2.540 Square Feet

The Relationship Between the Amount of the Fee and the Cost of the Portion of the Facility Attributed to the Development Project. The cost of adding 0.800 square feet of building space per person is roughly $487.69 based upon a $609.61 per square foot ($547.90 for construction, $48.21 for land acquisition (or $16.07 per square foot cost and a floor area ratio of 0.333) and parcel site hardscape improvements of $13.50.

Resulting DIFs. Table 12-4, following, indicates the proposed Public Meeting DIF.

Table 12-4
Summary of Public Meeting Facilities Impact Fee

DIF Land-use Type	Impact Fee Per Unit
Detached Dwelling Unit	$1,856
Attached Dwelling Unit	$1,645
High Density Dwelling Unit	$1,302
Mobile Home Dwelling Unit	$1,548

RECAP OF RECOMMENDED PUBLIC USE FACILITIES IMPACT FEES

- **General City** - Adopt Schedule 12.1 for the four basic residential dwelling categories.
- **Ontario Ranch** - Adopt Schedule 12.1 for the three basic residential dwelling categories in Ontario Ranch (detached, attached and high density dwelling units).

END OF CHAPTER TEXT

Schedule 12.1

City of Ontario
2021-22 Development Impact Cost Calculation Update
Public Use (Community Center) Facilities

	Land and Building	Total Cost
Armstrong Center	13,500	
Dorothy A. Quesada Center	10,000	
Civic Center Senior Center	13,964	
Anthony Munoz Community Center	24,000	
De Anza Community Center	23,683	
City of Ontario Museum	19,478	
Westwind Community Center and Gymnasium	26,260	
Facilities Represented in Existing DIF Fund Balance	14,685	
Existing City-owned Public Use Facilities Square Feet	145,570	
Current Population	182,004	
Square Foot per Resident Standard	0.800	
Average Public Use Facility Construction Cost/Square Foot	$547.90	
Hardscape Improvements, @ 0.333 FAR	$13.50	
Land/Grading Cost @ 0.333 Floor Area Ratio	$48.21	
Total Cost for a Single Square Foot of Public Use Space	$609.61	
Total Cost for One Square Foot of Public Use Space	$609.61	
Square Foot per Resident Standard	0.800	
Cost per New Resident	$487.69	

Cost per Land Use Residential Dwelling Unit	Density per Dwelling Unit	Total Public Use Resources	Total Cost
Detached Dwelling Unit	3.806	$1,856	$1,856
Attached Dwelling Unit	3.373	$1,645	$1,645
High Density Dwelling Unit	2.669	$1,302	$1,302
Mobile Home Dwelling Unit	3.175	$1,548	$1,548

Chapter 13
Aquatics Facilities

This component of City infrastructure is also separated from the Park Land Acquisition and DIF for the same reasons described in the previous Chapter regarding Public Use (community center) Facilities.

The Existing System. The City owns four aquatics facilities consisting of a total of 6,668 square feet of swimming pool surface and 4,294 square feet of combination locker/utilities/office buildings. The De Anza Park Pool, listed in the previous Report, has been dismantled and is no longer included in the calculation of the standard. These remaining facilities are available to individuals and groups represented by the existing 182,004 residents for leisure and general fitness uses. Table 13-1, following, details the aquatics complexes and the current fund balance.

Table 13-1
Existing City Pools/Utility Buildings

Pool Facility	Pool Surface Capacity	Pool Support Facilities
Anthony Munoz Park Aquatics Center	1,225	424
Bon View Park Aquatics Center	1,369	412
Vineyard Park Aquatics Center	1,296	450
Westwind Park Aquatics Center	2,580	2,880
Square Feet Represented by Fund Balance	1,061	683
Total Square Feet	**7,531**	**4,849**

Demand Upon Infrastructure Created by the Development of Underdeveloped or Undeveloped Parcels. Simply stated, additional residential dwelling units will increase the population placing greater demands upon the City's existing aquatics centers. The construction of detached dwelling and attached dwellings will create, on average, 3.806 and 3.373 potential new potential pool users, respectively. A high density dwelling will generate approximately 2.669 residents. The addition of mobile residences in the unlikely event that any mobile home dwelling pads be applied for and approved) will create 3.175 potential new pool users each. Table 12-2 indicates the current *de-facto* standards are 0.0266 square feet of locker/office building per person and 0.0414 square feet of pool surface per person in the City.

Table 13-2
Calculation of Aquatics Facilities - Square Foot Standards

	Pool Surface	Support Space
Space Square Feet	7,531	4,849
Current City Population	182,004	182,004
Square Foot per Resident Standard	0.0414	0.0266

The **Purpose** of the Fee. The purpose of the fee is to generate DIF revenue with which to expand the aquatics centers capacity to meet the added demands created by the construction of additional residential dwelling units. The City has preliminary plans on locating a $12.0 million aquatic facility in the City. The collected DIF revenue will only finance just over 68% of the facility as it is an increase in the existing standard. The remaining 32% will need to come from sources other than impact fees.

The **Use** of the Fee. The fee, if adopted, would be imposed, collected, and spent on the construction of additional aquatics centers that would benefit City of Ontario residents, but would not be spent on rehabilitation of the existing aquatic center.

The Relationship Between the Need for The Fee and The Type of Development Project. Different types of residential dwellings generally have differing numbers of people dwelling in them. United States Census 1990 data (see Table 2-3. page 23) was used to determine the occupancy density statistics for the City. They are summarized following:

Detached Dwelling Units	3.806 Persons/Unit
Attached Dwelling Units	3.373 Persons/Unit
High Density Dwelling Units	2.669 Persons/Unit
Mobile Home Dwelling Units	3.175 Persons/Unit

The Relationship Between the Use of the Fee and the Type of Development Paying the Fee. The fee will be used to expand the pool and aquatics center space in proportions consistent with the average persons per dwelling. The aquatic center pools and locker/utility buildings would be expanded in the amounts on the following page, by type of residential dwelling:

Detached Dwelling Units	0.1575 S.F. of locker space and 0.1014 S.F. of pool surface
Attached Dwelling Units	0.1396 S.F. of locker space and 0.0899 S.F. of pool surface
High Density Dwelling Units	0.1104 S.F. of locker space and 0.0711 S.F. of pool surface
Mobile Home Dwelling Units	0.1314 S.F. of locker space and 0.0846 S.F. of pool surface

The Relationship Between the Amount of the Fee and the Cost of the Portion of the Facility Attributed to the Development Project. Schedule 13.1 indicates the pool and locker building cost calculations. The pool construction costs are also based upon past pool construction costs received from previous agencies.

The two separate square foot costs above total about $29.44 per person for the pool expansion ($362.71/S.F. X 0.0414 = $15.01 per person) about $14.43 per person for the locker/service building expansion ($541.80/S.F. X 0.0266 = $14.43 per person) or $29.44 per person for both construction components. Thus a detached dwelling detached unit would incur impact costs of $112 (3.806 persons X $29.44, rounded). An attached dwelling unit would generate impact costs of about $100, (3.373 persons X $29.44, rounded). A high density dwelling unit requires aquatics facility expansion costs of $79 (2.669 persons X $29.44 rounded).

Resulting DIF Schedule. Schedule 13.1, as summarized by Table 13-2 following, indicates the proposed Aquatics Facilities DIF schedule.

Table 13-3
Summary of Aquatics Facilities Impact Fee

DIF Land-use Type	Impact Fee Per Unit
Detached Dwelling Unit	$112
Attached Dwelling Unit	$100
High Density Dwelling Unit	$79
Mobile Home Dwelling Unit	$94

RECAP OF RECOMMENDED AQUATICS FACILITIES IMPACT FEES

- **General City** - Adopt Schedule 13.1 for the four basic residential land-uses.
- **Ontario Ranch** - Adopt Schedule 13.1 for the three basic residential land-uses in Ontario Ranch (detached, attached and high density dwelling units).

END OF CHAPTER TEXT

Schedule 13.1

City of Ontario
2021-22 Development Impact Cost Calculation Update
Aquatics Facilities

	Pool Capacity in Surface Square Feet	Support Facilities in Square Feet
Anthony Munoz Park Aquatics Center	1,225	424
Dorothy A. Quesada Aquatics Center at Bon View Park	1,369	412
Vineyard Park Aquatics Center	1,296	450
Westwind Park Aquatics Center	2,580	2,880
Facilities Represented in Existing DIF Fund Balance	1,061	683
Current Pool Size (Surface Square Feet):	7,531	
Current Aquatics Building (Square Feet):		4,849
Current Population (1)	182,004	182,004
Existing Standards:		
Square Feet of Surface/Resident	0.0414	
Square Foot of Locker Building/Person		0.0266
Construction Costs		
Pool Cost per Surface Square Foot	$362.71	
Facilities Construction/Square Foot		$541.80
Existing Standards per Resident	0.0414	0.0266
Adjusted Pool Cost per Resident	$15.01	
Adjusted Facilities Cost per Resident		$14.43

Cost per Land Use Residential Dwelling Unit	Density per Dwelling Unit	Pool Surface	Support Facilities	Total Cost
Total Cost per Added Resident		$15.01	$14.43	$29.44
Detached Dwelling Unit	3.806	$57	$55	**$112**
Attached Dwelling Unit	3.373	$51	$49	**$100**
High Density Dwelling Unit	2.669	$40	$39	**$79**
Mobile Home Dwelling Unit	3.175	$48	$46	**$94**

Chapter 14
Park Land Acquisition and Park Infrastructure Development

This Chapter summarizes the City's existing inventory of parks and identifies the ratio of park land per resident allowable under the Quimby Act (§66477 of the Government Code) [16] for residential developments involving the subdivision of land and the Mitigation Fee Act (§66000 of the Government Code) for the construction of residential developments not involving the subdivision of land. The existing per capita standard is then utilized to calculate the park dedication requirement for future residential development.

EXISTING PARKS AND RECREATION SYSTEM

Intensive parks and park recreational facilities constitute one of the City of Ontario's greatest challenges both with respect to facilities for both current residents and future citizens. The provision of a well-planned park system, with a variation in the size and nature of facilities offered, is an important amenity to residents of any city, the City of Ontario included. A mixture of passive and active uses and facilities and programs which appeal to a broad spectrum of potential park users is considered optimal in most urban cities. A city's park system is often a major factor in selection of a place to live. The current acres dedicated to park use will serve well to meet the City's current needs. However if the number of park acres remains static at 452.94 acres, they will not continue to meet recreational demands in light of a potential near doubling of the City's population.

Future residential development, by increasing the City's population, will impact the City's park system by requiring additional baseball fields and adequate space for various athletic activities. Given the magnitude of growth projected in this and other reports, the challenge facing the City will be to provide new facilities and park land to serve the recreational needs of these new residents. Without additional park land acquisition and continued development of currently owned but underutilized park land during the next twenty to thirty years, the City's parks will become overcrowded and overused, with the ultimate result becoming a negative experience for park users.

Existing Parks. Currently, the City owns approximately 452.94 acres of park land, most of it developed. John Galvin, Westwind, DeAnza, Anthony Munoz, Soccer Park and Homer Briggs parks are the largest developed parks. At a total of 121.4 acres, they represent over a quarter of the park system acreage (when only traditional parks are considered) and provide the greatest variety of sports and passive uses. There are an additional 18.58 acres of potential park land represented in Fund Balance for a total of 471.52 acres in existing or potential parks.

Table 14-1, on the following page, is an inventory of the existing park acreage.

16 Adoption of a Quimby Act Fee requires a park "plan".

14-1
Inventory of Owned and Developed Park Land

Park or Space Name	Owned Park Acres	Developed Park Acres
Anthony Munoz Hall of Fame Park	15.80	15.80
Armstrong Community Center Park	1.14	1.14
Bon View Park	10.30	10.30
Celebration Park (North and South)	10.50	10.50
Centennial Park	4.60	4.60
Civic Center Conservation Park	1.00	1.00
Creekside Park	6.90	6.90
Cypress Park	4.70	4.70
De Anza Park	19.20	19.20
Del Rancho Park	4.80	4.80
Euclid Median Park	13.40	13.40
George Gibbs Park	2.70	2.70
Grove Park	3.10	3.10
Homer Briggs Park	14.40	14.40
James F. Bryant Park (L)	4.50	4.50
James Galanis Park	4.80	4.80
Jay Littleton Ballpark	9.70	9.70
John Galvin Park	25.60	25.60
Kimball Park	7.10	7.10
Nugent's Park	0.20	0.20
Ontario Motor Speedway Park	6.20	6.20
Ontario Soccer Park	23.40	23.40
Ontario Town Square Park	1.90	1.90
Ranch Park	1.80	1.80
Sam Alba Park	1.00	1.00
South Bon View Park	4.80	4.80
Veteran's Park	7.50	7.50
Vineyard Park	9.00	9.00
West Cucamonga Creek Trail	34.00	34.00
Westwind Park	23.00	23.00
Whispering Lakes Golf Course	176.30	176.30
Park Equivalent in Fund Balance	18.58	18.58
Total Park Acres	**471.52**	**471.52**

City De Facto Park Standard. Table 14-2, following, is a comparison of the acreage of parks to the City of Ontario's current population and indicates that the City presently possesses a total standard of 2.59 acres of owned park land per 1,000 residents, (471.52 acres ÷ [182,004 residents ÷ 1,000], rounded). Of the 471.52 total acres, 18.58 acres are represented in Park Acquisition and Park Improvements DIF fund balance (yet to be built) and do not require maintenance. This is slightly following the benchmark of 3.0 acres per 1,000 persons contained in Section 66477 of the California Government Code relating to dedication of parks.

Table 14-2
Calculation of Actual City-owned Park Acres Standard

	Owned Acres	Developed Acres
Total Park Acres	471.52	471.52
Current City Population	182,004	182,004
Population Divided by 1,000	182.0	182.0
Park Acres per 1,000 Population	2.59	2.59

However, the Quimby Act, to be discussed later, allows a minimum standard of 3.0 acres per thousand residents even if the City does not reach that standard. However, the *park acres owned* standard for the City of Ontario is 2.59 acres per 1,000 residents and thus the Quimby allowable minimum standard of 3.0 acres per 1,000 new residents will be used for *park land acquisition.*

The Quimby minimum of 3.0 acres per 1,000 residents has not been exceeded by the 2.59 acres per 1,000 residents and thus the Quimby allowable minimum of 3.0 acres per 1,000 will be used in the remainder of the Chapter for park *land acquisition and construction.* Though not relevant to the City of Ontario, the Quimby Act has a cap of 5.0 acres per thousand residents (Government Code §66447 (a) (2).

Planned Park Improvements. In addition to the on-going improvement of the existing 471.52 acres (17), the City will need to acquire 753.9 park acres, per Table 14-3, and develop these new parks to serve the additional 251,302 residents anticipated to live in both the General City and Ontario Ranch areas of the City at General Plan build-out. City staff has not proposed any specific improvements to existing parks or any new park configurations.

[This space left vacant to place the following table on a single page].

Table 14-3

17 The Quimby Act does allow for the use of receipts raised by the adoption of a Quimby Act park Impact Fee to be used for rehabilitation of existing park configurations.

Calculation of Required
Park Acres per Allowable Standard

General Plan Anticipated Population Increase	251,302
Additional Population Divided by 1,000	251.3
Allowable Standard in Acres/1,000	3.0
Park Acres required to Maintain Standard	753.9

These general improvements are outlined in the MFP. The 753.9 acres could be constructed in some combination of the following park configurations:

Mini or "Pocket" Parks - This the smallest of the parks designations and though generally not planned due to higher maintenance costs, usually are the result of acquiring an unusual parcel of land sometimes with historical significance. Nugent's Park fits best into this category.

Local or Neighborhood Parks - These parks are generally five to ten acres and serve local (1/4 mile walk-in distance) users. Not surprisingly, the City has a number of these parks. Centennial Park, James Galanis and South Bon View Park are good examples of this category.

Community or Sport Parks - These parks are most functional when they are twenty acres or larger and are designed to meet the needs of the entire community. Often, ten to twenty acre parks are forced to act as community or sports parks. These needs include youth and adult sports organizations, clubs or associations and large scale community events such as 4th of July celebrations or festivals. Anthony Munoz Hall of Fame Park, the Ontario Soccer Park or De Anza Park are good an example of sports parks and John Galvin Park best depicts a broad-based use community park.

The park and recreation improvements that could be contained within the almost 754 needed acres and the existing standard (Table 14-1) are both consistent with the City's Park and Recreation Element of the General Plan. The City's 2.59 acres per 1,000 population standard comes close but falls short of three acre per 1,000 population standard that is a common but frequently unmet minimum target of municipalities and recreation and park special districts throughout Southern California.

CALCULATION OF PARK DEDICATION STANDARD

Unlike the other facilities discussed in this Report, the California Government Code contains enabling legislation for the acquisition and development of community and neighborhood parks by a City. This legislation, codified as Section 66477 of the Government Code and known commonly as the "Quimby Act", establishes criteria for charging new development for park facilities based on specific park standards. This Report will recommend the adoption of Quimby-style park fees over an AB 1600-style DIF for developments requiring the subdivision of land and an AB 1600 fee for non-subdivided land.

Allowable Park Standard As stated earlier, under §66477 of the Government Code, the City

may charge new residential development based on a standard of 3.0 acres per 1,000 residents even if the City does not presently possess a ratio of 3.0 acres per 1,000 for the existing population. The Government Code also enables a city to charge development based on a standard higher than 3.0 acres (to a maximum of 5.0 acres) if the City currently exceeds the minimum benchmark ratio of 3.0 acres per 1,000 residents.

The law states that "if the amount of existing neighborhood and community park area ... exceeds the [3 acres of park area per 1,000 person] limit ... the legislative body may adopt the calculated amount as a higher standard not to exceed 5 acres per 1,000 persons" [18]. Park fees may be required by the City provided that the City meets certain conditions including:

- The amount and location of land to be dedicated or the fees to be paid shall bear a reasonable relationship to the use of the park by the future inhabitants of the subdivision.
- The legislative body has adopted a general plan containing a recreational element, and the park and recreational facilities are in accordance with definite principles and standards contained therein.
- The city ... shall develop a schedule specifying how, when, and where it will use the land or fees, or both, to develop park or recreational facilities ... Any fees collected under the ordinance shall be committed within five years after the payment of such fees.

Determination of a Park Standard. The City desires to have a standard of 5.0 acres/1,000 persons park standard within the Ontario Ranch area [19]. As previously identified, the City currently has 2.59 acres of owned and developed park acres/1,000 residents. The Quimby Act allows the City to adopt a standard of 3.0 acres per thousand as the low-end threshold. However, the 3.0 acres per 1,000 residents standard is the highest standard that can be adopted under the Quimby Act, without actually maintaining a standard higher than 3.0 acres/1,000. The adoption of the 5.0 acres/1,000 standard in the Ontario Ranch General Plan Amendment is not sufficient for adoption of an impact fee that is based upon the costs of acquiring and developing five acres/1,000 new residents, the City must currently meet that 5.0 per 1,000 standard. A specific plan identifying the need for the five acre requirement may be sufficient and adequate for the higher standard. The fact remains then, that the City will need to find an alternative to acquire the remaining 2.0 acres/1,000 residents.

CALCULATION OF IMPACT COSTS

Once a per capita standard for parks is determined, the cost of residential development's impact on the City's park system can then be computed as follows.

Park Land Acquisition Costs. Land costs will vary significantly from one park to another. The

18 California Government Code, Title 7, Division 2, Section 66447 (b).
19 Policy 12.1.1 page 5-13, City of Ontario Ontario Ranch General Plan Amendment.

park land to be acquired must be suitable for park construction and is conservatively estimated at approximately $761,490 per acre ($700,000/acre for the park land purchase and $61,490/acre for rough grading) which is used in the Park DIF calculation. This is consistent with the cost of some land suitable for residential dwelling development in Ontario Ranch.

Park Improvements Construction Costs. Park improvement construction costs are largely based upon the recent construction of the Ontario Soccer Park, the City's most recently constructed park. The park improvement construction cost of $560,200 per acre has been amended to recognize increases in park construction costs since that soccer facility was constructed. The City does not have any more recent park construction history. Community centers and aquatic centers were not included in the cost calculation (see Chapters 12 and 13).

Additional Park Infrastructure Impact Costs. The addition of park acres will increase maintenance costs, both in terms of demand upon the existing vehicles and then the maintenance of those vehicles and storage of park maintenance supplies. The City currently has $1,782,800 in existing park maintenance vehicles and equipment that deemed as adequate and sufficient for maintaining the existing amount of park acres. Based upon the 471.52 existing or potential park acres, the City has $3,983 in required maintenance vehicles per acre of developed park. Table 14-4 following demonstrates this.

Table 14-4
Calculation of Park Maintenance
Vehicles & Equipment Component

Existing Maintenance Vehicles Cost	$1,878,120
Total Existing Park Acres	471.52
Maintenance Vehicle Cost per Acre Maintained	$3,983
Acres/1,000 Park Acres/Resident Standard	3.0
Existing Vehicle Cost per Three Park Acres	$11,949
Divided by 1,000 New Residents	1,000
Maintenance Vehicle Cost per Additional Resident	$11.95

Additionally, the Parks operation has been allocated $4,047,273 as its share of the $44.5 million in the common City Yard improvements required to provide the City Yard with capacity to maintain the ever-growing inventory of infrastructure. Based upon the 753.9 acres to be built, each acre of additional park will require $5,638 towards the Park maintenance operations $4,047,273 of the total $68.7 million required in City Yard improvements. Table 14-5 following demonstrates this.

[This space left vacant to place the following table on a single page].

Table 14-5
Calculation of Park Maintenance
Share of Common City Yard improvements Component

City Yard Improvement Share	$4,047,273
Total New Park Acres Anticipated	753.9
Yard Improvement Cost per New Park Acre	$5,368
Park Acres Standard Acres/1,000 Residents	3.0
Yard Cost per Three Park Acres	$16,104
Yard Improvement Cost Divided by 1,000 Residents	1,000
Maintenance Yard Cost per Additional Resident	$16.10

Average Park Acquisition, Development and Maintenance Vehicles and Facilities Cost per Capita. The combined park land acquisition, park improvements development and support facilities cost is $1,331,041 per acre ($761,490/acre for land acquisition, $560,200 per acre for park improvements and $9,531 for the required maintenance vehicles and facilities). If the City were to charge development for the maximum allowable amount of park acreage as allowed in the Quimby Act and as recommended here, then the City would need to acquire 3.00 acres of new park land for every potential 1,000 new residents to the City. The 3.00 acres of land acquisition and development per 1,000 persons would be $3,993,122 or about $3,993.12 per new resident. Schedule 14.1 calculates the cost to develop 3.00 acres, which again represents the required park land cost for 1,000 persons.

Average Cost per Dwelling Unit. Schedule 14.1 further calculates the cost per dwelling unit based on the per person park land acquisition, development and maintenance vehicles cost of $3,993.12 (Schedule 14.1) and the average number of persons per unit for each category of housing. Detached dwelling residential housing has the highest number of persons per dwelling unit (@ 3.806 per unit) and consequently carries the highest impact fee, $15,198 per unit ($3,993.12 X 3.806 persons per unit, rounded). Attached dwelling units have an average of 3.373 persons per unit and would need to be assessed $13,470 ($3,993.12 X 3.373, rounded). Table 14-6, following, summarizes the calculated and recommended fees for each of these three residential categories. Schedule 14.1 provides greater park calculation detail and a complete schedule of Park Land Acquisition and Park Improvements DIFs for each of the four dwelling unit types.

[This space left vacant to place the following table on a single page].

Table 14-6
Summary of Park Development Fees for Residential Dwelling Construction

DIF Land-use Type	Development Impact Cost
Detached Dwelling Unit	$15,198/Unit
Attached Dwelling Unit	$13,470/Unit
High Density Dwelling Unit	$10,658/Unit
Mobile Home Dwelling Unit	$12,678/Unit

The DIFs for detached dwelling residential development involving the subdivision of land, as identified in Table 14-6, should be adopted under the auspices of the Quimby Act. The Residential dwelling units not requiring the sub-division of a privately-owned parcel will need to be adopted as a Government Code § 66000 supported DIF [20].

RECAP OF RECOMMENDED PARK LAND ACQUISITION AND PARK INFRASTRUCTURE DEVELOPMENT IMPACT FEES

- **General City** - Adopt Schedule 14.1 for the four basic residential land-uses.
- **Ontario Ranch** - Adopt Schedule 14.1 for the three basic residential land-uses in Ontario Ranch (detached, attached and high density dwelling units).

END OF CHAPTER TEXT

20 This is required because the Quimby Act is referenced in the State Subdivision Code

Schedule 14.1

City of Ontario
2021-22 Development Impact Cost Calculation Update
Park Land Acquisition and Park Infrastructure Development
(Quimby and Mitigation Act Calculation)

Park Name	Acres Owned or LT Lease	Developed/ Constructed Acres	Park Maintenance Requirements	Total Park Expansion Costs
Anthony Munoz Hall of Fame Park	15.80	15.80		
Armstrong Community Center Park	1.14	1.14		
Bon View Park	10.30	10.30		
Celebration Park - North/South	10.50	10.50		
Centennial Park	4.60	4.60		
Civic Center Community Conservation Park	1.00	1.00		
Creekside Park	6.90	6.90		
Cypress Park	4.70	4.70		
De Anza Park	19.20	19.20		
Del Rancho Park	4.80	4.80		
Euclid Median Park	13.40	13.40		
George Gibbs Park	2.70	2.70		
Grove Memorial Park	3.10	3.10		
Homer Briggs Park	14.40	14.40		
James F. Bryant Park (LTL)	4.50	4.50		
James Galanis Park	4.80	4.80		
Jay Littleton Ballpark	9.70	9.70		
John Galvin Park	25.60	25.60		
Kimball Park	7.10	7.10		
Nugent's Park	0.20	0.20		
Ontario Motor Speedway Park	6.20	6.20		
Ontario Soccer Park	23.40	23.40		
Ontario Town Square	1.90	1.90		
Ranch Park	1.80	1.80		
Sam Alba Park	1.00	1.00		
South Bon View Park	4.80	4.80		
Veteran's Memorial Park	7.50	7.50		
Vineyard Park	9.00	9.00		
West Cucamonga Creek Trail	34.00	34.00		
Westwind Park	23.00	23.00		
Whispering Lakes Golf Course	175.90	175.90		
Park Equivalent in Fund Balance	18.58	18.58		
Total Acres (Owned/Developed)	471.52	471.52		
Current Population	182,004	182,004		
Population/1,000	182.00	182.00		
Current Standard	2.59	2.59		
Minimum Acres/1,000 Population Standard	3.000	3.000	3.000	
Construction Cost per Acre		$560,200		
Land Acquisition Cost per Acre	$700,000			
Rough Grading/Site Preparation	$61,490			
City Yard Improvements per Acre (1)			$5,368	
Additional Maintenance Fleet per Acre (2)			$3,983	
Total Cost per Acre	$761,490	$560,200	$9,351	

Schedule 14.1

City of Ontario
2021-22 Development Impact Cost Calculation Update
Park Land Acquisition and Park Infrastructure Development
(Quimby and Mitigation Act Calculation)

Park Name	Acres Owned or LT Lease	Developed/ Constructed Acres	Park Maintenance Requirements	Total Park Expansion Costs
Minimum Acres/1,000 Population Standard	3.000	3.000	3.000	
Cost X 3.0 Acre/1,000 Residents Standard	$2,284,469	$1,680,600	$28,053	
Population Served by Standard	1,000.00	1,000.00	1,000.00	
Acquisition/Construction Cost per Resident	$2,284.47	$1,680.60	$28.05	

	Occupants/ Dwelling	Land Acquisition	Park Construction	Maintenance Requirements	Total Park Costs
Cost per Additional Resident		$2,284.47	$1,680.60	$28.05	$3,993.12
Detached Dwelling Unit	3.806	$8,695	$6,396	$107	$15,198
Attached Dwelling Unit	3.373	$7,706	$5,669	$95	$13,470
High Density Dwelling Unit	2.669	$6,097	$4,486	$75	$10,658
Mobile Home Dwelling Unit	3.175	$7,253	$5,336	$89	$12,678

Chapter 15
Ontario Ranch Species, Habitat Conservation and Open Space Mitigation
(Chapter is static and will never change)

This chapter is intended to establish the legal and policy basis for the establishment and imposition of DIFs on new development in the City of Ontario's Ontario Ranch ("OR"). The purpose of the fees is to finance the purchase of land and conservation easements to mitigate the loss of open space, to protect endangered and threatened species and their habitat, to promote open space conservation and its inherent benefits, and to mitigate some of the more generalized adverse impacts to the environment associated with development of the OR.

EXISTING ENVIRONMENTAL AND BIOLOGICAL SETTING

Environmental Setting. The OR is currently used primarily for agricultural, dairy farm and related uses. Of the roughly 8,200 acres in the OR, approximately 5,537 acres are considered developable acres. While some land in the OR is presently devoted to residential development, it generally exists to provide living areas for dairy owners and their employees. The agricultural, dairy and related uses in the OR have provided valuable habitat areas for a variety of wildlife and plant species, some of which are endangered or threatened. At the same time, the open space areas necessarily left vacant by agricultural and related activities provide other benefits to the region in general and to the citizens of the City of Ontario in particular. These benefits include, but are not limited to: (1) species migration corridors; (2) unobstructed view corridors and aesthetics; (3) passive recreational opportunities; and (4) open space preservation.

The decreased viability of dairy and agricultural industries in this area, coupled with the demand for housing in the region, has placed tremendous development pressures on land in the OR. With the adoption of the Sphere of Influence ("SOI") General Plan Amendment ("GPA"), certification of the Environmental Impact Report ("EIR") in 1998, the City planned for the orderly transition of the OR from an area primarily devoted to agricultural and dairy operations to one that is predominantly residential, with supporting office, commercial, industrial, recreational and open space uses. In 1999 the City secured the annexation of the OR into its corporate limits.

Biological Setting. The existing agricultural and dairy operations in the OR support a variety of wildlife. As set forth in the SOI GPA and EIR, the area supports a diversity of wildlife, especially birds. The topography of the area and the existing passive open space uses provide for the accumulation of standing water used by migratory and resident birdlife, including varieties of cormorants, herons, egrets, ibises, kites, harriers, hawks, merlins, plovers, curlews, gulls, burrowing owls, shrikes, and blackbirds, all of which have been observed in field observations of the area. Many of these are a species of special concern, a candidate species, a threatened species or an endangered species under federal or state law. Dozens of other species of birds protected under the Migratory Bird Treaty Act are also present in the OR. The state-endangered western yellowbilled cuckoo and federally listed California gnatcatcher may also be present, or have historically inhabited the area.

The current agricultural operations in the area provide a compatible land use for sensitive species since fields under cultivation and fallow areas collect surface run-off and flood waters. In addition, drainage patterns also influence the number and size of such ponds. In fact, there are numerous flood control channels, detention basins and creeks in the area. Wildlife, and particularly birds, relies upon these wetlands-watery areas as habitat and foraging areas.

Wildlife also inhabits the windrows, or tall vegetation, areas located in the OR. Of particular importance are the numerous species of raptors found in these trees, including red-tailed hawks and American kestrels. Wildlife also inhabits agricultural open fields. These fields are important to bird species. Fields act as an intermediate area between windrows and wet areas. Birds forage for rodents and other prey living in the fields. Indeed, fields are the most suitable habitat for mice and ground squirrels. The ferruginous hawk, a sensitive species, often roosts on the ground in these portions of the OR. Other birds perch on trees. Dairy operations and buildings also attract and provide nesting areas and other habitat for bird species and wildlife in the OR. Sparrows, rock doves, finches, egrets and blackbirds are more tolerant of human activity associated with such sites.

According to the United States Fish and Wildlife Service, portions of the OR could support one of the few remaining populations of the Delhi Sands Flower-Loving Fly ("DSF"), a federally listed endangered species in the Ontario Recovery Unit. The Ontario Recovery Unit is one of only three areas identified in the Federal Endangered Species Act ("FESA) recovery plan for the DSF. That plan states that preservation of occupied habitat and restoration of unoccupied habitat for the DSF in the Ontario Recovery Unit is to be accomplished through fee acquisition, conservation easements, voluntary management plans and habitat conservation plans.

Moreover, at least seven mammal species listed as species of special concern or candidate species also occupy the OR. These include numerous species of rare bats. There are also San Diego black-tailed hares, pocket mice and kangaroo rats, desert wood rats, raccoons, foxes and bobcats. Numerous amphibian and reptile species are also present. Residential, commercial and industrial development in the OR will directly, indirectly and cumulatively eliminate the habitat relied upon by the above species. Standing water needed by a large percentage of the species, particularly fowl will be largely eliminated due to the construction of infrastructure projects and the paving over of large areas in the OR area. Development will also eliminate potential habitat for the DSF and for small mammals, which are used as a food sources by raptors and other imperiled species in the area. Traffic, noise, pollution and other effects associated with development and its related infrastructure will also drive away species by eliminating perching areas, nesting sites and other components of habitat.

DEVELOPMENT FEE APPROACH

The City has exhaustively considered all potentially feasible mitigation that could be provided to offset impacts to species and open space in the OR. As a result of a CEQA lawsuit brought on the City by the Endangered Habitats League and the Sierra Club, extensive discussions with environmental groups and other stakeholders have occurred since the adoption of the GPA and EIR in 1998 and input has been received and utilized from the stakeholders. These discussions

have focused on ensuring that concrete steps to protect species, habitat and open space are taken, while allowing for flexibility in the process to allow funding to be used where it can provide maximum benefit. Memorialized in a settlement agreement between the City and Endangered Habitats League and Sierra Club, the City and the stakeholders have determined that raising funds sufficient to offset impacts to species and ensuring that these funds be put to the best and highest use are a priority. The City and the stakeholders have also determined that a third party with special expertise in species/habitat acquisition and management issues would be the most suitable entity to spearhead the conservation effort.

These funds will allow for the acquisition of mitigation property in the Chino/El Prado Basin area to offset impacts in the OR because lands in the greater Chino Basin have been shown to be used by species now resident in the OR. Moreover, Chino Basin lands are of higher biological value and can be purchased in larger blocks than can be purchased in the OR.

The settlement agreement (1) specifically allows for the acquisition of all OR habitat/open space mitigation property "offsite" so that larger, more biologically beneficial blocks of habitat can be purchased; (2) allow for the hiring or establishment of a land trust to spearhead the habitat/open space acquisition process; (3) give the land trust maximum flexibility to determine the type and amounts of land that should be purchased; (4) provide that DIFs be collected in amounts sufficient to offset the biological impacts to species now existing in the OR and loss of open space; (5) ensure, given the conclusions in the EIR and the underlying biological studies, that raptors, waterfowl and other bird species will bear a substantial burden and be unduly displaced by development of the OR, that the bulk of collected mitigation fees be used to offset impacts to such species; (6) provide that up to $500 per acre of mitigation fees may be used by the City to benefit DSF; and (7) provide that $22.7 million is the appropriate and justifiable amount that will be raised through DIFs to offset these impacts.

Justification for the amount and need for DIFs to be established and imposed in the OR by the City of Ontario can be divided into three categories. These include (1) compliance with the adopted policies and mitigation measures of the general plan amendments and their associated CEQA documents for the protection of species and their habitat; (2) mitigation for the loss of open space and its attendant benefits; and (3) mitigation for the direct, indirect and cumulative impacts on species from development and development-related infrastructure.

1. Compliance with the General Plan, Its Amendments and CEQA

To offset negative impacts to species, their habitat and open space, the SOI GPA and EIR require that suitable replacement habitat and natural open space lands be acquired in areas in and around the Chino/El Prado Basin. Birds and other species which currently inhabit the OR, whether seasonally or full time, range throughout the Chino/El Prado Basin and into surrounding areas. Lands to the south and southwest of the OR retain substantial standing water and thus serve as potential, viable habitat for many of these, particularly birds. Thus, the collection of DIFs to fund the purchase of land and conservation easements provides the most direct and beneficial method of mitigating the impacts to open space resources and habitat land. Moreover, the purchase of properties in areas outside the boundaries of the OR, but within the

Chino Basin, not only promotes the goals of the general plan amendments and related CEQA documents, but also provides a unique and biologically acceptable method for retaining open space for the benefit of species in a cost-effective manner.

Mitigation Fee Act (California Government Code, Section 66000 et seq.)

A set forth in Chapter 1, DIFs are imposed on development as a means to mitigate the impacts and infrastructure demands created by development activity. In accordance with the requirements of California Government Code, Section 66000 et seq., this section intends to:

1. Identify the purpose of the habitat and open space DIFs at issue;

2. Identify the uses to which these DIFs will be used;

3. Determine how there is a reasonable relationship between these DIFs and the types of development projects upon which the DIFs are imposed; and

5. Determine how there is a reasonable relationship between the need for the public facilities, in this case habitat land and open space, and the type of development projects upon which these DIFs are imposed.

In addition, this section will, in accordance with Government Code, Section 66001(b), generally discuss how there is a reasonable relationship between the amount of the proposed fees and the cost of the public facility or portion of the public facility attributable to the development on which the fee is imposed. The following analysis provides the justification required by the Mitigation Fee Act:

1. The Purpose of the Fee. The primary purpose of the fee is to acquire and restore mitigation lands to offset impacts to species now living in the OR and impacts to existing open space. The mitigation fee will be used to advance the goals, objectives and policies set forth in the SOI GPA adopted in 1998. .According to the GPA, "the City shall be reimbursed for mitigation land purchase and habitat creation costs with DIFs to be paid by each developer within the NMC" (now referred to as OR). Accordingly, one of the components of the habitat and open space mitigation fee, and indeed the largest one, is to be used to purchase the lands within the Chino/El Prado Basin required by the EIR.

The habitat mitigation and open space fee is also to provide funding to offset direct, indirect and cumulative impacts to DSF in the OR. Thus, a separate component of the habitat and open space DIF may be utilized to acquire and restore lands to partially offset direct and cumulative impacts to DSF. However, it should be noted that the fee is not intended to cover any DSF mitigation required by the Service or under CEQA on a project-by-project basis.

In sum, habitat mitigation and open space fees will be used to protect open space, sensitive habitat areas, wetlands, aesthetics and historic view sheds; and to provide habitat area for endangered and sensitive species and other wildlife. Collection of fees will allow the City to

satisfy its CEQA obligations and to purchase larger parcels of property which are more biologically suitable for species that might not be able to be obtained if habitat impacts to raptors and waterfowl were mitigated for on a project-by-project basis. Portions of the fee will also be used to benefit DSF and to offset generalized impacts to species and the environment.

2. The Use to which the Fee is to Be Put. Habitat and open space mitigation fees collected will be used to meet the requirements of the EIR to purchase, and where necessary enhance or restore, open space and habitat conservation areas near the OR to benefit raptors, mammals, burrowing owls, DSF and other species which currently occupy the area. In order to assure that land purchased with DIFs is appropriate for species, the City will hire or establish a land trust that is familiar with the biological and other needs of the species inhabiting the OR. With oversight by and subject to conditions imposed by the City, the land trust will purchase mitigation land to maintain natural conditions and assure the continued viability and use of acquired lands for habitat conservation and open space purposes.

Acquired lands will also benefit the public by providing natural open space which will be lost as a result of development of the OR. Thus, the fees will defray the cost of specific community amenities, including protecting historic view sheds and providing passive recreational opportunities for present and future residents of the OR. In addition to purchasing habitat and open space areas in fee, conservation easements, rights of way, management agreements and other legal entitlements or mechanisms which will ensure the long-term sustenance of habitat and open space may also be acquired. The lands to be purchased will be located in or adjacent to the greater Chino/El Prado Basin area. Acquiring mitigation lands in these areas will be more cost effective than purchasing lands in the more expensive OR.

3. The relationship between the fee's use and the type of development project upon which the fee is imposed. (Benefit Relationship). As the OR is developed, all types of development (i.e., residential, industrial and commercial) will use up more and more available open space/habitat areas. No single type of development will have a greater impact than another because it is the depletion of land in its natural state that severely impacts retention of species and open space amenities in the OR. Indeed, such development activity and related public infrastructure improvements necessarily deplete, both directly and cumulatively, open space and habitat area that would otherwise remain available to support the goals of the general plan and specific plan policies (i.e., protection of sensitive species, view sheds, flood protection, aesthetics, wetlands, development of property with sensitivity toward the environment). Of particular importance are the cumulative impacts associated with the development, all of which are to be taken into account when determining the benefit relationship.

As set forth above, there is a reasonable relationship between the purchase of open space/habitat and all developments in the OR. This impact is equalized among all types of development because it is the conversion of land from its natural state that creates the impact upon species and open space opportunities.

4. The relationship between the need for the public facility (open space) and the type of development project upon which the fee is imposed. (Impact Relationship). As set forth above, it would be infeasible and impractical for each development in the OR to provide sufficient open

space and quality habitat areas to meet the mitigation goals for waterfowl, raptors and other species set forth in the GPA and the related CEQA documents (i.e., to ensure long-term viability of sensitive species). Each development in the OR equally impacts (on an acre-by-acre basis) the supply of available land for open space and habitat areas. Thus, the imposition of fees is the most practical way of permitting development to proceed in an environmentally responsible manner.

The SOI GPA, EIR and related biological studies indicate that species currently range across all portions of the OR. All development, whether residential, commercial, industrial or otherwise, will lead to the urbanization of the area and the elimination of precious natural open space and habitat area. Moreover, all new development leads to the need for, or the size of, the construction of additional roadways and other public improvements which, in turn, have negative effects on species and the environment.

5. The relationship between the amount of the fee and the cost of the public facility (open space/habitat) attributable to the development upon which the fee is imposed. ("Rough Proportionality" Relationship). As set forth above, each development in the OR equally impacts the supply of available land for open space and habitat areas. Moreover, each individual development project and its related necessary infrastructure improvements, when examined along with the cumulative impacts of all development in the OR, will have an adverse effect on the availability of open space and species, as well as any remaining open space in the vicinity of development in the OR. Thus, imposition of DIFs to purchase replacement open space and habitat areas (and to protect them from infrastructure encroachments) is the most efficient, practical and equitable method of permitting development to proceed in an environmentally responsible manner and in a manner that complies with the adopted plans and mitigation measures for the OR.

CEQA Mitigation. The SOI GPA and their associated CEQA documents and biological studies require that 305 acres of land be acquired, restored and/or retained in its natural state to provide substantive beneficial opportunities for species protection and open space conservation. Under the terms of the Settlement Agreement between the City and Endangered Habitats League and Sierra Club, a mitigation fee of $2,000 per developable acre is to be assessed. Additionally, the cost of the off-site habitat/open space mitigation (305 acres) is to be funded at a rate of $40,000 per acre. Combined, these two factors equate to approximately $22.7 million.

The City and the stakeholders believe that providing maximum flexibility in the land acquisition and restoration process will be of the greatest benefit to species. Such flexibility will allow for the acquisition of larger parcels of land, corridors and other areas of high biological and open space value as such lands become available. At the same time, the City and the stakeholders wish to ensure that sufficient funds are raised through the DIF process to satisfy the requirements of the GPA and CEQA processes.

In determining the total amount needed to be collected to meet these needs, the City examined seven separate scenarios. These scenarios are set forth below. Under each scenario, the land trust acquires a combination of lands in fee and conservation easements in the Chino Basin for

the benefit of waterfowl and raptors. In some cases, DSF mitigation lands are acquired, where feasible. The restoration/enhancement of some of these lands is also assumed.

Scenario 1:

Purchase Price for Lands in Chino Basin in Fee:	200 acres x $85,000/acre = $17,000,000
Purchase Price for Conservation Easements in Chino Basin:	105 acres x $45,000/acre = $4,725,000
Restoration/Enhancement:	50 acres x $20,000/acre = $1,000,000
	Total = $22,725,000

Scenario 2

Purchase Price for Lands in Chino Basin in Fee:	175 acres x $85,000/acre = $14,875,000
Purchase Price for conservation Easements in Chino Basin:	100 acres x $45,000/acre = $4,500,000
Restoration/Enhancement:	40 acres x $20,000/acre = $800,000
Purchase Price for DSF habitat in Recovery Area:	25 acres x $100,000/acre = $2,500,000
DSF and Restoration Costs:	15 acres x $3,500/acre = $52:500
	Total = $22,727,500

Scenario 3:

Purchase Price for Lands in Chino Basin in Fee:	220 acres x $85,000/acre = $18,700,000
Purchase Price for conservation Easements in Chino Basin:	10 acres x $45,000/acre = $450,000
Restoration/Enhancement:	100 acres x $20,000/acre = $2,000,000
Purchase Price for DSF habitat in Recovery Area:	15 acres x $100,000/acre = $1,500,000
DSF Land Restoration Costs:	15 acres x $3,500/acre = $52,500
	Total = $22,702,500

Scenario 4:

Purchase Price for Lands in Chino Basin in Fee:	240 acres x $85,000/acre = $20,400,000
Purchase Price for Conservation Easements in Chino Basin:	25 acres x $45,000/acre = $1,125,000
Restoration/Enhancement:	10 acres x $20,000/acre = $200,000
Purchase Price for DSF habitat in Recovery Area:	10 acres x $1 00,000/acre = $1,000,000
DSF Land Restoration Costs:	5 acres x $3,500/acre = $17,500
	Total = $22,742,500

Scenario 5:

Purchase Price for Lands in Chino Basin in Fee:	125 acres x $85,000/acre = $10,625,000
Purchase Price for Conservation Easements in Chino Basin:	200 acres x $45,000/acre = $9,000,000
Restoration/Enhancement:	50 acres x $20,000/acre = $1,000,000
Purchase Price for DSF habitat in Recovery Area:	20 acres x $1 00,000/acre = $2,000,000
DSF and Restoration Costs:	20 acres x $3,500/acre = $70,000
	Total = $22,695,000

Scenario 6

Purchase Price for Lands in Chino Basin in Fee:	100 acres x $85,000/acre = $8,500,000
Purchase Price for conservation Easements in Chino Basin:	250 acres x $45,000/acre = $11,250,000
Restoration/Enhancement:	100 acres x $20,000/acre = $2,000,000
Purchase Price for DSF habitat in Recovery Area:	10 acres x $100,000/acre = $1,000,000
DSF Land Restoration Costs:	10 acres x $3,500/acre = $35,000

Scenario 7:

Purchase Price for Lands in Chino Basin in Fee:	150 acres x $85,000/acre = $12,750,000
Purchase Price for Conservation Easements in Chino Basin:	125 acres x $45,000/acre = $5,625,000
Restoration/Enhancement:	90 acres x $20,000/acre = $1,800,000
Purchase Price for DSF habitat in Recovery Area:	25 acres x $100,000/acre = $2,500,000
DSF and Restoration Costs:	15 acres x $3,500/acre = $52,500
	Total = $22,727,500

The habitat and open space mitigation fees adopted by the City will provide an effective way to establish a comprehensive program that can benefit multiple species due to the potential for acquiring larger expanses of open space areas and regional connection to other open space areas. In addition, the program raises public awareness of biological resource issues through the passive interface of active park areas with natural open space areas. Implementation of such a program allows appropriate economic and infrastructure projects in the OR to move forward compatibly with the protection/enhancement of biological resources.

Table 15-1, following, identifies the Mitigation DIFs on a per net developable acre and per unit. NOTE: The *per unit* figures are merely for presentation purposes only, these (non-development impact) fees will be imposed on a *per acre* ($4,320 per acre specifically) basis only.

Table 15-1
Species, Habitat Conservation and Open Space Mitigation
Impact Fee, per Acre (for adoption) and per Unit (for presentation)

DIF Category	Mitigation Impact Fee per Acre	Average Units per Acre	Open Space Cost per Unit
Detached Dwelling Units	$4,320	6.12	$706
Attached Dwelling Units	$4,320	28.19	$153
High Density Dwelling Units	$4,320	38.40	$113
Commercial Lodging Units	$4,320	44.00	$98
Retail/Service Uses (in SF)	$4,320	17,474	$0.247
Office Uses (in SF)	$4,320	33,287	$0.130
Business Park Uses (in SF)	$4,320	20,094	$0.215
Industrial Uses (in SF)	$4,320	27,608	$0.156
Institutional Use (in SF)	$4,320	21,780	$0.198

RECAP OF RECOMMENDED SPECIES, HABITAT CONSERVATION AND OPEN SPACE LAND MITIGATION IMPACT FEE

- General City - These fees do not apply to General City development.
- Ontario Ranch - Adopt the ***Mitigation Impact Fee per Acre*** column on Table 15-1 as the Mitigation Fees to be applied to all private development within Ontario Ranch and applied on the net acres of the development.

Per Net Acre Fee. Based upon the above scenarios and calculations, it has been conservatively estimated that the City must raise a net $22,718,000 to fund the acquisition of the WRCA and the other habitat and open space acreage required by the GPA and EIR. As there are 5,259 developable acres (5,537 less land required for pocket parks, community parks, and schools not previously removed from the land use table) in the OR, the recommended DIF for the acquisition of open space and habitat land is $4,320 per net acre (rounded).

Of the $4,320 amount, the City may utilize up to $500 per acre to carry out the provisions of the GPA and EIR related to DSF. As set forth above, the GPA requires the City "to cooperate with the Service to mitigate impacts to the DSF, establish standards for buffers for protecting DSF restoration areas, and work to create DSF habitat, where possible." The DSF Recovery Plan calls for the establishment of 150 acres of DSF preserve areas in or adjacent to the OR. To the extent feasible, there will be an attempt to acquire properties which benefit both DSF and raptors/waterfowl. The City may thus use the $500 per acre retained portion of the $4,320 fee to carry out requirements set by the Service. However, it should be noted that CEQA specific plan documents, or the Service or other regulatory agencies, may require mitigation for impacts to DSF on a project by project basis, if applicable. The $500 per acre retained portion of the habitat and open space DIF is not intended to cover or be used to purchase mitigation land associated with any such individual development project.

Other Costs. In addition, to the above costs, the City of Ontario could also elect to impose DIFs to offset the more general adverse impacts to species and the environment associated with development of area. However, in light of the per acre costs associated with the GPA and EIR mitigation, it is recommended that the City absorb these more generalized costs.

Conclusion

With the commercial, residential and industrial development anticipated for the OR, many of the existing species habitat and open space attributes will be compromised or eliminated as construction proceeds. To offset these negative impacts to species, open space, and the environment more generally, the City has adopted habitat conservation and open space mitigation fees to provide for the acquisition and restoration of lands within or adjacent to the Chino/El Prado Basin area suitable for habitat and open space. These fees will implement the goals and objectives of the GPA, the EIR, and the settlement agreement; enhance the long-term viability of imperiled species; provide a mechanism to facilitate more efficient and species-sensitive development; provide a mechanism to partially offset impacts associates with City

infrastructure improvements; and provide a substantial benefit to the City, its residents and its businesses.

RECAP OF RECOMMENDED SPECIES, HABITAT CONSERVATION AND OPEN SPACE LAND MITIGATION IMPACT FEE

- **General City** - These fees do not apply to General City development.
- **Ontario Ranch** - Adopt the ***Mitigation Impact Fee per Acre*** column on Schedule 15.2 and Table 15-1 as the Acre Mitigation Fees to be applied to all private development within Ontario Ranch and applied on the net acres of the development.

END OF CHAPTER TEXT

Schedule 15.1

City of Ontario - Ontario Ranch
2021-22 Development Impact Cost Calculation Update
Open Space Legal Agreement (OR)
(This fee is static, and is not subject to change.)

			Cost Distribution for Components I & II		Cost Distribution for Component III	
Line #	*Description*	*Estimated Cost*	*Percent Need*	*Apportioned Dollar Cost*	*Percent Need*	*Apportioned Dollar Cost*
LS-001	Habitat and Open Space Mitigation	$20,420,640	100.00%	$20,420,640	0.00%	$0
	ESTIMATED GENERAL PLAN SETTLEMENT COSTS	$20,420,640	100.00%	$20,420,640	0.00%	$0
	Existing Fund Balance (Does not reduce mitgation)	$6,805,316	100.00%	$6,805,316	0.00%	$0
	Total Lawsuit Contribution	$27,225,956	100.00%	$27,225,956	0.00%	$0

NOTE: Since this is not a project but a contribution by developers the "Existing Fund Balace" is dedicated to the estimated settlement costs, and does not reduce it.

Schedule 15.2

City of Ontario
2021-22 Development Impact Cost Calculation Update
Ontario Ranch Development Lawsuit Settlement Distribution (Not an Impact Fee)
Components I & II

Proposed Land Use	Undeveloped Acres	Undeveloped Units	Lawsuit Distribution Acre Factor	Total Acres Benefitting from Settlement	Percentage of Total Acres Benefitting	Allocation of Settlement Costs	Distribution of Settlement Costs per Acre	Average Units or Square Feet/Acre	Components I/II Settlement Cost per Unit or Square Foot
Detached Dwellings	1,423.0	11,662	1.0	1,423.00	30.10%	$6,147,360	$4,320	8.20	$527 per Unit
Attached Dwellings	1,316.0	29,684	1.0	1,316.00	27.84%	$5,685,120	$4,320	22.56	$192 per Unit
High Density Dwellings	439.0	13,082	1.0	439.00	9.29%	$1,896,480	$4,320	29.80	$145 per Unit
Mobile Home Dwellings	9.0	396	1.0	9.00	0.19%	$38,880	$4,320	44.00	$98 per Unit
Commercial Lodging Units	279.0	5,751,595	1.0	279.00	5.90%	$1,205,280	$4,320	20,615	$0.210 per S.F.
Retail/Service Uses	114.0	2,670,188	1.0	114.00	2.41%	$492,480	$4,320	23,423	$0.184 per S.F.
Office Uses	428.0	9,953,243	1.0	428.00	9.05%	$1,848,960	$4,320	23,255	$0.186 per S.F.
Business Park Uses	669.0	16,981,679	1.0	669.00	14.15%	$2,890,080	$4,320	25,384	$0.170 per S.F.
Industrial Uses	50.0	1,089,000	1.0	50.00	1.06%	$216,000	$4,320	21,780	$0.198 per S.F.
TOTAL	**4,727.00**			**4,727.00**	**100.00%**	**$20,420,640**	**in I & II Development Lawsuit Settlement Costs.**		

1. This is not a Development Impact Fee, it is a settlement applied to development within the Ontario Ranch. It has been included to provide an average per unit cost.

Chapter 16
Ontario Ranch
Fiber Optic Communications System

Fiber Optic Communications Equipment and Facilities is an infrastructure that will only be imposed upon development in the Ontario Ranch. General City already has communications lines imbedded within the right-of-way and thus could not benefit from the timing of the construction of the system described herein.

The City of Ontario is proposing a fiber optic telecommunication infrastructure to meet several goals including the following:

1. The telecommunication industry, specifically service providers, is in a period of rapid change. The Telecommunications Act of 1996 reaffirmed the principles of an open marketplace. Many new service providers are entering the market for voice, video and data services. All this is happening while the technology used in the "last mile" to residences and businesses has stabilized. In order for the City to protect its rights-of-way within the Ontario Ranch the City will install a *state of the art* telecommunications infrastructure which can accommodate a large number of competitive service providers. This will eliminate the need for future disruptions within developed right of ways in the Ontario Ranch by allowing service providers the use of the City's infrastructure to provide service. This infrastructure will also provide a platform for continued expansion of new technologies community benefits, and unlimited capacities as the need for access continues to grow.

2. Incumbent service providers lack of interest and resources limits their ability to install "state of the art" telecommunication infrastructure in the OR. Incumbents typically have a limited amount of funds, with large geographical, which leads to cherry-picking in high density markets and large cities through-out the United States. While they may install some fiber optics in the main delivery system, the systems they are likely to install to the dwelling will be based on a much more restricted technology. This limited infrastructure will quickly become outdated, forcing more disruptions in the rights-of-way and existing street infrastructure within OR.

3. The installation of a fiber optic telecommunications infrastructure will provide an enhanced amenity for the OR allowing residents and businesses a high level of access to technology. Examples include everything from interactive/high definition television, dwelling to medical screening, video conferencing, and access to high-speed business networks. This will enhance the attractiveness of the community to professionals, skilled technicians and technological businesses and improve the economic development potential of the OR.

4. The fiber optic telecommunications infrastructure will assist telecommuters by providing high-speed data access and video conferencing directly from the dwelling over secure virtual private networks. Within the OR location, the head end of one of the busiest commutes into Orange and Los Angeles Counties, the anticipated level of telecommuter

participation will be higher when compared to the national average. This fiber infrastructure will mitigate traffic congestion and significantly improve the quality of life for the residents of the OR.

5. The schools within the OR, from elementary through the College levels, will benefit from this fiber optic infrastructure inasmuch as it will allow improved curriculum based on distance learning and use of remote resources to support the educational process. Schools will be able to establish on-site broadcast capabilities in addition to downloading a variety of professionally developed curriculum from throughout the world.

6. The City will be able to use the fiber optic network to improve operations by enabling low cost, high speed connections between City facilities as well as by allowing the City to provide automated reading of meters and the use of video to assist with control of traffic flow in the OR.

7. Finally, the fiber optic telecommunications infrastructure will lower the overall costs when compared to the installation of multiple traditional telecommunications systems. The bandwidth capacity is significantly large enough to accommodate all services over this single fiber infrastructure. This will lower costs, dramatically improve telecommunications capability and spur open competition in the marketplace.

The **Purpose** of the Fee. The impact fee for telecommunication will allow the local government to control the telecommunications infrastructure in a manner designed to maximize the public benefit. This will be accomplished by lowering service cost as the result of competition between telecommunication service providers, significantly reducing right-of-way costs to the taxpayer, and improving security and quality of life issues in general. The impact fee will allow the infrastructure to be completed while self-sustaining income from the service providers will pay for the maintenance of the system. This model is similar to the construction of any other infrastructure including streets, water distribution facilities and sewer collection facilities.

The **Use** of the Fee. The fee will be used to construct the fiber optic communications system, consisting of the *head-end* equipment, the *core network*, *the last mile* and miscellaneous equipment necessary to extend voice, video and data services to the Ontario Ranch. According to the OntarioNet, A Master Plan for the Deployment of an Advanced Fiber Optic Telecommunications Network in the Ontario Ranch. The following costs were recalculated in 2021-22 with current costs and new operational requirements.

The *head-end* network (FO-001), typically housed in an environmentally controlled concrete enclosure, and is the central access point for the service providers and network support services. In simpler terms, it is the place where outside vendors (such as video broadcast) would connect to the system. This portion of the system is estimated to cost $9,628,430.

The *core network* (FO-002) is simply the largest part of the fiber optic cabling. The Master Plan consists of trenching, hand holes and fiber splices. This portion of the program is estimated to cost $17,055,967.

The implementation model (FO-003), has been completed.

The heart of the network is the Distribution Network – Major Streets Conduit System (FO-004) includes construction, installation, splicing, testing of backbone distribution infrastructure, including cabinets, pull boxes, conduit, miscellaneous equipment, uninterruptable power supply (UPS), remote equipment, and fiber and splicing connections has been re-estimated to be just over $14.8 million.

The System Distribution Network – Fiber System (FO-005) of equipment is a logical grouping of some 300 to 382 subscribers as a single node of service, depending upon the configuration of detached dwelling, detached and commercial, office or industrial business uses. This portion of the project will cost approximately $4,200,622.

The Cabling System Project (FO-006) is an additional project is to provide for the design and construction of the fiber cabling and related distribution cabinets and equipment for the Fiber Optic System within neighborhood (in-tract) streets in the Ontario Ranch area. This in-tract fiber cabling will connect the Fiber Optic system to the facilities located within the major streets within the Ontario Ranch area. The Project will include the design and construction of the fiber cabling to be installed in the conduit installed by the individual developers within the rights-of-way of the neighborhood streets in the Ontario Ranch area. This Project will provide a Fiber Optics system in both residential neighborhoods and non-residential areas in the Ontario Ranch area. The projected costs of this project are $35,980,788.

The Fiber Equipment for Residential Units (FO-007) Project includes the acquisition and installation of Fiber Optic System equipment for each residential unit in the Ontario Ranch Area. This includes attached, detached residential units and commercial lodging units. The Network Interface Device (NID) equipment will be acquired and installed in approximately 45,900 residential units within the Ontario Ranch area. The projected costs of this project are $35,893,754.

The Fiber Equipment for Non-Residential Units (FO-008) Project includes the acquisition and installation of Fiber Optic System equipment for each non-residential building in the Ontario Ranch Area. The Project will provide the design and installation of network interface equipment in all non-residential units within the Ontario Ranch area. The projected costs of this project are $10,716,065.

Share Of Common City Yard Improvements (FO-009) is defined as improvement and the use of facilities that provide storage, assembly, and execution for the Fiber Optic System. These facilities will be needed in the future to provide adequate space to support the expansion of the Fiber Optic System throughout the City. However, the estimated costs will need to be identified by a Master Planned City Yard Improvement Program and are not included in this update. Thus there is no estimate at this time.

Most of these individual projects are distributed by the future number of connections to the system.

The Relationship Between the Need for The Fee and The Type of Development Project. The distribution of the system construction costs will be based upon an equivalent Residential Unit (or bandwidth) methodology. A detached dwelling will be the equivalent dwelling unit base at a

minimum of 300 megabits per second (henceforth Mbps) of data capacity in order for the network to provide voice, data and video services with acceptable quality and delivery. Based upon network parameters, the cost (to be identified later in the Chapter) to construct the system in order to provide the 300 Mbps of service to one **detached dwelling residence** will be defined as a one ***R***esidential ***U***nit or ***RU*** (and which will be used as the common denominator in the following examples) and represents a minimum of 300 Mbps of service to one provider.

Each **detached dwelling** would require its own 300 Mbps of bandwidth for voice, data and video service, thus each detached unit will require its own RU for service activation.

Individual **commercial lodging (e.g. hotel/motel) units**, have close proximity and will require only the minimum 300 Mbps per ten rental units, or stated differently, each single unit will only need 10% of the single ***RU*** or 0.1 ***RU***.

Approximately 2,500 square feet of **Retail/Commercial Use** space will require 165% of an ***RU***, or 0.5 ***RU*** per 1,000 square feet.

Office Uses, again in close quarters, (defined as ten employees) operating in approximately 3,000 square feet of space) would demand the equivalent of 40% of an ***RU***.

Business Park Uses – (defined to have ten employees) operating in a 10,000 square foot industrial environment) would demand the equivalent of 40% of an ***RU***.

Industrial Uses, (defined to have ten employees, operating in a 10,000 square foot industrial environment) would demand the equivalent of 40% of an ***RU***.

Institutional Uses operating in a 21,780 square foot industrial environment) would demand the equivalent of 290% of an ***RU***.

Schedule 16.2 at the end of the Chapter contains a table identifying the number of RU's per acre based upon the various Floor Area Ratios that are summarized following in Table 16-1.

[This space left vacant in order to place the following table on a single page].

Table 16-1
Residential Unit (RU) Equivalents

DIF Use Category	Residential Unit Equivalent
Detached Dwelling Units	1.00
Attached Dwelling Units	1.00
High Density Dwelling Units	1.00
Commercial Lodging Units	0.10
Retail/Service Uses	1.65
Office Uses	3.12
Business Park Uses	1.43
Industrial Uses	1.02
Institutional Uses	2.90

The Relationship Between the Use of the Fee and the Type of Development Paying the Fee. The Fiber Optic DIFs that will be imposed and collected will be used to construct the system required to serve the system defined by the various mix of the types of development. If the development is an office property generating a greater amount of megabytes of bandwidth, the fee collected will be proportionally higher and will be enough to construct the required additions to the fiber optics communications system.

The Relationship Between the Amount of the Fee and the Cost of the Portion of the Facility Attributed to the Development Project. Similar to the section above, the relationship is based upon the projected amount of Mbps of bandwidth required to serve user base and the cost to provide that number of megabytes.

ONTARIO RANCH IMPACT FEE CALCULATION

Table 16-2, following and summarized from Schedule 16.2, identifies the fees necessary to be applied to the combination of proposed development of the varying land-uses in Ontario Ranch. The costs have been distributed using the same nexus identified earlier in this Chapter as Table 16-1 *Residential Unit Equivalents.* The proposed DIFs are as follows:

Table 16-2
Ontario Ranch Fiber Optic Communication
Development Impact Fee by Land Use

Development Use Category	Allocation of System Improvement Costs	Cost Impact per Unit or Square Foot
Detached Dwelling Units	$23,991,700	$2,057/Unit
Attached Dwelling Units	$61,067,539	$2,057/Unit
High Density Dwelling Units	$26,913,002	$2,057/Unit
Commercial Lodging Units	$717,319	$1,811/Unit
Retail/Service Uses	$8,249,166	$1.434/S.F.
Office Uses	$6,384,137	$2.391/S.F.
Business Park Uses	$10,992,911	$1.104/S.F.
Industrial Uses	$12,176,487	$0.717/S.F.
Institutional Uses	$2,600,281	$2.388/S.F.

RECAP OF RECOMMENDED FIBER OPTIC COMMUNICATIONS SYSTEM IMPACT FEES

- **General City** - There is no fiber optic system DIF schedule to be imposed in the General City area of the City.
- **Ontario Ranch** - Adopt Schedule 16.2 for the nine use development categories.

END OF CHAPTER TEXT

Schedule 16.1

City of Ontario - Ontario Ranch
2021-22 Development Impact Cost Calculation Update
Allocation of Project Cost Estimates
Fiber Optics Communication System (OR)

			Residential Common System Construction Costs		Non- Residential Common System Construction Costs	
Line #	Description	Estimated Cost	Percent Need	Apportioned Dollar Cost	Percent Need	Apportioned Dollar Cost
FO-001	Head End Facilities (Points Of Presence System)	$9,628,430	78.00%	$7,510,175	22.00%	$2,118,255
FO-002	Core Network - Planning/Installation - Equipment/Facilities	$17,055,967	78.00%	$13,303,654	22.00%	$3,752,313
FO-003	Project Completed or No Longer Needed	$0	78.00%	$0	22.00%	$0
FO-004	Distribution Network - Major Streets Conduit System	$14,874,465	78.00%	$11,602,083	22.00%	$3,272,382
FO-005	System Distribution Network - Fiber System	$4,200,622	78.00%	$3,276,485	22.00%	$924,137
FO-006	Cabling System - Residential/Non-Residential	$35,980,788	78.00%	$28,065,015	22.00%	$7,915,773
FO-007	Fiber Equipment Within Residential Units	$35,893,754	100.00%	$35,893,754	22.00%	$7,896,626
FO-008	Fiber Equipment Within Non-Residential Buildings	$10,716,065	0.00%	$0	100.00%	$10,716,065
FO-009	Share of Specific/Common City Yard Improvements	$0	78.00%	$0	22.00%	$0
	Sub-total Fiber Optic Information System	$128,350,091	77.64%	$99,651,166	28.51%	$36,595,551
	FINANCIAL ADJUSTMENTS:					
	Ontario Ranch - Regional Fiber Outstanding Credits	$1,767,574	77.64%	$1,372,347	28.51%	$503,976
	Ontario Ranch - Development Impact Fee Fund Balance	$14,101,895	77.64%	$10,948,728	28.51%	$4,020,773
	Sub-total - Financial Adjustments	$15,869,469	77.64%	$12,321,075	28.51%	$4,524,749
	Total	$144,219,560	77.64%	$111,972,241	28.51%	$41,120,300
			Forward to Schedule 16.2		Forward to Schedule 16.2	

NOTES:

(1). All developer-held "credits" under FINANCIAL ADJUSTMENTS will appear as a positive indicating an additional Infrastructure Fund obligation that will be redeemed (in lieu of a DIF payment) at some point in the future

(2). A negative figure under FINANCIAL ADJUSTMENTS indicates a positive Fund Balance mitigating the project total. A positive figure indicates an amount that needs to be recovered by DIFs.

Schedule 16.2

City of Ontario - Ontario Ranch
2020-21 Development Impact Cost Calculation Update - Amended
Allocation of Project Cost Estimates
Allocation of Distribution System Cost

Proposed Residential Land Uses	Undeveloped Acres	Undeveloped Units	Equivalent Residential Unit (RU)	Equivalent Residential Units (RU's)	Percentage of ERU's	Allocation of Total System Cost	System Cost Distribution per Acre	Average Units or Square Feet/Acre	Ontario Ranch Impact Cost per Unit or Square Foot
Detached Dwellings	1,423.0	11,662	1.00	11,662	21.43%	$23,995,651	$16,863	8.20	***$2,057 per Unit***
Attached Dwellings	1,316.0	29,684	1.00	29,684	54.54%	$61,069,660	$46,406	22.56	***$2,057 per Unit***
High Density Dwellings	439.0	13,082	1.00	13,082	24.03%	$26,906,930	$61,291	29.80	***$2,057 per Unit***
TOTAL - Residential	3,178	54,428	--	54,428	100.00%	***$111,972,241***	***OR Fiber-optic System G.P. Build-out Cost***		

Proposed Non-residential Land Uses	Undeveloped Acres	Undeveloped Units	Equivalent Residential Unit (RU)	Equivalent Residential Units (RU's)	Percentage of ERU's	Allocation of Total System Cost	System Cost Distribution per Acre	Average Units or Square Feet/Acre	Ontario Ranch Impact Cost per Unit or Square Foot
Commercial Lodging Units	9.0	396	0.10	40	1.74%	$717,319	$79,702	44.00	***$1,811 per Unit***
Retail/Service Uses	279.0	5,751,595	1.65	460	20.06%	$8,249,166	$29,567	20,615	***$1.434 per S.F.***
Office Uses	114.0	2,670,188	3.12	356	15.53%	$6,384,137	$56,001	23,423	***$2.391 per S.F.***
Business Park Uses	428.0	9,953,243	1.43	613	26.73%	$10,992,911	$25,684	23,255	***$1.104 per S.F.***
Industrial Uses	669.0	16,981,679	1.02	679	29.61%	$12,176,487	$18,201	25,384	***$0.717 per S.F.***
Private Institutional Use	50.0	1,089,000	2.90	145	6.32%	$2,600,281	$52,006	21,780	***$2.388 per S.F.***
TOTAL - Non-residential	1,549	--	--	2,293	100.00%	***$41,120,300***	***OR Fiber-optic System G.P. Build-out Cost***		

	Business Acres	Business Square Feet	Square Feet per Acre	Square Feet of "Unit"	"Units" per Acre	Residential Unit Equivalent	RU's per Acre
Retail/Service Uses	**279.0**	**5,751,595**	**20,615**	**2,500**	**8.246**	**20.00%**	**1.65**
Office Uses	**114.0**	**2,670,188**	**23,423**	**3,000**	**7.808**	**40.00%**	**3.12**
Business Park Uses	**428.0**	**9,953,243**	**23,255**	**6,500**	**3.578**	**40.00%**	**1.43**
Industrial Uses	**669.0**	**16,981,679**	**25,384**	**10,000**	**2.538**	**40.00%**	**1.02**
Private Institutional Use	**50.0**	**1,089,000**	**21,780**	**3,000**	**7.260**	**40.00%**	**2.90**

Appendix A

Summary of Recommendations

SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS

Chapter 3 - Law Enforcement Facilities and Equipment

- GC/OR - Adopt Schedule 3.2, p.37, *Entire City – Minimal Capital Needs-based Impact Costs*

Chapter 4 - Fire Suppression Facilities, Vehicles and Equipment

- GC – Adopt Schedule 4.2, p. 51, *GC Minimal Capital Needs-based Impact Costs.*
- OR – Adopt Schedule 4.4, p. 53, *OR Minimal Capital Needs-based Impact Costs.*
- Split/create separate GC/OR Fire Suppression Impact fee Funds.

Chapter 5 – Circulation (Streets, Signals and Bridges) System

- GC - Adopt Schedule 5.2, p.72, *GC - Minimal Capital Needs-based Impact Costs, and the ALTERNATIVE COST METHODOLOGY, per single trip-end cost from Schedule 5.2 to apply to Table 5-2 and the more specific ITE Trip Calculation, 7th Edition for Business Uses.*
- *OR - Adopt Schedule 5.4, P. 74, OR - Minimal Capital Needs-based Impact Costs, and the ALTERNATIVE COST METHODOLOGY, per single trip-end cost from Schedule 5.4 to apply to Table 5-5 and the more specific ITE Trip Calculation, 7th Edition for Business Uses.*

Chapter 6 - Storm Drainage Collection Facilities

- GC - Adopt Schedule 6.4, p. 87, *General Plan Build-out Average Infrastructure Costs* with alternative use of the *Cost Distribution per Acre* column for unusual uses.
- OR - Adopt Schedule 6.5, p. 89, *OR – Minimum Capital Needs-based Impact Costs* with alternative use of the use *Distribution of Cost Distribution per Acre* column for unusual uses.

Chapter 7 - Water Source, Storage and Distribution Facilities

- GC - Adopt Schedule 7.2, p. 104, *GC - Minimal Capital Needs-based Impact Costs, Table 7-7,* p. 98, and *Equivalent Water meter Size calculation based Upon Minimum Needs-based Impact Fees.*
- OR - Adopt Schedule 7.4, p. 106, *GC - Minimal Capital Needs-based Impact Costs, Table 7-11, p. 102, and Equivalent Water meter Size calculation based Upon Minimum Needs- based Impact Fees.*

Chapter 8 - Sewer Collection Facilities

- GC - Adopt Schedule 8.2, p. 116, *GC - Minimal Capital Needs-based Impact Costs.*
- OR - Adopt Schedule 8.4, p. 118, *OR - Minimal Capital Needs-based Impact Costs.*

Chapter 9 - Refuse Collection Facilities and Equipment

- GC/OR - Adopt Schedule 9.1, parts **A** through H, p. 126-128.

Appendix A - Summary of DIF Recommendations (continued)

Chapter 10 - General Facilities, Vehicles and Equipment

- GC/OR - Adopt Schedule 10.2, p. 135, Entire City – Minimal Needs-based Impact Costs.
- Create City Maintenance Yard Expansion DIF Fund and deposit the portion of each infrastructures DIF that is "City yard Improvement" related per page 187, Appendix C.

Chapter 11 - Library Facilities and Collection Items

- GC/OR - Adopt Schedule 11.1, p. 141.

Chapter 12 - Public Meeting (Community Centers) Facilities

- GC/OR - Adopt Schedule 12.1 p. 146.

Chapter 13 – Aquatics Facilities

- Adopt Schedule 13.1, p.150.

Chapter 14- Park Land Acquisition and Park Infrastructure Development

- Create Quimby Act Park land Acquisition and DIF Fund, Note (1).
- GC/OR - Adopt Schedule 14.1, page 159-160, for residential uses requiring the sub-division of land for Quimby Act application.
- GC/OR - Adopt Schedule 14.1, page 159-160, for residential uses not requiring the sub-division of land for AB1600 application.

NOTES:

(1). Separate Park Land Acquisition and Development Funds are necessary because the Quimby Act allows use of receipts for rehabilitation of existing facilities whereas the AB1600 requirements prevent such expenditures.

Chapter 15 - OR Species, Habitat Conservation and Open Space Land Mitigation

- OR – Extend the current adoption of the *Mitigation Fee per Acre* in Schedule-15.1, p. 172, as OR Species, Habitat Conservation and Open Space Land Mitigation Impact Fee. This "fee" does not change.

Chapter 16 - Ontario Ranch - Fiber Optic Communication System

- OR - Adopt Schedule 16.2 - Fiber Optic Communication System Impact Fee, p. 180.

Appendix B

Expanded Land-use Database

Total - Land-use Database General City & Ontario Ranch	Existing Development		Potential Development		Total General Plan Build-out	
	Acres	# of Units	Acres	# of Units	Acres	# of Units
Detached Dwellings	6,328	31,997	1,685	12,793	8,013	44,790
Attached Dwellings	722	13,097	1,499	32,372	2,221	45,469
High Density Dwellings	193	4,812	1,037	34,889	1,230	39,701
Mobile Home Dwellings	204	2,097	14	95	218	2,192
Commercial Lodging Units	143	5,810	12	546	155	6,356
Retail/Service Uses	487	18,522,286	1,271	13,916,010	1,758	32,438,296
Office Uses	310	9,959,192	936	23,565,934	1,246	33,525,126
Business Park Uses	777	10,271,628	769	16,922,869	1,546	27,194,497
Industrial Uses	6,890	112,134,057	1,110	47,631,804	8,000	159,765,861
Private Institutional Use	419	2,318,711	52	1,132,560	471	3,451,271
Total - City Limits	**16,473**		**8,385**		**24,858**	
Private Residences	**7,447**	**52,003**	**4,235**	**80,149**	**11,682**	**132,152**
Commercial Lodging Rooms	**143**	**5,810**	**12**	**546**	**155**	**6,356**
Business Square Feet	**8,883**	**153,205,874**	**4,138**	**103,169,177**	**13,021**	**256,375,051**

Land-use Database within City's General City Area - Net	Existing Development		Potential Development		Total General Plan Build-out	
	Acres	# of Units	Acres	# of Units	Acres	# of Units
Detached Dwellings	4,733	27,449	262	1,131	4,995	28,580
Attached Dwellings	641	12,050	183	2,688	824	14,738
High Density Dwellings	193	4,812	598	21,807	791	26,619
Mobile Home Dwellings	204	2,097	14	95	218	2,192
Commercial Lodging Units	143	5,810	3	150	146	5,960
Retail/Service Uses	477	18,418,611	992	8,164,415	1,469	26,583,026
Office Uses	310	9,959,192	822	20,895,746	1,132	30,854,938
Business Park Uses	741	9,587,138	341	6,969,626	1,082	16,556,764
Industrial Uses	6,610	106,400,598	441	30,650,125	7,051	137,050,723
Private Institutional Use	419	2,318,711	2	43,560	421	2,362,271
Sub-total - General City	**14,471**		**3,658**		**18,129**	

Land-use Database within City's Ontario Ranch Area	Existing Development		Potential Development		Total General Plan Build-out	
	Acres	# of Units	Acres	# of Units	Acres	# of Units
Detached Dwellings	1,595	4,548	1,423	11,662	3,018	16,210
Attached Dwellings	81	1,047	1,316	29,684	1,397	30,731
High Density Dwellings	-	0	439	13,082	439	13,082
Mobile Home Dwellings	-	0	-	0	-	0
Commercial Lodging Units	-	0	9	396	9	396
Retail/Service Uses	10	103,675	279	5,751,595	289	5,855,270
Office Uses	-	0	114	2,670,188	114	2,670,188
Business Park Uses	36	684,490	428	9,953,243	464	10,637,733
Industrial Uses	280	5,733,459	669	16,981,679	949	22,715,138
Private Institutional Use	-	0	50	1,089,000	50	1,089,000
Sub-total - Ontario Ranch	**2,002**		**4,727**		**6,729**	

Land-use Database within City's General City Existing/Vacant	Existing Development		Potential Development		Total General Plan Build-out	
	Acres	# of Units	Acres	# of Units	Acres	# of Units
Detached Dwellings	4,733	27,449	191	1,066	4,924	28,515
Attached Dwellings	641	12,050	183	2,688	824	14,738
High Density Dwellings	193	4,812	586	21,472	779	26,284
Mobile Home Dwellings	204	2,097	10	80	214	2,177
Commercial Lodging Units	143	5,810	3	150	146	5,960
Retail/Service Uses	477	18,418,611	728	8,016,724	1,205	26,435,335
Office Uses	310	9,959,192	810	20,889,370	1,120	30,848,562
Business Park Uses	741	9,587,138	46	4,755,133	787	14,342,271
Industrial Uses	6,610	106,400,598	431	30,605,125	7,041	137,005,723
Private Institutional Use	419	2,318,711	2	43,560	421	2,362,271
Sub-total - General City	**14,471**		**2,990**		**17,461**	

Land-use Database Consisting of General City - Demolition	Existing Development		Potential Development		Total General Plan Build-out	
	Acres	# of Units	Acres	# of Units	Acres	# of Units
Detached Dwellings			70	63	70	63
Attached Dwellings			-	0	-	0
High Density Dwellings			6	139	6	139
Mobile Home Dwellings			2	15	2	15
Commercial Lodging Units			-	0	-	0
Retail/Service Uses			132	103,621	132	103,621
Office Uses			6	6,376	6	6,376
Business Park Uses			113	885,732	113	885,732
Industrial Uses			5	45,000	5	45,000
Private Institutional Use			-	0	-	0
Sub-total - GC Demolition	-		**334**			**45,533**

Land-use Database Consisting of General City - Redeveloped	Existing Development		Potential Development		Total General Plan Build-out	
	Acres	# of Units	Acres	# of Units	Acres	# of Units
Detached Dwellings			1	2	1	2
Attached Dwellings			-	0	-	0
High Density Dwellings			6	196	6	196
Mobile Home Dwellings			2	0	2	0
Commercial Lodging Units			-	0	-	0
Retail/Service Uses			132	44,070	132	44,070
Office Uses			6	0	6	0
Business Park Uses			182	1,328,761	182	1,328,761
Industrial Uses			5	0	5	0
Private Institutional Use			-	0	-	0
Sub-total - GC Redevelopment	-		**334**		**334**	

Appendix C

City Yard Improvement
Cost Estimates and Distribution

Appendix C Percentage of Future City Yard Costs as a Function of Total Impact Fees to Be Collected by Infrastructure	With Application to	City Yard Costs to the Infrastructure	Total Impact Fees to be Collected	City Yard as Percentage of the Total
Law Enforcement Facilities, Vehicles and Equipment	Entire City	$2,365,388	$73,115,031	3.24%
Fire Suppression Facilities, Vehicles and Equipment	General City	$577,614	$30,199,506	1.91%
Fire Suppression Facilities, Vehicles and Equipment	Ontario Ranch	$827,231	$86,496,785	0.96%
Circulation (Streets, Signals and Bridges) System	General City	$984,776	$178,140,737	0.55%
Circulation (Streets, Signals and Bridges) System	Ontario Ranch	$930,800	$377,510,870	0.25%
Storm Drainage Collection System Facilities	General City	$782,254	$79,164,432	0.99%
Storm Drainage Collection System Facilities	Ontario Ranch	$957,206	$157,718,003	0.61%
Water Source, Storage and Distribution Facilities (1)	General City	$1,622,718	$78,802,618	2.06%
Water Source, Storage and Distribution Facilities (1)	Ontario Ranch	$7,850,241	$407,068,001	1.93%
Sewer Collection Facilities	General City	$1,111,603	$22,308,084	4.98%
Sewer Collection Facilities	Ontario Ranch	$2,858,406	$81,773,471	3.50%
Refuse Collection Facilities and Vehicles	Entire City	$17,965,667	$60,948,236	29.48%
General Facilities, Vehicles and Equipment	Entire City	$1,583,822	$19,332,180	8.19%
Library Facilities and Collection Items	Entire City	$0	$85,970,601	0.00%
Public Use (Community Center) Facilities	Entire City	$0	$122,568,286	0.00%
Aquatics Facilities	Entire City	$0	$7,435,177	0.00%
Park Land Acquisition and Park Infrastructure Development	Entire City	$4,047,273	$1,003,530,226	0.40%
Open Space Legal Agreement (OR)	Ontario Ranch	$0	$20,433,860	0.00%
Fiber Optics Communication System (OR)	Ontario Ranch	$0	$153,072,535	0.00%
Totals		$44,464,999	$3,045,588,639	

Appendix D

New and General City Development Impact Fee Policies

SUB-TABLE OF CONTENTS

Local Adjacent/Regional Development Impact Fee Policies Explanation 190

GC – Regional Circulation System Projects Identification 191
GC – Circulation System Regional/Local Adjacent Distribution 192

GC – Regional Storm Drainage System Projects Identification 193
GC – Storm Drainage System Regional/Local Adjacent Distribution 194

GC – Regional Water System Projects Identification 195
GC – Water System Regional/Local Adjacent Distribution 196

GC – Regional Sewer Collection System Projects Identification 197
GC – Sewer Collection System Regional/Local Adjacent Distribution 198

OR – Regional Circulation System Projects Identification 199
OR – Circulation System Regional/Local Adjacent Distribution 200

OR – Regional Storm Drainage System Projects Identification 201
OR – Storm Drainage System Regional/Local Adjacent Distribution 202

OR – Regional Water System Projects Identification 203
OR – Water System Regional/Local Adjacent Distribution 204

OR – Regional Sewer Collection System Projects Identification 205
OR – Sewer Collection System Regional/Local Adjacent Distribution 206

OR – Regional Optics Communication System Projects Identification 207
OR – Optic Communication System Regional/Local Adjacent Distribution 208

DEVELOPMENT IMPACT FEE REIMBURSEMENT POLICY CALCULATIONS

Exhibits "B" and "C" of the City of Ontario Development Impact Fee policies indicates that, within certain infrastructures, the project costs have been separated into two types of costs, they are: 1) Infrastructure projects that serve a local area referred to as *Local Adjacent Projects*; and 2) infrastructure projects that serve a larger regional area referred to as *Regional Projects*.

The two Exhibits within the Development Impact fee Policy's document further explain the conditions and limitations under which developers are to be reimbursed for the construction of public infrastructure identified in the *Development Impact Fee Calculation and Nexus Report* and the *Master Facilities Plan*. The reader should refer to that policy document for an in-depth explanation of the reimbursement policies.

The Local Adjacent/Regional schedules are now included in this document.

There are two schedules for each of the nine areas/schedules that require the distinction (i.e. the GC area Storm Drainage Collection System). The first establishes the percentage of the projects that are *Regional* project costs with its reciprocal establishing the *Local Adjacent* percentage of the project costs.

The second schedule within the area/infrastructure applies the two percentages (that add up to 100%) to the proposed development impact fee for that area (OR or GC) and infrastructure (i.e. circulation).

2021-22	General City Regional Projects Circulation System	GC		
DIF No.	DIF Program Project Description	Regional Project Costs		
ST-071	Holt Boulevard Bridge over West Cucamonga Creek	$109,972		
ST-072	Mission Boulevard Bridge over West Cucamonga Creek	$307,921		
ST-074	Francis Street Bridge over West Cucamonga Creek	$98,974		
ST-075	Eighth Street Bridge over West Cucamonga Creek	$846,784		
ST-076	Sixth Street Bridge over Cucamonga Creek	$676,004		
ST-077	Fourth Street Bridge over Cucamonga Creek	$790,240		
ST-079	Holt Boulevard Bridge over Cucamonga Creek	$1,229,098		
ST-081	Mission Boulevard Bridge over Cucamonga Creek	$901,770		
ST-082	Francis Street Bridge over Cucamonga Creek	$824,790		
ST-083	Philadelphia Street Bridge over Cucamonga Creek	$98,104		
ST-084	Riverside Drive Bridge over Cucamonga Creek	$481,199		
ST-085	Archibald Avenue Bridge over Upper Deer Creek	$533,094		
ST-086	Archibald Avenue Bridge over Upper Deer Creek Spillway	$774,332		
ST-087	Project Completed - No Longer Needed	$0		
ST-091	Grove Avenue Grade Separation under UPRR/Alhambra	$4,855,012		
ST-092	Milliken (N) Grade Separation under UPRR/Alhambra	$193,675		
ST-093	Project Completed - No Longer Needed	$0		
ST-094	Project Completed - No Longer Needed	$0		
ST-095	Archibald (S) Grade Separation over UPRR/LA	$14,999,108		
ST-096	San Antonio (S) Grade Separation Under UPRR/Alhambra	$10,958,112		
ST-097	Campus (S) Grade Separation under UPRR/Alhambra	$10,958,112		
ST-099	Project Completed - No Longer Needed	$0		
ST-100	Sultana (S) Grade Separation under UPRR/LA line	$4,358,340		
ST-103	Circulation System Maintenance Vehicles	$1,848,443		
ST-111	I-10 Freeway at Grove and Fourth	$19,897,431		
ST-112	Traffic Signal System Control and Operations Center	$1,140,906		
ST-113	General City Backbone Signal Interconnect	$539,604		
ST-114	I-10 at Euclid Avenue Eastbound On Ramp	$647,035		
ST-116	I-10 at Vineyard Interchange Reconstruction/Expansion	$1,095,390		
ST-118	Hellman Avenue Bridge over Cucamonga Creek	$2,183,267		
ST-126	Share of City Yard Improvements	$984,776		
ST-129	Fourth Street Under the I-10 Freeway	$9,614,094		Use
	Regional Total	**$91,945,587**	**53%**	**55%**
	Total All GC Streets	**$173,321,022**		
	Local Adjacent Streets	**$81,375,435**	**47%**	**45%**

Appendix D

City of Ontario
2021-22 Development Impact Cost Calculation Update
GC - Regional/Local Adjacent Distribution
Circulation (Streets, Signals and Bridges) System

Proposed Land-use	*Proposed Development Impact Fee*	*Regional DIF* Rounded to *55%*	*Local/Adjacent DIF* Rounded to *45%*
Detached Dwellings	$2,224	$1,223	$1,001
Attached Dwellings	$1,485	$817	$668
High Density Dwellings	$919	$505	$414
Mobile Home Dwellings	$1,159	$637	$522
Commercial Lodging Units	$1,173	$645	$528
Retail/Service Uses	$4.494	$2.472	$2.022
Office Uses	$2.568	$1.412	$1.156
Business Park Uses	$2.672	$1.470	$1.202
Industrial Uses	$1.377	$0.757	$0.620
Private Institutional Use	$2.934	$1.614	$1.320

2021-22 DIF No.	General City Regional Projects Storm Drain DIF Program Project Description	GC Regional Project Costs		
SD-069	Storm Drain Maintenance Vehicles	$260,175		
SD-074	San Savaine Channel	$1,875,549		
SD-075	Storm Drain Master Plan Update	$217,660		
SD-103	Share of Common City Yard Improvements	$782,254		Use
	Regional Storm Drain Total	**$3,135,638**	**5%**	**5%**
	Total All GC Storm Drain	**$68,710,652**		
	Local Adjacent Storm Drain	**$65,575,014**	**95%**	**95%**

Appendix D

City of Ontario
2021-22 Development Impact Cost Calculation Update
GC - Regional/Local Adjacent Distribution
Storm Drainage Collection System Facilities

Proposed Land-use	*Proposed Development Impact Fee*	*Regional DIF* Rounded to *5%*	*Local/Adjacent DIF* Rounded to *95%*
Detached Dwellings	$2,563	$384	$2,179
Attached Dwellings	$826	$124	$702
High Density Dwellings	$692	$104	$588
Mobile Home Dwellings	$1,492	$224	$1,268
Commercial Lodging Units	$425	$64	$361
Retail/Service Uses	$0.447	$0.067	$0.380
Office Uses	$0.537	$0.081	$0.456
Business Park Uses	$1.297	$0.195	$1.102
Industrial Uses	$1.132	$0.170	$0.962
Private Institutional Use	$3.292	$0.494	$2.798

2021-22 DIF No.	General City Regional Projects Water Distribution System DIF Program Project Description	GC Regional Project Costs		
WT-001	Phillips Street 1010' Zone Well	$764,470		
WT-002	Eighth Street - 1212' Zone Wells	$8,477,068		
WT-004	Eighth Street - 1212' Zone Transmission lines	$38,399,727		
WT-005	Eighth Street - 1212' Zone Reservoir Site Purchase	$3,600,000		
WT-006	Eighth Street- 1212' Zone Reservoir Construction	$25,679,453		
WT-009	Phillips Zone 1010' Zone Extension Mains Extension	$703,931		
WT-018	Reservoir 1010' Zone (2B) Landscaping	$248,268		
WT-027	Water Master Plan Updates	$267,938		
WT-031	Ontario-JCSD Reservoir (Phillips Street 1010' Zone)	$43,180		
WT-034	Water Source Supply	$3,934,352		
WT-037	Share of Common City Yard Improvements	$1,622,718		Use
	Regional Total	**$83,741,105**	**85%**	**85%**
	Total All GC Water	**$98,736,620**		
	Local Adjacent Water	**$14,995,515**	**15%**	**15%**

Appendix D

City of Ontario
2021-22 Development Impact Cost Calculation Update
GC - Regional/Local Adjacent Distribution
Water Source, Storage and Distribution Facilities

Proposed Land-use	*Proposed Development Impact Fee*	*Regional DIF* Rounded to *85%*	*Local/Adjacent DIF* Rounded to *15%*
Detached Dwellings	$3,113	$2,646	$467
Attached Dwellings	$2,130	$1,811	$320
High Density Dwellings	$1,437	$1,221	$216
Mobile Home Dwellings	$2,129	$1,810	$319
Commercial Lodging Units	$859	$730	$129
Retail/Service Uses	$1.531	$1.301	$0.230
Office Uses	$0.766	$0.651	$0.115
Business Park Uses	$0.617	$0.524	$0.093
Industrial Uses	$0.165	$0.140	$0.025
Private Institutional Use	$0.579	$0.492	$0.087

2021-22 DIF No.	General City Regional Projects Sewer Collection System DIF Program Project Description	GC Regional Project Costs	
SW-001	Eastern Trunk Sewer	$246,846	
SW-026	Sewer Utility Maintenance Vehicles	$265,188	
SW-027	Sewer Utility Master Plan update	$218,172	
SW-038	Easement N/O Holt Blvd, E/O Allyn Avenue	$39,791	
SW-046	Holt Sewer Phase A	$163,276	
SW-047	Holt Sewer Phase B	$374	
SW-048	Share of Common City Yard Improvements	$1,111,603	Use
	Regional Sewer Total	**$2,045,250**	**8% 10%**
	Total All GC Sewer	**$26,364,539**	
	Local Adjacent Sewer	**$24,319,289**	**92% 90%**

Appendix D

City of Ontario
2021-22 Development Impact Cost Calculation Update
GC - Regional/Local Adjacent Distribution
Sewer Collection Facilities

Proposed Land-use	*Proposed Development Impact Fee*	*Regional DIF* Rounded to *10%*	*Local/Adjacent DIF* Rounded to *90%*
Detached Dwellings	$577	$58	$519
Attached Dwellings	$505	$51	$455
High Density Dwellings	$433	$43	$390
Mobile Home Dwellings	$505	$51	$455
Commercial Lodging Units	$336	$34	$302
Retail/Service Uses	$0.263	$0.026	$0.237
Office Uses	$0.284	$0.028	$0.256
Business Park Uses	$0.141	$0.014	$0.127
Industrial Uses	$0.055	$0.006	$0.050
Private Institutional Use	$0.164	$0.016	$0.148

2021-22	Ontario Ranch Regional Projects Circulation System	OR Regional Project Costs	
DIF No.	DIF Program Project Description		
ST-025	Non-Developer ROW Frontage Improvements and SCE Pole Relocations	$540,035	
ST-026	Additional SCE Pole Relocations	$664,000	
ST-029	OR Offsite Galena Street Widening I-15 to Milliken/Hamner	$2,343,127	
ST-030	OR Offsite Euclid Avenue Improvements Merrill to US-71	$6,487,700	
ST-031	OR Offsite Archibald Bridge over Santa Ana River	$265,561	
ST-032	OR Offsite - Hamner Bridge over the Santa Ana River	$614,318	
ST-089	Archibald Avenue Bridge over Lower Deer Creek Channel	$371,964	
ST-094	Project Completed - No Longer Needed	$0	
ST-103	Circulation System Maintenance Vehicles	$1,747,131	
ST-104	Great Park Bridge Over Archibald Avenue	$5,177,843	
ST-105	SR-60 at Vineyard interchange Reconstruction/Expansion	$29,684,477	
ST-106	SR-60 at Archibald interchange Reconstruction/Expansion	$4,668,303	
ST-107	SR-60 at Euclid interchange Reconstruction/Expansion	$1,502,583	
ST-108	SR-60 at Grove interchange Reconstruction/Expansion	$25,011,847	
ST-109	SR-60 at Mountain Avenue Interchange Reconstruction/Expansion	$3,626,762	
ST-112	Traffic Signal System Control and Operations Center	$1,140,906	
ST-117	Ontario Ranch/Trails Separations	$2,328,050	
ST-119	Project Completed - No Longer Needed	$0	
ST-120	Project Completed - No Longer Needed	$0	
ST-121	Schaefer Avenue Bridge over Cucamonga Creek	$6,946,758	
ST-122	Schaefer Avenue Bridge over Cucamonga Creek Spillway	$12,349,792	
ST-123	Edison Avenue Bridge over Cucamonga Creek	$17,995,412	
ST-124	Eucalyptus Avenue Bridge over Cucamonga Creek	$11,000,000	
ST-125	Merrill Avenue Bridge over Cucamonga Creek	$11,000,000	
ST-126	Share of Common City Yard Improvements	$930,800	
ST-128	Ontario Ranch Street Design Studies	$1,074,109	
ST-131	Ontario Ranch Traffic Study	$94,815	Use
	Regional Total	**$147,566,293**	**43% 45%**
	Total All OR Streets	**$346,386,801**	
	Local Adjacent Streets	**$198,820,508**	**57% 55%**

Appendix D

City of Ontario
2021-22 Development Impact Cost Calculation Update
OR - Regional/Local Adjacent Distribution
Circulation (Streets, Signals and Bridges) System

Proposed Land-use	*Proposed Development Impact Fee*	*Regional DIF* Rounded to *45%*	*Local/Adjacent DIF* Rounded to *55%*
Detached Dwellings	$4,986	$2,244	$2,742
Attached Dwellings	$3,329	$1,498	$1,831
High Density Dwellings	$2,060	$927	$1,133
Commercial Lodging Units	$2,629	$1,183	$1,446
Retail/Service Uses	$10.075	$4.534	$5.541
Office Uses	$5.758	$2.591	$3.167
Business Park Uses	$5.991	$2.696	$3.295
Industrial Uses	$3.088	$1.390	$1.698
Private Institutional Use	$6.579	$2.961	$3.618

2021-22	Ontario Ranch Regional Projects Storm Drainage Collection System	OR Regional Project Costs	
DIF No.	DIF Program Project Description		
SD-004	Project Completed - No Longer Needed	$0	
SD-050	Offsite Euclid Avenue Storm Drain	$21,110,125	
SD-051	Project Completed - No Longer Needed	$0	
SD-052	Project Completed - No Longer Needed	$0	
SD-069	Storm Drain Maintenance Vehicles	$318,364	
SD-075	Storm Drain Master Plan	$266,340	
SD-103	Share of Common City Yard improvements	$957,206	
SD-104	Project Completed - No Longer Needed	$0	
SD-105	Ontario Ranch Storm Drain Study	$1,053,500	Use
	Regional Storm Drain Total	**$23,705,535**	**17% 15%**
	Total All OR Storm Drain	**$138,667,242**	
	Local Adjacent Storm Drain	**$114,961,707**	**83% 85%**

Appendix D

City of Ontario
2021-22 Development Impact Cost Calculation Update
OR - Regional/Local Adjacent Distribution
Storm Drainage Collection System Facilities

Proposed Land-use	*Proposed Development Impact Fee*	*Regional DIF* Rounded to *15%*	*Local/Adjacent DIF* Rounded to *85%*
Detached Dwellings	$3,744	$562	$3,182
Attached Dwellings	$1,422	$213	$1,209
High Density Dwellings	$1,196	$179	$1,017
Commercial Lodging	$810	$122	$689
Retail/Service Uses	$1.728	$0.259	$1.469
Office Uses	$1.521	$0.228	$1.293
Business Park Uses	$1.490	$0.224	$1.267
Industrial Uses	$1.482	$0.222	$1.260
Institutional Use	$1.727	$0.259	$1.468

2021-22	Ontario Ranch Regional Projects Water		
DIF No.	DIF Program Project Description	OR Regional Project Costs	
WT-002	Eighth Street - 1212' Zone Wells	$6,161,281	
WT-007	Francis Street 925' Zone Wells	$54,967,749	
WT-008	Phillips Street 1010' Zone Wells	$5,536,808	
WT-009	Phillips Street 1010' Zone Extension Mains Extension	$1,169,812	
WT-010	Francis Street 925' Zone Transmission Lines	$26,110,371	
WT-012	Francis Zone 925' Well Collection System	$11,944,714	
WT-013	Pressure Reducing Stations, Potable Water System (1010' - 925')	$1,830,000	
WT-014	Francis Zone 925' Zone Reservoirs	$49,151,462	
WT-015	Phillips Zone 1010' Zone Reservoirs	$3,747,521	
WT-017	Backup Power Supply	$956,392	
WT-027	Water Master Plan Updates	$1,296,205	
WT-031	Ontario-JCSD Reservoir (Phillips Street 1010' Zone)	$215,899	
WT-032	Water Treatment	$27,420,981	
WT-033	Project Completed - No Longer Needed	$0	
WT-034	Water Supply	$58,614,971	
WT-037	Share of Common City Yard Improvements	$7,850,241	
WT-038	Project Completed - No Longer Needed	$0	Use
	Reimbursement for Water System	$4,375,000	
	Regional Total	**$261,349,407**	**73% 75%**
	Total All OR Water	**$359,056,789**	
	Local Adjacent Water	**$97,707,382**	**27% 25%**

Appendix D

City of Ontario
2021-22 Development Impact Cost Calculation Update
OR - Regional/Local Adjacent Distribution
Water Source, Storage and Distribution Facilities

Proposed Land-use	*Proposed Development Impact Fee*	*Regional DIF* Rounded to *75%*	*Local/Adjacent DIF* Rounded to *25%*
Detached Dwellings	$9,711	$7,283	$2,428
Attached Dwellings	$5,332	$3,999	$1,333
High Density Dwellings	$2,829	$2,122	$707
Commercial Lodging	$4,080	$3,060	$1,020
Retail/Service Uses	$3.188	$2.391	$0.797
Office Uses	$2.882	$2.162	$0.721
Business Park Uses	$2.483	$1.862	$0.621
Industrial Uses	$2.569	$1.927	$0.642
Institutional Use	$2.339	$1.754	$0.585

2021-22	Ontario Ranch Regional Projects Sewer Collection System	OR Regional Project Costs		
DIF No.	DIF Program Project Description			
SW-001	Eastern Trunk Sewer	$2,804,686		
SW-002	Western Trunk Sewer	$36,174,154		
SW-026	Sewer Utility Maintenance Vehicles	$681,912		
SW-027	Sewer Utility Master Plan Update	$561,012		
SW-048	Share of Common City Yard Improvements	$2,858,406		
SW-049	Project Completed - No Longer Needed	$0		Use
	Regional Sewer Total	**$43,080,170**	**56%**	**55%**
	Total All OR Sewer	**$77,500,028**		
	Local Adjacent Sewer	**$34,419,858**	**44%**	**45%**

Appendix D

City of Ontario
2021-22 Development Impact Cost Calculation Update
OR - Regional/Local Adjacent Distribution
Sewer Collection Facilities

Proposed Land-use	*Proposed Development Impact Fee*	*Regional DIF* Rounded to *55%*	*Local/Adjacent DIF* Rounded to *45%*
Detached Dwellings	$1,642	$164	$1,478
Attached Dwellings	$1,246	$125	$1,121
High Density Dwellings	$753	$75	$678
Commercial Lodging	$958	$96	$862
Retail/Service Uses	$0.299	$0.030	$0.269
Office Uses	$0.877	$0.088	$0.789
Business Park Uses	$0.353	$0.035	$0.318
Industrial Uses	$0.431	$0.043	$0.388
Institutional Use	$0.472	$0.047	$0.425

2021-22 DIF No.	Ontario Ranch Regional Projects Fiber Communications DIF Program Project Description	OR Regional Project Costs		
FO-001	Head End Facilities (Points of Presence System)	$9,628,430		
FO-002	Core Network - Planning/Installation - Equipment Facilities	$17,055,967		
FO-005	System Distribution Network - Fiber System	$4,200,622		
				Use
	Regional Fiber Communications Total	**$30,885,019**	**21%**	**20%**
	Total All OR Fiber Communications	**$144,219,560**		
	Local Adjacent Fiber Communications	**$113,334,541**	**79%**	**80%**

Appendix D

City of Ontario - Ontario Ranch
2020-21 Development Impact Cost Calculation Update - Amended
OR - Regional/Local Adjacent Distribution
Fiber Optics Communication System (OR)

Proposed Land-use	*Proposed Development Impact Fee*	*Regional DIF* Rounded to *20%*	*Local/Adjacent DIF* Rounded to *80%*
Detached Dwellings	$2,057	$411	$1,646
Attached Dwellings	$2,057	$411	$1,646
High Density Dwellings	$2,057	$411	$1,646

Proposed Land-use	*Proposed Development Impact Fee*	*Regional DIF* Rounded to *20%*	*Local/Adjacent DIF* Rounded to *70%*
Commercial Lodging Units	$1,811	$362	$1,449
Retail/Service Uses	$1.434	$0.287	$1.147
Office Uses	$2.391	$0.478	$1.913
Business Park Uses	$1.104	$0.221	$0.883
Industrial Uses	$0.717	$0.143	$0.574
Private Institutional Use	$2.388	$0.478	$1.910

Appendix E

Major Four – Hard Infrastructure Costing Adjustments

Circulation System Cost Estimate Tracking 210
Storm Drainage System Cost Estimate Tracking 215
Water System Cost Estimate Tracking 219
Sewer Collection System Cost Estimate Tracking 221

Appendix E, Schedule 5.0

City of Ontario

2021-22 Development Impact Cost Calculation Update

Circulation (Streets, Signals and Bridges) System Worksheet

Remaining Cost/Obligation Calculation Worksheet

Project Number	Project Title	New Project Estimate	Less Completed Portion	Less in 2021-2022 Budget	Borrowed From Any Other Fund	Remaining DIF Fund Obligation
ST-001	Archibald Avenue From Riverside to Edison (P)	$4,962,365	-$4,685,389	$0	$0	$276,976
ST-002	Archibald Avenue From Edison To South City Limit (P)	$10,154,297	-$9,832,448	$0	$0	$321,849
ST-003	Bellegrave Avenue From Archibald To Milliken (P)	$2,618,660	-$908,983	$0	$0	$1,709,677
ST-004	Campus Avenue From Riverside To Merrill	$5,125,449	$0	$0	$0	$5,125,449
ST-005	Chino Avenue From Euclid To Milliken	$8,103,659	-$148,086	$0	$0	$7,955,573
ST-006	Mill Creek Avenue From Riverside To Bellegrave (P)	$3,174,500	-$249,854	$0	$0	$2,924,646
ST-007	Edison Avenue From Euclid To Walker	$11,315,002	$0	$0	$0	$11,315,002
ST-008	Edison Avenue From Walker To Vineyard	$3,336,357	$0	$0	$0	$3,336,357
ST-009	Edison Avenue From Vineyard To Mill Creek	$17,913,400	-$10,420,935	$0	$0	$7,492,465
ST-010	Edison Avenue From Mill Creek to Milliken (P)	$3,444,547	-$2,634,778	$0	$0	$809,769
ST-011	Eucalyptus Avenue From Euclid To Milliken	$9,161,856	-$397,139	$0	$0	$8,764,717
ST-012	Euclid Avenue From Riverside To Merrill	$11,910,586	$0	$0	$0	$11,910,586
ST-013	Grove Avenue From Riverside To Merrill	$8,293,822	$0	$0	$0	$8,293,822
ST-014	Haven Avenue From Riverside To Bellegrave (P)	$6,206,387	-$904,698	$0	$0	$5,301,689
ST-015	Merrill Avenue From Euclid To Archibald	$6,162,460	-$409,234	$0	$0	$5,753,226
ST-016	Milliken Avenue From Riverside To Edison	$4,703,562	$0	$0	$0	$4,703,562
ST-017	Milliken Avenue From Edison To Bellegrave	$2,406,049	$0	$0	$0	$2,406,049
ST-018	Hellman Avenue From Riverside To Merrill	$3,930,435	-$14,377	$0	$0	$3,916,058
ST-019	Riverside Drive From Euclid To Milliken (P)	$4,959,138	-$391,161	$0	$0	$4,567,977
ST-020	Schaefer Avenue From Euclid To Haven	$7,621,139	-$1,150,821	$0	$0	$6,470,318
ST-021	Turner Avenue From Riverside To Schaefer	$314,257	$0	$0	$0	$314,257
ST-022	Vineyard Avenue From Riverside To Merrill	$11,505,904	$0	$0	$0	$11,505,904
ST-023	Walker Avenue From Riverside To Merrill	$3,915,292	$0	$0	$0	$3,915,292
ST-024	Ontario Ranch Traffic Control System (P)	$28,962,001	-$3,149,904	$0	$0	$25,812,097
ST-025	Non-Dev. ROW, Frontage Imps. & SCE Pole Relocations	$56,486,685	-$5,118,283	$0	$0	$51,368,402
ST-026	Additional SCE Pole Relocations	$3,079,000	-$2,415,000	$0	$0	$664,000
ST-027	Project Completed or No Longer Needed	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0
ST-028	Project Completed or No Longer Needed	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0

Appendix E, Schedule 5.0

City of Ontario
2021-22 Development Impact Cost Calculation Update
Circulation (Streets, Signals and Bridges) System Worksheet
Remaining Cost/Obligation Calculation Worksheet

Project Number	Project Title	New Project Estimate	Less Completed Portion	Less in 2021-2022 Budget	Borrowed From Any Other Fund	Remaining DIF Fund Obligation
ST-029	OR Offsite Cantu Galleano Widening I-15 To Milliken	$2,343,127	$0	$0	$0	$2,343,127
ST-030	OR Offsite Euclid Avenue Improvements, Merrill To US-71	$6,487,700	$0	$0	$0	$6,487,700
ST-031	OR Offsite Archibald Avenue Bridge Over Santa Ana River	$265,561	$0	$0	$0	$265,561
ST-032	OR Offsite Hamner Avenue Bridge Over The Santa Ana River	$614,318	$0	$0	$0	$614,318
ST-033	General City Street Lights (P)	$3,725,315	-$276,000	$0	$0	$3,449,315
ST-034	General City Traffic Signals	$17,069,144	-$481,488	$0	$0	$16,587,656
ST-035	Benson Avenue From Mission To Philadelphia	$898,664	$0	$0	$0	$898,664
ST-036	Mountain Avenue From Sixth To Holt (P)	$9,392,185	-$6,762,026	$0	$0	$2,630,159
ST-037	Project Completed or No Longer Needed	$1,812,254	-$396,275	-$1,415,979	$0	$0
ST-038	Bon View Avenue From Holt to Mission	$1,172,758	$0	$0	$0	$1,172,758
ST-039	Bon View Avenue From Mission To Belmont	$659,505	$0	$0	$0	$659,505
ST-040	Project Completed or No Longer Needed	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0
ST-041	Project Completed or No Longer Needed	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0
ST-042	Grove Avenue From Fourth Street to Airport Drive	$39,848,874	$0	-$1,955,258	$0	$37,893,616
ST-043	Turner Avenue, From Inland Empire Boulevard To Fourth	$740,915	$0	$0	$0	$740,915
ST-044	Archibald Avenue from Fourth To Guasti Park Entrance	$1,993,436	$0	$0	$0	$1,993,436
ST-045	Milliken Avenue From SR-60 To Riverside	$395,257	$0	$0	$0	$395,257
ST-046	Project Completed or No Longer Needed	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0
ST-047	Etiwanda Avenue At Airport Drive	$10,242,258	-$266,097	-$1,243,306	$0	$8,732,855
ST-048	Eight Street From West Cucamonga Creek To Grove	$161,637	$0	$0	$0	$161,637
ST-049	Project Completed or No Longer Needed	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0
ST-050	Fourth Street From Palmetto To San Antonio	$1,224,737	$0	$0	$0	$1,224,737
ST-051	Fourth Street From Campus To Cucamonga	$1,015,343	$0	$0	$0	$1,015,343
ST-052	Fourth Street From Vineyard To Archibald	$1,236,722	-$581,747	$0	$0	$654,975
ST-053	Holt Boulevard From Benson To Vineyard	$52,038,963	-$1,141,274	$0	$0	$50,897,689
ST-054	Guasti Road From Holt To Archibald	$966,772	$0	$0	$0	$966,772
ST-055	State Street From Benson To Grove	$4,795,686	$0	$0	$0	$4,795,686
ST-056	Airport Drive Under The I-15 Freeway	$3,004,539	$0	$0	$0	$3,004,539

Appendix E, Schedule 5.0

City of Ontario

2021-22 Development Impact Cost Calculation Update

Circulation (Streets, Signals and Bridges) System Worksheet

Remaining Cost/Obligation Calculation Worksheet

Project Number	Project Title	New Project Estimate	Less Completed Portion	Less in 2021-2022 Budget	Borrowed From Any Other Fund	Remaining DIF Fund Obligation
ST-057	Project Completed or No Longer Needed	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0
ST-058	Mission Boulevard From Cypress To Grove	$5,492,817	$0	$0	$0	$5,492,817
ST-059	Mission Boulevard From Grove To Milliken (P)	$12,462,588	-$1,634,366	$0	$0	$10,828,222
ST-060	Phillips Street From Benson To Mountain	$1,768,210	-$1,211,812	$0	$0	$556,398
ST-061	Project Completed or No Longer Needed	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0
ST-062	Acacia Street From Baker To Vineyard	$72,662	$0	$0	$0	$72,662
ST-063	Francis Street From Benson To Campus	$4,496,927	$0	$0	$0	$4,496,927
ST-064	Jurupa Street From Archibald To East Of Turner	$762,141	$0	$0	$0	$762,141
ST-065	Philadelphia Street From Campus To Grove	$847,658	$0	$0	$0	$847,658
ST-066	Philadelphia From E/O Vineyard to Cucamonga Creek	$523,338	$0	$0	$0	$523,338
ST-067	Project Completed or No Longer Needed	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0
ST-068	Project Completed or No Longer Needed	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0
ST-069	Grove Avenue Bridge Over West Cucamonga Creek	$940,937	$0	$0	$0	$940,937
ST-070	Project Completed or No Longer Needed	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0
ST-071	Holt Boulevard Bridge Over West Cucamonga Creek	$249,936	$0	$0	$0	$249,936
ST-072	Mission Boulevard Bridge Over West Cucamonga Creek	$699,821	$0	$0	$0	$699,821
ST-073	Project Completed or No Longer Needed	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0
ST-074	Francis Street Bridge Over West Cucamonga Creek	$224,942	$0	$0	$0	$224,942
ST-075	Eighth Street Bridge Over Cucamonga Creek	$1,924,510	$0	$0	$0	$1,924,510
ST-076	Sixth Street Bridge Over Cucamonga Creek	$1,536,373	$0	$0	$0	$1,536,373
ST-077	Fourth Street Bridge Over Cucamonga Creek	$790,240	$0	$0	$0	$790,240
ST-078	Project Completed or No Longer Needed	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0
ST-079	Holt Boulevard Bridge Over Cucamonga Creek	$2,793,405	$0	$0	$0	$2,793,405
ST-080	Project Completed or No Longer Needed	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0
ST-081	Mission Boulevard Bridge Over Cucamonga Creek	$2,049,478	$0	$0	$0	$2,049,478
ST-082	Francis Street Bridge Over Cucamonga Creek	$1,874,522	$0	$0	$0	$1,874,522
ST-083	Philadelphia Street Bridge Over Cucamonga Creek	$222,963	$0	$0	$0	$222,963
ST-084	Riverside Drive Bridge Over Cucamonga Creek	$1,093,633	$0	$0	$0	$1,093,633

Appendix E, Schedule 5.0

City of Ontario
2021-22 Development Impact Cost Calculation Update
Circulation (Streets, Signals and Bridges) System Worksheet
Remaining Cost/Obligation Calculation Worksheet

Project Number	Project Title	New Project Estimate	Less Completed Portion	Less in 2021-2022 Budget	Borrowed From Any Other Fund	Remaining DIF Fund Obligation
ST-085	Archibald Avenue Bridge Over Upper Deer Creek	$1,257,032	$0	$0	$0	$1,257,032
ST-086	Archibald Avenue Bridge Over Upper Deer Creek Spillway	$1,759,846	$0	$0	$0	$1,759,846
ST-087	Project Completed or No Longer Needed	$1,428,134	-$1,428,134	$0	$0	$0
ST-088	Project Completed or No Longer Needed	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0
ST-089	Archibald Avenue Bridge Over Lower Deer Creek	$371,964	$0	$0	$0	$371,964
ST-090	Project Completed or No Longer Needed	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0
ST-091	Grove Avenue Grade Separation Under UPRR/Alhambra	$11,034,119	$0	$0	$0	$11,034,119
ST-092	Milliken (N) Grade Separation Under UPRR/Alhambra	$32,382,452	-$5,646,650	$0	$0	$26,735,802
ST-093	Project Completed or No Longer Needed	$47,503,759	-$45,270,154	-$2,233,605	$0	$0
ST-094	Project Completed or No Longer Needed	$72,962,932	-$69,791,306	-$3,171,626	$0	$0
ST-095	Archibald (S) Grade Separation Over UPRR/LA	$60,062,000	-$532,806	$0	$0	$59,529,194
ST-096	San Antonio (S) Grade Separation Under UPRR/Alhambra	$24,904,800	$0	$0	$0	$24,904,800
ST-097	Campus (S) Grade Separation Under UPRR/Alhambra	$24,904,800	$0	$0	$0	$24,904,800
ST-098	Project Completed or No Longer Needed	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0
ST-099	Vine (S) Grade Separation Under UPRR/LA Line	$21,791,700	$0	$0	$0	$21,791,700
ST-100	Sultana (S) Grade Separation Under UPRR/LA Line	$21,791,700	$0	$0	$0	$21,791,700
ST-101	Bon View (S) Grade Separation Under UPRR/LA Line	$21,791,700	$0	$0	$0	$21,791,700
ST-102	Pavement Management System Rehabilitation Program	$27,863,941	$0	$0	$0	$27,863,941
ST-103	Circulation System Maintenance Vehicles	$3,595,574	$0	$0	$0	$3,595,574
ST-104	Great Park Bridge Over Archibald Avenue	$5,177,843	$0	$0	$0	$5,177,843
ST-105	SR-60 At Vineyard Interchange Reconstruction/Expansion	$52,725,537	$0	$0	$0	$52,725,537
ST-106	SR-60 At Archibald Interchange Reconstruction/Expansion	$26,621,116	-$13,630,658	$0	$0	$12,990,458
ST-107	SR-60 At Euclid Interchange Reconstruction/Expansion (P)	$6,214,919	-$299,236	$0	$0	$5,915,683
ST-108	SR-60 At Grove Interchange Reconstruction/Expansion	$52,725,537	$0	-$289,800	$0	$52,435,737
ST-109	SR-60 At Mountain Interchange Reconstruction/Expansion	$15,565,500	$0	$0	$0	$15,565,500
ST-110	Project Completed or No Longer Needed	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0
ST-111	I-10 Freeway at Grove/Fourth	$182,545,236	$0	$0	$0	$182,545,236
ST-112	Traffic Signal System Control and Operations Center (P)	$2,281,811	$0	$0	$0	$2,281,811

Appendix E, Schedule 5.0

City of Ontario

2021-22 Development Impact Cost Calculation Update

Circulation (Streets, Signals and Bridges) System Worksheet

Remaining Cost/Obligation Calculation Worksheet

Project Number	Project Title	New Project Estimate	Less Completed Portion	Less in 2021-2022 Budget	Borrowed From Any Other Fund	Remaining DIF Fund Obligation
ST-113	General City Backbone Signal Interconnect	$2,698,020	$0	$0	$0	$2,698,020
ST-114	I-10 At Euclid Avenue Eastbound On Ramp (P)	$9,350,940	$0	-$107,586	$0	$9,243,354
ST-115	Project Completed or No Longer Needed	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0
ST-116	I-10 At Vineyard Interchange Reconstruction/Expansion (P)	$3,057,078	$0	-$318,604	$0	$2,738,474
ST-117	Ontario Ranch Road/Trail Separation	$2,328,050	$0	$0	$0	$2,328,050
ST-118	Hellman Avenue Bridge Over Cucamonga Creek	$2,183,267	$0	$0	$0	$2,183,267
ST-119	Project Completed or No Longer Needed	$1,051,974	-$1,051,974	$0	$0	$0
ST-120	Project Completed or No Longer Needed	$3,187,800	-$3,187,800	$0	$0	$0
ST-121	Schaefer Avenue Bridge Over Cucamonga Creek	$6,946,758	$0	$0	$0	$6,946,758
ST-122	Schaefer Avenue Over Cucamonga Creek Spillway	$12,349,792	$0	$0	$0	$12,349,792
ST-123	Edison Avenue Bridge Over Cucamonga Creek	$17,995,412	$0	$0	$0	$17,995,412
ST-124	Eucalyptus Avenue Bridge Over Cucamonga Creek	$11,000,000	$0	$0	$0	$11,000,000
ST-125	Merrill Avenue Bridge Over Cucamonga Creek	$11,000,000	$0	$0	$0	$11,000,000
ST-126	Share of Common City Yard Improvements	$1,915,576	$0	$0	$0	$1,915,576
ST-127	Ontario Ranch Bus Stop Shelters	$3,088,824	$0	$0	$0	$3,088,824
ST-128	Ontario Ranch Street Design Studies	$1,074,109	$0	$0	$0	$1,074,109
ST-129	Fourth Street Under The I-10 Freeway	$23,408,753	$0	-$2,651,094	$0	$20,757,659
ST-130	Guasti Road Extension From 1,530' E/O Of Haven Easterly 310'	$607,375	$0	$0	$0	$607,375
ST-131	Ontario Ranch Traffic Study	$94,815	$0	$0	$0	$94,815
	Sub-Total General Plan Total- New Circulation Projects	$1,275,302,075	($196,420,893)	($13,386,858)	$0	$1,065,494,324

Appendix E - Schedule 6.0

City of Ontario
2021-22 Development Impact Cost Calculation Update
Storm Drainage Collection System Facilities
Remaining Cost/Obligation Calculation Worksheet

Project Number	*Project Title*	New Project Estimate	Less Completed Portion	Less in 2021-2022 Budget	Borrowed From Any Other Fund	Remaining DIF Fund Requirements
SD-001	Euclid Avenue, Riverside To Merrill	$9,631,342	$0	$0	$0	$9,631,342
SD-002	Grove Avenue, Grove Basin To Merrill	$12,233,373	$0	$0	$0	$12,233,373
SD-003	Project Completed or No Longer Needed	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0
SD-004	Project Completed or No Longer Needed	$2,500,119	-$2,500,119	$0	$0	$0
SD-005	Merrill Avenue, Euclid To Bon View	$7,046,489	$0	$0	$0	$7,046,489
SD-006	Campus Avenue, 920' N/O Eucalyptus To Merrill	$1,607,718	$0	$0	$0	$1,607,718
SD-007	Bon View, 1,320' N/O Chino To Merrill	$8,511,617	$0	$0	$0	$8,511,617
SD-008	Euclid Avenue Laterals	$6,659,804	$0	$0	$0	$6,659,804
SD-009	Project Completed or No Longer Needed	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0
SD-010	Project Completed or No Longer Needed	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0
SD-011	Project Completed or No Longer Needed	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0
SD-012	Project Completed or No Longer Needed	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0
SD-013	Walker Avenue, Merrill To Chino	$7,125,547	$0	$0	$0	$7,125,547
SD-014	Merrill Avenue, Vineyard to 1420' W/O Walker	$7,114,980	$0	$0	$0	$7,114,980
SD-015	Ontario Ranch Road, Walker to 880' E/O Walker	$1,180,896	$0	$0	$0	$1,180,896
SD-016	Schaefer Avenue, Walker To 1,950' E/O Walker	$1,193,236	$0	$0	$0	$1,193,236
SD-017	Project Completed or No Longer Needed	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0
SD-018	Project Completed or No Longer Needed	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0
SD-019	Project Completed or No Longer Needed	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0
SD-020	Hellman Avenue, Chino Avenue To 1,500' N/O Chino	$577,059	$0	$0	$0	$577,059
SD-021	Project Completed or No Longer Needed	$6,871,050	-$6,871,050	$0	$0	$0
SD-022	Eucalyptus Avenue, Archibald To 1,300' E/O Archibald (P)	$1,139,227	-$128,600	$0	$0	$1,010,627
SD-023	Project Completed or No Longer Needed	$1,136,097	-$1,136,097	$0	$0	$0
SD-024	Project Completed or No Longer Needed	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0
SD-025	Turner Avenue, Riverside To County Line Channel (P)	$7,505,479	-$5,869,604	$0	$0	$1,635,875
SD-026	Turner Avenue Laterals	$2,554,651	-$1,291,166	$0	$0	$1,263,485
SD-027	Haven Avenue, Riverside To County Line Channel (P)	$8,367,468	-$5,578,511	$0	$0	$2,788,957

Appendix E - Schedule 6.0

City of Ontario

2021-22 Development Impact Cost Calculation Update

Storm Drainage Collection System Facilities

Remaining Cost/Obligation Calculation Worksheet

Project Number	Project Title	New Project Estimate	Less Completed Portion	Less in 2021-2022 Budget	Borrowed From Any Other Fund	Remaining DIF Fund Requirements
SD-028	Ontario Ranch Road, Between Haven And Mill Creek (P)	$422,682	-$90,614	$0	$0	$332,068
SD-029	Haven Avenue Laterals E/O Haven And N/O Schaefer	$2,180,511	$0	$0	$0	$2,180,511
SD-030	Haven Avenue Laterals	$339,199	$0	$0	$0	$339,199
SD-031	Project Completed or No Longer Needed	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0
SD-032	Mill Creek, Chino To County Line Channel (P)	$10,741,570	-$1,185,093	$0	$0	$9,556,477
SD-033	Eucalyptus Avenue Between Mill Creek And Milliken	$388,556	$0	$0	$0	$388,556
SD-034	Eucalyptus Avenue Between Haven And Mill Creek	$693,363	$0	$0	$0	$693,363
SD-035	Project Completed or No Longer Needed	$1,247,525	-$1,247,525	$0	$0	$0
SD-036	Schaefer Avenue Between Mill Creek And Milliken	$1,818,996	$0	$0	$0	$1,818,996
SD-037	Hellman Avenue, Schaefer To Ontario Ranch Road And Late	$4,986,124	$0	$0	$0	$4,986,124
SD-038	Project Completed or No Longer Needed	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0
SD-039	Ontario Ranch-Hellman/Vineyard, Hellman-OR/Merrill To C. C	$4,889,904	$0	$0	$0	$4,889,904
SD-040	Eucalyptus Avenue, Hellman To Cucamonga Channel	$2,537,214	-$1,304,595	$0	$0	$1,232,619
SD-041	Merrill Avenue, Cucamonga Channel To Walker	$22,588,165	-$8,034,507	$0	$0	$14,553,658
SD-042	Project Completed or No Longer Needed	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0
SD-043	Project Completed or No Longer Needed	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0
SD-044	Project Completed or No Longer Needed	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0
SD-045	Eucalyptus Avenue, Cucamonga Channel To W/O Archibald	$724,868	$0	$0	$0	$724,868
SD-046	Ontario Ranch Road Laterals E/O Cucamonga Channel	$1,144,929	$0	$0	$0	$1,144,929
SD-047	Project Completed or No Longer Needed	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0
SD-048	Chino Avenue, Cucamonga Channel To N/O Chino	$1,249,320	-$653,756	$0	$0	$595,564
SD-049	Milliken Avenue, Riverside To County Line Channel (P)	$3,734,147	-$1,216,892	$0	$0	$2,517,255
SD-050	Offsite Euclid Avenue Storm Drain	$21,110,125	$0	$0	$0	$21,110,125
SD-051	Project Completed or No Longer Needed	$20,615,221	-$20,615,221	$0	$0	$0
SD-052	Project Completed or No Longer Needed	$12,956,885	-$9,890,544	-$3,066,341	$0	$0
SD-053	Project Completed or No Longer Needed	$9,883,731	-$9,883,731	$0	$0	$0
SD-054	Project Completed or No Longer Needed	$1,851,739	-$1,851,739	$0	$0	$0

Appendix E - Schedule 6.0

City of Ontario
2021-22 Development Impact Cost Calculation Update
Storm Drainage Collection System Facilities
Remaining Cost/Obligation Calculation Worksheet

Project Number	*Project Title*	New Project Estimate	Less Completed Portion	Less in 2021-2022 Budget	Borrowed From Any Other Fund	Remaining DIF Fund Requirements
SD-055	Project Completed or No Longer Needed	$2,870,475	-$2,870,475	$0	$0	$0
SD-056	Sixth Street, Glenn To Cucamonga Channel	$7,780,102	$0	$0	$0	$7,780,102
SD-057	G Street, Berlyn to West Cucamonga Channel & Various Stre	$6,732,172	$0	$0	$0	$6,732,172
SD-058	Grove Avenue, 60 Freeway To Riverside Drive	$2,205,860	$0	$0	$0	$2,205,860
SD-059	Campus Avenue, Cedar To Riverside	$3,681,523	$0	$0	$0	$3,681,523
SD-060	D and I Streets, Grove To West Cucamonga Channel	$1,432,227	$0	$0	$0	$1,432,227
SD-061	Inland Empire Blvd., Vineyard To Cucamonga Channel	$4,244,060	-$3,539,349	$0	$0	$704,711
SD-062	Sultana Avenue, Phillips To Philadelphia	$4,342,519	$0	$0	$0	$4,342,519
SD-063	Fourth Street, El Dorado To Cucamonga Creek	$6,843,553	-$3,956,274	-$397,528	$0	$2,489,751
SD-064	Baker, Vineyard, Carlos, Hellman - Acacia to Philadelphia	$2,730,804	$0	$0	$0	$2,730,804
SD-065	Bon View Avenue, 60 Freeway To Riverside (P)	$2,851,072	$0	-$279,016	$0	$2,572,056
SD-066	Cucamonga Avenue, 60 Freeway To Riverside	$2,482,871	$0	$0	$0	$2,482,871
SD-067	Bon View Avenue, Mission To Francis	$3,678,744	$0	$0	$0	$3,678,744
SD-068	Cucamonga Avenue, Phillips To Francis	$2,273,929	$0	$0	$0	$2,273,929
SD-069	Storm Drainage Maintenance Vehicles	$578,539	$0	$0	$0	$578,539
SD-070	Boulder Avenue, I Street To State	$12,939,211	$0	$0	$0	$12,939,211
SD-071	Benson Avenue, State To I Street	$4,090,142	$0	$0	$0	$4,090,142
SD-072	Mountain Avenue, Philadelphia To Phillips	$7,791,496	$0	$0	$0	$7,791,496
SD-073	San Antonio Avenue, Francis To Cypress Channel	$13,490,213	$0	-$3,000,000	$0	$10,490,213
SD-074	San Sevaine Channel	$1,875,549	$0	$0	$0	$1,875,549
SD-075	Storm Drain Master Plan (P)	$655,297	-$171,297	$0	$0	$484,000
SD-076	Project Completed or No Longer Needed	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0
SD-077	Campus Avenue, State to Francis (Phase 2 Of SD-053)	$4,291,433	$0	$0	$0	$4,291,433
SD-078	Parco Avenue, Philadelphia to 60 Freeway (Phase 2 Of SD-0	$921,951	$0	$0	$0	$921,951
SD-079	Grove Avenue, Francis to 60 Freeway (Phase 2 Of SD-058)	$1,423,685	$0	$0	$0	$1,423,685
SD-080	Sultana Avenue, State to Phillips (Phase 2 Of SD-062)	$3,436,111	$0	$0	$0	$3,436,111
SD-081	Bon View Avenue, 60 Freeway To Francis (Phase 2 Of SD-06	$1,613,962	$0	$0	$0	$1,613,962

Appendix E - Schedule 6.0

City of Ontario
2021-22 Development Impact Cost Calculation Update
Storm Drainage Collection System Facilities
Remaining Cost/Obligation Calculation Worksheet

Project Number	*Project Title*	New Project Estimate	Less Completed Portion	Less in 2021-2022 Budget	Borrowed From Any Other Fund	Remaining DIF Fund Requirements
SD-082	Cucamonga Avenue, Francis to 60 FWY (Phase 2 Of SD-066	$1,278,352	$0	$0	$0	$1,278,352
SD-083	Mountain & Boulder, I-10 to I Street (Phase 2 Of SD-070)	$5,899,391	$0	$0	$0	$5,899,391
SD-084	Benson Avenue Laterals (Phase 2 Of SD-071)	$4,406,951	$0	$0	$0	$4,406,951
SD-085	Mountain Avenue, State to Phillips (Phase 2 Of SD-072)	$2,230,596	$0	$0	$0	$2,230,596
SD-086	San Antonio & Phillips, Euclid to Francis (Phase 2, SD-073)	$5,762,052	$0	$0	$0	$5,762,052
SD-087	Oakland Avenue, State to Phillips (Phase 2 Of SD-074)	$7,214,086	$0	$0	$0	$7,214,086
SD-088	Walker Avenue, 60 Freeway To Riverside And Lateral	$1,933,241	$0	$0	$0	$1,933,241
SD-089	Baker Avenue And Riverside Drive, S/O 60 Freeway	$2,731,268	$0	$0	$0	$2,731,268
SD-090	G Street, Corona To Del Norte	$2,854,437	$0	$0	$0	$2,854,437
SD-091	Del Norte and Imperial Avenues From I Street To G Street	$1,259,756	$0	$0	$0	$1,259,756
SD-092	Vine Avenue, G Street To State	$3,760,467	$0	$0	$0	$3,760,467
SD-093	Vine Avenue, Sixth To G Street	$3,951,911	$0	$0	$0	$3,951,911
SD-094	Sultana Avenue, Fifth To Holt	$6,755,724	$0	$0	$0	$6,755,724
SD-095	Benson Avenue And Laterals	$2,268,234	$0	$0	$0	$2,268,234
SD-096	Benson Avenue, Francis To Philadelphia	$3,010,954	$0	$0	$0	$3,010,954
SD-097	Mission, Benson, Phillips & Oaks, W/O Magnolia	$4,834,304	$0	$0	$0	$4,834,304
SD-098	Holt Boulevard, Convention Center To Cucamonga Channel	$1,120,942	$0	$0	$0	$1,120,942
SD-099	Mission Boulevard, Proforma To Turner	$1,039,219	$0	$0	$0	$1,039,219
SD-100	6th Street, West Cucamonga Creek To Grove	$546,474	$0	$0	$0	$546,474
SD-101	Archibald Avenue, Inland Empire To Airport Drive	$2,250,187	$0	$0	$0	$2,250,187
SD-102	Fifth Street, Balboa To Cucamonga Channel	$1,424,679	$0	$0	$0	$1,424,679
SD-103	Share Of Common City Yard Improvements	$1,739,460	$0	$0	$0	$1,739,460
SD-104	Project Completed or No Longer Needed	$813,062	-$813,062	$0	$0	$0
SD-105	Ontario Ranch Storm Drain Study	$1,053,500	$0	$0	$0	$1,053,500
	Sub-Total General Plan Total New Projects	$396,457,673	-$90,699,821	-$6,742,885	$0	$299,014,967

Appendix E - Schedule 7.0

City of Ontario
2021-22 Development Impact Cost Calculation Update
Water Collection Facilities Remaining Cost Worksheet
Remaining Cost/Obligation Calculation Worksheet

Line #	Project Title	New Project Estimate	Less Completed Portion	Less in 2021-2022 Budget	Borrowed From Any Other Fund	Remianing DIF Fund Obligations
WT-001	Phillips Street 1010' Zone Well	$764,470	$0	$0	$0	$764,470
WT-002	Eighth Street 1212' Zone Wells	$16,259,543	-$1,603,844	-$3,600,551	$3,583,201	$14,638,349
WT-003	Project Completed or No Longer Needed	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0
WT-004	Eighth Street 1212' Zone Transmission Lines	$45,942,741	$0	-$1,500,000	$6,756,895	$51,199,636
WT-005	Eighth Street 1212' Zone Reservoir Site Purchase	$6,400,000	-$6,400,000	$0	$4,800,000	$4,800,000
WT-006	Eighth Street 1212' Zone Reservoir Construction	$33,839,883	$0	$0	$399,388	$34,239,271
WT-007	Francis Street 925' Zone Wells	$57,750,608	-$2,782,859	$0	$0	$54,967,749
WT-008	Phillips Street 1010' Zone Wells	$8,262,695	-$2,725,887	$0	$0	$5,536,808
WT-009	Phillips Street 1010' Zone Extension Mains Extension	$21,859,129	-$2,962,230	-$8,529,723	$0	$10,367,176
WT-010	Francis Street 925' Zone Transmission Lines	$35,910,796	-$9,800,425	$0	$0	$26,110,371
WT-011	Francis Street 925' Zone Distribution Mains	$40,926,752	-$6,530,216	$0	$847,372	$35,243,908
WT-012	Francis Street 925' Zone Well Collection System	$11,944,714	$0	$0	$0	$11,944,714
WT-013	Pressure Reducing Station, Potable Water System (1010' - 925')	$2,748,237	-$918,237	$0	$0	$1,830,000
WT-014	Francis Street 925' Zone Reservoirs	$63,679,032	-$14,659,911	$0	$132,341	$49,151,462
WT-015	Phillips Street 1010' Zone Reservoirs	$9,327,338	-$9,327,338	$0	$3,747,521	$3,747,521
WT-016	Recycled Water System	$76,979,181	-$18,435,485	-$1,746,319	$10,617,042	$67,414,419
WT-017	Back-Up Power Supply	$3,622,275	-$147,013	$0	$0	$3,475,262
WT-018	Reservoir 1010' (2B) Landscaping	$242,730	$0	$0	$5,538	$248,268
WT-019	Project Completed or No Longer Needed	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0
WT-020	Project Completed or No Longer Needed	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0
WT-021	Distribution System Pressure, Size And Age Improvements	$146,132,182	$0	$0	$0	$146,132,182
WT-022	Miscellaneous Up-Sized Facilities	$6,035,733	-$592,748	-$135,721	$0	$5,307,264
WT-023	Abandon Existing General City Wells	$525,052	$0	$0	$0	$525,052
WT-024	Project Completed or No Longer Needed	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0
WT-025	Decommission Galvin Treatment Plant/Abandon 1212-3 Reservoir	$2,474,310	$0	$0	$0	$2,474,310
WT-026	Seismic Upgrades And Replacements	$13,653,639	-$15,710	$0	$210,807	$13,848,736
WT-027	Water Master Plan Updates	$1,596,376	-$1,304,856	$0	$1,272,623	$1,564,143
WT-028	Water System Maintenance Vehicle/Equipment Fleet	$1,367,350	$0	$0	$0	$1,367,350

Appendix E - Schedule 7.0

City of Ontario
2021-22 Development Impact Cost Calculation Update
Water Collection Facilities Remaining Cost Worksheet
Remaining Cost/Obligation Calculation Worksheet

Line #	Project Title	New Project Estimate	Less Completed Portion	Less in 2021-2022 Budget	Borrowed From Any Other Fund	Remianing DIF Fund Obligations
WT-029	Project Completed or No Longer Needed	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0
WT-030	Project Completed or No Longer Needed	$2,797,348	-$2,797,348	$0	$0	$0
WT-031	JCSD/Ontario Reservoir (Phillips Street 1010" Zone)	$1,078,186	-$1,078,186	$0	$431,798	$431,798
WT-032	Water Treatment	$55,181,991	-$910,594	-$2,988,387	$907,666	$52,190,676
WT-033	Phillips Street 1010' Zone Well Connection System	$5,039,874	-$5,039,874	$0	$0	$0
WT-034	Water Source Supply	$62,549,323	-$62,549,323	$0	$62,549,323	$62,549,323
WT-035	General System Reliability Improvements	$1,863,936	$0	$0	$0	$1,863,936
WT-036	Fourth Street 1074' Zone Transmission Improvements	$3,010,563	$0	$0	$0	$3,010,563
WT-037	Share Of Common City Yard Improvements	$9,472,959	-$2,102,272	$0	$2,102,272	$9,472,959
WT-038	Ontario Ranch Water/Recycled Water Design Studies	$24,302	-$24,302	$0	$0	$0
	Total	$749,263,248	-$152,708,658	-$18,500,701	$98,363,787	$676,417,676

Appendix E - Schedule 8.0

City of Ontario
2021-22 Development Impact Cost Calculation Update
Sewer Collection Facilities Remaining Cost Worksheet
Remaining Cost/Obligation Calculation Worksheet

Project Number	Project Title Title	New Project Estimate	Less Completed Portion	Less in 2021-2022 Budget	Borrowed From Any Other Fund	Remaining DIF Fund Obligations
SW-001	Eastern Trunk Sewer	$23,049,453	-$1,594,587	-$175,006	$0	$21,279,860
SW-002	Western Trunk Sewer	$36,174,154	$0	$0	$0	$36,174,154
SW-003	Eucalyptus East Trunk Sewer	$697,535	$0	$0	$0	$697,535
SW-004	Edison Trunk Sewer	$2,487,402	-$2,487,402	$0	$0	$0
SW-005	Haven Trunk Sewer	$6,031,460	-$4,533,680	$0	$0	$1,497,780
SW-006	Mill Creek Trunk Sewer	$12,850,031	-$1,785,718	$0	$0	$11,064,313
SW-007	Project Completed or No Longer Needed	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0
SW-008	Walker Trunk Sewer	$986,909	$0	$0	$0	$986,909
SW-009	Grove Trunk Sewer	$4,903,394	$0	$0	$0	$4,903,394
SW-010	Bon View Trunk Sewer	$4,903,394	$0	$0	$0	$4,903,394
SW-011	Euclid Trunk Sewer	$4,903,394	$0	$0	$0	$4,903,394
SW-012	Project Completed or No Longer Needed	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0
SW-013	Project Completed or No Longer Needed	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0
SW-014	Project Completed or No Longer Needed	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0
SW-015	Plaza Serena Street, Granda Court To Vineyard Avenue	$100,324	-$73,330	$0	$3,103	$30,097
SW-016	Philadelphia Between Parco And Vineyard	$6,146,285	$0	$0	$0	$6,146,285
SW-017	Holt Boulevard, West Of Imperial Avenue	$407,568	$0	$0	$0	$407,568
SW-018	Campus Avenue, North Of Holt Boulevard	$46,461	-$46,461	$0	$0	$0
SW-019	Project Completed or No Longer Needed	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0
SW-020	Cherry Avenue, North Of G Street	$64,824	-$47,382	$0	$0	$17,442
SW-021	Project Completed or No Longer Needed	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0
SW-022	Vineyard Avenue, South Of Cedar Et. Al.	$18,606,994	-$1,264,797	-$3,394,324	$0	$13,947,873
SW-023	Easement East Of Haven Street	$1,659,109	-$1,212,694	$0	$764,735	$1,211,150
SW-024	Project Completed or No Longer Needed	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0
SW-025	Project Completed or No Longer Needed	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0
SW-026	Sewer Utility Maintenance Vehicles	$947,100	$0	$0	$0	$947,100
SW-027	Sewer Utility Master Plan	$779,184	-$779,184	$0	$779,184	$779,184
SW-028	Project Completed or No Longer Needed	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0
SW-029	Carpenter Trunk Sewer	$7,060,402	-$1,597,263	$0	$0	$5,463,139
SW-030	Project Completed or No Longer Needed	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0
SW-031	Easement N/O & S/O Hollowell, E/O Boulder Avenue	$380,221	-$277,915	$0	$0	$102,306
SW-032	D Street Between Corona And Vineyard	$269,693	-$197,127	$0	$0	$72,566
SW-033	Easement W/O Euclid From N/O J St To Easement S/O G	$696,901	-$509,386	$0	$0	$187,515
SW-034	Benson Avenue Between I Street and G Street	$496,054	-$362,581	$0	$0	$133,473

Appendix E - Schedule 8.0

City of Ontario
2021-22 Development Impact Cost Calculation Update
Sewer Collection Facilities Remaining Cost Worksheet
Remaining Cost/Obligation Calculation Worksheet

Project Number	*Project Title Title*	New Project Estimate	Less Completed Portion	Less in 2021-2022 Budget	Borrowed From Any Other Fund	Remaining DIF Fund Obligations
SW-035	Virginia Avenue Between D Street and Nocta Street	$216,458	-$158,216	$0	$0	$58,242
SW-036	Deer Creek Loop And Laurel Tree Drive	$809,492	$0	$0	$0	$809,492
SW-037	Hollowell, Boulder and Holt Avenue	$833,748	-$609,412	$0	$25,788	$250,124
SW-038	Easement N/O Holt Blvd, E/O Allyn Avenue	$360,692	-$263,641	$0	$0	$97,051
SW-039	Riverside Drive Between Sultana And Campus Avenues	$657,740	-$480,762	$0	$0	$176,978
SW-040	Vineyard S/O Airport And Easement	$6,769,613	-$245,312	$0	$0	$6,524,301
SW-041	Mills Circle N/O Mall Drive	$132,250	$0	$0	$0	$132,250
SW-042	Holt Boulevard E/O Vineyard Avenue	$420,132	$0	$0	$0	$420,132
SW-043	Bon View Avenue N/O Francis	$318,923	-$233,111	$0	$111,920	$197,732
SW-044	Acacia, Easement, Locust And Parco	$1,736,460	$0	$0	$0	$1,736,460
SW-045	Turner Avenue, N/O Cedar Street	$132,250	$0	$0	$0	$132,250
SW-046	Holt Sewer Phase A	$5,649,689	-$5,649,689	$0	$960,447	$960,447
SW-047	Holt Sewer Phase B	$3,744,159	-$3,744,159	$0	$37,442	$37,442
SW-048	Share Of Common City Yard Improvements	$3,970,009	-$977,855	$0	$977,855	$3,970,009
SW-049	Project Completed or No Longer Needed	$24,302	-$24,302	$0	$0	$0
SW-050	Airport Drive Main, E/O Grove	$1,459,979	-$869,002	$0	$0	$590,977
SW-051	Project Completed or No Longer Needed	$2,140,007	-$2,140,007	$0	$0	$0
SW-052	Piedmonte Specific Densification Mitigation in Various Stre	$5,198,088	$0	$0	$0	$5,198,088
	Total	$169,222,237	-$32,164,975	-$3,569,330	$3,660,474	$137,148,406

Appendix F

Findings in Support of Continuation of City Policy to Impose Residential Development Impact Fees on a per Unit Basis

Findings in Support of Continuation of City Policy to Impose Residential Development Impact Fees on a per Unit Basis.

AB-602 (Gov't C. sections 66016.5(a)(5)(A) and (B)) states that if the City adopts a calculation and nexus study after July 1, 2022, it must *either* "calculate a fee imposed on a housing development project proportionately to the square footage of proposed units of the development" *or* make the following findings:

> (i) An explanation as to why square footage is not an appropriate metric to calculate fees imposed on housing development projects.
>
> (ii) An explanation that an alternative basis of calculating the fee bears a reasonable relationship between the fee charged and the burden posed by the development.
>
> (iii) That other policies in the fee structure support smaller developments, or otherwise ensure that smaller developments are not charged disproportionate fees.

There is no requirement for the City to have a financial element in the City's General Plan document. Thus, a properly calculated *Development Impact Fee Calculation and Nexus Report* functions as the de-facto financial plan in support of the City's General Zoning Plan. It identifies the anticipated service demands by infrastructure based upon averages and lays out a fair and reasonable method with which to finance the required capital projects and acquisitions necessary to accommodate those anticipated new service demands.

The City of Ontario has expressed that it will continue to impose residential development impact fees based upon the same manner that additional development service demands are calculated – that is, by type of average unit. The City will not impose development impact fees based on residential development projects proportionate to the square footage of proposed units for completing the City's General Plan. The current set of fees fosters greater accuracy in planning and provides the City with the required level of certainty in impact fee collection.

The California Mitigation Fee Act (Government Code §66000, et.seq.), which was first established in 1987, specifies that every public agency that adopts development impact fees must provide the essential calculation and nexus report with fees calculated upon data that is as empirical as possible. AB-602's *Proportionate to Square Footage,* is based upon a *presumption*[1] that a smaller detached dwelling creates less local government service demands than a larger detached dwelling. AB-602 does not offer any peer reviewed, third party empirical data that substantiates that a small square footage detached dwelling unit creates less municipal service impacts than a larger square foot detached dwelling. As such, the City has determined that the best practices for both managing development and obtaining the adequate impact fee financing for the development-generated infrastructure is as identified in this Report.

The City's zoning code allows for identification of the use of privately held land and in some cases, primarily business uses, provides for a maximum Floor Area Ratio (FAR) that limits the amount of square feet that can be constructed on an acre of business space. No such limitation is placed upon the construction of a detached dwelling unit (AKA "single family residence"). The detached dwellings can be a size that the developer determines to be a marketable product.

[1] (noun: **presumption**; plural noun: **presumptions** – an idea that is taken to be true, and often used as the basis for other ideas, although it is not known for certain.

This Report indicates that the City (using recent GIS data) has 1,685 acres zoned for detached dwellings. At approximately 7.6 detached dwelling units per acre, this equates to an additional 12,793 detached dwellings to be constructed by General Plan build-out of the City. The City does not, however, have any information as to how many square feet any of these 12,793 detached dwelling units will be, that is, within applicable zoning, determined by the developers of the various parcels.

This Report employs the most defensible empirical sources, appropriate to the demands of that particular infrastructure to determine the *average* demands of an *average* detached dwelling. These sources determine demand by an average detached dwelling but does produce this demand data for various sized detached dwellings. Such data is simply not available.

The amount of and complexity of any City's infrastructure defines (in all or part) the Level of Service (LOS) of that infrastructure, not just currently but in perpetuity. This makes the one-time DIF financing of any City's infrastructure that much more important. It takes balance to accommodate development with the police responses within the desired standard. It will take a combination of additional law enforcement station space, response and support vehicles and specialty equipment to support the required officers (non-impact supported). The importance of having a properly calculated and documented DIF schedule in order to accommodate development-related demands cannot be over-stated. The same concept holds true for the two labor-intensive public safety services and the infrastructure intensive services such as circulation, storm drainage collection, potable and recycled water distribution and sewer collection.

The collection of an impact fee to raise capital revenue for development-based demands is one- time but represents the municipal service needs of that dwelling unit as long as that structure exists. Thus the argument that any new detached dwelling will generate less municipal service demand based on its smaller square footage is divorced from the reality that any particular residential dwelling may have different occupants over 50 years (e.g. a home for a family of four to a single resident).

Police and Fire Calls-for-Service (CFS) - For the calculation of Police and Fire demand data, RCS used Ontario- sourced GIS-based calls-for-service matched up with the City's Land-Use GIS database. As an example, in 2020 there were 12,454 calls-for-service logged into the dispatch data to the 12,793 existing detached dwellings for an average of 0.973 calls-for-service to a single detached dwelling. Again, the City does not know what size these detached dwellings are so could not possibly determine the total square feet of 12,793 detached dwellings or the individual square footage of each of those 12,793 dwellings. GIS data does not include the size of each residential dwelling in the City.

Circulation Needs - According to the volume of empirical data collected by the highly respected *Institute of Traffic Engineering* (ITE), an average detached dwelling generates approximately 9.5 trip-ends per day, but the ITE does not offer any distinction between small and large homes, because such data does not exist in their database.

Storm Drainage - The storm runoff from a 1,800 square foot single-floor residence is the same as the storm runoff from a 3,600 square foot two-story building. Both have a 1,800 square foot pad, so a 50% fee for the 1,800 square foot home compared to the 3,600 square foot home would be inequitable and unsupported by data. This Report utilizes rainfall runoff data from the *San Bernardino Hydrology Manual* (1986). Williamson and Schmidt, Irvine, CA, Figure C-4. The document indicates that the coefficient of drainage for a development of homes close to seven units per acre is 0.775. No such data is available for large versus small homes.

Public Utilities - Water and Sewer Master Plans are the documents that engineering consultants and City staff use to ensure that the proposed spine water distribution and sewer collection systems are adequate and sufficient to meet all needs within the City's limits. These Master Plan total demand calculations are typically based upon averages for each of the City's utilities. Master Plans are based on the proposed number of dwelling units or business square feet in order to identify the demand for new infrastructure. Financing them should be on the same basis.

Quality of Life Infrastructure (parks, aquatic facilities, libraries and community centers) - Quality of Life standards are based upon current population numbers. As an example there are

145,570 square feet of public use facilities (i.e. community centers). Given an existing population of 182,004 residents, that creates an existing standard of 0.800 square feet of public use facilities per resident. A fee for a new square foot of public use facility is determined and then multiplied by the empirically-based average number of persons per type of residential dwelling. These impact fees are generally based upon census data that identifies average number of persons per type of dwelling unit. In Ontario, those figures are 3.806 persons per detached dwelling, 3.373 per attached dwelling unit and 3.175 per mobile home (see Table 2-4). The Census data does not determine these figures by size of dwelling unit and thus they represent the most empirically driven data. Anecdotally there are likely 1,300 square foot dwellings with anywhere from one, two or six residents just as there can be in a 2,600 square foot home. Therefore an average based on type of dwelling is far more empirical than dividing the average cost by some unsubstantiated average dwelling size. By doing so, larger residential dwellings could be treated unfairly if they end up being assessed a greater amount in order to balance or subsidize the smaller detached dwelling units based upon the presumption (non-empirical data) that these smaller detached dwelling units somehow create lesser dwelling densities than would a larger unit. Such a subsidy flies in the face of The Mitigation Fee Act.

Importance of a Static or Average Development Impact Fee Schedule. The City must be able to depend on the collection of sufficient impact fee revenues with which to finance development-generated projects necessary to accommodate new development with adequate and sufficient service levels without decreasing the existing levels of service. This assurance will be diminished should the City choose a per residential square foot impact fee schedule. As an example, the City has identified that a 6,200 square foot basic 2X2 fire station is required to service an area with about 3,000 average detached dwellings. However, if a greater proportion of the 3,000 homes are far smaller than the City had anticipated, the City will not have adequate DIF revenue to construct that station. With flat fee representing an average demand per unit, the City can have greater confidence in receiving the DIF revenue necessary to construct that station and thus respond to those 3,000 detached dwellings, regardless of the size of the detached dwellings.

The City's development practices neither favor nor penalize any one land-use over another. Nor are the City's policies unfair within any one land-use. For residential units based upon empirically-based averages, all are assessed the same fee; no developer is charged disproportionately. The type of dwelling unit drives the fee, not the square footage. For residential units, all are assessed the same fee; none are charged disproportionately.

Since the City does not impose per square foot-based impact fees, it also does not apply such fees on any room addition to a residential dwelling.

DIFs for non-residential uses (i.e. the variety of businesses) have always been calculated and imposed on a per square foot basis as empirical data is available for those uses. Additionally each of those business uses (see Table 2-1) has differing maximum allowable floor area ratio (FAR).

The City is mindful that the state is encouraging construction of smaller detached dwellings and is assuming that these types of residential dwellings create lesser demand merely because they are smaller. However, given the lack of any empirical data supporting such an assumption, the City feels obligated to adopt residential impact fees that are fair to all developers of residential dwellings, regardless of size. In the end, the City has determined to err on the side of fair treatment of all residential development.

In conclusion, given the empirically-based and significant effort spent on identifying the number and capacity of increasing infrastructure projects needed to accommodate the planned-for and anticipated new development and the fair means demonstrated in the calculation and Report, the City has determined that the empirically-driven per Unit residential fee is the most appropriate metric with which to calculate and fairly impose the City's schedule of impact fees.

End of Report