Development Impact Fee
Calculation and Nexus Update Report
For the
City of Ontario, California

September 17, 2019

Revenue & Cost Specialists, LLC

Serving Local Governments Since 1975

September 17, 2019

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

RE: September 2019 Update to the 2017 Development Impact Fee (DIF) Calculation

Honorable Mayor, Council and City Manager Ochoa:

Please find enclosed copies of the amended Development Impact Fee schedules (DIFs) updated from the April 2017 *Development Impact Fee Calculation and Nexus Report* and the amended individual project detail pages from the April 2017 *Master Facilities Plan*. The City's Development Impact Fees (DIF) have been reviewed periodically since they were comprehensively calculated in May 2003 in order to maintain continued viability of the DIF capital financing system, and they have been amended as necessary to allow for changes to project scopes, cost estimates and allocability. This September 2019 update includes numerous adjustments, as discussed below.

The format of this amendment of the existing Development Impact Fees consists of:

1. This letter identifying the alterations made by infrastructure or Chapter.

2. A section containing the amended Development Impact Fee summary schedules which identify the proposed fees, total estimated collections, total infrastructure costs and the collection differences.

3. A section containing the twelve separate amended infrastructure Development Impact Fee calculation schedules indicating the distribution of costs with the appropriate infrastructure nexus.

4. A section containing the updated *Master Facilities Plan* pages identifying any combined changes in the specific project costs, descriptions and/or source responsibilities.

Generally, there has been no attempt to amend the text contained within the *Development Impact Fee Calculation and Nexus Report* as the nexus and logic within the Report does not change. However, certain amounts contained within the text, and some tables included in the individual chapters have been updated to present the current amounts. For the most part, the modifications and/or types of modifications included in the 2019 update are as follows:

- The cost per acre for land acquisition has been increased from $400,000 to $585,000;
- In numerous infrastructure categories, the individual 2012 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 (Streets, Storm Drains, Water and Sewer), numerous individual project cost estimates have been adjusted to reflect updated engineering estimates and/or actual costs;
- The cost per acre for Parks construction has been increased from $445,700 to $500,000; and
- The cost per acre for Parks grading/site preparation has been reduced from $168,678 to $54,882.

Please refer to the Exhibit to this letter for the specifics of the detailed adjustments made to every project in the 2019 update that includes an adjustment from the 2017 Report.

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.

EXHIBIT

2019 DIF UPDATE INDIVIDUAL PROJECT COST CHANGES

LAW ENFORCEMENT FACILITIES, VEHICLES AND EQUIPMENT

Project Number	Project Description	Current Amount	Proposed Amount	Project Cost Adjustment Basis
LE-002	Additional Police Station Space	$ 7,203,750	$ 8,514,833	ENR Building Cost Index Escalation Applied
LE-003	Additional Patrol/Detective/Specialty/Staff Vehicles	$ 13,415,682	$ 14,757,250	Consumer Price Index Escalation Applied
LE-004	Additional Officer Assigned Equipment	$ 2,185,530	$ 2,404,083	Consumer Price Index Escalation Applied
LE-005	Additional Specialty Equipment	$ 1,000,000	$ 1,100,000	Consumer Price Index Escalation Applied
LE-006	Acquire Multi-Channel Portable Radios	$ 4,208,000	$ 4,628,800	Consumer Price Index Escalation Applied
LE-007	Emergency Services Communication System	$ 2,749,320	$ 3,024,252	Consumer Price Index Escalation Applied
LE-008	Additional Helicopter Capacity	$ 2,750,000	$ 3,025,000	Consumer Price Index Escalation Applied
LE-009	Advanced Technology Software And Equipment	$ 960,000	$ 1,056,000	Consumer Price Index Escalation Applied
LE-010	Share of Common City Yard Improvements	$ 2,001,174	$ 2,365,388	ENR Building Cost Index Escalation Applied

FIRE SUPPRESSION FACILITIES, VEHICLES AND EQUIPMENT

Project Number	Project Description	Current Amount	Proposed Amount	Project Cost Adjustment Basis
FS-001	Fire Station #9 Land Acquisition And Construction	$ 7,051,360	$ 8,154,350	Updated Engineering Cost Estimate
FS-003	Fire Station #11 Land Acquisition And Construction	$ 7,051,360	$ 8,154,350	Updated Engineering Cost Estimate
FS-004	Fire Station #11 Response Engine	$ 700,000	$ 770,000	Consumer Price Index Escalation Applied
FS-005	Fire Station #12 Land Acquisition And Construction	$ 7,274,460	$ 8,383,040	Updated Engineering Cost Estimate
FS-006	Fire Station #12 Response Engine (2)	$ 1,400,000	$ 1,540,000	Consumer Price Index Escalation Applied
FS-007	Fire Station #13 Land Acquisition And Construction	$ 7,051,360	$ 8,154,350	Updated Engineering Cost Estimate
FS-008	Fire Station #13 Response Engine	$ 700,000	$ 770,000	Consumer Price Index Escalation Applied
FS-009	Fire Station #14 Land Acquisition And Construction	$ 7,051,360	$ 8,154,350	Updated Engineering Cost Estimate
FS-010	Fire Station #14 Response Engine	$ 700,000	$ 770,000	Consumer Price Index Escalation Applied
FS-011	Reserve Response Engines	$ 1,400,000	$ 1,196,191	Updated Engineering Cost Estimate
FS-012	Aerial Response Truck	$ 1,200,000	$ 1,675,000	Updated Engineering Cost Estimate
FS-013	Battalion Chief Response/Incident Command Vehicle	$ 65,000	$ 125,000	Updated Engineering Cost Estimate
FS-014	Fire Fighter Assigned Equipment	$ 963,666	$ 1,060,033	Consumer Price Index Escalation Applied
FS-015	Fire Administration Headquarters Relocation	$ 5,586,500	$ 25,016,050	Updated Engineering Cost Estimate
FS-016	Training Center Expansion	$ 2,214,050	$ 2,617,007	ENR Building Cost Index Escalation Applied
FS-018	Special Operations Support Vehicle	$ 90,000	$ 125,000	Updated Engineering Cost Estimate
FS-019	Mobile Air And Lighting Support Vehicle	$ 475,000	$ 522,500	Consumer Price Index Escalation Applied
FS-020	Emergency Services Communication System	$ 2,800,000	$ 3,080,000	Consumer Price Index Escalation Applied
FS-021	Share Of Common City Yard Improvements	$ 1,188,532	$ 1,404,845	ENR Building Cost Index Escalation Applied
FS-023	Fire Station #1 Relocation/Expansion	$ 8,091,840	$ 16,939,820	Updated Engineering Cost Estimate
FS-024	Expand Station #3 (East Francis)	$ 3,772,790	$ 4,842,850	Updated Engineering Cost Estimate
FS-025	Fire Station #3, Second Company Aerial Truck	$ 1,200,000	$ 930,000	Updated Engineering Cost Estimate
FS-026	Temporary Fire Station #9	$ -	$ 1,161,447	New Project Added to DIF Program

CIRCULATION (STREETS, SIGNALS AND BRIDGES) SYSTEM

Project Number	Project Description	Current Amount	Proposed Amount	Project Cost Adjustment Basis
ST-009	Edison Avenue From Vineyard To Mill Creek	$ 14,718,299	$ 16,178,840	Updated Engineering Cost Estimate
ST-024	New Model Colony Traffic Control System	$ 22,245,200	$ 27,201,323	Updated Engineering Cost Estimate
ST-034	Old Model Colony Traffic Signals	$ 6,111,500	$ 10,658,044	Updated Engineering Cost Estimate
ST-042	Grove Avenue From Fourth Street to Airport Drive	$ 32,200,000	$ 37,688,000	Updated Engineering Cost Estimate
ST-047	Etiwanda Avenue At Airport Drive	$ 2,375,000	$ 9,879,821	Updated Engineering Cost Estimate
ST-060	Phillips Street From Benson To Mountain	$ 801,767	$ 548,925	Updated Engineering Cost Estimate
ST-092	Milliken (N) Grade Separation Under UPRR/Alhambra	$ 8,253,300	$ 32,382,452	Updated Engineering Cost Estimate
ST-093	Vineyard (N) Grade Separation Under UPRR/Alhambra	$ 50,072,033	$ 47,353,237	Updated Engineering Cost Estimate
ST-094	Milliken (S) Grade Separation Over UPRR/Alhambra	$ 78,140,766	$ 72,962,932	Updated Engineering Cost Estimate
ST-104	Great Park Bridge Over Archibald Avenue	$ 7,000,000	$ 4,989,730	Updated Engineering Cost Estimate
ST-106	SR-60 At Archibald Interchange Reconstruction/Expansion	$ 14,563,000	$ 22,540,439	Updated Engineering Cost Estimate
ST-111	I-10 Freeway at Grove/Fourth	$ 199,423,000	$ 176,085,553	Updated Engineering Cost Estimate
ST-117	Ontario Ranch Road/Trail Separation	$ 2,315,000	$ 2,243,472	Updated Engineering Cost Estimate
ST-129	Fourth Street Under the I-10 Freeway	$ -	$ 22,336,447	New Project Added to DIF Program
ST-130	Road Extension from 1,530' E/o to 1,840' E/o Haven	$ -	$ 585,309	New Project Added to DIF Program
ST-131	Ontario Ranch Traffic Study	$ -	$ 90,000	New Project Added to DIF Program

2019 DIF UPDATE INDIVIDUAL PROJECT COST CHANGES

STORM DRAINAGE COLLECTION SYSTEM

Project Number	Project Description	Current Amount	Proposed Amount	Project Cost Adjustment Basis
SD-021	Archibald Avenue, Schafer To County Line Channel	$ 6,704,437	$ 6,871,050	Updated to Reflect Final Actual Project Cost
SD-035	Mill Creek Avenue Laterals On Edison	$ 1,304,974	$ 1,247,525	Updated to Reflect Final Actual Project Cost
SD-051	Offsite Walker Avenue Storm Drain And Basins	$ 19,237,800	$ 20,200,000	Updated Engineering Cost Estimate
SD-054	Fifth Street, Beryln To West Cucamonga Creek	$ 2,063,219	$ 1,851,739	Updated to Reflect Final Actual Project Cost
SD-055	Parco Avenue, 60 Freeway To Riverside And Lateral	$ 2,699,421	$ 3,847,609	Updated Engineering Cost Estimate
SD-056	Sixth Street, Glenn To Cucamonga Channel	$ 7,543,474	$ 7,780,102	Updated to Reflect Final Actual Project Cost
SD-105	Ontario Ranch Storm Drain Study	$ -	$ 1,000,000	New Project Added to DIF Program

WATER SOURCE, STORAGE AND DISTRIBUTION SYSTEM

Project Number	Project Description	Current Amount	Proposed Amount	Project Cost Adjustment Basis
WT-002	Eighth Street 1212' Zone Wells	$ 8,436,927	$ 8,762,663	Updated Engineering Cost Estimate
WT-004	Eighth Street 1212' Zone Transmission Lines	$ 16,461,572	$ 36,642,539	Updated Engineering Cost Estimate
WT-006	Eighth Street 1212' Zone Reservoir Construction	$ 24,288,000	$ 29,242,752	ENR Construction Cost Index Escalation Applied
WT-007	Francis Street 925' Zone Wells	$ 29,227,164	$ 33,924,835	Updated Engineering Cost Estimate
WT-008	Phillips Street 1010' Zone Wells	$ 5,896,818	$ 6,647,387	Updated Engineering Cost Estimate
WT-009	Phillips Street 1010' Zone Extension Mains Extension	$ 17,432,459	$ 22,882,247	Updated Engineering Cost Estimate
WT-010	Francis Street 925' Zone Transmission Lines	$ 26,699,390	$ 35,524,302	Updated Engineering Cost Estimate
WT-011	Francis Street 925' Zone Distribution Mains	$ 36,563,560	$ 40,033,253	Updated Engineering Cost Estimate
WT-012	Francis Street 925' Zone Well Collection System	$ 5,911,598	$ 11,511,287	Updated Engineering Cost Estimate
WT-013	Pressure Reducing Station, Potable Water System (1010' - 925')	$ 1,466,189	$ 1,778,766	Updated Engineering Cost Estimate
WT-014	Francis Street 925' Zone Reservoirs	$ 51,597,072	$ 62,024,039	Updated Engineering Cost Estimate
WT-015	Phillips Street 1010' Zone Reservoirs	$ 9,327,651	$ 9,327,338	Updated Engineering Cost Estimate
WT-016	Recycled Water System	$ 63,421,750	$ 73,065,670	Updated Engineering Cost Estimate
WT-017	Back-Up Power Supply	$ 3,508,000	$ 3,527,013	Updated Engineering Cost Estimate
WT-021	Distribution System Pressure, Size And Age Improvements	$ 117,226,355	$ 140,836,512	Updated Engineering Cost Estimate
WT-022	Miscellaneous Up-Sized Facilities	$ 2,000,000	$ 5,925,291	Updated Engineering Cost Estimate
WT-028	Water System Maintenance Vehicle/Equipment Fleet	$ 1,179,920	$ 1,297,912	Consumer Price Index Escalation Applied
WT-029	Ontario-JCSD Interconnection	$ 53,066	$ -	Project Removed from the DIF
WT-030	CDA Facility Modifications (Booster Station & Pipeline)	$ 3,453,660	$ 2,797,348	Updated to Reflect Final Actual Project Cost
WT-031	JCSD/Ontario Reservoir (Phillips Street 1010" Zone)	$ 1,075,266	$ 1,078,186	Updated to Reflect Final Actual Project Cost
WT-032	Water Treatment	$ 24,135,850	$ 26,716,450	Updated Engineering Cost Estimate
WT-033	Phillips Street 1010' Zone Well Connection System	$ 4,113,536	$ 5,039,874	Updated to Reflect Final Actual Project Cost
WT-035	General System Reliability Improvements	$ 1,764,500	$ 1,796,300	Updated Engineering Cost Estimate
WT-036	Fourth Street 1074' Zone Transmission Improvements	$ 1,634,380	$ 2,858,784	Updated Engineering Cost Estimate
WT-037	Share Of Common City Yard Improvements	$ 8,014,348	$ 9,472,959	ENR Building Cost Index Escalation Applied

SEWER COLLECTION SYSTEM

Project Number	Project Description	Current Amount	Proposed Amount	Project Cost Adjustment Basis
SW-001	Eastern Trunk Sewer	$ 21,018,299	$ 23,049,453	Updated to Reflect Final Actual Project Cost
SW-002	Western Trunk Sewer	$ 13,632,263	$ 14,969,080	Updated Engineering Cost Estimate
SW-003	Eucalyptus East Trunk Sewer	$ 1,010,134	$ 987,467	Updated Engineering Cost Estimate
SW-004	Edison/Ontario Ranch Road Trunk Sewer	$ 2,275,267	$ 2,487,802	Updated to Reflect Final Actual Project Cost
SW-005	Haven Trunk Sewer	$ 3,540,801	$ 3,908,348	Updated Engineering Cost Estimate
SW-006	Mill Creek Trunk Sewer	$ 6,499,430	$ 6,706,236	Updated Engineering Cost Estimate
SW-008	Walker Trunk Sewer	$ 543,758	$ 512,325	Updated Engineering Cost Estimate
SW-009	Grove Trunk Sewer	$ 2,880,377	$ 2,647,013	Updated Engineering Cost Estimate
SW-010	Bon View Trunk Sewer	$ 2,873,123	$ 2,647,013	Updated Engineering Cost Estimate
SW-011	Euclid Trunk Sewer	$ 2,880,514	$ 2,647,013	Updated Engineering Cost Estimate
SW-015	Plaza Serena Street, Granda Court To Vineyard Avenue	$ 63,308	$ 100,324	Updated Engineering Cost Estimate
SW-016	Philadelphia Between Parco And Vineyard	$ 4,919,637	$ 5,923,236	Updated Engineering Cost Estimate
SW-017	Holt Boulevard, West Of Imperial Avenue	$ 326,228	$ 392,779	ENR Construction Cost Index Escalation Applied
SW-020	Cherry Avenue, North Of G Street	$ 59,142	$ 64,824	Updated Engineering Cost Estimate
SW-022	Vineyard Avenue, South Of Cedar Et. Al.	$ 14,643,872	$ 17,981,955	Updated Engineering Cost Estimate
SW-023	Easement East Of Haven Street	$ 1,327,999	$ 1,598,918	ENR Construction Cost Index Escalation Applied
SW-026	Sewer Utility Maintenance Vehicles	$ 861,000	$ 947,100	Consumer Price Index Escalation Applied
SW-027	Sewer Utility Master Plan	$ 486,334	$ 534,967	Consumer Price Index Escalation Applied
SW-029	Carpenter Trunk Sewer	$ 4,484,971	$ 4,795,305	Updated Engineering Cost Estimate
SW-031	Easement N/O & S/O Hollowell, E/O Boulder Avenue	$ 130,553	$ 380,221	Updated Engineering Cost Estimate
SW-032	D Street Between Corona And Vineyard	$ 297,767	$ 269,693	Updated Engineering Cost Estimate
SW-033	Easement W/O Euclid From N/O J St To Easement S/O G St	$ 1,017,160	$ 696,901	Updated Engineering Cost Estimate
SW-034	Benson Avenue Between I Street and G Street	$ 563,515	$ 496,054	Updated Engineering Cost Estimate
SW-035	Virginia Avenue Between D Street and Nocta Street	$ 226,356	$ 216,458	Updated Engineering Cost Estimate

2019 DIF UPDATE INDIVIDUAL PROJECT COST CHANGES

SW-036	Deer Creek Loop And Laurel Tree Drive	$ 647,937	$ 780,117	ENR Construction Cost Index Escalation Applied
SW-037	Hollowell, Boulder and Holt Avenue	$ 969,657	$ 833,748	Updated Engineering Cost Estimate
SW-038	Easement N/O Holt Blvd, E/O Allyn Avenue	$ 44,529	$ 36,062	Updated Engineering Cost Estimate
SW-039	Riverside Drive Between Sultana And Campus Avenues	$ 626,311	$ 657,740	Updated Engineering Cost Estimate
SW-040	Vineyard S/O Airport And Easement	$ 960,873	$ 1,156,890	Updated Engineering Cost Estimate
SW-042	Holt Boulevard E/O Vineyard Avenue	$ 336,285	$ 404,890	ENR Construction Cost Index Escalation Applied
SW-043	Bon View Avenue N/O Francis	$ 239,320	$ 318,923	Updated Engineering Cost Estimate
SW-044	Acacia, Easement, Locust And Parco	$ 1,389,910	$ 1,673,464	Updated Engineering Cost Estimate
SW-048	Share Of Common City Yard Improvements	$ 3,358,722	$ 3,970,009	ENR Construction Cost Index Escalation Applied
SW-050	Airport Drive Main, E/O Grove	$ -	$ 1,459,979	New Project Added to DIF Program
SW-051	Grove Avenue Main, S/O Airport Drive	$ -	$ 1,848,807	New Project Added to DIF Program

REFUSE COLLECTION FACILITIES AND VEHICLES

Project Number	Project Description	Current Amount	Proposed Amount	Project Cost Adjustment Basis
RC-001	Side Loader Collection Barrels	$ 2,549,767	$ 2,278,514	Updated Cost Estimate
RC-002	Side Loader Collection Vehicles	$ 3,952,839	$ 4,841,623	Updated Cost Estimate
RC-003	Front Loader Collection Bins	$ 8,327,488	$ 9,160,263	Consumer Price Index Escalation Applied
RC-004	Front Loader Collection Vehicles	$ 4,537,500	$ 5,786,420	Updated Cost Estimate
RC-005	Roll-off Collection Boxes	$ 961,707	$ 1,057,878	Consumer Price Index Escalation Applied
RC-006	Roll-off Collection Vehicles	$ 772,200	$ 907,753	Updated Cost Estimate
RC-007	Share of Common City Yard Improvements	$ 15,199,380	$ 17,965,667	ENR Building Cost Index Escalation Applied

GENERAL FACILITIES, VEHICLES AND EQUIPMENT

Project Number	Project Description	Current Amount	Proposed Amount	Project Cost Adjustment Basis
GF-002	Expansion Of Administrative Pool Car Fleet	$ 532,500	$ 585,750	Consumer Price Index Escalation Applied
GF-003	Electronic Specialty Equipment/Computer Hardware/Software	$ 10,997,200	$ 12,096,920	Consumer Price Index Escalation Applied
GF-004	City Animal Holding Facility	$ 1,969,500	$ 2,327,949	ENR Building Cost Index Escalation Applied
GF-005	Share Of Common City Yard Improvements	$ 1,339,951	$ 1,583,822	ENR Building Cost Index Escalation Applied

LIBRARY FACILITIES

Project Number	Project Description	Current Amount	Proposed Amount	Project Cost Adjustment Basis
LB-001	Library Facilities Space Expansion	$ 47,400,878	$ 55,677,517	New Cost of Land Based on Appraisal, and ENR Building Cost Index Escalation Applied
LB-002	Library Collection Expansion	$ 9,360,246	$ 10,299,921	Consumer Price Index Escalation Applied

PUBLIC USE (COMMUNITY CENTER) FACILITIES

Project Number	Project Description	Current Amount	Proposed Amount	Project Cost Adjustment Basis
PF-001	Public Use Facilities Space Expansion	$ 62,002,302	$ 72,667,747	New Cost of Land Based on Appraisal, and ENR Building Cost Index Escalation Applied

AQUATICS FACILITIES

Project Number	Project Description	Current Amount	Proposed Amount	Project Cost Adjustment Basis
AQ-001	Aquatics Facilities - Pool Expansion	$ 10,000,000	$ 12,040,000	ENR Construction Cost Index Escalation Applied

PARK LAND ACQUISITION AND PARK IMPROVEMENTS

Project Number	Project Description	Current Amount	Proposed Amount	Project Cost Adjustment Basis
PK-001	Park Land Acquisition And Park Facilities Development	$ 610,876,888	$ 685,268,923	New Cost of Land Based on Appraisal, and ENR Building Cost Index Escalation Applied
PK-002	Park Maintenance Vehicles	$ 2,389,437	$ 2,612,226	Consumer Price Index Escalation Applied
PK-003	Share of Common City Yard Improvements	$ 3,410,857	$ 4,047,273	ENR Building Cost Index Escalation Applied

CITY OF ONTARIO
DEVELOPMENT IMPACT FEE CALCULATION AND NEXUS REPORT

TABLE OF CONTENTS

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 the 2017 update at the request of the NMC Builders. That action eliminated any purpose for the name *Old Model Colony* and thus this area was renamed as the *General City.* All references to the previous names have been removed, save for any technical report or plan that specifically has those names in the title.

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 2000-01 Report's intent to include a significant amount of detail such as a complete list of all 381 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 83% 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 17% 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. However, make no mistake about it, the amount of and complexity of any infrastructure defines (in part or all) of the level of service (LOS). This makes the one-time DIF financing of any City's infrastructure that much more important. It takes a balance to accommodate development with the police responses within the

desired standard. It will take additional properly equipped officers, law enforcement station space, response and support vehicles and specialty equipment. 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. 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 and D of this Report.

RCS staff has worked with Financial 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 streetlights, 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 estimate has been updated based on an appraisal of recent City land transactions. Arguments for higher or lower costs can be made; however, the herein contained per acre amount(s) 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, had not been altered from the last (2014) update until this report. However, City finance staff has indicated that land acquisition costs will continue to be reviewed periodically 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 "0n-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.

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,

2 Not unlike a private corporation.

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 $55.4 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. 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. The 2019 update did not address any changes to Table 2-1 Land Use Database on page 14.

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, 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 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 the General City and the Ontario Ranch.

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 number 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 31,188 residential units with an average maximum density of 18 dwelling units per acre. TOP approval increased the density up to 25 dwelling units per acre in the Medium Density Residential category and provided densities up to 65 dwelling units per acre in the Mixed-Use categories. The net result is the total number of residential units increased by almost 16,000 to 47,092 and the projected population increased from 101,845 to 162,517 people.

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 and Ontario Ranch	Existing Development		Potential Development		Total General Plan Build-out	
	Acres	# of Units	Acres	# of Units	Acres	# of Units
Detached Dwellings	4,652.57	25,056	2,889.79	17,774	7,542.36	42,830
Attached Dwellings	836.84	12,045	935.31	27,699	1,772.15	39,744
High Density Dwellings	1.00	40	337.00	13,615	338.00	13,655
Mobile Home Dwellings	193.00	2,511	1.00	13	194.00	2,524
Commercial Lodging Units	38.50	4,338	10.00	436	48.50	4,774
Retail/Service Uses	928.70	9,709,001	506.67	18,064,000	1,435.37	27,773,001
Office Uses	42.00	914,760	583.65	26,386,000	625.65	27,300,760
Business Park Uses	80.00	1,306,800	805.51	16,222,000	885.51	17,528,800
Industrial Uses	6,426.00	125,962,452	877.13	38,484,000	7,303.13	164,446,452
Institutional Use	127.00	2,766,060	2.00	43,560	129.00	2,809,620
Total - City Limits	**13,325.61**		**6,948.06**		**20,273.67**	
Private Residences	**5,683.41**	**39,652**	**4,163.10**	**59,101**	**9,846.51**	**98,753**
Commercial Lodging Rooms	**38.50**	**4,338**	**10.00**	**436**	**48.50**	**4,774**
Business Square Feet	**7,603.70**	**140,659,073**	**2,774.96**	**99,199,560**	**10,378.66**	**239,858,633**

Land-use Database within the 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	4,638.80	24,894	(112.73)	(610)	4,526.07	24,284
Attached Dwellings	827.20	11,870	115.22	4,580	942.42	16,450
High Density Dwellings	1.00	40	199.15	8,322	200.15	8,362
Mobile Home Dwellings	193.00	2,511	1.00	13	194.00	2,524
Commercial Lodging Units	38.50	4,338	1.00	40	39.50	4,378
Retail/Service Uses	928.70	9,709,001	147.73	11,792,000	1,076.43	21,501,001
Office Uses	42.00	914,760	275.00	16,112,000	317.00	17,026,760
Business Park Uses	80.00	1,306,800	139.65	2,842,000	219.65	4,148,800
Industrial Uses	6,426.00	125,962,452	643.90	32,045,000	7,069.90	158,007,452
Institutional Use	127.00	2,766,060	1.00	21,780	128.00	2,787,840
Sub-total - General City	**13,302.20**		**1,410.92**		**14,713.12**	

Land-use Database within the 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	13.77	162	3,002.52	18,384	3,016.29	18,546
Attached Dwellings	9.64	175	820.09	23,119	829.73	23,294
High Density Dwellings	0.00	0	137.85	5,293	137.85	5,293
Mobile Home Dwellings	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0
Commercial Lodging Units	0.00	0	9.00	396	9.00	396
Retail/Service Uses	0.00	0	358.94	6,272,000	358.94	6,272,000
Office Uses	0.00	0	308.65	10,274,000	308.65	10,274,000
Business Park Uses	0.00	0	665.86	13,380,000	665.86	13,380,000
Industrial Uses	0.00	0	233.23	6,439,000	233.23	6,439,000
Institutional Use	0.00	0	1.00	21,780	1.00	21,780
Sub-total - Ontario Ranch	**23.41**		**5,537.14**		**5,560.55**	

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 are 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 13,325.61 acres of privately-held developed land within the City's current City boundaries. Conversely, there remain 6,948.06 acres of vacant or substantially undeveloped land in the City, with most of it, some 5,537.14 acres, in Ontario Ranch. Acreage designated for Detached Dwelling development constitutes the greatest amount (14.3%) 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	4,652.57	22.9%	2,889.79	14.3%	7,542.36
Attached Dwelling Units	836.84	4.1%	935.31	4.6%	1,772.15
High Density Dwelling Units	1.00	0.0%	337.00	1.7%	338.00
Mobile Home Dwelling Units	193.00	1.0%	1.00	0.0%	194.00
Commercial Lodging Units	38.50	0.2%	10.00	0.0%	48.50
Retail/Service Uses	928.70	4.6%	506.67	2.5%	1,435.37
Office Uses	42.00	0.2%	583.65	2.9%	625.65
Business Park Uses	80.00	0.4%	805.51	4.0%	885.51
Industrial Uses	6,426.00	31.7%	877.13	4.3%	7,303.13
Institutional Uses	127.00	0.6%	2.00	0.0%	129.00
Total Acres	13,325.61	65.7%	6,948.06	34.3%	20,273.67

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 189,071 to 197,456 additional residents (3) to the City of Ontario, joining the 166,134 citizens already living in City, resulting in a total estimated population at build-out (based upon the inclusion of existing City limits) of approximately 359,398 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 359,398 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 359,398 (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

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

will increase from recent historical levels. Given that the Ontario Ranch area has some 5,500 net acres to develop, this latter scenario is probably more likely to occur. As the residentially 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 01/01/12 Population	**166,134**

G.P. Build-out Population At Historic Occupancy Rates	*Anticipated Units*	*Occupancy Rate*	*Probable Occupancy*	*Dwelling Density*	*Anticipated Population*
Potential Detached Dwellings	17,774	97.69%	17,363	3.806	66,084
Potential Attached Dwellings	27,699	93.98%	26,032	3.373	87,806
Potential High Density Dwellings	13,615	96.71%	13,167	2.669	35,143
Potential Mobile Home Dwellings	13	93.72%	12	3.175	38

Population to be Added Via Development at Historic Occupancy Rates	189,071	189,071
Current State of California Department of Finance Population		166,134
Potential "Build-out" Population, at Historic Vacancy Rates.		355,205

G.P. Build-out Population At 100% Occupancy Rate	*Anticipated Units*	*Occupancy Rate*	*Probable Occupancy*	*Dwelling Density*	*Anticipated Population*
Potential Detached Dwellings	17,774	100.00%	17,774	3.806	67,648
Potential Attached Dwellings	27,699	100.00%	27,699	3.373	93,429
Potential High Density Dwellings	13,615	100.00%	13,615	2.669	36,338
Potential Mobile Home Dwellings	13	100.00%	13	3.175	41

Population to be Added Via Development at 100% Occupancy	197,456	197,456
Current State of California Department of Finance Population		166,134
Potential Maximum "Build-out" Population.		363,590

Population at General Plan Build-out @ Low per Dwelling Resident Densities	355,205
Population at General Plan Build-out @ High per Dwelling Resident Densities	363,590
Average Population at General Plan Build-out	359,398

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

City staff and RCS have identified over $3.60 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 71.9% or about $2.59 billion of the total project list is required as the result of accommodating development. Less than 2% of the identified development-generated capital projects can be funded by an existing balance in the various existing DIF receipts (or fund balance). Table 2-5 indicates the capital project costs by area.

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

Infrastructure Type	General City	Ontario Ranch	Total - All Projects
Law Enforcement	$27,401,977	$36,521,791	$63,923,768
Fire Suppression	$30,528,836	$81,986,501	$112,515,337
Circulation System	$376,082,842	$843,497,513	$1,219,580,355
Storm Drainage	$92,991,201	$289,549,860	$382,541,061
Water System	$121,455,009	$539,153,139	$660,608,148
Sewer System	$43,134,175	$73,357,940	$116,492,115
Refuse Collection	$10,664,610	$31,333,508	$41,998,118
General Government	$7,866,160	$22,073,281	$29,939,441
Library Expansion	$11,823,710	$54,153,728	$65,977,438
Public Meeting Space	$13,020,727	$59,647,020	$72,667,747
Aquatics Facilities	$2,153,526	$9,886,474	$12,040,000
Park Land Development	$123,984,210	$567,944,212	$691,928,422
Land Use Settlement	$0	$24,124,064	$24,124,064
Fiber Optic System	$0	$104,180,169	$104,180,169
Sub-total DIF Related	$861,106,984	$2,737,409,199	$3,598,516,183
Non-DIF Related Projects			$939,681,260
Total - All Projects			$4,538,197,443

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 area's development-generated capital facilities by raising upwards to $2.5 billion in new DIF revenues (to be combined with the existing DIF fund balance of $55.4 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	$32,623/Unit
Attached Dwelling Unit	$24,392/Unit
High Density Dwelling Unit	$18,122/Unit
Mobile Home Dwelling Unit	$23,567/Unit
Commercial Lodging Keyed Unit	$4,888/Unit
Retail/Service Uses Square Foot	$7.505/S.F.
Office Uses Square Foot	$6.351/S.F.
Business Park Uses Square Foot	$6.671/S.F.
Industrial Uses square Foot	$3.460/S.F.
Institutional Use Square Foot	$6.557/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	$41,082/Unit
Attached Dwelling Units	$27,878/Unit
High Density Dwelling Units	$20,563/Unit
Commercial Lodging Units	$8,984/Unit
Retail/Service Uses	$17.692/Unit
Office Uses	$13.264/S.F.
Business Park Uses	$12.091/S.F.
Industrial Uses	$7.420/S.F.
Institutional Uses	$12.114/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 (amended in 2019)
CHAPTER 4 - Fire Suppression Facilities, Vehicles, and Equipment (amended in 2019)
CHAPTER 5 - Circulation (Streets, Signals and Bridges) System (amended in 2019)
CHAPTER 6 - Storm Drainage Collection System Facilities (amended in 2019)
CHAPTER 7 - Water Source, Storage and Distribution (amended in 2019)

CHAPTER 8 - Sewer Collection System (amended in 2019)
CHAPTER 9 - Refuse Collection Facilities and Equipment (amended in 2019)
CHAPTER 10 - General Facilities, Vehicles and Equipment (amended in 2019)
CHAPTER 11 - Library Facilities and Collection Items (amended in 2019)
CHAPTER 12 - Public Use (Community Center) Facilities (amended in 2019)
CHAPTER 13 - Aquatics Facilities (amended in 2019)
CHAPTER 14 - Park Land Acquisition and Park Facilities Development (amended in 2019)
CHAPTER 15 - Ontario Ranch Open Space Land Acquisition
CHAPTER 16 - Fiber Optics Communication System (amended in 2017)

APPENDIX A - Summary of Recommendations.
APPENDIX B - Expanded Land-use Database.
APPENDIX C - Detailed Distribution of Common City Yard Improvement Costs.
APPENDIX D - New and General City Development Impact Fee Policies

NOTE: Amendments made in 2019 were made in all DIF category chapters except Chapter 15, Ontario Ranch Species, Habitat Conservation and Open Space Mitigation, and Chapter 16, Ontario Ranch Fiber Optics Communication System.

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's 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 2019 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 (1)	Storm Drainage Facilities (1)	Water Distribution Facilities (1)	Sewer Collection Facilities (1)	Refuse Collection Equipment	General Government Facilities
	Schedule 3.2	Schedule 4.2	Schedule 5.2	Schedule 6.4	Schedule 7.2	Schedule 8.2	Schedule 9.1	Schedule 10.2
Calculated Development Impact Costs								
Detached Dwellings	$405	$317	$2,439	$3,404	$7,473	$1,384	$699	$610
Attached Dwellings	$362	$265	$1,629	$1,094	$5,109	$1,211	$509	$127
High Density Dwellings	$362	$265	$1,008	$508	$3,447	$1,038	$255	$93
Mobile Home Dwellings	$195	$278	$1,269	$1,449	$5,109	$1,212	$509	$289
Commercial Lodging Units	$149	$135	$1,287	$191	$2,060	$807	$173	$86
Retail/Service Uses	$0.561	$0.278	$4.929	$1.062	$0.379	$0.065	$0.126	$0.105
Office Uses	$0.748	$1.132	$2.817	$0.395	$0.797	$0.295	$0.084	$0.083
Business Park Uses	$0.240	$0.173	$2.931	$1.092	$1.485	$0.340	$0.224	$0.186
Industrial Uses	$0.014	$0.013	$1.510	$1.002	$0.552	$0.185	$0.098	$0.086
Institutional Use	$0.102	$0.083	$3.219	$1.028	$1.387	$0.391	$0.175	$0.172
Potential Collection with Recommended Impact Fee Schedule								
Detached Dwellings	-$247,050	-$193,370	-$1,487,790	-$2,076,440	-$4,558,530	-$844,240	-$426,390	-$372,100
Attached Dwellings	$1,657,960	$1,213,700	$7,460,820	$5,010,520	$23,399,220	$5,546,380	$2,331,220	$581,660
High Density Dwellings	$3,012,564	$2,205,330	$8,388,576	$4,227,576	$28,685,934	$8,638,236	$2,122,110	$773,946
Mobile Home Dwellings	$2,535	$3,614	$16,497	$18,837	$66,417	$15,756	$6,617	$3,757
Commercial Lodging Units	$5,960	$5,400	$51,480	$7,640	$82,400	$32,280	$6,920	$3,440
Retail/Service Uses	$6,615,312	$3,278,176	$58,122,768	$12,523,104	$4,469,168	$766,480	$1,485,792	$1,238,160
Office Uses	$12,051,776	$18,238,784	$45,387,504	$6,364,240	$12,841,264	$4,753,040	$1,353,408	$1,337,296
Business Park Uses	$682,080	$491,666	$8,329,902	$3,103,464	$4,220,370	$966,280	$636,608	$528,612
Industrial Uses	$448,630	$416,585	$48,387,950	$32,109,090	$17,688,840	$5,928,325	$3,140,410	$2,755,870
Institutional Use	$2,222	$1,808	$70,110	$22,390	$30,209	$8,516	$3,812	$3,746
Total	$24,231,989	$25,661,693	$174,727,817	$61,310,421	$86,925,292	$25,811,053	$10,660,507	$6,854,387
Potential GC DIF Receipts	$24,231,989	$25,661,693	$174,727,817	$61,310,421	$86,925,292	$25,811,053	$10,660,507	$6,854,387
Fund Balance and Other Rev.	$109,071	$141,378	$16,307,216	$17,171,088	$7,235,811	$2,987,878	$0	$261,099
Potential OR DIF Receipts (2.2)	$32,296,780	$68,915,579	$391,888,336	$190,904,339	$385,871,644	$43,896,647	$31,321,452	$19,234,140
Required Capital Total	$63,923,768	$112,515,337	$1,219,580,355	$382,541,061	$660,608,148	$116,492,115	$41,998,118	$29,939,441
Over or (Under) Collection	-$7,285,928	-$17,796,687	-$636,656,986	-$113,155,213	-$180,575,401	-$43,796,537	-$16,159	-$3,589,815

(1) This infrastructure was amended during the 2016-17 Fiscal Year Update.

Schedule 2.1

City of Ontario, General City, at General Plan Maintenance Costs, Reflecting 2019 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 Schedule 11.1	Public Meeting Facilities Schedule 12.1	Aquatics Center Facilities Schedule 13.1	Parkland Facilities Development Schedule 14.1	Open Space Agreement (Non-DIF) Schedule 15.1	Fiber Optic System (1) Schedule 16.1	Development Impact Fee Total Per Unit or Square Feet
Calculated Development Impact Costs							
Detached Dwellings	$1,270	$1,386	$93	$13,143	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	$32,623 per Unit
Attached Dwellings	$1,126	$1,228	$83	$11,649	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	$24,392 per Unit
High Density Dwellings	$891	$972	$65	$9,218	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	$18,122 per Unit
Mobile Home Dwellings	$1,059	$1,156	$77	$10,965	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	$23,567 per Unit
Commercial Lodging Units	No Fee	No Fee	No Fee	No Fee	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	$4,888 per Unit
Retail/Service Uses	No Fee	No Fee	No Fee	No Fee	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	$7.505 per S.F.
Office Uses	No Fee	No Fee	No Fee	No Fee	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	$6.351 per S.F.
Business Park Uses	No Fee	No Fee	No Fee	No Fee	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	$6.671 per S.F.
Industrial Uses	No Fee	No Fee	No Fee	No Fee	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	$3.460 per S.F.
Institutional Use	No Fee	No Fee	No Fee	No Fee	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	$6.557 per S.F.
Potential Collection with Recommended Impact Fee Schedule							
Detached Dwellings	-$774,700	-$845,460	-$56,730	-$8,017,230	$0	$0	-$19,900,030
Attached Dwellings	$5,157,080	$5,624,240	$380,140	$53,352,420	$0	$0	$111,715,360
High Density Dwellings	$7,414,902	$8,088,984	$540,930	$76,712,196	$0	$0	$150,811,284
Mobile Home Dwellings	$13,767	$15,028	$1,001	$142,545	$0	$0	$306,371
Commercial Lodging Units	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$195,520
Retail/Service Uses	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$88,498,960
Office Uses	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$102,327,312
Business Park Uses	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$18,958,982
Industrial Uses	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$110,875,700
Institutional Use	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$142,813
Total	$11,811,049	$12,882,792	$865,341	$122,189,931	$0	$0	$563,932,272
Probable GC DIF Receipts	$11,811,049	$12,882,792	$865,341	$122,189,931	$0	$0	$563,932,272
Fund Balance/Other Revenues	$70,652	$769,803	$100,562	$10,013,474	$203,619	$15,231	$55,386,882
Potential OR DIF Receipts (2.2)	$54,095,737	$59,015,152	$3,972,634	$559,725,017	$23,923,528	$104,156,971	$1,969,217,956
Required Capital Total	$65,977,438	$72,667,747	$12,040,000	$691,928,422	$24,124,064	$104,180,169	$3,598,516,183
Over or (Under) Collection	$0	$0	-$7,101,463	$0	$3,083	-$7,967	-$1,009,979,073

(1) This infrastructure was amended during the 2016-17 Fiscal Year Update.

Schedule 2.2

City of Ontario, Ontario Ranch, at General Plan Maintenance Costs, Reflecting 2019 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	$405	$746	$4,847	$5,335	$8,997	$902	$699	$610
Attached Dwellings	$362	$627	$3,237	$1,211	$4,939	$684	$509	$127
High Density Dwellings	$362	$627	$2,002	$988	$2,621	$413	$255	$93
Commercial Lodging Units	$149	$312	$2,556	$862	$3,780	$527	$173	$86
Retail/Service Uses	$0.561	$0.657	$9.794	$2.171	$3.484	$0.194	$0.126	$0.105
Office Uses	$0.748	$2.674	$5.598	$1.140	$1.879	$0.339	$0.084	$0.083
Business Park Uses	$0.240	$0.409	$5.824	$1.835	$2.662	$0.224	$0.224	$0.186
Industrial Uses	$0.014	$0.030	$3.002	$1.450	$2.189	$0.218	$0.098	$0.086
Institutional Use	$0.102	$0.196	$6.396	$1.838	$2.167	$0.262	$0.175	$0.172
Potential Collection with Recommended Impact Fee Schedule								
Detached Dwellings	$7,445,520	$13,714,464	$89,107,248	$98,078,640	$165,400,848	$16,582,368	$12,850,416	$11,214,240
Attached Dwellings	$8,369,078	$14,495,613	$74,836,203	$27,997,109	$114,184,741	$15,813,396	$11,767,571	$2,936,113
High Density Dwellings	$1,916,066	$3,318,711	$10,596,586	$5,229,484	$13,872,953	$2,186,009	$1,349,715	$492,249
Mobile Home Dwellings	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0
Commercial Lodging Units	$59,004	$123,552	$1,012,176	$341,352	$1,496,880	$208,692	$68,508	$34,056
Retail/Service Uses	$3,518,592	$4,120,704	$61,427,968	$13,616,512	$21,851,648	$1,216,768	$790,272	$658,560
Office Uses	$7,684,952	$27,472,676	$57,513,852	$11,712,360	$19,304,846	$3,482,886	$863,016	$852,742
Business Park Uses	$3,211,200	$5,472,420	$77,925,120	$24,552,300	$35,617,560	$2,997,120	$2,997,120	$2,488,680
Industrial Uses	$90,146	$193,170	$19,329,878	$9,336,550	$14,094,971	$1,403,702	$631,022	$553,754
Institutional Use	$2,222	$4,269	$139,305	$40,032	$47,197	$5,706	$3,812	$3,746
Total	$32,296,780	$68,915,579	$391,888,336	$190,904,339	$385,871,644	$43,896,647	$31,321,452	$19,234,140
Potential OR DIF Collection	$32,296,780	$68,915,579	$391,888,336	$190,904,339	$385,871,644	$43,896,647	$31,321,452	$19,234,140
Existing Fund Balance/Other	$109,071	$141,378	$16,307,216	$17,171,088	$7,235,811	$2,987,878	$0	$ 261,099
Potential GC DIF Collection (2.1)	$24,231,989	$25,661,693	$174,727,817	$61,310,421	$86,925,292	$25,811,053	$10,660,507	$6,854,387
Required Capital Total	$63,923,768	$112,515,337	$1,219,580,355	$382,541,061	$660,608,148	$116,492,115	$41,998,118	$29,939,441
Over or (Under) Collection	-$7,285,928	-$17,796,687	-$636,656,986	-$113,155,213	-$180,575,401	-$43,796,537	-$16,159	-$3,589,815

Schedule 2.2

City of Ontario, Ontario Ranch, at General Plan Maintenance Costs, Reflecting 2019 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 Schedule 11.1	Public Meeting Facilities Schedule 12.1	Aquatics Center Facilities Schedule 13.1	Parkland Facilities Development Schedule 14.1	Open Space Agreement (Non-DIF) Schedule 15.1	Fiber Optic System Schedule 16.2	Development Impact Cost Per Dwelling Unit or Business Square Feet
Calculated Development Impact Costs/Fees							
Detached Dwellings	$1,270	$1,386	$93	$13,143	$706	$1,943	$41,082 per Unit
Attached Dwellings	$1,126	$1,228	$83	$11,649	$153	$1,943	$27,878 per Unit
High Density Dwellings	$891	$972	$65	$9,218	$113	$1,943	$20,563 per Unit
Commercial Lodging Units	No Fee	No Fee	No Fee	No Fee	$98	$441	$8,984 per Unit
Retail/Service Uses	No Fee	No Fee	No Fee	No Fee	$0.247	$0.353	$17.692 per S.F.
Office Uses	No Fee	No Fee	No Fee	No Fee	$0.130	$0.589	$13.264 per S.F.
Business Park Uses	No Fee	No Fee	No Fee	No Fee	$0.215	$0.272	$12.091 per S.F.
Industrial Uses	No Fee	No Fee	No Fee	No Fee	$0.156	$0.177	$7.420 per S.F.
Institutional Use	No Fee	No Fee	No Fee	No Fee	$0.198	$0.608	$12.114 per S.F.
Potential Collection with Recommended Impact Fee Schedule							
Detached Dwellings	$23,347,680	$25,480,224	$1,709,712	$241,620,912	$12,979,104	$35,720,112	$755,251,488
Attached Dwellings	$26,031,994	$28,390,132	$1,918,877	$269,313,231	$3,537,207	$44,920,217	$644,511,482
High Density Dwellings	$4,716,063	$5,144,796	$344,045	$48,790,874	$598,109	$10,284,299	$108,839,959
Mobile Home Dwellings	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0
Commercial Lodging Units	$0	$0	$0	$0	$38,808	$174,636	$3,557,664
Retail/Service Uses	$0	$0	$0	$0	$1,549,184	$2,214,016	$110,964,224
Office Uses	$0	$0	$0	$0	$1,335,620	$6,051,386	$136,274,336
Business Park Uses	$0	$0	$0	$0	$2,876,700	$3,639,360	$161,777,580
Industrial Uses	$0	$0	$0	$0	$1,004,484	$1,139,703	$47,777,380
Institutional Use	$0	$0	$0	$0	$4,312	$13,242	$263,843
Total	$54,095,737	$59,015,152	$3,972,634	$559,725,017	$23,923,528	$104,156,971	$1,969,217,956
Potential OR DIF Collection	$54,095,737	$59,015,152	$3,972,634	$559,725,017	$23,923,528	$104,156,971	$1,969,217,956
Existing Fund Balance/Other	$70,652	$769,803	$100,562	$10,013,474	$203,619	$15,231	$55,386,882
Potential GC DIF Collection (2.1)	$11,811,049	$12,882,792	$865,341	$122,189,931	$0	$0	$563,932,272
Required Capital Total	$65,977,438	$72,667,747	$12,040,000	$691,928,422	$24,124,064	$104,180,169	$3,598,516,183
Over or (Under) Collection	$0	$0	-$7,101,463	$0	$3,083	-$7,967	-$1,009,979,073

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 175,000 square foot facility on roughly 20 acres at 2500 South Archibald Avenue. The building was specifically purchased due to its excess capacity and its ability to absorb many additional sworn officers as significant development occurs.

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 the burglar not been arrested he/she may have broken into your unit 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 by the knowledge 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 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 number 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 property and sales tax 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 expand 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. The projects include:

LE-001, Police Station Purchase and Interior Improvements – 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 $23.1 million is split proportionally between the existing calls-for-service (32.14%) and the calls-for-service generated by new development at General Plan build-out (67.86%). The facility space demands are based upon a minimum standard of 250 square feet per officer.

LE-002, Additional Police Station Space – The existing station can meet the needs of 700 officers at 250 square feet per officer. In order to maintain the existing level of service, the department will need to have 751 officers or 51 over the capacity of the existing facility. This additional capacity would provide for 12,750 square feet for the additional officers required over 700 officers (51 officer X 250 S.F./officer).

LE-003, Additional Patrol/Detectives/Specialty/Staff Vehicles – This project is the acquisition of 491 assorted law enforcement vehicles in order to maintain the existing 0.9333 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 are included at $4,571 per officer.

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, and other specialty equipment.

LE-006, Acquire Multi-Channel Portable Radios – The additional 526 officers will need radios sets at about $8,800 each.

LE-007, Emergency Services Communication System – Establish a 700 MHz five site simulcast mixed mode communication system for the City's undeveloped areas. This project has ½ of the costs of the system with the remaining ½ of the costs placed in Fire Suppression (FS-020).

LE-008, Additional Helicopter Capacity – The City's helicopter program capacity will be overwhelmed with the proposed addition of 59,000 dwelling units and 100,000,000 square feet of business use space. The capacity of an additional helicopter will be required to maintain the existing level of service.

LE-009, 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-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 $2.4 million is law enforcement's portion of the $45.2 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.

[This space left vacant 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	25,056	16,047	0.640/Unit
Attached Dwelling Units (a)	12,045	6,889	0.572/Unit
Mobile Home Dwelling Units	2,511	868	0.346/Unit
Commercial Lodging Units	4,338	1,030	0.237/Unit
Retail/Service Uses	9,709,001	8,615	0.887/KSF
Office Uses	914,760	1,082	1.183/KSF
Business Park Uses	1,306,800	495	0.379/KSF
Industrial Uses	125,962,452	2,735	0.022/KSF
Institutional Uses	2,766,060	463	0.167/KSF

(a) Includes forty (40) High Density Dwelling Units.

As an example, there were approximately 16,047 calls-for-service that generated a response to one of the 25,056 detached dwelling units in the City. The result indicates that, on average, each dwelling will generate just over 0.640 calls per year. The same analysis was undertaken for most land uses, with the limited exception that attached dwelling units and forty high density dwelling units were combined. Since these calls-for-service by land use are an average, they were used to project the number of additional calls that could be expected by multiplying the calls per residential unit or business acre by the number of anticipated numbers 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 officer 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 89,354, were then divided by the number of calls-for-service that a single officer can absorb.

The existing complement of 225 sworn officers currently absorbs the 38,247 annual calls by responding to just over 170 calls-for-service each to privately-owned and developed parcels annually. Based upon the addition of 89,354 calls-for-service, the City will need to successfully recruit 526 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*** level of service. To adequately mobilize the 526 new sworn officers, the City will need to add 491 response vehicles at a total cost of $14,757,250 to maintain the existing ratio of 0.9333 vehicles

per sworn officer (210 vehicles divided by 225 officers) and for the personnel recruitment and equipment at a combined cost of $2,404,083 (526 officers X $4,571 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 feet, along with the 12,500 square feet in LE-002, will meet the needs for operations space (and location) through General Plan build-out. The build-out complement of 751 sworn officers, (225 current and 526 projected) will allow for an average of about 250 square foot per officer. Detail regarding the full acquisition cost of the existing police station construction is outlined in *Master Facilities Project* detail page identified as LE-001 and LE-002. The relationship for each project is identified on the individual detail project pages in the MFP.

Basic Needs-based Fees. Table 3-2, following, summarizes the resulting DIFs (from Schedule 3.2) for development to contribute $56,515,430 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	$7,194,563	$405/Unit
Attached Dwelling Units	$10,021,157	$362/Unit
High Density Dwelling Units	$4,925,825	$362/Unit
Mobile Home Units	$2,530	$195/Unit
Commercial Lodging Units	$65,146	$149/Unit
Retail/Service Uses	$10,134,373	$0.561/S.F.
Office Uses	$19,743,147	$0.748/S.F.
Business Park Uses	$3,888,543	$0.240/S.F.
Industrial Uses	$535,718	$0.014/S.F.
Institutional Uses	$4,427	$0.102/S.F.

Existing Financial Commitment Comparison Costs. The City invested about $20.8 million in the outright purchase and the remodeling (to date) 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 210 assorted vehicles with various added extra equipment costing a total of $5,737,868 for an average cost of about $27,323 per vehicle. The inventory of 210 vehicles consists of 133 standard response vehicles and 77 staff/specialty vehicles. The existing 225 sworn officers each have assigned equipment such as various leathers, armament, clothing and safety apparel costing some $4,155 per sworn officer or a combined $934,875. Existing hand-held communications equipment has a replacement cost of approximately $2,864,000. The helicopter program has assets with a replacement cost of approximately $2,639,350. Lastly, there is $2,183,700 invested in land-based communications equipment, specialty equipment and computer workstations. Combined, the City has invested, at current dollars, some $35,268,864 into the law enforcement services including the $109,071 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 150%) 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	$16,988,265	$678/Unit
Attached Dwelling Units	$7,293,215	$605/Unit
High Density Dwelling Units	$24,220	$605/Unit
Mobile Home Dwelling Units	$918,914	$366/Unit
Commercial Lodging Units	$1,090,416	$251/Unit
Retail/Service Uses	$9,120,328	$0.939/S.F.
Office Uses	$1,145,467	$1.252/S.F.
Business Park Uses	$524,035	$0.401/S.F.
Industrial Uses	$2,895,426	$0.023/S.F.
Institutional Uses	$490,158	$0.177/S.F.

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
2019 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 Interior Improvements	$23,048,162	32.14%	$7,408,338	67.86%	$15,639,824
LE-002	Additional Police Station Space	$8,514,833	0.00%	$0	100.00%	$8,514,833
LE-003	Additional Patrol/Detective/Specialty/Staff Vehicles	$14,757,250	0.00%	$0	100.00%	$14,757,250
LE-004	Additional Officer Assigned Equipment	$2,404,083	0.00%	$0	100.00%	$2,404,083
LE-005	Additional Specialty Equipment	$1,100,000	0.00%	$0	100.00%	$1,100,000
LE-006	Acquire Multi-Channel Portable Radios	$4,628,800	0.00%	$0	100.00%	$4,628,800
LE-007	Emergency Services Communication System	$3,024,252	0.00%	$0	100.00%	$3,024,252
LE-008	Additional Helicopter Capacity	$3,025,000	0.00%	$0	100.00%	$3,025,000
LE-009	Advanced Technology Software And Equipment	$1,056,000	0.00%	$0	100.00%	$1,056,000
LE-010	Share of Common City Yard Improvements	$2,365,388	0.00%	$0	100.00%	$2,365,388
	Sub-Total General Plan Total New Project Costs	$63,923,768	11.59%	$7,408,338	88.41%	$56,515,430
	LESS:					
	Development Impact Fee Fund Balance	$109,071	100.00%	$109,071	0.00%	$0
	Total General Plan Total New Project Costs	$63,814,697	11.44%	$7,299,267	88.56%	$56,515,430
						Forward to Schedule 3.2

NOTES:
1. Costs distributed based upon recent actual twelve month Police Department "Calls-for-Service" statistics.

Schedule 3.2

City of Ontario
2019 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	2,889.79	17,774	0.640	11,375	12.73%	$7,194,563	$2,490	6.15	***$405 per Unit***
Attached Dwellings	935.31	27,699	0.572	15,844	17.73%	$10,021,157	$10,714	29.61	***$362 per Unit***
High Density Dwellings	337.00	13,615	0.572	7,788	8.72%	$4,925,825	$14,617	40.40	***$362 per Unit***
Mobile Home Dwellings	1.00	13	0.346	4	0.00%	$2,530	$2,530	13.00	***$195 per Unit***
Commercial Lodging Units	10.00	436	0.237	103	0.12%	$65,146	$6,515	43.60	***$149 per Unit***
Retail/Service Uses	506.67	18,064,000	0.887	16,023	17.93%	$10,134,373	$20,002	35,652	***$0.561 per S.F.***
Office Uses	583.65	26,386,000	1.183	31,215	34.93%	$19,743,147	$33,827	45,209	***$0.748 per S.F.***
Business Park Uses	805.51	16,222,000	0.379	6,148	6.88%	$3,888,543	$4,827	20,139	***$0.240 per S.F.***
Industrial Uses	877.13	38,484,000	0.022	847	0.95%	$535,718	$611	43,875	***$0.014 per S.F.***
Institutional Use	2.00	43,560	0.167	7	0.01%	$4,427	$2,214	21,780	***$0.102 per S.F.***
TOTAL	**6,948.06**	**--**	**--**	**89,354**	**100.00%**	**$56,515,430 in Total Equity in Current Law Enforcement Assets**			

Schedule 3.3

City of Ontario
2019 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	4,652.57	25,056	0.640	16,047	41.96%	$16,988,265	$3,651	5.39	*$678 per Unit*
Attached Dwellings	836.84	12,045	0.572	6,889	18.01%	$7,293,215	$8,715	14.39	*$605 per Unit*
High Density Dwellings	1.00	40	0.572	23	0.06%	$24,220	$24,220	40.00	*$605 per Unit*
Mobile Home Dwellings	193.00	2,511	0.346	868	2.27%	$918,914	$4,761	13.01	*$366 per Unit*
Commercial Lodging Units	38.50	4,338	0.237	1,030	2.69%	$1,090,416	$28,323	112.68	*$251 per Unit*
Retail/Service Uses	928.70	9,709,001	0.887	8,615	22.52%	$9,120,328	$9,821	10,454	*$0.939 per S.F.*
Office Uses	42.00	914,760	1.183	1,082	2.83%	$1,145,467	$27,273	21,780	*$1.252 per S.F.*
Business Park Uses	80.00	1,306,800	0.379	495	1.29%	$524,035	$6,550	16,335	*$0.401 per S.F.*
Industrial Uses	6,426.00	125,962,452	0.022	2,735	7.15%	$2,895,426	$451	19,602	*$0.023 per S.F.*
Institutional Use	127.00	2,766,060	0.167	463	1.21%	$490,158	$3,860	21,780	*$0.177 per S.F.*
TOTAL	13,325.61	--	--	38,247	100.00%	$40,490,444	Total Law Enforcement System Capital Assets		

$24,585,600	in Law Enforcement Facility Assets
$1,028,363	in Law Enforcement Officer Equipment Assets
$6,311,655	in Law Enforcement Vehicles Assets
$2,402,070	in Computer/Electronic Equipment Assets
$3,150,400	in Personal Communications Equipment Assets
$2,903,285	in Helicopter Program Equipment/Assets.
$109,071	in Existing Law Enforcement DIF Fund Balance

DIF Land-use Type	Units or Acres	Calls for Service	Annual Calls Per Unit
Attached Dwellings	12,045	6,889	0.572
High Density Dwellings	40	23	0.572
Average Calls-for-Service	12,085	6,912	0.572

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 eight (8) existing stations 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 eight 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. Station #3 houses the Hazardous materials Team and response unit.

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.

The **Training Center** is located at 1408 East Francis adjacent to Station #3 on a 154,240 square foot parcel and consists of 2,500 square feet of classrooms and offices and 3,000 square feet of apparatus and storage bays and numerous training exercise implements and props. The site no longer has the training tower due to construction/aging safety issues.

The land and replacement construction costs of the existing stations and training facilities is approximately $74,917,160. 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;
- Thirteen fire engines, one brush engine and one water tender;
- Seven SUV type staff vehicles;
- Ten sedan type staff vehicles;
- Three pick-up truck utility vehicles;
- Four utility trucks/flatbed/trailer;
- One Bomb Squad, one Hazmat Squad, one Technical Rescue Squad, and one Mobile Command Post; and,
- One Bomb trailer, one Investigations trailer, and one Fire Safety House trailer.

The total investment in the vehicle compliment is about $19,680,000. State or County vehicles and equipment are not included in the financial commitment figure. The City's fire-fighter assigned equipment and successful psychological/back-ground checks, at $9,734 per fire-fighter, is approximately $1,323,824 total for the existing staff of one hundred and thirty-six fire fighters. The Urban Search and Rescue (USAR), hazardous materials (HazMat) and Bomb Squads have specialty equipment of approximately $1.0 million. Lastly, the Fire Suppression Facility, Vehicle and Equipment Impact Fee fund balance is $141,378.

The current financial commitment or investment, in fire stations, training facilities, response fleet with specialty equipment and fund balance is a sizable $97,062,362. This figure represents what it would cost to establish the existing Department response capability 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, FS-003, FS-005, FS-007 and FS-009 - Land acquisition and construction of five new 9,445 square foot stations, each of which would be located in the Ontario Ranch area of the City where approximately 46,796 detached, attached and high density dwelling units and 36.4 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 five stations would be approximately 9,445 square feet each with one having an additional 300 square feet to house the

Battalion Chief for this area. Each has estimated land acquisition/construction cost of approximately $7.8 million each. One station has added space for a battalion chief.

FS-004, FS-006, FS-008, FS-010 - Each of the previously referenced stations would need a basic response engine at $770,000. **FS-02** is an actual amount based upon previous contributions from OR developers where a portion may need to be reimbursed to those having made that excess contribution. The contribution was a fully outfitted engine and a contribution to advancing the City's truck replacement program.

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

FS-012, Aerial Response Truck - The Ontario Ranch area will require an aerial response vehicle for the additional over-width and over-height structures anticipated to be constructed.

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 99 fire-fighters will be needed for the Ontario Ranch area and will require personally assigned equipment.

FS-015, Fire Administrative Headquarters Relocation - The numerous reasons and justifications for this project are explained on the FS-015 MFP detail page.

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.

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

FS-018, Special Operations Support Vehicle - The project consists 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 and cover half of the cost for the added communication capacity.

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 $1.2 million is the fire suppression portion of the $38.2 million in improvements required at the maintenance yard.

FS-022, Construction of Replacement Station #7, which has been constructed at the corner of Vanderbilt and Auto Center Drive and was moved due to a shifting of calls-for-services in lieu of constructing an additional station.

FS-023, Fire Station No. 1 Relocation– Additional development in the General City area will ultimately force the City to relocate existing Station No. 1 or construct a new one. While not determined yet, the actual development and its resulting demand changes will define the ultimate resolution to this needed additional service capability.

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** is the addition of a response engine for the second company.

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 $112,373,959 after subtracting the existing $141,378 in current Fire Suppression Facilities DIF Fund balance.

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 undertaken 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 Calls-for-Service Generated by Land Use
(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	24,894	4,346	0.175/Unit
Attached Dwelling Units (1)	11,870	1,747	0.147/Unit
Mobile Home Dwelling Units	2,511	383	0.153/Unit
Commercial Lodging Units	4,338	316	0.073/Unit
Retail/Service Uses	9,709,001	1,495	0.154/KSF
Office Uses	914,760	574	0.627/KSF
Business Park Uses	1,306,800	125	0.096/KSF
Industrial Uses	125,962,452	827	0.007/KSF
Institutional Uses	2,766,060	128	0.046/KSF

(1) Includes forty (40) High Density Dwelling Units.

Of residential land uses, a detached dwelling unit is just slightly more likely to require an emergency fire service response at 0.175 annual responses per unit than an attached dwelling unit at 0.147 annual responses per unit. Office use development is shown to generate the highest business use demand at 0.627 responses per 1,000 square foot of building space, while industrial development generates the least demand of 0.007 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 9,947 annual calls-for-service to private development by 14,210 to 24,157 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 (97.3%) of the proposed 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)	-$193,206	$317/Unit
Attached Dwelling Units	$1,215,210	$265/Unit
High Density Dwelling Units	$2,208,323	$265/Unit
Mobile Home Units	$3,611	$278/Unit
Commercial Lodging Units	$5,417	$135/Unit
Retail/Service Uses	$3,279,080	$0.278/S.F.
Office Uses	$18,240,783	$1.132/S.F.
Business Park Uses	$492,945	$0.173/S.F.
Industrial Uses	$404,468	$0.013/S.F.
Institutional Uses	$1,806	$0.083/S.F.

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

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 (24.67%), OR (40.08%) and GC (35.25%), 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 $97,062,362 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 $97,062,362 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 $1,315 into fire suppression capital while the proposed DIF is nearly one fifth at $262 per attached dwelling.

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	$32,732,480	$1,315/Unit
Attached Dwelling Units	$13,158,611	$1,109/Unit
High Density Dwelling Units	$44,342	$1,109/Unit
Mobile Home Dwelling Units	$2,884,616	$1,149/Unit
Commercial Lodging Units	$2,379,996	$549/Unit
Retail/Service Uses	$11,259,792	$1.160/S.F.
Office Uses	$4,323,158	$4.726/S.F.
Business Park Uses	$941,454	$0.720/S.F.
Industrial Uses	$6,228,661	$0.049/S.F.
Institutional Uses	$964,049	$0.349/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 46,796 residential dwellings, 396 commercial lodging units and 36.4 million square feet of business use space which will generate nearly 16,160 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 $51,665,729 to establish. 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)

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	$13,718,117	$746/Unit
Attached Dwelling Units	$14,489,948	$627/Unit
High Density Dwelling Units	$3,317,593	$627/Unit
Commercial Lodging Units	$123,663	$312/Unit
Retail/Service Uses	$4,119,273	$0.657/S.F.
Office Uses	$27,470,348	$2.674/S.F.
Business Park Uses	$5,475,307	$0.409/S.F.
Industrial Uses	$191,892	$0.030/S.F.
Institutional Uses	$4,264	$0.196/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
2019 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		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
FS-001	Fire Station #9 Land Acquisition And Construction	$8,154,350	0.00%	$0	100.00%	$8,154,350	0.00%	$0
FS-002	Fire Station #9 Response Engine	$999,154	0.00%	$0	100.00%	$999,154	0.00%	$0
FS-003	Fire Station #11 Land Acquisition And Construction	$8,154,350	0.00%	$0	100.00%	$8,154,350	0.00%	$0
FS-004	Fire Station #11 Response Engine	$770,000	0.00%	$0	100.00%	$770,000	0.00%	$0
FS-005	Fire Station #12 Land Acquisition And Construction	$8,383,040	0.00%	$0	100.00%	$8,383,040	0.00%	$0
FS-006	Fire Station #12 Response Engines (2)	$1,540,000	0.00%	$0	100.00%	$1,540,000	0.00%	$0
FS-007	Fire Station #13 Land Acquisition And Construction	$8,154,350	0.00%	$0	100.00%	$8,154,350	0.00%	$0
FS-008	Fire Station #13 Response Engine	$770,000	0.00%	$0	100.00%	$770,000	0.00%	$0
FS-009	Fire Station #14 Land Acquisition And Construction	$8,154,350	0.00%	$0	100.00%	$8,154,350	0.00%	$0
FS-010	Fire Station #14 Response Engine	$770,000	0.00%	$0	100.00%	$770,000	0.00%	$0
FS-011	Reserve Response Engines	$1,196,191	0.00%	$0	100.00%	$1,196,191	0.00%	$0
FS-012	Aerial Response Truck	$1,675,000	0.00%	$0	100.00%	$1,675,000	0.00%	$0
FS-013	Battalion Chief Response Vehicle	$125,000	0.00%	$0	100.00%	$125,000	0.00%	$0
FS-014	Fire Fighter Assigned Equipment	$1,060,033	0.00%	$0	100.00%	$1,060,033	0.00%	$0
FS-015	Fire Administration Headquarters Relocation	$25,016,050	24.67%	$6,171,460	40.08%	$10,026,433	35.25%	$8,818,158
FS-016	Emergency Training Center Expansion	$2,617,007	0.00%	$0	53.21%	$1,392,520	46.79%	$1,224,487
FS-017	City Emergency Operations Center	$2,450,000	24.67%	$604,415	40.08%	$981,960	35.25%	$863,625
FS-018	Special Operations Support Vehicle	$125,000	24.67%	$30,838	40.08%	$50,100	35.25%	$44,063
FS-019	Mobile Air And Lighting Support Vehicle	$522,500	24.67%	$128,901	40.08%	$209,418	35.25%	$184,181
FS-020	Emergency Services Communication System	$3,080,000	0.00%	$0	100.00%	$3,080,000	0.00%	$0
FS-021	Share Of Common City Yard Improvements	$1,404,845	0.00%	$0	53.21%	$747,524	46.79%	$657,321
FS-022	Fire Station #7 Land Acquisition And Construction	$3,520,000	0.00%	$0	0.00%	$0	100.00%	$3,520,000
FS-023	Fire Station #1 Relocation	$16,939,820	65.00%	$11,010,883	8.00%	$1,355,186	27.00%	$4,573,751
FS-024	Expand Station #3 (East Francis)	$4,842,850	0.00%	$0	0.00%	$0	100.00%	$4,842,850
FS-025	Fire Station #3, Second Company Aerial Truck	$930,000	0.00%	$0	0.00%	$0	100.00%	$930,000
FS-026	Temporary Fire Station #9	$1,161,447	0.00%	$0	100.00%	$1,161,447	0.00%	$0
	Sub-Total General Plan Total New Project Costs	$112,515,337	15.95%	$17,946,496	61.25%	$68,910,405	22.80%	$25,658,436
	LESS: **Development Impact Fee Fund Balance**	$141,378	100.00%	$141,378	0.00%	$0	0.00%	$0
	Total General Plan Total New Project Costs	$112,373,959	15.84%	$17,805,118	61.32%	$68,910,405	22.83%	$25,658,436
					Forward to Schedule 4.4		Forward to Schedule 4.2	

NOTES:
1. Costs distribution based upon the Fire Department "Calls-for-Service" statistics.

Schedule 4.2

City of Ontario
2019 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	(112.73)	(610)	0.175	(107)	-0.75%	-$193,206	$1,714	5.41	*$317 per Unit*
Attached Dwellings	115.22	4,580	0.147	673	4.74%	$1,215,210	$10,547	39.75	*$265 per Unit*
High Density Dwellings	199.15	8,322	0.147	1,223	8.61%	$2,208,323	$11,089	41.79	*$265 per Unit*
Mobile Home Dwellings	1.00	13	0.153	2	0.01%	$3,611	$3,611	13.00	*$278 per Unit*
Commercial Lodging Units	1.00	40	0.073	3	0.02%	$5,417	$5,417	40.00	*$135 per Unit*
Retail/Service Uses	147.73	11,792,000	0.154	1,816	12.78%	$3,279,080	$22,196	79,821	*$0.278 per S.F.*
Office Uses	275.00	16,112,000	0.627	10,102	71.09%	$18,240,783	$66,330	58,589	*$1.132 per S.F.*
Business Park Uses	139.65	2,842,000	0.096	273	1.92%	$492,945	$3,530	20,351	*$0.173 per S.F.*
Industrial Uses	643.90	32,045,000	0.007	224	1.58%	$404,468	$628	49,767	*$0.013 per S.F.*
Institutional Use	1.00	21,780	0.046	1	0.01%	$1,806	$1,806	21,780	*$0.083 per S.F.*
TOTAL	**1,410.92**	--	--	**14,210**	**100.00%**	**$25,658,436**	**in Total Equity in General City Area Capital Needs**		

Schedule 4.3

City of Ontario
2019 Development Impact Cost Calculation Update
Existing Community Financial Commitment Comparison
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	4,638.80	24,894	0.175	4,346	43.69%	$32,732,480	$7,056	5.37	*$1,315 per Unit*
Attached Dwellings	827.20	11,870	0.147	1,747	17.56%	$13,158,611	$15,907	14.35	*$1,109 per Unit*
High Density Dwellings	1.00	40	0.147	6	0.06%	$44,342	$44,342	40.00	*$1,109 per Unit*
Mobile Home Dwellings	193.00	2,511	0.153	383	3.85%	$2,884,616	$14,946	13.01	*$1,149 per Unit*
Commercial Lodging Units	38.50	4,338	0.073	316	3.18%	$2,379,996	$61,818	112.68	*$549 per Unit*
Retail/Service Uses	928.70	9,709,001	0.154	1,495	15.03%	$11,259,792	$12,124	10,454	*$1.160 per S.F.*
Office Uses	42.00	914,760	0.627	574	5.77%	$4,323,158	$102,932	21,780	*$4.726 per S.F.*
Business Park Uses	80.00	1,306,800	0.096	125	1.26%	$941,454	$11,768	16,335	*$0.720 per S.F.*
Industrial Uses	6,426.00	125,962,452	0.007	827	8.31%	$6,228,661	$969	19,602	*$0.049 per S.F.*
Institutional Use	127.00	2,766,060	0.046	128	1.29%	$964,049	$7,591	21,780	*$0.349 per S.F.*
TOTAL	13,302.20	--	--	9,947	100.00%				

$97,062,362	Total Existing Fire Suppression System Assets
$74,917,160	in Fire Suppression Facilities Assets
$19,680,000	in Fire Suppression Vehicles Assets
$1,323,824	in Fire Fighter Assigned Equipment Assets
$300,000	in USAR Specialty Equipment Assets
$300,000	in Haz-Mat Unit Specialty Equipment Assets
$400,000	in Bomb Squad Specialty Equipment Assets
$141,378	in Fire Suppression DIF Fund Balance

Land Use	Units or Acres	Calls for Service	Annual Calls Per Unit
Attached Dwellings	11,870	1,747	0.147
High Density Dwellings	40	6	0.147
Average Calls-for-Service	11,910	1,753	0.147

The replacment value of the City's existing fire system assets has not been updated.

Schedule 4.4

2019 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	3,002.52	18,384	0.175	3,217	19.91%	$13,718,117	$4,569	6.12	***$746 per Unit***
Attached Dwellings	820.09	23,119	0.147	3,398	21.03%	$14,489,948	$17,669	28.19	***$627 per Unit***
High Density Dwellings	137.85	5,293	0.147	778	4.81%	$3,317,593	$24,067	38.40	***$627 per Unit***
Commercial Lodging Units	9.00	396	0.073	29	0.18%	$123,663	$13,740	44.00	***$312 per Unit***
Retail/Service Uses	358.94	6,272,000	0.154	966	5.98%	$4,119,273	$11,476	17,474	***$0.657 per S.F.***
Office Uses	308.65	10,274,000	0.627	6,442	39.86%	$27,470,348	$89,002	33,287	***$2.674 per S.F.***
Business Park Uses	665.86	13,380,000	0.096	1,284	7.95%	$5,475,307	$8,223	20,094	***$0.409 per S.F.***
Industrial Uses	233.23	6,439,000	0.007	45	0.28%	$191,892	$823	27,608	***$0.030 per S.F.***
Institutional Use	1.00	21,780	0.046	1	0.01%	$4,264	$4,264	21,780	***$0.196 per S.F.***
TOTAL	**5,537.14**	--	--	**16,160**	**100.00%**	**$68,910,405**	**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 and OR 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 transportation capital project involves both a street improvement and 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, construction of these streets is the responsibility of the developer, who then dedicates the completed

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*.

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 number 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 62.8 million square feet of private business uses on the net 1,207 under or undeveloped acres will generate 2.3 million additional daily trip-miles or about 91.7% 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 12,305 additional dwelling units contributing approximately 203,818 new (net) daily trip-miles or just over 8.2% of the newly expected daily trip-miles.

- The addition of about 40 commercial lodging units will generate about 730 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 General City is developed, the City can expect an additional 2,477,702 daily trip-miles. For perspective, the City currently experiences an estimated 4,853,714 daily trip-miles from/to the existing residences and businesses. The roughly 2,477,702 newly anticipated trip-miles represent about a 50% increase over the current 4,853,714 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 one hundred and thirty-one circulation-related projects covering both the General City and Ontario Ranch areas of the City. They have an estimated cost of $1,219,580,355. Approximately 15.6% of this amount or $189,749,908 has been identified as the responsibility of GC development as these projects will increase the capacity of the GC circulation system. Approximately 32.2% or $393,181,444 of the total project amount has been identified as the responsibility of OR Development. The remainder, 52.2% or $636,649,003 are projects that are not development-generated and will require non-DIF revenue sources. Most of this latter amount, about $334.4 million, is necessary for the ten planned but very costly grade separations under or over the Alhambra and Los Angeles rail-lines and $188.1 million for three I-10 interchange improvements. The ten grade separations will not be fully financed by DIFs. An additional $26.8 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 2,477,702 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 111,571 daily trip-miles. Each would pay its proportionate share of the total 2,477,702 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 1.3% of the total 2,477,702 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 1.3% of the total development-related project costs. The 20-acre retail/service development would finance 4.5% 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 3,991 trip-ends daily. However, approximately 15% of those trip-ends, or about 599 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.

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.

---

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.

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 (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.

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 worksite 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 2,447,702 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.
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.

---

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.

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)	-$1,487,955	$2,439/Unit
Attached Dwelling Units	$7,459,520	$1,629/Unit
High Density Dwelling Units	$8,385,692	$1,008/Unit
Mobile Home Units	$16,502	$1,269/Unit
Commercial Lodging Units	$51,481	$1,287/Unit
Retail/Service Uses	$58,118,881	$4.929/S.F.
Office Uses	$45,386,674	$2.817/S.F.
Business Park Uses	$8,329,133	$2.931/S.F.
Industrial Uses	$48,403,768	$1.510/S.F.
Institutional Uses	$70,099	$3.219/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 $65.43 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, on the following page. 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	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
INDUSTRIAL (per 1,000 SF):						
General Light Industrial	6.17	9.0	0.5	27.8	$70.52	$1,960.46 /KSF
Heavy Industrial	5.97	9.0	0.5	26.9	$70.52	$1,896.99 /KSF
Manufacturing	2.73	9.0	0.5	12.3	$70.52	$867.40 /KSF
Warehousing	4.39	9.0	0.5	19.8	$70.52	$1,396.30 /KSF
MISCELLANEOUS BUSINESS USES (per 1,000 SF):						
Office Park	9.08	8.8	0.5	40.0	$70.52	$2,820.80 /KSF
Research Park	7.18	8.8	0.5	31.6	$70.52	$2,228.43 /KSF
Business Park (Specific)	11.29	8.8	0.5	49.7	$70.52	$3,504.84 /KSF
RETAIL/SERVICE USES (per 1,000 SF):						
Bldg. Materials/Lumber Store	29.35	4.3	0.5	63.1	$70.52	$4,449.81 /KSF
Garden Center	23.45	4.3	0.5	50.4	$70.52	$3,554.21 /KSF
Movie Theater	2.47	4.3	0.5	5.3	$70.52	$373.76 /KSF
Church	5.92	4.3	0.5	12.7	$70.52	$895.60 /KSF
Medical-Dental Office	22.21	8.8	0.5	97.7	$70.52	$6,889.80 /KSF
General Office Building	7.16	8.8	0.5	31.5	$70.52	$2,221.38 /KSF
Shopping Center	30.20	4.3	0.5	64.9	$70.52	$4,576.75 /KSF
Hospital	11.42	4.3	0.5	24.6	$70.52	$1,734.79 /KSF
Discount Center	62.93	4.3	0.5	135.3	$70.52	$9,541.36 /KSF
High-Turnover Restaurant	8.90	4.3	0.5	19.1	$70.52	$1,346.93 /KSF
Convenience Market	43.57	4.3	0.5	93.7	$70.52	$6,607.72 /KSF
Walk-in Bank	13.97	4.3	0.5	30.0	$70.52	$2,115.60 /KSF
Other: (not available "per KSF")						
Cemetary (per acre)	3.07	4.3	0.5	6.6	$70.52	$465.43 /Acre
Service Station/Market (avg)	107.69	4.3	0.5	231.5	$70.52	$16,325.38 /FP/Day
Service Station/Car Wash	99.35	4.3	0.5	213.6	$70.52	$15,063.07 /FP/Day

NOTES:

1. ADT = Average Daily Trips

2. KSF = Thousand Square Feet of Gross Floor Area

3. Adjusted for Pass-by and Diverted Trips.

4. FP/Day = per "Fueling Position" per 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 $700,080,412 consists of the existing circulation plan arterial and collector lanes (along with curb, gutter and sidewalks) at $475,662,730, streetlights with a replacement value of $79,820,000 plus signalized intersections valued at $36,490,000. 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 fund balance of $15,016,112. When 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
(Not updated in 2017)

DIF Land-use Category	Allocation of Development Costs	Development Impact Cost Per Unit or Square Foot
Detached Dwelling Units	$124,193,419	$4,989/Unit
Attached Dwelling Units	$39,540,575	$3,331/Unit
High Density Dwelling Units	$82,503	$2,063/Unit
Mobile Home Units	$6,531,873	$2,601/Unit
Commercial Lodging Units	$11,411,954	$2,631/Unit
Retail/Service Uses	$97,870,201	$10.080/S.F.
Office Uses	$5,270,240	$5.761/S.F.
Business Park Uses	$7,833,026	$5.994/S.F.
Industrial Uses	$389,140,284	$3.089/S.F.
Institutional Uses	$18,206,336	$6.582/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 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.

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 streetlights.

However, construction of the extra lanes would be financed by the Circulation System DIF, contributed to by all development within the Ontario Ranch 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 $391,890,340 in necessary streets (in "extra" lane miles), signals and bridges necessary to accommodate the 2,796,326 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 calculates to approximately $140.14 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	$89,114,247	$4,847/Unit
Attached Dwelling Units	$74,828,174	$3,237/Unit
High Density Dwelling Units	$10,598,865	$2,002/Unit
Commercial Lodging Units	$1,012,265	$2,556/Unit
Retail/Service Uses	$61,430,619	$9.794/S.F.
Office Uses	$57,513,153	$5.598/S.F.
Business Park Uses	$77,925,793	$5.824/S.F.
Industrial Uses	$19,327,920	$3.002/S.F.
Institutional Uses	$139,304	$6.396/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 $140.14 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	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
INDUSTRIAL (per 1,000 SF):						
General Light Industrial	6.17	9.0	0.5	27.8	$140.14	$3,896.02 /KSF
Heavy Industrial	5.97	9.0	0.5	26.9	$140.14	$3,769.89 /KSF
Manufacturing	2.73	9.0	0.5	12.3	$140.14	$1,723.78 /KSF
Warehousing	4.39	9.0	0.5	19.8	$140.14	$2,774.87 /KSF
MISCELLANEOUS BUSINESS USES (per 1,000 SF):						
Office Park	9.08	8.8	0.5	40.0	$140.14	$5,605.79 /KSF
Research Park	7.18	8.8	0.5	31.6	$140.14	$4,428.57 /KSF
Business Park (Specific)	11.29	8.8	0.5	49.7	$140.14	$6,965.19 /KSF
RETAIL/SERVICE USES (per 1,000 SF):						
Bldg. Materials/Lumber Store	29.35	4.3	0.5	63.1	$140.14	$8,843.13 /KSF
Garden Center	23.45	4.3	0.5	50.4	$140.14	$7,063.29 /KSF
Movie Theater	2.47	4.3	0.5	5.3	$140.14	$742.77 /KSF
Church	5.92	4.3	0.5	12.7	$140.14	$1,779.84 /KSF
Medical-Dental Office	22.21	8.8	0.5	97.7	$140.14	$13,692.14 /KSF
General Office Building	7.16	8.8	0.5	31.5	$140.14	$4,414.56 /KSF
Shopping Center	30.20	4.3	0.5	64.9	$140.14	$9,095.39 /KSF
Hospital	11.42	4.3	0.5	24.6	$140.14	$3,447.56 /KSF
Discount Center	62.93	4.3	0.5	135.3	$140.14	$18,961.58 /KSF
High-Turnover Restaurant	8.90	4.3	0.5	19.1	$140.14	$2,676.76 /KSF
Convenience Market	43.57	4.3	0.5	93.7	$140.14	$13,131.56 /KSF
Walk-in Bank	13.97	4.3	0.5	30.0	$140.14	$4,204.34 /KSF
Other: (not available "per KSF")						
Cemetary (per acre)	3.07	4.3	0.5	6.6	$140.14	$924.96 /Acre
Service Station/Market (avg)	107.69	4.3	0.5	231.5	$140.14	$32,443.50 /FP/Day
Service Station/Car Wash	99.35	4.3	0.5	213.6	$140.14	$29,934.91 /FP/Day

NOTES:

1. ADT = Average Daily Trips

2. KSF = Thousand Square Feet of Gross Floor Area

3. Adjusted for Pass-by and Diverted Trips.

4. FP/Day = per "Fueling Position" per 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
2019 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)	$4,772,008	0.00%	$0	100.00%	$4,772,008	0.00%	$0
ST-002	Archibald Avenue From Edison To South City Limit (P)	$9,923,475	0.00%	$0	100.00%	$9,923,475	0.00%	$0
ST-003	Bellegrave Avenue From Archibald To Milliken (P)	$2,556,547	0.00%	$0	100.00%	$2,556,547	0.00%	$0
ST-004	Campus Avenue From Riverside To Merrill	$4,939,240	0.00%	$0	100.00%	$4,939,240	0.00%	$0
ST-005	Chino Avenue From Euclid To Milliken	$7,814,630	0.00%	$0	100.00%	$7,814,630	0.00%	$0
ST-006	Mill Creek Avenue From Riverside To Bellegrave (P)	$3,068,247	0.00%	$0	100.00%	$3,068,247	0.00%	$0
ST-007	Edison Avenue From Euclid To Walker	$10,273,326	0.00%	$0	100.00%	$10,273,326	0.00%	$0
ST-008	Edison Avenue From Walker To Vineyard	$2,990,054	0.00%	$0	100.00%	$2,990,054	0.00%	$0
ST-009	Edison Avenue From Vineyard To Mill Creek	$16,246,147	0.00%	$0	100.00%	$16,246,147	0.00%	$0
ST-010	Edison Avenue From Mill Creek to Milliken (P)	$2,942,696	0.00%	$0	100.00%	$2,942,696	0.00%	$0
ST-011	Eucalyptus Avenue From Euclid To Milliken	$8,779,073	0.00%	$0	100.00%	$8,779,073	0.00%	$0
ST-012	Euclid Avenue From Riverside To Merrill	$10,999,257	0.00%	$0	100.00%	$10,999,257	0.00%	$0
ST-013	Grove Avenue From Riverside To Merrill	$7,992,505	0.00%	$0	100.00%	$7,992,505	0.00%	$0
ST-014	Haven Avenue From Riverside To Bellegrave (P)	$6,013,772	0.00%	$0	100.00%	$6,013,772	0.00%	$0
ST-015	Merrill Avenue From Euclid To Archibald	$4,175,855	0.00%	$0	100.00%	$4,175,855	0.00%	$0
ST-016	Milliken Avenue From Riverside To Edison	$4,242,119	0.00%	$0	100.00%	$4,242,119	0.00%	$0
ST-017	Milliken Avenue From Edison To Bellegrave	$2,225,604	0.00%	$0	100.00%	$2,225,604	0.00%	$0
ST-018	Hellman Avenue From Riverside To Merrill	$3,773,786	0.00%	$0	100.00%	$3,773,786	0.00%	$0
ST-019	Riverside Drive From Euclid To Milliken (P)	$4,793,182	0.00%	$0	100.00%	$4,793,182	0.00%	$0
ST-020	Schaefer Avenue From Euclid To Haven	$7,386,070	0.00%	$0	100.00%	$7,386,070	0.00%	$0
ST-021	Turner Avenue From Riverside To Schaefer	$302,840	0.00%	$0	100.00%	$302,840	0.00%	$0
ST-022	Vineyard Avenue From Riverside To Merrill	$11,087,891	0.00%	$0	100.00%	$11,087,891	0.00%	$0
ST-023	Walker Avenue From Riverside To Merrill	$3,773,048	0.00%	$0	100.00%	$3,773,048	0.00%	$0
ST-024	Ontario Ranch Traffic Control System (P)	$27,201,323	0.00%	$0	100.00%	$27,201,323	0.00%	$0
ST-025	Non-Dev. ROW, Frontage Imps. & SCE Pole Relocations	$54,458,324	0.00%	$0	100.00%	$54,458,324	0.00%	$0
ST-026	Additional SCE Pole Relocations	$2,415,000	0.00%	$0	100.00%	$2,415,000	0.00%	$0
ST-027	Project No Longer Needed	$0	0.00%	$0	0.00%	$0	0.00%	$0
ST-028	Project No Longer Needed	$0	0.00%	$0	0.00%	$0	0.00%	$0
ST-029	OR Offsite Cantu Galleano Widening I-15 To Milliken	$2,258,000	0.00%	$0	100.00%	$2,258,000	0.00%	$0
ST-030	OR Offsite Euclid Avenue Improvements, Merrill To US-71	$6,252,000	0.00%	$0	100.00%	$6,252,000	0.00%	$0

Schedule 5.1

City of Ontario
2019 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-031	OR Offsite Archibald Avenue Bridge Over Santa Ana River	$256,000	0.00%	$0	100.00%	$256,000	0.00%	$0
ST-032	OR Offsite Hamner Avenue Bridge Over The Santa Ana River	$592,000	0.00%	$0	100.00%	$592,000	0.00%	$0
ST-033	General City Street Lights (P)	$3,600,000	0.00%	$0	0.00%	$0	100.00%	$3,600,000
ST-034	General City Traffic Signals	$10,658,044	0.00%	$0	0.00%	$0	100.00%	$10,658,044
ST-035	Benson Avenue From Mission To Philadelphia	$866,015	56.00%	$484,968	0.00%	$0	44.00%	$381,047
ST-036	Mountain Avenue From Sixth To Holt (P)	$7,467,194	56.00%	$4,181,629	0.00%	$0	44.00%	$3,285,565
ST-037	San Antonio Avenue From Park To Phillips	$1,746,414	56.00%	$977,992	0.00%	$0	44.00%	$768,422
ST-038	Bon View Avenue From Holt to Mission	$1,130,151	56.00%	$632,885	0.00%	$0	44.00%	$497,266
ST-039	Bon View Avenue From Mission To Belmont	$635,545	56.00%	$355,905	0.00%	$0	44.00%	$279,640
ST-040	Project No Longer Needed	$0	0.00%	$0	0.00%	$0	0.00%	$0
ST-041	Project No Longer Needed	$0	0.00%	$0	0.00%	$0	0.00%	$0
ST-042	Grove Avenue From Fourth Street to Airport Drive	$37,688,000	56.00%	$21,105,280	0.00%	$0	44.00%	$16,582,720
ST-043	Turner Avenue, From Inland Empire Boulevard To Fourth	$713,997	56.00%	$399,838	0.00%	$0	44.00%	$314,159
ST-044	Archibald Avenue from Fourth To Guasti Park Entrance	$1,921,014	56.00%	$1,075,768	0.00%	$0	44.00%	$845,246
ST-045	Milliken Avenue From SR-60 To Riverside	$380,897	56.00%	$213,302	0.00%	$0	44.00%	$167,595
ST-046	Project No Longer Needed	$0	0.00%	$0	0.00%	$0	0.00%	$0
ST-047	Etiwanda Avenue At Airport Drive	$9,879,821	82.27%	$8,127,924	0.00%	$0	17.73%	$1,751,897
ST-048	Eight Street From West Cucamonga Creek To Grove	$155,765	56.00%	$87,228	0.00%	$0	44.00%	$68,537
ST-049	Project No Longer Needed	$0	0.00%	$0	0.00%	$0	0.00%	$0
ST-050	Fourth Street From Palmetto To San Antonio	$1,180,242	56.00%	$660,936	0.00%	$0	44.00%	$519,306
ST-051	Fourth Street From Campus To Cucamonga	$978,455	56.00%	$547,935	0.00%	$0	44.00%	$430,520
ST-052	Fourth Street From Vineyard To Archibald	$1,212,927	0.00%	$0	0.00%	$0	100.00%	$1,212,927
ST-053	Holt Boulevard From Benson To Vineyard	$48,817,215	56.00%	$27,337,640	0.00%	$0	44.00%	$21,479,575
ST-054	Guasti Road From Holt To Archibald	$931,601	56.00%	$521,697	0.00%	$0	44.00%	$409,904
ST-055	State Street From Benson To Grove	$4,621,457	56.00%	$2,588,016	0.00%	$0	44.00%	$2,033,441
ST-056	Airport Drive Under The I-15 Freeway	$2,895,383	56.00%	$1,621,414	0.00%	$0	44.00%	$1,273,969
ST-057	Project No Longer Needed	$0	0.00%	$0	0.00%	$0	0.00%	$0
ST-058	Mission Boulevard From Cypress To Grove	$3,038,186	56.00%	$1,701,384	0.00%	$0	44.00%	$1,336,802
ST-059	Mission Boulevard From Grove To Milliken (P)	$10,562,154	56.00%	$5,914,806	0.00%	$0	44.00%	$4,647,348
ST-060	Phillips Street From Benson To Mountain	$548,925	56.00%	$307,398	0.00%	$0	44.00%	$241,527

Schedule 5.1

City of Ontario
2019 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-061	Project No Longer Needed	$0	0.00%	$0	0.00%	$0	0.00%	$0
ST-062	Acacia Street From Baker To Vineyard	$70,022	56.00%	$39,212	0.00%	$0	44.00%	$30,810
ST-063	Francis Street From Benson To Campus	$3,225,352	56.00%	$1,806,197	0.00%	$0	44.00%	$1,419,155
ST-064	Jurupa Street From Archibald To East Of Turner	$734,452	56.00%	$411,293	0.00%	$0	44.00%	$323,159
ST-065	Philadelphia Street From Campus To Grove	$816,862	56.00%	$457,443	0.00%	$0	44.00%	$359,419
ST-066	Philadelphia From E/O Vineyard to Cucamonga Creek	$793,426	56.00%	$444,319	0.00%	$0	44.00%	$349,107
ST-067	Project No Longer Needed	$0	0.00%	$0	0.00%	$0	0.00%	$0
ST-068	Project No Longer Needed	$0	0.00%	$0	0.00%	$0	0.00%	$0
ST-069	Grove Avenue Bridge Over West Cucamonga Creek	$906,752	56.00%	$507,781	0.00%	$0	44.00%	$398,971
ST-070	Project No Longer Needed	$0	0.00%	$0	0.00%	$0	0.00%	$0
ST-071	Holt Boulevard Bridge Over West Cucamonga Creek	$240,856	56.00%	$134,879	0.00%	$0	44.00%	$105,977
ST-072	Mission Boulevard Bridge Over West Cucamonga Creek	$674,396	56.00%	$377,662	0.00%	$0	44.00%	$296,734
ST-073	Project No Longer Needed	$0	0.00%	$0	0.00%	$0	0.00%	$0
ST-074	Francis Street Bridge Over West Cucamonga Creek	$216,770	56.00%	$121,391	0.00%	$0	44.00%	$95,379
ST-075	Eighth Street Bridge Over Cucamonga Creek	$1,854,592	56.00%	$1,038,572	0.00%	$0	44.00%	$816,020
ST-076	Sixth Street Bridge Over Cucamonga Creek	$1,480,556	56.00%	$829,111	0.00%	$0	44.00%	$651,445
ST-077	Fourth Street Bridge Over Cucamonga Creek	$761,530	0.00%	$0	0.00%	$0	100.00%	$761,530
ST-078	Project No Longer Needed	$0	0.00%	$0	0.00%	$0	0.00%	$0
ST-079	Holt Boulevard Bridge Over Cucamonga Creek	$2,691,920	56.00%	$1,507,475	0.00%	$0	44.00%	$1,184,445
ST-080	Project No Longer Needed	$0	0.00%	$0	0.00%	$0	0.00%	$0
ST-081	Mission Boulevard Bridge Over Cucamonga Creek	$1,975,020	56.00%	$1,106,011	0.00%	$0	44.00%	$869,009
ST-082	Francis Street Bridge Over Cucamonga Creek	$1,806,420	56.00%	$1,011,595	0.00%	$0	44.00%	$794,825
ST-083	Philadelphia Street Bridge Over Cucamonga Creek	$2,142,202	56.00%	$1,199,633	0.00%	$0	44.00%	$942,569
ST-084	Riverside Drive Bridge Over Cucamonga Creek	$1,051,974	56.00%	$589,105	0.00%	$0	44.00%	$462,869
ST-085	Archibald Avenue Bridge Over Upper Deer Creek	$1,211,364	56.00%	$678,364	0.00%	$0	44.00%	$533,000
ST-086	Archibald Avenue Bridge Over Upper Deer Creek Spillway	$1,695,910	56.00%	$949,710	0.00%	$0	44.00%	$746,200
ST-087	Inland Empire Boulevard Bridge Over Upper Deer Creek	$1,428,134	0.00%	$0	0.00%	$0	100.00%	$1,428,134
ST-088	Project No Longer Needed	$0	0.00%	$0	0.00%	$0	0.00%	$0
ST-089	Archibald Avenue Bridge Over Lower Deer Creek	$358,450	0.00%	$0	100.00%	$358,450	0.00%	$0
ST-090	Project No Longer Needed	$0	0.00%	$0	0.00%	$0	0.00%	$0

Schedule 5.1

City of Ontario
2019 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-091	Grove Avenue Grade Separation Under UPRR/Alhambra	$10,633,246	56.00%	$5,954,618	0.00%	$0	44.00%	$4,678,628
ST-092	Milliken (N) Grade Separation Under UPRR/Alhambra	$32,382,452	99.28%	$32,147,872	0.00%	$0	0.72%	$234,580
ST-093	Vineyard (N) Grade Separation Under UPRR/Alhambra	$47,353,237	100.00%	$47,353,237	0.00%	$0	0.00%	$0
ST-094	Milliken (S) Grade Separation Over UPRR/Alhambra	$72,962,932	66.89%	$48,807,302	4.54%	$3,309,823	28.57%	$20,845,807
ST-095	Archibald (S) Grade Separation Over UPRR/LA	$60,062,000	74.80%	$44,928,645	0.00%	$0	25.20%	$15,133,355
ST-096	San Antonio (S) Grade Separation Under UPRR/Alhambra	$24,000,000	56.00%	$13,440,000	0.00%	$0	44.00%	$10,560,000
ST-097	Campus (S) Grade Separation Under UPRR/Alhambra	$24,000,000	56.00%	$13,440,000	0.00%	$0	44.00%	$10,560,000
ST-098	Project No Longer Needed	$0	0.00%	$0	0.00%	$0	0.00%	$0
ST-099	Vine (S) Grade Separation Under UPRR/LA Line	$21,000,000	100.00%	$21,000,000	0.00%	$0	0.00%	$0
ST-100	Sultana (S) Grade Separation Under UPRR/LA Line	$21,000,000	80.00%	$16,800,000	0.00%	$0	20.00%	$4,200,000
ST-101	Bon View (S) Grade Separation Under UPRR/LA Line	$21,000,000	100.00%	$21,000,000	0.00%	$0	0.00%	$0
ST-102	Pavement Management System Rehabilitation Program	$26,851,634	100.00%	$26,851,634	0.00%	$0	0.00%	$0
ST-103	Circulation System Maintenance Vehicles	$3,412,980	0.00%	$0	53.02%	$1,809,586	46.98%	$1,603,394
ST-104	Great Park Bridge Over Archibald Avenue	$4,989,730	0.00%	$0	100.00%	$4,989,730	0.00%	$0
ST-105	SR-60 At Vineyard Interchange Reconstruction/Expansion	$50,810,000	43.70%	$22,203,970	56.30%	$28,606,030	0.00%	$0
ST-106	SR-60 At Archibald Interchange Reconstruction/Expansion	$22,540,439	30.84%	$6,952,146	69.16%	$15,588,293	0.00%	$0
ST-107	SR-60 At Euclid Interchange Reconstruction/Expansion (P)	$6,000,000	74.60%	$4,476,000	25.40%	$1,524,000	0.00%	$0
ST-108	SR-60 At Grove Interchange Reconstruction/Expansion	$50,810,000	52.30%	$26,573,630	47.70%	$24,236,370	0.00%	$0
ST-109	SR-60 At Mountain Interchange Reconstruction/Expansion	$15,000,000	76.70%	$11,505,000	23.30%	$3,495,000	0.00%	$0
ST-110	Project No Longer Needed	$0	0.00%	$0	0.00%	$0	0.00%	$0
ST-111	I-10 Freeway at Grove/Fourth	$176,085,553	89.10%	$156,892,228	0.00%	$0	10.90%	$19,193,325
ST-112	Traffic Signal System Control and Operations Center (P)	$2,200,000	0.00%	$0	50.00%	$1,100,000	50.00%	$1,100,000
ST-113	General City Backbone Signal Interconnect	$2,600,000	80.00%	$2,080,000	0.00%	$0	20.00%	$520,000
ST-114	I-10 At Euclid Avenue Eastbound On Ramp (P)	$9,030,000	93.00%	$8,397,900	0.00%	$0	7.00%	$632,100
ST-115	Project No Longer Needed	$0	0.00%	$0	0.00%	$0	0.00%	$0
ST-116	I-10 At Vineyard Interchange Reconstruction/Expansion (P)	$3,000,000	60.00%	$1,800,000	0.00%	$0	40.00%	$1,200,000
ST-117	Ontario Ranch Road/Trail Separation	$2,243,471	0.00%	$0	100.00%	$2,243,471	0.00%	$0
ST-118	Hellman Avenue Bridge Over Cucamonga Creek	$2,103,948	0.00%	$0	0.00%	$0	100.00%	$2,103,948
ST-119	Riverside Drive Bridge Over Cucamonga Creek	$1,051,974	0.00%	$0	100.00%	$1,051,974	0.00%	$0
ST-120	Chino Avenue Bridge Over Cucamonga Creek	$3,187,800	0.00%	$0	100.00%	$3,187,800	0.00%	$0

Schedule 5.1

City of Ontario
2019 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-121	Schaefer Avenue Bridge Over Cucamonga Creek	$6,694,380	0.00%	$0	100.00%	$6,694,380	0.00%	$0
ST-122	Schaefer Avenue Over Cucamonga Creek Spillway	$11,901,120	0.00%	$0	100.00%	$11,901,120	0.00%	$0
ST-123	Edison Avenue Bridge Over Cucamonga Creek	$17,341,632	0.00%	$0	100.00%	$17,341,632	0.00%	$0
ST-124	Eucalyptus Avenue Bridge Over Cucamonga Creek	$12,878,712	0.00%	$0	100.00%	$12,878,712	0.00%	$0
ST-125	Merrill Avenue Bridge Over Cucamonga Creek	$13,261,248	0.00%	$0	100.00%	$13,261,248	0.00%	$0
ST-126	Share of Common City Yard Improvements	$1,915,576	0.00%	$0	53.02%	$1,015,652	46.98%	$899,924
ST-127	Ontario Ranch Bus Stop Shelters	$2,920,045	0.00%	$0	100.00%	$2,920,045	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	$22,336,447	53.68%	$11,991,123	0.00%	$0	46.32%	$10,345,324
ST-130	Guasti Road Extension From 1,530' to 1,840 Easterly	$585,309	0.00%	$0	0.00%	$0	100.00%	$585,309
ST-131	Ontario Ranch Traffic Study	$90,000	0.00%	$0	100.00%	$90,000	0.00%	$0
	Sub-Total General Plan Total New Projects	$1,219,580,355	52.20%	$636,649,003	32.24%	$393,181,444	15.56%	$189,749,908
	LESS:							
	GC Development Impact Fee Fund Balance	$15,016,112	0.00%	$0	0.00%	$0	100.00%	$15,016,112
	OR Development Impact Fee Fund Balance	$1,291,104	0.00%	$0	100.00%	$1,291,104	0.00%	$0
	Development Impact Fee Fund Balance Total	$16,307,216	$0	$0	7.92%	$1,291,104	92.08%	$15,016,112
	Total Net General Plan Project Costs	$1,203,273,139	52.91%	$636,649,003	32.57%	$391,890,340	14.52%	$174,733,796
					Forward to Schedule 5.4		Forward to Schedule 5.2	

NOTES:

1. Costs distribution based upon a frequency and distance factor.
2. (P) indicates a project that is partially complete

Schedule 5.2

City of Ontario
2019 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	(112.7)	(610)	34.588	(21,099)	-0.85%	-$1,487,955	$13,199	5.41	*$2,439 per Unit*
Attached Dwellings	115.2	4,580	23.095	105,775	4.27%	$7,459,520	$64,742	39.75	*$1,629 per Unit*
High Density Dwellings	199.2	8,322	14.288	118,908	4.80%	$8,385,692	$42,107	41.79	*$1,008 per Unit*
Mobile Home Dwellings	1.0	13	18.035	234	0.01%	$16,502	$16,502	13.00	*$1,269 per Unit*
Commercial Lodging Units	1.0	40	18.239	730	0.03%	$51,481	$51,481	40.00	*$1,287 per Unit*
Retail/Service Uses	147.7	11,792,000	69.888	824,118	33.26%	$58,118,881	$393,413	79,821	*$4.929 per S.F.*
Office Uses	275.0	16,112,000	39.944	643,577	25.97%	$45,386,674	$165,042	58,589	*$2.817 per S.F.*
Business Park Uses	139.7	2,842,000	41.557	118,106	4.77%	$8,329,133	$59,643	20,351	*$2.931 per S.F.*
Industrial Uses	643.9	32,045,000	21.419	686,359	27.70%	$48,403,768	$75,173	49,767	*$1.510 per S.F.*
Institutional Use	1.0	21,780	45.634	994	0.04%	$70,099	$70,099	21,780	*$3.219 per S.F.*
TOTAL	**1,410.92**	--	--	**2,477,702**	**100.00%**	**$174,733,796**	**in Total GC Circulation General Plan Projects**		
ALTERNATIVE FEE METHODOLOGY				***2,477,702***		***$174,733,796***	***$70.52 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***
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
2019 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	4,638.80	24,894	34.588	861,043	17.74%	$124,193,419	$26,773	5.37	*$4,989 per Unit*
Attached Dwellings	827.20	11,870	23.095	274,138	5.65%	$39,540,575	$47,801	14.35	*$3,331 per Unit*
High Density Dwellings	1.00	40	14.288	572	0.01%	$82,503	$82,503	40.00	*$2,063 per Unit*
Mobile Home Dwellings	193.00	2,511	18.035	45,286	0.93%	$6,531,873	$33,844	13.01	*$2,601 per Unit*
Commercial Lodging Units	38.50	4,338	18.239	79,120	1.63%	$11,411,954	$296,414	112.68	*$2,631 per Unit*
Retail/Service Uses	928.70	9,709,001	69.888	678,542	13.98%	$97,870,201	$105,384	10,454	*$10.080 per S.F.*
Office Uses	42.00	914,760	39.944	36,539	0.75%	$5,270,240	$125,482	21,780	*$5.761 per S.F.*
Business Park Uses	80.00	1,306,800	41.557	54,307	1.12%	$7,833,026	$97,913	16,335	*$5.994 per S.F.*
Industrial Uses	6,426.00	125,962,452	21.419	2,697,941	55.59%	$389,140,284	$60,557	19,602	*$3.089 per S.F.*
Institutional Use	127.00	2,766,060	45.634	126,226	2.60%	$18,206,336	$143,357	21,780	*$6.582 per S.F.*
TOTAL	**13,302.20**	--	--	**4,853,714**	**100.00%**	**$700,080,412**	**Total Circulation System Capital Assets**		
						$475,662,730	**in General Plan Streets Assets (not ROW)**		
						$63,790,000	**in General Plan Bridges Assets**		
						$26,500,000	**in General Plan Grade Separation Assets**		
						$36,490,000	**in General Plan Signal/Intersection Assets**		
						$2,801,570	**in Street Maintenance Vehicle Assets**		
						$79,820,000	**in Street Light Assets**		
						$15,016,112	**in Circulation System DIF Fund Balance**		

The replacement value of the City's existing circulation system assets has not been updated.

Schedule 5.4

City of Ontario
2019 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	3,002.5	18,384	34.588	635,873	22.74%	$89,114,247	$29,680	6.12	*$4,847 per Unit*
Attached Dwellings	820.1	23,119	23.095	533,935	19.09%	$74,828,174	$91,244	28.19	*$3,237 per Unit*
High Density Dwellings	137.9	5,293	14.288	75,628	2.70%	$10,598,865	$76,887	38.40	*$2,002 per Unit*
Commercial Lodging	9.0	396	18.239	7,223	0.26%	$1,012,265	$112,474	44.00	*$2,556 per Unit*
Retail/Service Uses	358.9	6,272,000	69.888	438,337	15.68%	$61,430,619	$171,145	17,474	*$9.794 per S.F.*
Office Uses	308.7	10,274,000	39.944	410,384	14.68%	$57,513,153	$186,338	33,287	*$5.598 per S.F.*
Business Park Uses	665.9	13,380,000	41.557	556,038	19.88%	$77,925,793	$117,030	20,094	*$5.824 per S.F.*
Industrial Uses	233.2	6,439,000	21.419	137,914	4.93%	$19,327,920	$82,871	27,608	*$3.002 per S.F.*
Institutional Use	1.0	21,780	45.634	994	0.04%	$139,304	$139,304	21,780	*$6.396 per S.F.*
TOTAL	5,537.14	–	–	2,796,326	100.00%	$391,890,340	in Total OR Circulation General Plan Projects		
			ALTERNATIVE FEE METHODOLOGY	*2,796,326*		*$391,890,340*	*$140.14 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 and OR 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 ensure adequate safety response times to a few large vacant areas to be developed.

City records indicate that there are currently 320,018 linear feet of reinforced concrete pipe sized averaging about 50", requiring 1,275 inlet boxes, 323 junction boxes and 1,275 inlets. The City also has 25,691 linear feet of concrete channel requiring 21 junctions and 140 inlets.

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 *run-off* and thus accelerate the need for additional storm drainage facilities to handle increased *run-off* 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 amounts of the rainfall *runs 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, 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%.

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

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 (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 $382,541,061 in storm drainage projects required to fully complete the City's network of pipes and small channels.

The existing Storm Drainage DIF Fund balance of $17,171,088 acts to reduce that figure to $365,369,973. Of that figure, $76,569,642 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, consisting of projects to service future development, mostly within the OR, include $190,892,446 in OR Storm Drainage DIF projects. Category B projects, consisting mostly of mainline storm drain facilities that will improve drainage conditions in City streets with existing storm drains, are not included in the proposed DIF and total $97,907,885.

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 $76,569,642 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 to fully fund the *Category A* 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).

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

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	-$5,137,112	$8,421/Unit
Attached Dwelling Units	$5,487,705	$1,198/Unit
High Density Dwelling Units	$10,539,031	$1,266/Unit
Mobile Home Units	$47,040	$3,618/Unit
Commercial Lodging Units	$52,920	$1,323/Unit
Retail/Service Uses	$7,817,881	$0.663/S.F.
Office Uses	$14,553,018	$0.903/S.F.
Business Park Uses	$7,185,001	$2.528/S.F.
Industrial Uses	$35,968,298	$1.122/S.F.
Institutional Uses	$55,860	$2.565/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 or flood control channel) need to be sized to handle all of the stormwater collected upstream. Stormwater that is collected in one location accumulates with feeder lines along the way and thus the downstream system must be built increasingly larger (at increasing higher material and construction costs) the farther it gets away from its source.

Table 6-3, following, distributes the total equity replacement value of the existing storm drainage system at $228,076,754 over the existing GC developed community. The total consists of the actual existing storm drainage pipe and channel systems at $211,659,167, the existing storm drainage maintenance vehicle allocation of $349,600 and existing GC Storm Drainage Collection System DIF fund balance of $16,067,987. The development impact costs figures represent 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	$70,539,370	$2,834/Unit
Attached Dwelling Units	$13,146,791	$1,108/Unit
High Density Dwelling Units	$17,659	$441/Unit
Mobile Home Units	$3,029,504	$1,206/Unit
Commercial Lodging Units	$679,872	$157/Unit
Retail/Service Uses	$16,399,937	$1.689/S.F.
Office Uses	$741,679	$0.811/S.F.
Business Park Uses	$1,373,480	$1.051/S.F.
Industrial Uses	$119,781,171	$0.951/S.F.
Institutional Uses	$2,367,290	$0.856/S.F.

Of note is the fact that in Table 6-3, the investment "equity" of the current community is noticeably less (by roughly two-thirds, at 34%) 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 6-2 and Schedule 6.2) the remainder of the Storm Water Collection System needs for the General City area of the City.

Table 6-4, following, combines the total *Category A* capital needs of $76,569,642 with the existing $228,076,754 asset replacement value of the existing storm drainage system to form the General Plan build-out storm drainage collection system total cost for the GC area of the City. In short it is the Category A storm drainage collection system that needs to be in place at General Plan build-out for protection of the street system and travel. The combined $304,646,396 is then distributed over the General Plan Build-out land-use database (or the combination of Schedules 6.2 and 6.3). The resulting impact costs are identified in table 6-4 following.

Table 6-4
City of Ontario's General City Area
General Plan Build-out Proportional 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	$82,669,814	$3,404/Unit
Attached Dwelling Units	$17,990,925	$1,094/Unit
High Density Dwelling Units	$4,245,434	$508/Unit
Mobile Home Units	$3,657,764	$1,449/Unit
Commercial Lodging Units	$837,845	$191/Unit
Retail/Service Uses	$22,832,438	$1.062/S.F.
Office Uses	$6,723,970	$0.395/S.F.
Business Park Uses	$4,529,635	$1.092/S.F.
Industrial Uses	$158,292,693	$1.002/S.F.
Institutional Uses	$2,865,877	$1.028/S.F.

Recommended General City Storm Drainage Development Impact Fee Schedule. The adoption of Schedule 6.4 and summarized in Table 6-4 as the Storm Drainage Collection System DIF schedule would generate capital to construct approximately 87% the 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 $190.9 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 ensure that no projects benefitting new development in the General City have been included in the net $190,892,446 in OR storm drainage capital needs. This cost would be distributed over the 4,529.37 additional acres of impervious surface from OR developments.

Table 6-5, 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:

Table 6-5
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	$98,070,583	$5,335/Unit
Attached Dwelling Units	$27,996,109	$1,211/Unit
High Density Dwelling Units	$5,228,781	$988/Unit
Commercial Lodging Units	$341,378	$862/Unit
Retail/Service Uses	$13,614,933	$2.171/S.F.
Office Uses	$11,707,386	$1.140/S.F.
Business Park Uses	$24,555,124	$1.835/S.F.
Industrial Uses	$9,338,114	$1.450/S.F.
Institutional Uses	$40,038	$1.838/S.F.

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

RECAP OF RECOMMENDED STORM DRAINAGE IMPROVEMENTS DIFS

- **General City** - Adopt Schedule 6.4 for the ten land-uses and the *Cost Distribution per Acre* figure (from the third column from the right side of the Schedule 6.5) for developments that do not involve a building pad, (e.g. additional asphalt parking area).

- **Ontario Ranch** - Adopt Schedule 6.5 for the nine land-uses and the C*ost Distribution per Acre* figure (from the third column from the right side of Schedule 6.5) 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 6.5

END OF CHAPTER TEXT

Schedule 6.1

City of Ontario
2019 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		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
SD-001	Euclid Avenue, Riverside To Merrill	$9,281,432	0.00%	$0	100.00%	$9,281,432	0.00%	$0
SD-002	Grove Avenue, Grove Basin To Merrill	$11,788,930	0.00%	$0	100.00%	$11,788,930	0.00%	$0
SD-003	Project No Longer Needed	$0	0.00%	$0	0.00%	$0	0.00%	$0
SD-004	County Line Channel In Bellegrave Avenue	$2,500,119	0.00%	$0	100.00%	$2,500,119	0.00%	$0
SD-005	Merrill Avenue, Euclid To Bon View	$6,790,488	0.00%	$0	100.00%	$6,790,488	0.00%	$0
SD-006	Campus Avenue, 920' N/O Eucalyptus To Merrill	$1,549,309	0.00%	$0	100.00%	$1,549,309	0.00%	$0
SD-007	Bon View, 1,320' N/O Chino To Merrill	$8,202,387	0.00%	$0	100.00%	$8,202,387	0.00%	$0
SD-008	Euclid Avenue Laterals	$6,417,851	0.00%	$0	100.00%	$6,417,851	0.00%	$0
SD-009	Project No Longer Needed	$0	0.00%	$0	0.00%	$0	0.00%	$0
SD-010	Project No Longer Needed	$0	0.00%	$0	0.00%	$0	0.00%	$0
SD-011	Project No Longer Needed	$0	0.00%	$0	0.00%	$0	0.00%	$0
SD-012	Project No Longer Needed	$0	0.00%	$0	0.00%	$0	0.00%	$0
SD-013	Walker Avenue, Merrill To Chino	$6,866,673	0.00%	$0	100.00%	$6,866,673	0.00%	$0
SD-014	Merrill Avenue, Vineyard to 1420' W/O Walker	$6,856,490	0.00%	$0	100.00%	$6,856,490	0.00%	$0
SD-015	Ontario Ranch Road, Walker to 880' E/O Walker	$1,137,994	0.00%	$0	100.00%	$1,137,994	0.00%	$0
SD-016	Schaefer Avenue, Walker To 1,950' E/O Walker	$1,149,885	0.00%	$0	100.00%	$1,149,885	0.00%	$0
SD-017	Project No Longer Needed	$0	0.00%	$0	0.00%	$0	0.00%	$0
SD-018	Project No Longer Needed	$0	0.00%	$0	0.00%	$0	0.00%	$0
SD-019	Project 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	$556,094	0.00%	$0	100.00%	$556,094	0.00%	$0
SD-021	Archibald Avenue, Schaefer To County Line Channel	$6,871,050	0.00%	$0	100.00%	$6,871,050	0.00%	$0
SD-022	Eucalyptus Avenue, Archibald To 1,300' E/O Archibald (P)	$1,102,511	0.00%	$0	100.00%	$1,102,511	0.00%	$0
SD-023	Ontario Ranch Road, Archibald to 2,500' E/O Archibald	$1,136,097	0.00%	$0	100.00%	$1,136,097	0.00%	$0
SD-024	Project No Longer Needed	$0	0.00%	$0	0.00%	$0	0.00%	$0
SD-025	Turner Avenue, Riverside To County Line Channel (P)	$7,446,047	0.00%	$0	100.00%	$7,446,047	0.00%	$0
SD-026	Turner Avenue Laterals	$2,508,748	0.00%	$0	100.00%	$2,508,748	0.00%	$0
SD-027	Haven Avenue, Riverside To County Line Channel (P)	$8,266,144	0.00%	$0	100.00%	$8,266,144	0.00%	$0
SD-028	Ontario Ranch Road, Between Haven And Mill Creek (P)	$410,618	0.00%	$0	100.00%	$410,618	0.00%	$0
SD-029	Haven Avenue Laterals E/O Haven And N/O Schaefer	$2,101,292	0.00%	$0	100.00%	$2,101,292	0.00%	$0
SD-030	Haven Avenue Laterals	$326,876	0.00%	$0	100.00%	$326,876	0.00%	$0
SD-031	Project No Longer Needed	$0	0.00%	$0	0.00%	$0	0.00%	$0

Schedule 6.1

City of Ontario
2019 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		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
SD-032	Mill Creek, Chino To County Line Channel (P)	$10,394,380	0.00%	$0	94.00%	$9,770,717	6.00%	$623,663
SD-033	Eucalyptus Avenue Between Mill Creek And Milliken	$374,440	0.00%	$0	100.00%	$374,440	0.00%	$0
SD-034	Eucalyptus Avenue Between Haven And Mill Creek	$668,173	0.00%	$0	100.00%	$668,173	0.00%	$0
SD-035	Mill Creek Avenue Laterals On Ontario Ranch Road	$1,247,525	0.00%	$0	100.00%	$1,247,525	0.00%	$0
SD-036	Schaefer Avenue Between Mill Creek And Milliken	$1,752,911	0.00%	$0	100.00%	$1,752,911	0.00%	$0
SD-037	Hellman Avenue, Schaefer To Ontario Ranch Road And Laterals	$4,804,976	0.00%	$0	100.00%	$4,804,976	0.00%	$0
SD-038	Project 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	$4,712,252	0.00%	$0	100.00%	$4,712,252	0.00%	$0
SD-040	Eucalyptus Avenue, Hellman To Cucamonga Channel	$1,304,595	0.00%	$0	100.00%	$1,304,595	0.00%	$0
SD-041	Merrill Avenue, Cucamonga Channel To Walker	$20,396,101	0.00%	$0	100.00%	$20,396,101	0.00%	$0
SD-042	Project No Longer Needed	$0	0.00%	$0	0.00%	$0	0.00%	$0
SD-043	Project No Longer Needed	$0	0.00%	$0	0.00%	$0	0.00%	$0
SD-044	Project No Longer Needed	$0	0.00%	$0	0.00%	$0	0.00%	$0
SD-045	Eucalyptus Avenue, Cucamonga Channel To W/O Archibald	$698,533	0.00%	$0	100.00%	$698,533	0.00%	$0
SD-046	Ontario Ranch Road Laterals E/O Cucamonga Channel	$1,103,333	0.00%	$0	100.00%	$1,103,333	0.00%	$0
SD-047	Project No Longer Needed	$0	0.00%	$0	0.00%	$0	0.00%	$0
SD-048	Chino Avenue, Cucamonga Channel To N/O Chino	$1,227,683	0.00%	$0	100.00%	$1,227,683	0.00%	$0
SD-049	Milliken Avenue, Riverside To County Line Channel (P)	$3,642,694	0.00%	$0	100.00%	$3,642,694	0.00%	$0
SD-050	Offsite Euclid Avenue Storm Drain	$19,715,234	0.00%	$0	100.00%	$19,715,234	0.00%	$0
SD-051	Offsite Walker Avenue Basin	$20,200,000	47.52%	$9,600,000	52.48%	$10,600,000	0.00%	$0
SD-052	Offsite Grove Avenue Storm Drain And Basin	$12,956,885	0.00%	$0	100.00%	$12,956,885	0.00%	$0
SD-053	Francis Avenue, Campus To West Cucamonga Creek Channel (P)	$9,905,459	0.00%	$0	0.00%	$0	100.00%	$9,905,459
SD-054	Fifth Street, Beryln To West Cucamonga Creek	$1,851,739	0.00%	$0	0.00%	$0	100.00%	$1,851,739
SD-055	Parco Avenue, 60 Freeway To Riverside And Lateral	$3,847,609	0.00%	$0	0.00%	$0	100.00%	$3,847,609
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	$6,487,590	0.00%	$0	0.00%	$0	100.00%	$6,487,590
SD-058	Grove Avenue, 60 Freeway To Riverside Drive	$2,125,720	0.00%	$0	0.00%	$0	100.00%	$2,125,720
SD-059	Campus Avenue, Cedar To Riverside	$3,547,772	0.00%	$0	0.00%	$0	100.00%	$3,547,772
SD-060	D and I Streets, Grove To West Cucamonga Channel	$1,380,194	100.00%	$1,380,194	0.00%	$0	0.00%	$0
SD-061	Inland Empire Blvd., Vineyard To Cucamonga Channel	$4,218,458	0.00%	$0	0.00%	$0	100.00%	$4,218,458
SD-062	Sultana Avenue, Phillips To Philadelphia	$4,184,754	0.00%	$0	0.00%	$0	100.00%	$4,184,754

Schedule 6.1

City of Ontario
2019 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	$6,738,657	0.00%	$0	0.00%	$0	100.00%	$6,738,657
SD-064	Baker, Vineyard, Carlos, Hellman - Acacia to Philadelphia	$2,631,593	100.00%	$2,631,593	0.00%	$0	0.00%	$0
SD-065	Bon View Avenue, 60 Freeway To Riverside (P)	$2,830,315	0.00%	$0	0.00%	$0	100.00%	$2,830,315
SD-066	Cucamonga Avenue, 60 Freeway To Riverside	$2,392,667	0.00%	$0	0.00%	$0	100.00%	$2,392,667
SD-067	Bon View Avenue, Mission To Francis	$3,545,094	100.00%	$3,545,094	0.00%	$0	0.00%	$0
SD-068	Cucamonga Avenue, Phillips To Francis	$2,191,316	100.00%	$2,191,316	0.00%	$0	0.00%	$0
SD-069	Storm Drainage Maintenance Vehicles	$557,520	0.00%	$0	77.67%	$433,025	22.33%	$124,495
SD-070	Boulder Avenue, I Street To State	$12,469,125	100.00%	$12,469,125	0.00%	$0	0.00%	$0
SD-071	Benson Avenue, State To I Street	$3,941,546	100.00%	$3,941,546	0.00%	$0	0.00%	$0
SD-072	Mountain Avenue, Philadelphia To Phillips	$7,508,428	0.00%	$0	0.00%	$0	100.00%	$7,508,428
SD-073	San Antonio Avenue, Francis To Cypress Channel	$13,000,109	0.00%	$0	0.00%	$0	100.00%	$13,000,109
SD-074	San Sevaine Channel	$1,807,410	0.00%	$0	0.00%	$0	100.00%	$1,807,410
SD-075	Storm Drain Master Plan (P)	$200,000	0.00%	$0	77.67%	$155,340	22.33%	$44,660
SD-076	Project 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)	$4,135,524	0.00%	$0	0.00%	$0	100.00%	$4,135,524
SD-078	Parco Avenue, Philadelphia to 60 Freeway (Phase 2 Of SD-055)	$888,456	100.00%	$888,456	0.00%	$0	0.00%	$0
SD-079	Grove Avenue, Francis to 60 Freeway (Phase 2 Of SD-058)	$1,371,962	100.00%	$1,371,962	0.00%	$0	0.00%	$0
SD-080	Sultana Avenue, State to Phillips (Phase 2 Of SD-062)	$3,311,276	100.00%	$3,311,276	0.00%	$0	0.00%	$0
SD-081	Bon View Avenue, 60 Freeway To Francis (Phase 2 Of SD-065)	$1,555,326	100.00%	$1,555,326	0.00%	$0	0.00%	$0
SD-082	Cucamonga Avenue, Francis to 60 FWY (Phase 2 Of SD-066)	$1,231,909	100.00%	$1,231,909	0.00%	$0	0.00%	$0
SD-083	Mountain & Boulder, I-10 to I Street (Phase 2 Of SD-070)	$5,685,064	100.00%	$5,685,064	0.00%	$0	0.00%	$0
SD-084	Benson Avenue Laterals (Phase 2 Of SD-071)	$4,246,845	100.00%	$4,246,845	0.00%	$0	0.00%	$0
SD-085	Mountain Avenue, State to Phillips (Phase 2 Of SD-072)	$2,149,558	100.00%	$2,149,558	0.00%	$0	0.00%	$0
SD-086	San Antonio & Phillips, Euclid to Francis (Phase 2, SD-073)	$5,552,715	0.00%	$0	0.00%	$0	100.00%	$5,552,715
SD-087	Oakland Avenue, State to Phillips (Phase 2 Of SD-074)	$6,951,996	100.00%	$6,951,996	0.00%	$0	0.00%	$0
SD-088	Walker Avenue, 60 Freeway To Riverside And Lateral	$1,863,006	100.00%	$1,863,006	0.00%	$0	0.00%	$0
SD-089	Baker Avenue And Riverside Drive, S/O 60 Freeway	$2,632,040	100.00%	$2,632,040	0.00%	$0	0.00%	$0
SD-090	G Street, Corona To Del Norte	$2,750,734	100.00%	$2,750,734	0.00%	$0	0.00%	$0
SD-091	Del Norte and Imperial Avenues From I Street To G Street	$1,213,989	100.00%	$1,213,989	0.00%	$0	0.00%	$0
SD-092	Vine Avenue, G Street To State	$3,623,848	100.00%	$3,623,848	0.00%	$0	0.00%	$0
SD-093	Vine Avenue, Sixth To G Street	$3,808,337	100.00%	$3,808,337	0.00%	$0	0.00%	$0

Schedule 6.1

City of Ontario
2019 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		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
SD-094	Sultana Avenue, Fifth To Holt	$6,510,304	100.00%	$6,510,304	0.00%	$0	0.00%	$0
SD-095	Benson Avenue And Laterals	$2,185,828	100.00%	$2,185,828	0.00%	$0	0.00%	$0
SD-096	Benson Avenue, Francis To Philadelphia	$2,901,565	100.00%	$2,901,565	0.00%	$0	0.00%	$0
SD-097	Mission, Benson, Phillips & Oaks, W/O Magnolia	$4,658,672	100.00%	$4,658,672	0.00%	$0	0.00%	$0
SD-098	Holt Boulevard, Convention Center To Cucamonga Channel	$1,080,218	100.00%	$1,080,218	0.00%	$0	0.00%	$0
SD-099	Mission Boulevard, Proforma To Turner	$1,001,464	100.00%	$1,001,464	0.00%	$0	0.00%	$0
SD-100	6th Street, West Cucamonga Creek To Grove	$526,620	100.00%	$526,620	0.00%	$0	0.00%	$0
SD-101	Archibald Avenue, Inland Empire To Airport Drive	$2,168,437	0.00%	$0	0.00%	$0	100.00%	$2,168,437
SD-102	Fifth Street, Balboa To Cucamonga Channel	$1,372,920	0.00%	$0	0.00%	$0	100.00%	$1,372,920
SD-103	Share Of Common City Yard Improvements	$1,739,460	0.00%	$0	77.67%	$1,351,035	22.33%	$388,425
SD-104	Ontario Ranch Storm Drain Design Studies	$813,062	0.00%	$0	100.00%	$813,062	0.00%	$0
SD-105	Ontario Ranch Storm Drain Study	$1,000,000	0.00%	$0	100.00%	$1,000,000	0.00%	$0
	Sub-Total General Plan Total New Projects	$382,541,061	25.59%	$97,907,885	50.19%	$191,995,547	24.22%	$92,637,629
	LESS:							
	GC Development Impact Fee Fund Balance	$16,067,987	0.00%	$0	0.00%	$0	100.00%	$16,067,987
	OR Development Impact Fee Fund Balance	$1,103,101	0.00%	$0	100.00%	$1,103,101	0.00%	$0
	Sub-total Off-setting Revenuse	$17,171,088	0.00%	$0	6.42%	$1,103,101	93.58%	$16,067,987
	Total Net General Plan Project Costs	$366,473,074	26.72%	$97,907,885	52.09%	$190,892,446	20.89%	$76,569,642
					Forward to Schedule 6.5		**Forward to Schedule 6.2**	

NOTES:
1. Costs distribution based upon Coefficient of Drainage statistics.

Schedule 6.2

City of Ontario
2019 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	(112.7)	(610)	0.775	(87.37)	-6.71%	-$5,137,112	$45,570	5.41	*$8,421 per Unit*
Attached Dwellings	115.2	4,580	0.810	93.33	7.17%	$5,487,705	$47,628	39.75	*$1,198 per Unit*
High Density Dwellings	199.2	8,322	0.900	179.24	13.76%	$10,539,031	$52,920	41.79	*$1,266 per Unit*
Mobile Home Dwellings	1.0	13	0.800	0.80	0.06%	$47,040	$47,040	13.00	*$3,618 per Unit*
Commercial Lodging Units	1.0	40	0.900	0.90	0.07%	$52,920	$52,920	40.00	*$1,323 per Unit*
Retail/Service Uses	147.7	11,792,000	0.900	132.96	10.21%	$7,817,881	$52,920	79,821	*$0.663 per S.F.*
Office Uses	275.0	16,112,000	0.900	247.50	19.01%	$14,553,018	$52,920	58,589	*$0.903 per S.F.*
Business Park Uses	139.7	2,842,000	0.875	122.19	9.38%	$7,185,001	$51,450	20,351	*$2.528 per S.F.*
Industrial Uses	643.9	32,045,000	0.950	611.71	46.97%	$35,968,298	$55,860	49,767	*$1.122 per S.F.*
Institutional Use	1.0	21,780	0.950	0.95	0.07%	$55,860	$55,860	21,780	*$2.565 per S.F.*
TOTAL	**1,410.92**	**--**	**--**	**1,302.20**	**100.00%**	**$76,569,642**	**in Total GC Storm Drainage General Plan Projects**		

Schedule 6.3

City of Ontario
2019 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	4,638.80	24,894	0.775	3,595.07	30.93%	$70,539,370	$15,206	5.37	***$2,834 per Unit***
Attached Dwellings	827.20	11,870	0.810	670.03	5.76%	$13,146,791	$15,893	14.35	***$1,108 per Unit***
High Density Dwellings	1.00	40	0.900	0.90	0.01%	$17,659	$17,659	40.00	***$441 per Unit***
Mobile Home Dwellings	193.00	2,511	0.800	154.40	1.33%	$3,029,504	$15,697	13.01	***$1,206 per Unit***
Commercial Lodging Units	38.50	4,338	0.900	34.65	0.30%	$679,872	$17,659	112.68	***$157 per Unit***
Retail/Service Uses	928.70	9,709,001	0.900	835.83	7.19%	$16,399,937	$17,659	10,454	***$1.689 per S.F.***
Office Uses	42.00	914,760	0.900	37.80	0.33%	$741,679	$17,659	21,780	***$0.811 per S.F.***
Business Park Uses	80.00	1,306,800	0.875	70.00	0.60%	$1,373,480	$17,168	16,335	***$1.051 per S.F.***
Industrial Uses	6,426.00	125,962,452	0.950	6,104.70	52.52%	$119,781,171	$18,640	19,602	***$0.951 per S.F.***
Institutional Use	127.00	2,766,060	0.950	120.65	1.04%	$2,367,290	$18,640	21,780	***$0.856 per S.F.***
TOTAL	**13,302.20**	--	--	**11,624.03**	**100.00%**	**$228,076,754**	**Total Storm Drainage Existing Assets**		
						$211,659,167	**in General Plan Storm Drainage System Pipe Assets**		
						$349,600	**in Storm Drainage Maintenance Vehicle Assets**		
						$16,067,987	**in GC Storm Drainage System DIF Fund Balance**		

Schedule 6.4

City of Ontario
2019 Development Impact Cost Calculation Update
General Plan Build-out Average Infrastructure Costs
Storm Drainage Collection System Facilities
Combines Existing System and GC Needs Spread Over the General Plan Build-out of the General City Area (Schedules 6.2 and 6.3 combined).

Proposed Land Use	General Plan Build-out Acres	General Plan Build-out Units	Run-off Coefficient Index Rate	GC GP 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	4,526.1	24,284	0.775	3,507.70	27.14%	$82,669,814	$18,265	5.37	***$3,404 per Unit***
Attached Dwellings	942.4	16,450	0.810	763.36	5.91%	$17,990,925	$19,090	17.46	***$1,094 per Unit***
High Density Dwellings	200.2	8,362	0.900	180.14	1.39%	$4,245,434	$21,211	41.78	***$508 per Unit***
Mobile Home Dwellings	194.0	2,524	0.800	155.20	1.20%	$3,657,764	$18,854	13.01	***$1,449 per Unit***
Commercial Lodging Units	39.5	4,378	0.900	35.55	0.28%	$837,845	$21,211	110.84	***$191 per Unit***
Retail/Service Uses	1,076.4	21,501,001	0.900	968.79	7.49%	$22,832,438	$21,211	19,974	***$1.062 per S.F.***
Office Uses	317.0	17,026,760	0.900	285.30	2.21%	$6,723,970	$21,211	53,712	***$0.395 per S.F.***
Business Park Uses	219.7	4,148,800	0.875	192.19	1.49%	$4,529,635	$20,622	18,888	***$1.092 per S.F.***
Industrial Uses	7,069.9	158,007,452	0.950	6,716.41	51.96%	$158,292,693	$22,390	22,349	***$1.002 per S.F.***
Institutional Use	128.0	2,787,840	0.950	121.60	0.94%	$2,865,877	$22,390	21,780	***$1.028 per S.F.***
TOTAL	**14,713.12**	--	--	**12,926.24**	**100.00%**	**$304,646,396**	**System Nominal Cost @ GC General Plan Build-out**		
						$228,076,754	**Existing Storm Drainage System at Replacement Costs**		
						$76,569,642	**Remaining Category "A" Storm Drainage Projects**		

Schedule 6.5

City of Ontario
2019 Development Impact Cost Calculation Update
Ontario Ranch (OR) - Minimum Capital Needs-based Impact Costs
Storm Drainage Collection System Facilities

Proposed Land Use	*Undeveloped* *Acres*	*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	3,002.5	18,384	0.775	2,326.95	51.37%	$98,070,583	$32,663	6.12	*$5,335 per Unit*
Attached Dwellings	820.1	23,119	0.810	664.27	14.67%	$27,996,109	$34,138	28.19	*$1,211 per Unit*
High Density Dwellings	137.9	5,293	0.900	124.07	2.74%	$5,228,781	$37,931	38.40	*$988 per Unit*
Commercial Lodging	9.0	396	0.900	8.10	0.18%	$341,378	$37,931	44.00	*$862 per Unit*
Retail/Service Uses	358.9	6,272,000	0.900	323.05	7.13%	$13,614,933	$37,931	17,474	*$2.171 per S.F.*
Office Uses	308.7	10,274,000	0.900	277.79	6.13%	$11,707,386	$37,931	33,287	*$1.140 per S.F.*
Business Park Uses	665.9	13,380,000	0.875	582.63	12.86%	$24,555,124	$36,877	20,094	*$1.835 per S.F.*
Industrial Uses	233.2	6,439,000	0.950	221.57	4.89%	$9,338,114	$40,038	27,608	*$1.450 per S.F.*
Institutional Use	1.0	21,780	0.950	0.95	0.02%	$40,038	$40,038	21,780	*$1.838 per S.F.*
TOTAL	5,537.14	--	--	4,529.37	100.00%	$190,892,446	**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 System151,213,122, the City has well capacities with a replacement value of $81,466,000 and reservoirs at $113,850,000. The City owns Water Facility Authority (WFA) and San Antonio water shares valued at roughly $17,834,593. The system also has PRV stations ($5,060,000), booster stations ($7,590,000), treatment facilities ($12,614,443), altitude valves ($632,500) and a share of the utility maintenance vehicles ($2,491,749). There is also an GC DIF fund balance of $7,235,811. The total assets are $399,988,218. 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. This recovery will be discussed later. 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 currently (on average) delivers about 35.0 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	Potential Residential Units	Potential Business Acres	Water Demand in GPD or GPAD	Projected GPD Water Demand
Detached Dwellings	24,894		544/Unit	13,542,336
Attached Dwellings	11,870		372/Unit	4,415,640
High Density Dwellings	40		251/Unit	10,040
Mobile Residences Dwellings	2,511		372/Unit	934,092
Commercial Lodging Units	4,338		150/Unit	650,700
Retail/Service Uses		9,709,001	2,200/Acre	2,043,140
Office Uses		914,760	3,400/Acre	142,800
Business Park Uses		1,306,800	2,200/Acre	176,000
Industrial Uses		125,962,452	2,000/Acre	12,852,000
Institutional Uses		2,766,060	2,200/Acre	279,400
Total Gallons per Day	**- - -**	**- - -**	**- - -**	**35,046,148**

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 6.3 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 35.0 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	-610		544/Unit	-331,840
Attached Dwellings	4,580		372/Unit	1,703,760
High Density Dwellings	8,322		251/Unit	2,088,822
Mobile Residences Dwellings	13		372/Unit	4,836
Commercial Lodging Units	40		150/Unit	6,000
Retail/Service Uses		147.7	2,200/Acre	325,006
Office Uses		275.0	3,400/Acre	935,000
Business Park Uses		139.7	2,200/Acre	307,230
Industrial Uses		643.9	2,000/Acre	1,287,800
Institutional Uses		1.0	2,200/Acre	2,200
Total Gallons per Day	**- - -**	**- - -**	**- - -**	**6,328,814**

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

Table 7-4
Total Existing 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	24,284		544/Unit	13,210,496
Attached Dwellings	16,450		372/Unit	6,119,400
High Density Dwellings	8,362		251/Unit	2,098,862
Mobile Residences Dwellings	2,524		372/Unit	938,928
Commercial Lodging Units	4,378		150/Unit	656,700
Retail/Service Uses		1,076.4	2,200/Acre	2,368,146
Office Uses		317.0	3,400/Acre	1,077,800
Business Park Uses		219.7	2,200/Acre	483,230
Industrial Uses		7,069.9	2,000/Acre	14,139,800
Institutional Uses		128.0	2,200/Acre	281,600
Total Gallons per Day	**- - -**	**- - -**	**- - -**	**41,374,962**

The total projected average daily demand from all GC Ontario privately held acreage at General Plan build-out is about 41.4 million gallons daily. Although encouraged, widespread conservation efforts are not currently mandated in the GC area of the City. 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 thirty-eight 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 $660.6 million. Staff has identified thirteen projects (or portions thereof) totaling some $192.2 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 $86.9 million in projects identified as benefitting new development in GC area of the City. This figure was used to calculate the GC DIF schedule.

Approximately $381.5 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 $385.9 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.

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 $468.4 million in new water capital expansion is required in the GC and OR portions of the City. Approximately $86,916,705 of this cost has been identified for GC DIF funding. The $86.9 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 (1)	-$4,557,321	$7,473/Unit
Attached Dwelling Units	$23,398,571	$5,109/Unit
High Density Dwelling Units	$28,686,816	$3,447/Unit
Mobile Home Dwelling Units	$66,415	$5,109/Unit
Commercial Lodging Units	$82,401	$2,060/Unit
Retail/Service Uses	$4,463,467	$0.379/S.F.
Office Uses	$12,840,813	$0.797/S.F.
Business Park Uses	$4,219,340	$1.485/S.F.
Industrial Uses	$17,685,989	$0.552/S.F.
Institutional Uses	$30,214	$1.387/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 $399,988,218. This figure does not include local (tract) lines and connections, estimated conservatively to be in the area of an additional $100.0 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 $400.0 million figure is the existing fund balance in the Water System DIF Fund of $7,235,811.

When this nearly $400.0 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 $6,205 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	$185,521,302	$7,447/Unit
Attached Dwelling Units	$60,491,431	$5,096/Unit
High Density Dwelling Units	$137,542	$3,439/Unit
Mobile Home Units	$12,796,460	$5,096/Unit
Commercial Lodging Units	$8,914,172	$2,055/Unit
Retail/Service Uses	$27,989,705	$2.883/S.F.
Office Uses	$1,956,268	$2.139/S.F.
Business Park Uses	$2,411,087	$1.845/S.F.
Industrial Uses	$176,064,142	$1.398/S.F.
Institutional Uses	$3,827,600	$1.384/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 $7,473 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 ($12,457) than the $7,473 for the 3/4" meter. Other meter sizes are as follows:

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

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	$7,473	$7,473
1' Meter	25	1.667	$7,473	$12,457
1 & ½" Meter	50	3.333	$7,473	$24,908
2" Meter	80	5.333	$7,473	$39,854
3" Meter	240	16.000	$7,473	$119,568
4" Meter	420	28.000	$7,473	$209,244
6" Meter	920	61.333	$7,473	$458,342
8" Meter	1,600	106.667	$7,473	$797,122
10" Meter	2,500	166.667	$7,473	$1,245,502
12" Meter	3,300	220.000	$7,473	$1,644,060

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 $381,501,295 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. The total of $385,876,295 in costs will be spread over users generating demands of 30,623,455 gallons per day.

OR Water Demands, by Land Use. The 30.6 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.

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	$165,398,717	$8,997/Unit
Attached Dwelling Units	$114,195,509	$4,939/Unit
High Density Dwelling Units	$13,872,641	$2,621/Unit
Commercial Lodging Units	$1,496,961	$3,780/Unit
Retail/Service Uses	$21,854,591	$3.484/S.F.
Office Uses	$19,302,097	$1.879/S.F.
Business Park Uses	$35,616,774	$2.662/S.F.
Industrial Uses	$14,091,817	$2.189/S.F.
Institutional Uses	$47,190	$2.167/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) flow12 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 $8,997 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 ($14,998) than the $8,997 for the 3/4" meter. Other meter sizes are as follows in Table 7-10:

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	$8,997	$8,997
1' Meter	25	1.667	$8,997	$14,998
1 & ½" Meter	50	3.333	$8,997	$29,987
2" Meter	80	5.333	$8,997	$47,981
3" Meter	240	16.000	$8,997	$143,952
4" Meter	420	28.000	$8,997	$251,916
6" Meter	920	61.333	$8,997	$551,813
8" Meter	1,600	106.667	$8,997	$959,683
10" Meter	2,500	166.667	$8,997	$1,499,503
12" Meter	3,300	220.000	$8,997	$1,979,340

[This space left vacant to place the Chapter RECAP on a single page].

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

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
2019 Development Impact Cost Calculation Update
Allocation of Project Cost Estimates
Water Source, Storage and Distribution Facilities

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
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	$8,762,663	0.00%	$0	37.89%	$3,319,811	62.11%	$5,442,852
WT-003	Project No Longer Needed	$0	0.00%	$0	0.00%	$0	0.00%	$0
WT-004	Eighth Street 1212' Zone Transmission Lines	$36,642,539	14.73%	$5,395,630	0.00%	$0	85.27%	$31,246,909
WT-005	Eighth Street 1212' Zone Reservoir Site Purchase	$6,400,000	25.00%	$1,600,000	0.00%	$0	75.00%	$4,800,000
WT-006	Eighth Street 1212' Zone Reservoir Construction	$29,242,752	25.00%	$7,310,688	0.00%	$0	75.00%	$21,932,064
WT-007	Francis Street 925' Zone Wells	$33,924,835	0.00%	$0	100.00%	$33,924,835	0.00%	$0
WT-008	Phillips Street 1010' Zone Wells	$6,647,387	0.00%	$0	100.00%	$6,647,387	0.00%	$0
WT-009	Phillips Street 1010' Zone Extension Mains Extension	$22,882,247	8.85%	$2,025,284	84.93%	$19,433,200	6.22%	$1,423,763
WT-010	Francis Street 925' Zone Transmission Lines	$35,524,302	0.00%	$0	100.00%	$35,524,302	0.00%	$0
WT-011	Francis Street 925' Zone Distribution Mains	$40,033,253	0.00%	$0	100.00%	$40,033,253	0.00%	$0
WT-012	Francis Street 925' Zone Well Collection System	$11,511,287	0.00%	$0	100.00%	$11,511,287	0.00%	$0
WT-013	Pressure Reducing Station, Potable Water System (1010' - 925')	$1,778,766	0.00%	$0	100.00%	$1,778,766	0.00%	$0
WT-014	Francis Street 925' Zone Reservoirs	$62,024,039	0.00%	$0	100.00%	$62,024,039	0.00%	$0
WT-015	Phillips Street 1010' Zone Reservoirs	$9,327,338	0.00%	$0	100.00%	$9,327,338	0.00%	$0
WT-016	Recycled Water System	$73,065,670	0.00%	$0	88.06%	$64,340,694	11.94%	$8,724,976
WT-017	Back-Up Power Supply	$3,527,013	64.56%	$2,277,000	28.27%	$997,013	7.17%	$253,000
WT-018	Reservoir 1010' (2B) Landscaping	$242,730	0.00%	$0	0.00%	$0	100.00%	$242,730
WT-019	Project No Longer Needed	$0	0.00%	$0	0.00%	$0	0.00%	$0
WT-020	Project No Longer Needed	$0	0.00%	$0	0.00%	$0	0.00%	$0
WT-021	Distribution System Pressure, Size And Age Improvements	$140,836,512	100.00%	$140,836,512	0.00%	$0	0.00%	$0
WT-022	Miscellaneous Up-Sized Facilities	$5,925,291	0.00%	$0	0.00%	$0	100.00%	$5,925,291
WT-023	Abandon Existing General City Wells	$506,000	100.00%	$506,000	0.00%	$0	0.00%	$0
WT-024	Project No Longer Needed	$0	0.00%	$0	0.00%	$0	0.00%	$0
WT-025	Decommission Galvin Treatment Plant/Abandon 1212-3 Reservoir	$2,384,525	100.00%	$2,384,525	0.00%	$0	0.00%	$0
WT-026	Seismic Upgrades And Replacements	$13,426,715	100.00%	$13,426,715	0.00%	$0	0.00%	$0
WT-027	Water Master Plan Updates	$1,596,376	0.00%	$0	82.87%	$1,322,965	17.13%	$273,411
WT-028	Water System Maintenance Vehicle/Equipment Fleet	$1,297,912	0.00%	$0	82.87%	$1,075,619	17.13%	$222,293
WT-029	Project No Longer Needed	$0	0.00%	$0	100.00%	$0	0.00%	$0
WT-030	CDA Facility Modifications (Booster Station & Pipeline)	$2,797,348	0.00%	$0	100.00%	$2,797,348	0.00%	$0
WT-031	JCSD/Ontario Reservoir (Phillips Street 1010" Zone)	$1,078,186	40.00%	$431,274	50.00%	$539,093	10.00%	$107,819
WT-032	Water Treatment	$26,716,450	42.45%	$11,341,436	57.55%	$15,375,014	0.00%	$0
WT-033	Phillips Street 1010' Zone Well Connection System	$5,039,874	0.00%	$0	100.00%	$5,039,874	0.00%	$0
WT-034	Water Source Supply	$62,549,323	0.00%	$0	93.71%	$58,614,629	6.29%	$3,934,694
WT-035	General System Reliability Improvements	$1,796,300	100.00%	$1,796,300	0.00%	$0	0.00%	$0

Schedule 7.1

City of Ontario
2019 Development Impact Cost Calculation Update
Allocation of Project Cost Estimates
Water Source, Storage and Distribution 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
WT-036	Fourth Street 1074' Zone Transmission Improvements	$2,858,784	100.00%	$2,858,784	0.00%	$0	0.00%	$0
WT-037	Share Of Common City Yard Improvements	$9,472,959	0.00%	$0	82.87%	$7,850,526	17.13%	$1,622,433
WT-038	Ontario Ranch Water/Recycled Water Design Studies	$24,302	0.00%	$0	100.00%	$24,302	0.00%	$0
	Sub-Total General Plan Total New Projects	$660,608,148	29.09%	$192,190,148	57.75%	$381,501,295	13.16%	$86,916,705
	OR Reimbursement for Water System	$ 4,375,000	0	$0	100.00%	$ 4,375,000	0.00%	0.00%
	Less: OR Reimbursement for previous GC Expenses	$ (4,375,000)	100%	$ (4,375,000)	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
	LESS:							
	GC Development Impact Fee Fund Balance	$7,235,811	100.00%	$7,235,811	0.00%	$0	0.00%	$0
	OR Development Impact Fee Fund Balance	$0	100.00%	$0	0.00%	$0	0.00%	$0
	Development Impact Fee Fund Balance Total	$7,235,811	100.00%	$7,235,811	0.00%	$0	0.00%	$0
	Total Net General Plan Project Costs	$653,372,337	27.64%	$180,579,337	59.06%	$385,876,295	13.30%	$86,916,705
					Forward to Schedule 7.4		Forward to Schedule 7.2	

NOTES:
1. Costs distribution based upon the water allocation factors from the Water Master Plan.

Schedule 7.2

City of Ontario
2019 Development Impact Cost Calculation Update
General City (GC) - Minimum Capital Needs-based Impact Costs
Water Source, Storage and Distribution Facilities

Proposed Land Use	Undeveloped Acres	Undeveloped Units	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
Detached Dwellings	(112.7)	(610)	544	(331,840)	-5.24%	-$4,557,321	$40,427	5.41	*$7,473 per Unit*
Attached Dwellings	115.2	4,580	372	1,703,760	26.92%	$23,398,571	$203,077	39.75	*$5,109 per Unit*
High Density Dwellings	199.2	8,322	251	2,088,822	33.00%	$28,686,816	$144,046	41.79	*$3,447 per Unit*
Mobile Home Dwellings	1.0	13	372	4,836	0.08%	$66,415	$66,415	13.00	*$5,109 per Unit*
Commercial Lodging Units	1.0	40	150	6,000	0.09%	$82,401	$82,401	40.00	*$2,060 per Unit*
Retail/Service Uses	147.7	11,792,000	2,200	325,006	5.14%	$4,463,467	$30,214	79,821	*$0.379 per S.F.*
Office Uses	275.0	16,112,000	3,400	935,000	14.77%	$12,840,813	$46,694	58,589	*$0.797 per S.F.*
Business Park Uses	139.7	2,842,000	2,200	307,230	4.85%	$4,219,340	$30,214	20,351	*$1.485 per S.F.*
Industrial Uses	643.9	32,045,000	2,000	1,287,800	20.35%	$17,685,989	$27,467	49,767	*$0.552 per S.F.*
Institutional Use	1.0	21,780	2,200	2,200	0.03%	$30,214	$30,214	21,780	*$1.387 per S.F.*
TOTAL	**1,410.92**	--	--	**6,328,814**	**100.00%**	**$86,916,705**	**in Total GC Water System General Plan Projects**		
ALTERNATE FEE METHODOLOGY				**6,328,814**		**$86,916,705**	**$13.733 Per Gallon Demand**		

(1). Allocation rates are based upon Potable water demand rates from the 2012 Water Master Plan and exclude potential recycled water demands. Recycled water usage in the GC area is limited to specific areas and does not include "regional" recycled water usage areas as in the OR.

Schedule 7.3

City of Ontario
2019 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	4,638.80	24,894	544	13,542,336	38.64%	$154,561,204	$33,319	5.37	***$6,205 per Unit***
Attached Dwellings	827.20	11,870	372	4,415,640	12.60%	$50,396,522	$60,924	14.35	***$4,246 per Unit***
High Density Dwellings	1.00	40	251	10,040	0.03%	$114,588	$114,588	40.00	***$2,865 per Unit***
Mobile Home Dwellings	193.00	2,511	372	934,092	2.67%	$10,660,966	$55,238	13.01	***$4,246 per Unit***
Commercial Lodging Units	38.50	4,338	150	650,700	1.86%	$7,426,560	$192,898	112.68	***$1,712 per Unit***
Retail/Service Uses	928.70	9,709,001	2,200	2,043,140	5.83%	$23,318,738	$25,109	10,454	***$2.402 per S.F.***
Office Uses	42.00	914,760	3,400	142,800	0.41%	$1,629,803	$38,805	21,780	***$1.782 per S.F.***
Business Park Uses	80.00	1,306,800	2,200	176,000	0.50%	$2,008,721	$25,109	16,335	***$1.537 per S.F.***
Industrial Uses	6,426.00	125,962,452	2,000	12,852,000	36.67%	$146,682,271	$22,826	19,602	***$1.164 per S.F.***
Institutional Use	127.00	2,766,060	2,200	279,400	0.80%	$3,188,844	$25,109	21,780	***$1.153 per S.F.***
TOTAL	**13,302.20**	--	--	**35,046,148**	**100.00%**	**$399,988,218**	**Total Existing Water System Inventory**		

$151,213,122	**in Water Distribution System Assets**
$113,850,000	**in Water Storage Reservoir Assets**
$81,466,000	**In Water Well Assets**
$17,834,593	**in Water Shares Assets**
$5,060,000	**in Pressure Reducing Stations (PRVs) Assets**
$7,590,000	**In Booster Station Assets**
$12,614,443	**in Treatment Facilities Assets**
$2,491,749	**in Water Maintenance Vehicles/Equipment Assets**
$632,500	**in Altitude Valve Assets**
$7,235,811	**in Water System DIF Fund Balance**

(1) The replacement value of the City's water system has not been updated.
(2). Allocation rates are based upon Potable water demand rates from the 2012 Water Master Plan and exclude potential recycled water demands. Recycled water usage in the GC area is limited to specific areas and does not include "regional" recycled water usage areas as in the OR.

Schedule 7.4

City of Ontario
2019 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	3,002.5	18,384	714	13,126,176	42.86%	$165,398,717	$55,087	6.12	*$8,997 per Unit*
Attached Dwellings	820.1	23,119	392	9,062,648	29.59%	$114,195,509	$139,248	28.19	*$4,939 per Unit*
High Density Dwellings	137.9	5,293	208	1,100,944	3.60%	$13,872,641	$100,636	38.40	*$2,621 per Unit*
Commercial Lodging	9.0	396	300	118,800	0.39%	$1,496,961	$166,329	44.00	*$3,780 per Unit*
Retail/Service Uses	358.9	6,272,000	4,832	1,734,398	5.66%	$21,854,591	$60,886	17,474	*$3.484 per S.F.*
Office Uses	308.7	10,274,000	4,963	1,531,830	5.00%	$19,302,097	$62,537	33,287	*$1.879 per S.F.*
Business Park Uses	665.9	13,380,000	4,245	2,826,576	9.23%	$35,616,774	$53,490	20,094	*$2.662 per S.F.*
Industrial Uses	233.2	6,439,000	4,795	1,118,338	3.65%	$14,091,817	$60,420	27,608	*$2.189 per S.F.*
Institutional Use	1.0	21,780	3,745	3,745	0.01%	$47,190	$47,190	21,780	*$2.167 per S.F.*
TOTAL	5,537.14	–	–	30,623,455	100.00%	$385,876,295	**in Total OR Water System General Plan Projects**		
ALTERNATE FEE METHODOLOGY				**30,623,455**		**$385,876,295**	**$12.601 Per Gallon Demand**		

(1) Ontario Ranch allocation rates are based upon Potable water and recycled Water demands from the 2012 water and recycled Water Master Plans. Recycled water demands include the landscaped medians, neighborhood edges and parkways and other landscaped areas.

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 ensure 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 1,942,722 linear feet of various sized (10" to 42") reinforced concrete pipe, over 7,582 manholes and various backfill, road base and asphalt. The current cost of duplicating the entire system of laterals, locals and collectors, would be approximately $205,739,712. There are also a number of pump stations with a replacement value $6,000,000. There is an existing GC DIF fund balance of $2,811,194 and $1,341,711 in specialty equipment and vehicles dedicated to sewer collection system maintenance. These individual assets create system equity of $215,892,617.

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 fifty-one capital projects 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 (or all) of twenty-four of the projects. OR had some (or all) of the responsibility for fifteen of the projects. Twenty-seven 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 $116,492,115 to design, construct and inspect, or acquire. The combined GC and OR DIF fund balances of $2,987,878 reduce that figure to a net $113,680,921.

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

[This space left vacant on intentionally].

DISTRIBUTION OF CAPTAL COSTS

Table 8-2, following, is extracted from Schedule 8.2 and demonstrates the results of distributing the $25,827,933 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	-$844,315	$1,384/Unit
Attached Dwelling Units	$5,546,290	$1,211/Unit
High Density Dwelling Units	$8,637,894	$1,038/Unit
Mobile Home Units	$15,755	$1,212/Unit
Commercial Lodging Units	$32,285	$807/Unit
Retail/Service Uses	$766,573	$0.065/S.F.
Office Uses	$4,757,247	$0.295/S.F.
Business Park Uses	$966,223	$0.340/S.F.
Industrial Uses	$5,940,941	$0.185/S.F.
Institutional Uses	$8,523	$0.391/S.F.

The results indicate that the varying types of residential dwellings will need to contribute anywhere from a low of $1,038 for a high density dwelling unit to a high of $1,384 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 cost, or equity, 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 $1,835 per unit and a detached dwelling unit has contributed about $2,450 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
(Not updated in 2017)

DIF Land-use Type	Allocation of Development Costs	Development Impact Cost Per Unit or Square Foot
Detached Dwelling Units	$61,017,730	$2,450/Unit
Attached Dwelling Units	$25,458,057	$2,145/Unit
High Density Dwelling Units	$73,403	$1,835/Unit
Mobile Home Units	$5,384,362	$2,144/Unit
Commercial Lodging Units	$6,202,595	$1,430/Unit
Retail/Service Uses	$8,536,394	$0.879/S.F.
Office Uses	$1,286,720	$1.407/S.F.
Business Park Uses	$980,152	$0.750/S.F.
Industrial Uses	$105,005,851	$0.834/S.F.
Institutional Uses	$1,945,192	$0.703/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 credit for previous contributions to capital from vacant parcels, simply because there were none. Additionally, there has 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 $39,952,526 in collection trunk mains and other general improvements. In addition, there is the $684,584 in costs for a proportional expansion of the sewer maintenance fleet and a OR Sewer Master Plan at $386,686. Additionally, there is $2,869,608 as the sewer operations share of the City maintenance yard improvements. The total of $43,893,404 (after the $176,684 fund balance is subtracted from the sub-total of $44,070,088) will be spread over users developing on 5,537.14 vacant acres generating demands of 11,680,184 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	$16,580,733	$902/Unit
Attached Dwelling Units	$15,812,160	$684/Unit
High Density Dwelling Units	$2,188,086	$413/Unit
Commercial Lodging Units	$208,494	$527/Unit
Retail/Service Uses	$1,214,092	$0.194/S.F.
Office Uses	$3,479,869	$0.339/S.F.
Business Park Uses	$3,002,748	$0.224/S.F.
Industrial Uses	$1,402,394	$0.218/S.F.
Institutional Uses	$5,706	$0.262/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
2019 Development Impact Cost Calculation Update
Allocation of Project Cost Estimates
Sewer Collection Facilities

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
SW-001	Eastern Trunk Sewer	$23,049,453	85.67%	$19,745,376	13.18%	$3,037,144	1.16%	$266,933
SW-002	Western Trunk Sewer	$14,969,080	35.00%	$5,239,838	65.00%	$9,729,242	0.00%	$0
SW-003	Eucalyptus East Trunk Sewer	$987,467	0.00%	$0	100.00%	$987,467	0.00%	$0
SW-004	Edison Trunk Sewer	$2,487,802	0.00%	$0	100.00%	$2,487,802	0.00%	$0
SW-005	Haven Trunk Sewer	$3,908,348	0.00%	$0	100.00%	$3,908,348	0.00%	$0
SW-006	Mill Creek Trunk Sewer	$6,706,236	0.00%	$0	100.00%	$6,706,236	0.00%	$0
SW-007	Project No Longer Needed	$0	0.00%	$0	0.00%	$0	0.00%	$0
SW-008	Walker Trunk Sewer	$512,325	0.00%	$0	100.00%	$512,325	0.00%	$0
SW-009	Grove Trunk Sewer	$2,647,013	0.00%	$0	100.00%	$2,647,013	0.00%	$0
SW-010	Bon View Trunk Sewer	$2,647,013	0.00%	$0	100.00%	$2,647,013	0.00%	$0
SW-011	Euclid Trunk Sewer	$2,647,013	0.00%	$0	100.00%	$2,647,013	0.00%	$0
SW-012	Project No Longer Needed	$0	0.00%	$0	0.00%	$0	0.00%	$0
SW-013	Project No Longer Needed	$0	0.00%	$0	0.00%	$0	0.00%	$0
SW-014	Project No Longer Needed	$0	0.00%	$0	0.00%	$0	0.00%	$0
SW-015	Plaza Serena Street, Granda Court To Vineyard Avenue	$100,324	70.20%	$70,426	0.00%	$0	29.80%	$29,898
SW-016	Philadelphia Between Parco And Vineyard	$5,923,236	84.71%	$5,017,668	0.00%	$0	15.29%	$905,568
SW-017	Holt Boulevard, West Of Imperial Avenue	$392,779	61.30%	$240,755	0.00%	$0	38.70%	$152,024
SW-018	Campus Avenue, North Of Holt Boulevard	$46,461	100.00%	$46,461	0.00%	$0	0.00%	$0
SW-019	Project No Longer Needed	$0	0.00%	$0	0.00%	$0	0.00%	$0
SW-020	Cherry Avenue, North Of G Street	$64,824	100.00%	$64,824	0.00%	$0	0.00%	$0
SW-021	Project No Longer Needed	$0	0.00%	$0	0.00%	$0	0.00%	$0
SW-022	Vineyard Avenue, South Of Cedar Et. Al.	$17,981,955	12.77%	$2,296,775	0.00%	$0	87.23%	$15,685,180
SW-023	Easement East Of Haven Street	$1,598,918	26.59%	$425,197	0.00%	$0	73.41%	$1,173,721
SW-024	Project No Longer Needed	$0	0.00%	$0	0.00%	$0	0.00%	$0
SW-025	Project No Longer Needed	$0	0.00%	$0	0.00%	$0	0.00%	$0
SW-026	Sewer Utility Maintenance Vehicles	$947,100	0.00%	$0	72.28%	$684,584	27.72%	$262,516
SW-027	Sewer Utility Master Plan	$534,967	0.00%	$0	72.28%	$386,686	27.72%	$148,281
SW-028	Project No Longer Needed	$0	0.00%	$0	0.00%	$0	0.00%	$0
SW-029	Carpenter Trunk Sewer	$4,795,305	0.00%	$0	100.00%	$4,795,305	0.00%	$0
SW-030	Project 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	$380,221	100.00%	$380,221	0.00%	$0	0.00%	$0
SW-032	D Street Between Corona And Vineyard	$269,693	100.00%	$269,693	0.00%	$0	0.00%	$0
SW-033	Easement W/O Euclid From N/O J St To Easement S/O G St	$696,901	100.00%	$696,901	0.00%	$0	0.00%	$0

Schedule 8.1

City of Ontario
2019 Development Impact Cost Calculation Update
Allocation of Project Cost Estimates
Sewer Collection 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
SW-034	Benson Avenue Between I Street and G Street	$496,054	100.00%	$496,054	0.00%	$0	0.00%	$0
SW-035	Virginia Avenue Between D Street and Nocta Street	$216,458	80.40%	$174,036	0.00%	$0	19.60%	$42,422
SW-036	Deer Creek Loop And Laurel Tree Drive	$780,117	99.69%	$777,699	0.00%	$0	0.31%	$2,418
SW-037	Hollowell, Boulder and Holt Avenue	$833,748	69.52%	$579,622	0.00%	$0	30.48%	$254,126
SW-038	Easement N/O Holt Blvd, E/O Allyn Avenue	$36,062	88.81%	$32,028	0.00%	$0	11.19%	$4,034
SW-039	Riverside Drive Between Sultana And Campus Avenues	$657,740	82.46%	$542,344	0.00%	$0	17.54%	$115,396
SW-040	Vineyard S/O Airport And Easement	$1,156,890	69.19%	$800,503	0.00%	$0	30.81%	$356,387
SW-041	Mills Circle N/O Mall Drive	$132,250	66.35%	$87,754	0.00%	$0	33.65%	$44,496
SW-042	Holt Boulevard E/O Vineyard Avenue	$404,890	52.07%	$210,826	0.00%	$0	47.93%	$194,064
SW-043	Bon View Avenue N/O Francis	$318,923	38.18%	$121,751	0.00%	$0	61.82%	$197,172
SW-044	Acacia, Easement, Locust And Parco	$1,673,464	18.72%	$313,299	0.00%	$0	81.28%	$1,360,165
SW-045	Turner Avenue, N/O Cedar Street	$132,250	18.90%	$24,989	0.00%	$0	81.10%	$107,261
SW-046	Holt Sewer Phase A	$5,649,689	83.45%	$4,714,411	0.00%	$0	16.55%	$935,278
SW-047	Holt Sewer Phase B	$2,406,049	99.06%	$2,383,331	0.00%	$0	0.94%	$22,718
SW-048	Share Of Common City Yard Improvements	$3,970,009	0.00%	$0	72.28%	$2,869,608	27.72%	$1,100,401
SW-049	Ontario Ranch Sewer Design Studies	$24,302	0.00%	$0	100.00%	$24,302	0.00%	$0
SW-050	Airport Drive Main, E/O Grove	$1,459,979	0.00%	$0	0.00%	$0	100.00%	$1,459,979
SW-051	Grove Avenue Main, S/O Airport Drive	$1,848,807	45.51%	$841,312	0.00%	$0	54.49%	$1,007,495
	Sub-Total General Plan Total New Projects	$116,492,115	40.00%	$46,594,094	37.83%	$44,070,088	22.17%	$25,827,933
	LESS:							
	GC Development Impact Fee Fund Balance	$2,811,194	100.00%	$2,811,194	0.00%	$0	0.00%	$0
	OR Development Impact Fee Fund Balance	$176,684	0.00%	$0	100.00%	$176,684	0.00%	$0
	Development Impact Fee Fund Balance Total	$2,987,878	94.09%	$2,811,194	5.91%	$176,684	0.00%	$0
	Total Net General Plan Project Costs	$113,680,921	38.51%	$43,782,900	38.61%	$43,893,404	22.72%	$25,827,933
					Forward to Schedule 8.4		Forward to Schedule 8.2	

NOTES:
1. Costs distribution based upon a demand rates.

Schedule 8.2

City of Ontario
2019 Development Impact Cost Calculation Update
General City (GC) - Minimum Capital Needs-based Impact Costs
Sewer Collection Facilities

Proposed Land Use	Undeveloped		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
	Acres	Units							
Detached Dwellings	(112.7)	(610)	240	(146,400)	-3.27%	-$844,315	$7,490	5.41	*$1,384 per Unit*
Attached Dwellings	115.2	4,580	210	961,800	21.47%	$5,546,290	$48,137	39.75	*$1,211 per Unit*
High Density Dwellings	199.2	8,322	180	1,497,960	33.44%	$8,637,894	$43,374	41.79	*$1,038 per Unit*
Mobile Home Dwellings	1.0	13	210	2,730	0.06%	$15,755	$15,755	13.00	*$1,212 per Unit*
Commercial Lodging Units	1.0	40	140	5,600	0.13%	$32,285	$32,285	40.00	*$807 per Unit*
Retail/Service Uses	147.7	11,792,000	900	132,957	2.97%	$766,573	$5,189	79,821	*$0.065 per S.F.*
Office Uses	275.0	16,112,000	3,000	825,000	18.42%	$4,757,247	$17,299	58,589	*$0.295 per S.F.*
Business Park Uses	139.7	2,842,000	1,200	167,580	3.74%	$966,223	$6,919	20,351	*$0.340 per S.F.*
Industrial Uses	643.9	32,045,000	1,600	1,030,240	23.00%	$5,940,941	$9,226	49,767	*$0.185 per S.F.*
Institutional Use	1.0	21,780	1,500	1,500	0.03%	$8,523	$8,523	21,780	*$0.391 per S.F.*
TOTAL	**1,410.92**	--	--	**4,478,967.00**	**100.00%**	**$25,827,933 in Total GC Sewer General Plan Projects**			

The demand characteristics have been taken from Table 3 from the June, 2011 Technical Memorandum from AKM Consulting Engineers.

Schedule 8.3

City of Ontario
2019 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	4,638.80	24,894	240	5,974,560	28.26%	$61,017,730	$13,154	5.37	***$2,450 per Unit***
Attached Dwellings	827.20	11,870	210	2,492,700	11.79%	$25,458,057	$30,776	14.35	***$2,145 per Unit***
High Density Dwellings	1.00	40	180	7,200	0.03%	$73,403	$73,403	40.00	***$1,835 per Unit***
Mobile Home Dwellings	193.00	2,511	210	527,310	2.49%	$5,384,362	$27,898	13.01	***$2,144 per Unit***
Commercial Lodging Units	38.50	4,338	140	607,320	2.87%	$6,202,595	$161,106	112.68	***$1,430 per Unit***
Retail/Service Uses	928.70	9,709,001	900	835,830	3.95%	$8,536,394	$9,192	10,454	***$0.879 per S.F.***
Office Uses	42.00	914,760	3,000	126,000	0.60%	$1,286,720	$30,636	21,780	***$1.407 per S.F.***
Business Park Uses	80.00	1,306,800	1,200	96,000	0.45%	$980,152	$12,252	16,335	***$0.750 per S.F.***
Industrial Uses	6,426.00	125,962,452	1,600	10,281,600	48.64%	$105,005,851	$16,341	19,602	***$0.834 per S.F.***
Institutional Use	127.00	2,766,060	1,500	190,500	0.90%	$1,945,192	$15,316	21,780	***$0.703 per S.F.***
TOTAL	**13,302.20**	**--**	**--**	**21,139,020**	**100.00%**	**$215,892,617 Total Sewer Capital Needs to Finish System**			

$205,739,712 In Sewer Collection System Assets
$6,000,000 In Sewer Collection Pump Station Assets
$1,341,711 In Sewer Maintenance Vehicle Assets
$2,811,194 In Sewer System DIF Fund Balance

(1) The replacement value of the City's seter system has not been updated.
(2) The demand characteristics have been taken from Table 3 from the June, 2011 Technical Memorandum from AKM Consulting Engineers.

Schedule 8.4

City of Ontario
2019 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	3,002.5	18,384	240	4,412,160	37.78%	$16,580,733	$5,522	6.12	*$902 per Unit*
Attached Dwellings	820.1	23,119	182	4,207,658	36.02%	$15,812,160	$19,281	28.19	*$684 per Unit*
High Density Dwellings	137.9	5,293	110	582,230	4.99%	$2,188,086	$15,873	38.40	*$413 per Unit*
Commercial Lodging	9.0	396	140	55,440	0.48%	$208,494	$23,166	44.00	*$527 per Unit*
Retail/Service Uses	358.9	6,272,000	900	323,046	2.77%	$1,214,092	$3,382	17,474	*$0.194 per S.F.*
Office Uses	308.7	10,274,000	3,000	925,950	7.93%	$3,479,869	$11,274	33,287	*$0.339 per S.F.*
Business Park Uses	665.9	13,380,000	1,200	799,032	6.84%	$3,002,748	$4,510	20,094	*$0.224 per S.F.*
Industrial Uses	233.2	6,439,000	1,600	373,168	3.20%	$1,402,394	$6,013	27,608	*$0.218 per S.F.*
Institutional Use	1.0	21,780	1,500	1,500	0.01%	$5,706	$5,706	21,780	*$0.262 per S.F.*
TOTAL	**5,537.14**	--	--	**11,680,184**	**100.00%**	**$43,893,404 in Total OR Sewer General Plan Projects**			

The demand characteristics have been taken from Table 3 from the June, 2011 Technical Memorandum from AKM Consulting Engineers.

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 $312,336 and thus it costs $89.24 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 $42.00 each. The resulting cost is $400 (rounded) per detached dwelling unit.

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

	Cost per Item	Items Required	Total Cost
Collection Barrels	$42.00	3.05	$128.10
Portion of Side-loader Vehicle	$89.24	3.05	$272.18
Total (rounded)			**$400.00**

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 $318,811. 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 $398.51 per four cubic yard bin pick-up.

On average, it takes two - four cubic yard refuse bins and two - four cubic yard recycles bins to serve fifteen attached dwelling units. The bins, at $693.86 each, would cost $2,775.44. The cost for the truck to collect the four bins would be $1,594.04 (4 X $398.51). The combined bin and collection cost of $4,369.48, when divided by the fifteen detached units indicates a rounded cost of $291 per dwelling.

The high-density units would require the same vehicle/bin combination costs of $4,369.48 but would serve twice as many (30) units resulting in a rounded cost of $146 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	$398.51	4	$1,594.04
Four Cubic Yard Bins	$693.86	4	$2,775.44
Total Cost for Vehicle & Bins			$4,369.48
Number of Units/Acre			15
Cost per Attached Dwelling Unit			**$291.00**
Total Cost for Vehicle & Bins			$4,369.48
Number of Units/Acre			30
Cost/High Density Dwelling Unit			**$146.00**

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 35,652 square feet (14) 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 $318,811. This cost is divided by the estimated 800 bins the truck can collect weekly to derive a cost of $398.51 per bin pick-up or $797.02, for the two bins, one and a half pick-ups per week. The bin cost is $693.86 each for a total of $1,387.72.

The total capital acquisition cost for serving the one acre of Retail/Service business is $2,583.25 or based upon an average of 35,652 square feet pad yield per acre results in a $0.072/square foot cost. The total capital cost for serving the one acre of Business Park use is the same at $2,583.25 per acre but based upon a lower average of 20,319 square feet pad yield per acre generates a $0.127/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	$398.51	3	$1,195.53
Four Cubic Yard Bins	$693.86	2	$1,387.72
Total Cost for Vehicle & Bins			$2,583.25
Retail/Service Square Feet/Acre			35,652
Cost per Square Foot			**$0.072**
Total Cost for Vehicle & Bins			$2,583.25
Business Park Square Feet/Acre			20,319
Cost per Square Foot			**$0.127**

[This space left blank intentionally].

14 Based upon 18,064,000 square feet of building pad on 506.4 acres, per Table 2-1, Land-use Database.

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 a less frequent pick-up. 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 $318,811. When divided by the estimated 800 bins the truck can collect weekly, a cost of $398.51 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 $2,789.57. The two bins cost $693.86 each for a total of $1,387.72. The total capital cost for serving the one-acre commercial restaurant business is $4,177.29. Based upon the average 11,979 square feet yield of business pad a per acre, an impact fee of $0.349 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	$398.51	7	$2,789.57
Four Cubic Yard Bins	$693.86	2	$1,387.72
Total Cost for Vehicle & Bins			$4,177.29
Restaurant Square Feet/Acre			11,979
Cost per Square Foot			**$0.349**

[This space left blank intentionally].

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 $318,811. This cost is divided by the estimated 800 bins the truck can collect weekly to derive a cost of $398.51 per bin pick-up or $1,594.04 for the four bin pick-ups per week. The two bins cost $693.86 each for a total of $1,387.72. The total capital cost required for serving the one acre of hotel/motel units is $2,981.76. There is an average of thirty commercial lodging units per acre resulting in an $99.00 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	$398.51	4	$1,594.04
Four Cubic Yard Bin Cost	$693.86	2	$1,387.72
Total Cost for Vehicle(s) & Bin(s)			$2,981.76
Commercial Lodging Units/Acre			30
Cost/Commercial Lodging Unit			$99.00

[This space left blank intentionally].

Commercial Collection for Office and Institutional Units (Schedule 9.1-F) - A typical one-acre office establishment with a building pad size of 45,209 square feet (15) 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 $318,811. This cost is divided by the estimated 800 bins the truck can collect weekly to derive a cost of $398.51 per bin pick-up or $797.02 for the two required pick-ups. The two bins cost $693.86 each for a total of $1,387.72. The total capital cost for serving the one-acre commercial business is $2,184.74 or $0.048 per square foot for the office use and $0.100 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	$398.51	2	$797.02
Four Cubic Yard Bins	$693.86	2	$1,387.72
Total Cost for Vehicle & Bins			$2,184.74
Office Square Feet/Acre			45,209
Cost per Square Foot			**$0.048**
Total Cost for Vehicle & Bins			$2,184.74
Institutional Square Feet/Acre			21,780
Cost per Square Foot			**$0.100**

[This space left blank intentionally].

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

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 $258,619, will collect and transport approximately 50 loads per week, which generates a one-time capital cost of $5,172.38 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 $6,030.20.

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:

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

	Cost per Item	Items Required	Total Cost
Front-loader Vehicle Cost/Bin	$398.51	1	$398.51
Four Cubic Yard Bins	$693.86	1	$693.86
Forty Cubic Yard Vehicle	$5,172.38	1	$5,172.38
Forty Cubic Yard Bin	$6,030.20	1	$6,030.20
Total Cost for Vehicle(s) & Bin(s)			$12,294.95
Industrial Square Feet Served/Five Acres			219,375
Cost Square Foot of Industrial Businesses			**$0.056**

Share of Common City Yard Improvements. Based upon the Table 2-1, the City refuse collection operation will need to acquire $41,998,118 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 72% surcharge on the capital acquisition cost. 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.

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	$400.00	174.76%	$699.00
Attached Dwelling Unit	$291.00	174.76%	$509.00
High Density Dwelling Unit	$146.00	174.76%	$255.00
Retail Uses by S. F.	$0.072	174.76%	$0.126
Business Park Uses by S. F.	$0.128	174.76%	$0.224
Commercial Restaurants by S.F.	$0.349	174.76%	$0.610
Commercial Lodging Unit	$99.00	174.76%	$173.00
Office Uses by S.F.	$0.048	174.76%	$0.084
Institutional Use by S.F.	$0.100	174.76%	$0.175
Industrial Uses by S.F.	$0.056	174.76%	$0.098

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
2019 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	$312,336	per Side-Loader Truck
Pick-up Capability of One Vehicle	3,500	Barrels per Week
Cost per Barrel per Pick-up Stop	$89.24	per Barrel per Stop

	Truck Cost	Barrel Cost	Total Cost per Home
Refuse/Trash Collection Barrel	$89.24	$42.00	$131.24
Green Waste Collection Barrel	$89.24	$42.00	$131.24
Recycle Collection Barrel	$89.24	$42.00	$131.24
Average 2nd Barrel (5% of Homes)	$4.46	$2.10	$6.56
Total (rounded)	$272.18	$128.10	$400.00

B. COMMERCIAL COLLECTION FOR ATTACHED UNITS

Cost per Front-loader Truck	$318,811	per Front-loader truck
Collection Capability of one Truck	800	Bins per Week
Cost per Bin Collection	$398.51	per Bin per Stop

	Truck Cost	Bin Cost	Total Cost
Four Cubic Yard Trash Bin	$398.51	$693.86	$1,092.37
Four Cubic Yard Trash Bin	$398.51	$693.86	$1,092.37
Four Cubic Yard Recycle Bin	$398.51	$693.86	$1,092.37
Four Cubic Yard Recycle Bin	$398.51	$693.86	$1,092.37
Total Cost per Standard Attached Acre			$4,369.48
Average Number of Attached Residential Units/Acre			15
Total Truck Cost per Attached Unit (rounded)			$291.00

Total Cost per High Density Attached Acre	$4,369.48
Average Number of High Density Residential Units/Acre	30
Total Truck Cost per High Density Unit (rounded)	$146.00

C. COLLECTION FOR RETAIL/SERVICE AND BUSINESS PARK UNITS

	Truck Cost	Bin Cost	Total Cost
Refuse Bin (1.5 Collections/Week)	$597.77	$693.86	$1,291.63
Recycle Bin (1.5 Collections/Week)	$597.77	$693.86	$1,291.63
Total Cost per Average General Retail/Service Acre			$2,583.25

Average Square Feet of Retail/Service Pad per Acre	35,652
Cost per Square Foot for Average Retail/Service Uses	$0.072

Average Square Feet of Business Park Pad per Acre	20,139
Cost per Square Foot for Average Business Park Uses	$0.128

Schedule 9.1
2019 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	$1,992.55	$693.86	$2,686.41
Restaurant Recycle, Two/Week	$797.02	$693.86	$1,490.88
Total Cost per Average Restaurant Commercial Acre			$4,177.29
Average Square Feet of Restaurant Pad/Acre			11,979
Cost per Five Days a Week Collection			$0.349

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

	Truck Cost	**Bin Cost**	**Total Cost**
Commercial - General (Three/week)	$1,195.53	$693.86	$1,889.39
Commercial - Recycle (One/week)	$398.51	$693.86	$1,092.37
Total Cost per Average Hotel/Motel Acre			$2,981.76
Average Hotel/Motel Units per Acre			30
Cost per Hotel/Motel Unit (rounded)			$99.00

F. OFFICE AND INSTITUTIONAL USES

Office and Institutional Refuse	$398.51	$693.86	$1,092.37
Office and Institutional Recycle	$398.51	$693.86	$1,092.37
Total Cost per Average Retail, Office and Institutional Acre			$2,184.74
Average Square Feet of Office Pad/Acre			45,209
Cost per Square Foot			$0.048
Average Square Feet of Institutional Pad/Acre			21,780
Cost per Square Foot			$0.100

G. INDUSTRIAL ROLL-OFF COLLECTION FOR MISCELLANEOUS UNITS

Cost of Roll-off Boxes Collection Truck	$258,619
Units per Week	50
Collection Cost per Weekly Roll-off Stop	$5,172.38
Cost of a 40 Cubic Yard Roll-off Box	$6,030.20
Cost of Once/Week Front Loader Pick-up	$398.51
Cost of Four Cubic Yard Recycle Bin and Once/Week Pick-up	$693.86
Total Cost of Industrial Pick-up for Five Acres	$12,294.95
Square Feet of Pad In Five Acre Parcel	219,375
Cost per square Foot of Industrial/Manufacturing Pad per Acre	$0.056

Schedule 9.1
2019 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	$400.00	174.76%	$699
B. COMMERCIAL COLLECTION FOR ATTACHED UNITS				
	Attached Dwellings per Unit	$291.00	174.76%	$509
	High Density Dwellings per Unit	$146.00	174.76%	$255
C. COLLECTION FOR RETAIL/SERVICE AND BUSINESS PARK UNITS				
	Retail Uses, per Square Foot	$0.072	174.76%	$0.126
	Business Park Uses, per Square Foot	$0.128	174.76%	$0.224
D. COMMERCIAL COLLECTION FOR RESTAURANTS				
	Commercial Restaurants	$0.349	174.76%	$0.610
E. HOTEL/MOTEL UNITS COLLECTION (assumes thrice weekly)				
	Hotel Units, per Keyed Unit	$99.00	174.76%	$173
F. OFFICE AND INSTITUTIONAL USES				
	Office Uses, per Square Foot	$0.048	174.76%	$0.084
	Institutional Uses, per Square Foot	$0.100	174.76%	$0.175
G. INDUSTRIAL ROLL-OFF COLLECTION FOR MISCELLANEOUS UNITS				
	Industrial Roll-off Users per Square Foot	$0.056	174.76%	$0.098

H. ORGANIC FOOD WASTE COLLECTION PROGRAM (New in 2019)		
Cost per Front-loader Truck	$318,811	per Front-loader truck
Collection Capability of one Truck	700	Bins per Week
Cost per Bin Collection	$455.44	per Bin per Stop

32 Gallon Food Waste Bin	$252
64 Gallon Food Waste Bin	$1,050
1.5 CY Bin Food Waste Bin	$1,500
3.0 CY Bin Food Waste Bin	$6,900

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	$31,611,181
Computer and Miscellaneous Equipment	$28,462,000
General Fund Portion of City Yard & Garage	$18,300,386
General Fund (pool and some maintenance) Vehicles	$4,000,000
General fund Computer Capacity	$31,300,000
General Facilities Impact Fee Fund balance	$261,099

The combined replacement cost of the structures, land, and equipment is $85,472,666. 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.
- Construction of an animal control/holding facility
- Completion of the City maintenance service center by financing the General Fund portion of the *Share of Common City Yard Improvements*.

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 all of its infrastructure. As a result, staff has estimated the need for the following City Yard improvements:

1. Conversion of 84,000 square feet of a building purchased by the existing community.
2. Construct a five-acre refuse vehicle parking lot.
3. Restructure/reconfigure (rather than build more) the 15,000 S.F. Fleet Maintenance building
4. Expand the welding facility capacity by 7,200 square foot, and;
5. Construct the miscellaneous remaining fencing and security lighting.

These five 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
Park Maintenance	Chapter 14	$4,047,273
Total Allocated Cost (rounded)		**$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	$10,844,774	$610/Unit
Attached Dwelling Units	$3,510,022	$127/Unit
High Density Dwelling Units	$1,264,690	$93/Unit
Mobile Home Units	$3,753	$289/Unit
Commercial Lodging Units	$37,528	$86/Unit
Retail/Service Uses	$1,901,426	$0.105/S.F.
Office Uses	$2,190,316	$0.083/S.F.
Business Park Uses	$3,022,910	$0.186/S.F.
Industrial Uses	$3,291,684	$0.086/S.F.
Institutional Uses	$7,506	$0.172/S.F.

It must be restated that the existing community has established the City Hall, City maintenance service center, General Fund fleet, and electronic equipment. 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	$29,842,353	$1,191/Unit
Attached Dwelling Units	$5,367,630	$446/Unit
High Density Dwelling Units	$6,414	$160/Unit
Mobile Home Units	$1,237,934	$493/Unit
Commercial Lodging Units	$246,945	$57/Unit
Retail/Service Uses	$5,936,835	$0.614/S.F.
Office Uses	$269,395	$0.294/S.F.
Business Park Uses	$513,133	$0.393/S.F.
Industrial Uses	$41,217,427	$0.327/S.F.
Institutional Uses	$814,599	$0.294/S.F.

Of importance is the fact that the existing community has contributed over 80% again the amount needed to meet the City's General Facilities build-out needs than would be imposed upon the future residents and business owners.

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 10.2 for the ten basic land-uses.
- **Ontario Ranch** - Adopt Schedule 10.2 for the nine basic land-uses.

END OF CHAPTER TEXT

Schedule 10.1

City of Ontario
2019 Development Impact Cost Calculation Update
Allocation of Project Cost Estimates
General Facilities, Vehicles and Equipment

Line #	Project Title	Estimated Cost	Construction Needs Supported by Other Resources		Construction Needs Generated by New Development - GC/OR	
			Percent Need	Apportioned Dollar Cost	Percent Need	Apportioned Dollar Cost
GF-001	City Hall And Annex Reconfiguration	$13,345,000	20.00%	$2,669,000	80.00%	$10,676,000
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	$2,327,949	40.15%	$934,734	59.85%	$1,393,215
GF-005	Share Of Common City Yard Improvements	$1,583,822	0.00%	$0	100.00%	$1,583,822
	Sub-Total General Plan Total New Project Costs	$29,939,441	12.04%	$3,603,734	87.96%	$26,335,707
	LESS:					
	Development Impact Fee Fund Balance	$261,099	0.00%	$0	100.00%	$261,099
	Total General Plan Total New Project Costs	$29,678,342	12.14%	$3,603,734	87.86%	$26,074,608
						Forward to Schedule 10.2

Schedule 10.2

City of Ontario
2019 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	2,889.79	17,774	1.000	2,889.79	41.59%	$10,844,774	$3,753	6.15	***$610*** *per Unit*
Attached Dwellings	935.31	27,699	1.000	935.31	13.46%	$3,510,022	$3,753	29.61	***$127*** *per Unit*
High Density Dwellings	337.00	13,615	1.000	337.00	4.85%	$1,264,690	$3,753	40.40	***$93*** *per Unit*
Mobile Home Dwellings	1.00	13	1.000	1.00	0.01%	$3,753	$3,753	13.00	***$289*** *per Unit*
Commercial Lodging Units	10.00	436	1.000	10.00	0.14%	$37,528	$3,753	43.60	***$86*** *per Unit*
Retail/Service Uses	506.67	18,064,000	1.000	506.67	7.29%	$1,901,426	$3,753	35,652	***$0.105*** *per S.F.*
Office Uses	583.65	26,386,000	1.000	583.65	8.40%	$2,190,316	$3,753	45,209	***$0.083*** *per S.F.*
Business Park Uses	805.51	16,222,000	1.000	805.51	11.59%	$3,022,910	$3,753	20,139	***$0.186*** *per S.F.*
Industrial Uses	877.13	38,484,000	1.000	877.13	12.62%	$3,291,684	$3,753	43,875	***$0.086*** *per S.F.*
Institutional Use	2.00	43,560	1.000	2.00	0.03%	$7,506	$3,753	21,780	***$0.172*** *per S.F.*
TOTAL	**6,948.06**	--	--	**6,948.06**	**100.00%**	**$26,074,608**	**in Total Equity in General Facilities Capital Needs**		

Schedule 10.3

City of Ontario
2019 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	4,652.57	25,056	1.000	4,652.57	34.91%	$29,842,353	$6,414	5.39	***$1,191 per Unit***
Attached Dwellings	836.84	12,045	1.000	836.84	6.28%	$5,367,630	$6,414	14.39	***$446 per Unit***
High Density Dwellings	1.00	40	1.000	1.00	0.01%	$6,414	$6,414	40.00	***$160 per Unit***
Mobile Home Dwellings	193.00	2,511	1.000	193.00	1.45%	$1,237,934	$6,414	13.01	***$493 per Unit***
Commercial Lodging Units	38.50	4,338	1.000	38.50	0.29%	$246,945	$6,414	112.68	***$57 per Unit***
Retail/Service Uses	928.70	9,709,001	1.000	928.70	6.97%	$5,956,835	$6,414	10,454	***$0.614 per S.F.***
Office Uses	42.00	914,760	1.000	42.00	0.32%	$269,395	$6,414	21,780	***$0.294 per S.F.***
Business Park Uses	80.00	1,306,800	1.000	80.00	0.60%	$513,133	$6,414	16,335	***$0.393 per S.F.***
Industrial Uses	6,426.00	125,962,452	1.000	6,426.00	48.22%	$41,217,427	$6,414	19,602	***$0.327 per S.F.***
Institutional Use	127.00	2,766,060	1.000	127.00	0.95%	$814,599	$6,414	21,780	***$0.294 per S.F.***
TOTAL	**13,325.61**	--	--	**13,325.61**	**100.00%**				

$85,472,666	**in Total Existing General Facilities Capital Assets**
$16,131,181	**in City Hall Land/Facilities**
$15,480,000	**in City Hall Annex land/Facilities**
$18,300,386	**in City Yard Facilities (General Fund Portion)**
$31,300,000	**in Equity in Existing Computer/Electronic Equipment**
$4,000,000	**in General Fund Vehicles**
$261,099	**in Existing General Facilities Impact Fee Fund Balance.**

(1) The replacement value of the City's general facilities system has not been updated.

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 $70,652 in Library DIF fund balance representing about 113 square feet of future library space. When the total 72,913 square feet are divided by the current population of 166,134, a library facilities space standard of 0.439 square feet/person is established (72,913 square feet ÷166,134 persons).

Demand Upon Infrastructure Created by the Development of Underdeveloped or Undeveloped Parcels. Stated simply, the 72,913 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 square feet and additional volumes 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 86,683 square feet in order to maintain the existing library facility standard of 0.439 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	17,774	3.806	67,648
Attached Dwelling Units	27,699	3.373	93,429
High Density Dwelling Units	13,615	2.669	36,338
Mobile Home Units	13	3.175	41
Additional City Residents from Added Dwelling Units			197,456
Square Foot per Person Existing Standard			0.439
Square Feet of Library Space Required to Maintain Standard			**86,683**

The City also has an extensive inventory of books, tapes, subscriptions called a *collection* of volumes. The City currently has 286,121 volumes in its collection. Again, divided by the existing population of 166,134, the resulting standard is 1.722 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 340,019 volumes to maintain the existing 1.72 volumes per person in light of the additional 197,456, 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	17,774	3.806	67,648
Attached Dwelling Units	27,699	3.373	93,429
High Density Dwelling Units	13,615	2.669	36,338
Mobile Home Units	13	3.175	41
Additional City Residents from Added Dwelling Units			197,456
Collection Items per Person Existing Standard			1.722
Library Collection Items Required to Maintain Standard			**340,019**

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 $641.40 per square foot per Schedule 11.1. The 72,913 square feet of library space, when divided by the 166,134 existing citizens creates a standard of 0.439 square feet of library space per citizen. The standard of 0.439 square foot standard multiplied by the $641.40 per square foot of pad cost of library construction results in a charge of $281.57 per additional City resident.

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

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

City-owned (or generated) Library Square Feet	72,913
Current Population	166,134
Square Feet per Resident	0.439
Construction Cost of Library per Square Foot	$641.40
Cost per Additional Resident	**$281.57**

The cost of acquiring additional volumes, called the accession process (16) (per Schedule 11.1) is $30.25 per volume. The accession process cost has been decreased greatly due to contracting out this time intensive process. The 286,121 current volumes, when divided by the 166,134 existing citizens create a standard of 1.722 library collection items per City resident. The standard of 1.722 collection items multiplied by the $30.25 per volume results in a cost of $52.09 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	286,121
Current Population	166,134
Collection Items per Resident	1.722
Accessions Cost per Collection Item	$30.25
Cost per Additional Resident	**$52.09**

Resulting Library Space and Collection Items DIF Schedule. The combined cost per new resident is $333.66 ($281.57 for 0.439 square feet of library space and $52.09 for 1.722 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 86,683 square feet of library space and an additional 340,019 volumes.

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

16 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	$333.66	$1,270
Attached Dwelling Units	3.373	$333.66	$1,126
High Density Dwelling Units	2.669	$333.66	$891
Mobile Home Dwelling Units	3.175	$333.66	$1,059

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
2019 Development Impact Cost Calculation Update
Library Facilities and Collection Items

	Library Space	Collection Items	Total Resources
Ovitt Main Library	58,000	212,747	
Colony Library	14,800	72,931	
Library Facilities Represented by Existing Fund Balance	113	443	
Existing Library Square Feet	72,913		
Existing Number of Collection Items		286,121	
Existing Standards:			
Current Population	166,134	166,134	
Square Foot of Library Space per Resident	0.439		
Collection Items per Resident		1.722	
Library Construction per Square Foot	$583.14		
Hardscape Improvements, @ 0.333 FAR and $4.50/S.F.	$16.26		
Land/Grading Cost @ $14.00/S.F. and 0.333 Floor Area Ratio	$42.00		
Land Acquisition and Construction per Square Foot	$641.40		
Accessions Cost per Collection Item		$30.25	
Cost per Facility Square Foot or Collection Item	$641.40	$30.25	
Existing Library Facilities and Collection Item Standard	0.439	1.722	
Library Facility Construction Cost per Resident	$281.57		
Collection Item Cost per Resident		$52.09	

Cost per Land Use Residential Dwelling Unit	Density per Dwelling Unit	Library Space	Collection Items	Total Resources
Detached Dwelling Unit	3.806	$1,072	$198	$1,270
Attached Dwelling Unit	3.373	$950	$176	$1,126
High Density Dwelling Unit	2.669	$752	$139	$891
Mobile Home Dwelling Unit	3.175	$894	$165	$1,059

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 ensure 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	5,103
De Anza Community Center	23,683
City of Ontario Museum	20,000
Westwind Community Center & Gymnasium	26,260
Future Facilities in DIF Fund Balance	1,707
Total Public Use Square Feet	**114,217**

Based upon an existing population of 166,134, the 114,217 square feet creates an impressive standard of 0.688 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	114,217
Current City Population	166,134
Square Foot per Resident Standard	0.688

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 135,850 square feet to meet the added demands created by the construction of additional residential dwelling units. It should be noted that 135,850 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 135,850 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:

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	17,774	3.806	67,648
Attached Dwelling Units	27,699	3.373	93,429
High Density Dwelling Units	13,615	2.669	36,338
Mobile Home Units	13	3.175	41
Additional City Residents from Added Dwelling Units			197,456
Square Foot per Person Existing Standard			0.688
Community Center Space (SF) Required to Maintain Standard			**135,850**

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 0.688 Square Feet = 2.619 Square Feet
Attached Dwelling Unit .....3.373 Persons per Unit X 0.688 Square Feet = 2.321 Square Feet
High Density Dwelling Unit.....2.669 Persons per Unit X 0.688 Square Feet = 1.837 Square Feet
Mobile Home Dwelling Unit.....3.175 Persons per Unit X 0.688 Square Feet = 2.185 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 0.688 square feet of building space per person is roughly $364.12 based upon a $530.82 per square foot ($470.58 for construction, $43.98 for land acquisition based upon a $14.66 per square foot cost and a floor area ratio of 0.333) and parcel site hardscape improvements of $16.26 ($5.42) per square foot, again with a 0.333 floor area ratio). A detached dwelling unit with 3.806 persons would require 2.619 square feet of public meeting space at a cost of $1,386 (2.619 square feet X $364.12 per square foot, rounded). An attached dwelling unit requires 2.321 square feet of public meeting space at a cost of about $1,228 (2.321 square feet X $364.12 per square foot).

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	$1,386
Attached Dwelling Unit	$1,228
High Density Dwelling Unit	$972
Mobile Home Dwelling Unit	$1,156

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
2019 Development Impact Cost Calculation Update
Public Use (Community Center) Facilities

	Land and Building
Armstrong Center	13,500
Dorothy A. Quesada Center	10,000
Civic Center Senior Center	13,964
Anthony Munoz Community Center	5,103
De Anza Community Center	23,683
City of Ontario Museum	20,000
Westwind Community Center and Gymnasium	26,260
Facilities Represented in Existing DIF Fund Balance	1,450
Existing City-owned Public Use Facilities Square Feet	113,960
Current Population	166,134
Square Foot per Resident Standard	0.686
Average Public Use Facility Construction Cost per Square Foot	$470.58
Hardscape Improvements, @ 0.333 FAR and $5.42/S.F.	$16.26
Land/Grading Cost @ $14.66 S.F. and 0.333 Floor Area Ratio	$43.98
Total Cost for a Single Square Foot of Public Use Space	$530.82
Total Cost for One Square Foot of Public Use Space	$530.82
Square Foot per Resident Standard	0.686
Cost per New Resident	$364.12

Cost per Land Use Residential Dwelling Unit	Density per Dwelling Unit	Total Resources
Detached Dwelling Unit	3.806	$1,386
Attached Dwelling Unit	3.373	$1,228
High Density Dwelling Unit	2.669	$972
Mobile Home Dwelling Unit	3.175	$1,156

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 166,134 residents for leisure and general fitness uses. Table 13-1, following, details the four aquatics complexes and the existing 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
Fund Balance Square Feet	198	128
Total Square Feet	**6,668**	**4,294**

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 parks be applied for and approved) will create 3.175 potential new pool users each. The current *de-facto* standards are 0.0258 square feet of locker/office building per person and 0.0401 square feet of pool surface per person in the City.

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 $10.0 million aquatic facility in the City. The collected DIF revenue will only finance just over 40% of the facility as it is an increase in the existing standard.

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 .....0.153 S.F. of locker space and 0.098 S.F. of pool surface
Attached Dwelling Units .....0.135 S.F. of locker space and 0.087 S.F. of pool surface
High Density Dwelling Units .....0.107 S.F. of locker space and 0.069 S.F. of pool surface
Mobile Home Dwelling Units .....0.127 S.F. of locker space and 0.082 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 $12.02 per person for the pool expansion ($301/S.F. X 0.0399 = $12.02 per person) about $12.43 per person for the locker building expansion ($483.58/S.F. X 0.0257 = $12.43 per person) or $24.45 per person for both construction components. Thus, a detached dwelling detached unit would incur impact costs of $93, (3.806 persons X $24.45, rounded). An attached dwelling unit would generate impact costs of about $83, (3.373 persons X $24.45, rounded). A high-density dwelling unit requires aquatics facility expansion costs of $65 (2.669 persons X $24.45 rounded).

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

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

Table 13-2
Summary of Aquatics Facilities Impact Fee

DIF Land-use Type	Impact Fee Per Unit
Detached Dwelling Unit	$93
Attached Dwelling Unit	$83
High Density Dwelling Unit	$65
Mobile Home Dwelling Unit	$77

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
2019 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
Bon View Park Aquatices Center	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	164	106
Current Pool Size (Surface Square Feet):	6,634	
Current Aquatics Building (Square Feet):		4,272
Current Population (1)	166,134	166,134
Existing Standards:		
Square Feet of Surface /Resident	0.0399	
Square Foot of Locker Building/Person		0.0257
Construction Costs		
Pool Cost per Surface Square Foot	$301.00	
Facilities Construction/Square Foot		$483.58
Existing Standards per Resident	0.0399	0.0257
Adjusted Pool Cost per Resident	$12.02	
Adjusted Facilities Cost per Resident		$12.43

Cost per Land Use Residential Dwelling Unit	Density per Dwelling Unit	Pool Surface	Support Facilities	Total Cost
Total Cost per Added Resident		$12.02	$12.43	$24.45
Detached Dwelling Unit	3.806	$46	$47	**$93**
Attached Dwelling Unit	3.373	$41	$42	**$83**
High Density Dwelling Unit	2.669	$32	$33	**$65**
Mobile Home Dwelling Unit	3.175	$38	$39	**$77**

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) (17) 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 454.62 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 454.62 acres of park land, most of it developed. John Galvin, Westwind, De Anza, Anthony Munoz and Homer Briggs parks are the largest developed parks, representing over half of the park system acreage (when only traditional parks are considered) and provide the greatest variety of sports and passive uses.

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

17 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	18.00	18.00
Armstrong Community Center Park	1.14	1.14
Bon View Park	11.70	11.70
Centennial Park	4.60	4.60
Creekside Golf Course (L)	11.90	0.00
Creekside Park	5.10	5.10
Cypress Park	4.70	4.70
De Anza Park	19.10	19.10
Del Rancho Park	5.00	5.00
Euclid Median Park	35.00	35.00
George Gibbs Park	3.00	3.00
Grove Park	4.65	4.65
Homer Briggs Park	15.00	15.00
James F. Bryant Park (L)	4.46	4.46
James Galanis Park	5.00	5.00
John Galvin Park	36.00	36.00
Kimball Park	7.00	7.00
Nugent's Park	0.50	0.50
Ontario Motor Speedway Park	6.10	6.10
Ontario Soccer Park	23.40	23.40
Ranch Park	1.80	1.80
Sam Alba Park	1.00	1.00
South Bon View Park	5.00	5.00
Town Square Park (not completed)	0.00	0.00
Veteran's Park	7.00	7.00
Vineyard Park	10.00	10.00
Westwind Park	22.00	22.00
Whispering Lakes Golf Course	176.60	176.60
Park Equivalent in Fund Balance	9.87	9.87
Total Park Acres	**454.62**	**442.72**

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 2.74 acres of owned park land per 1,000 residents, (454.62 acres ÷ [166,134 residents ÷ 1,000], rounded). Of the 454.62 total acres, 9.87 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	454.62	442.72
Current City Population	166,134	166,134
Population Divided by 1,000	166.13	166.13
Park Acres per 1,000 Population	2.74	2.66

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 2.74 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 2.74 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 *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 454.62 acres (18), the City will need to acquire 592 park acres, per Table 14-3, and develop these new parks to serve the additional 197,456 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].

18 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.

Table 14-3
Calculation of Required
Park Acres per Allowable Standard

General Plan Anticipated Population Increase	197,456
Additional Population Divided by 1,000	197.46
Allowable Standard in Acres/1,000	3.0
Park Acres required to Maintain Standard	592.37

These general improvements are outlined in the MFP. The 592.37 acres could be constructed in any of the following 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 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 592 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 2.74 acres per 1,000 population standard speaks well for the City as a three acre per 1,000 population standard is a common minimum, but frequently unmet, target of municipalities and recreation and park special districts throughout Southern California. When completed, the City of Ontario will match that amount.

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" (19). 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 (20). As previously identified, the City currently has 2.74 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 park land to be acquired must be suitable for park construction and is conservatively estimated at approximately $639,882 per acre ($585,000/acre for the land purchase and $54,882/acre for

19 California Government Code, Title 7, Division 2, Section 66447 (b).

20 Policy 12.1.1 page 5-13, City of Ontario Ontario Ranch General Plan Amendment.

rough grading and site preparation costs) which is used in the park DIF calculation. This is consistent with the cost of land suitable for residential dwelling development in Ontario Ranch. However, the use of this figure could be criticized if a developer can show that the cost of the residential land they are developing is currently valued at less than the $585,000 per acre figure. The fee recommendation at the end of the Chapter will recognize this challenge.

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 previous park improvement construction costs of $445,700 per acre has been revised in this update to $500,00 per acre based on reviews of the costs of recently constructed comparable nearby parks, and joint cost analyses with members of the development community. 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 444.45 acres of existing park acres (excluding the 9.87 acres of parks yet to be built from the park DIF fund balance), the City has $4,011 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	$1,782,800
Total Existing Park Acres (454.32 acres less 9.87 acres)	444.45
Maintenance Vehicle Cost per Acre Maintained	$4,011
Acres/1,000 Park Acres/Resident Standard	3.0
Existing Vehicle Cost per Three Park Acres	$12,033
Divided by 1,000 New Residents	1,000
Maintenance Vehicle Cost per Additional Resident	$12.03

Additionally, the Parks operation has been allocated $4,031,633 as its share of the $45.2 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 592.37 acres to be built, each acre of additional park will require $6,806 towards the $45.2 million 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	$4,031,633
Total New Park Acres Anticipated	592.37
Yard Improvement Cost per New Park Acre	$6,806
Park Acres Standard Acres/1,000 Residents	3.0
Yard Cost per Three Park Acres	$20,418
Yard Improvement Cost Divided by 1,000 Residents	1,000
Maintenance Yard Cost per Additional Resident	$20.42

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 $1,151,104 per acre ($639,882/acre for land acquisition, $500,000 per acre for park improvements and $11,222 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 $3,453,320 or about $3,453.32 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 $3,453.32 (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, $13,143 per unit ($3,453.32 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 $11,649 ($3,453.32 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	$13,143/Unit
Attached Dwelling Unit	$11,649/Unit
High Density Dwelling Unit	$9,218/Unit
Mobile Home Dwelling Unit	$10,965/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 [21].

Park Acquisition and DIF Calculation Example. Developers have been allowed to donate sites in the past and it is in the City's best interests to continue this practice. The size of the park needed to serve the proposed residential development is calculated by multiplying the number of single and detached residences to be developed by the average number of people living in the units. The example demonstrated in Table 14-7, following, calculates the developed park size required for a 1,000 detached dwelling unit development:

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

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

Table 14-7
Example of Park Construction in-lieu of Fee

Park Development Requirement	Park Cost	Maintenance Support Costs	Total Park Cost
Number of Detached Dwelling Units	1,000	1,000	
Average Number of residents per Unit	3.806	3.806	
Total Number of New Residents	3,806	3,806	
Basis of Standard	1,000	1,000	
Added Population Divided by 1,000	3.806	3.806	
Acres Required per 1,000 Population	3.0	3.0	
Required Park Acquisition/Improvement Acres	11.418	11.418	
Cost of Park Development per Acre	$1,151,104		
Sub-total 11.418 Acres of Park	$13,143,305		$13,143,305
Cost of Park Maintenance Support per Acre		$11,222	
Sub-total 11.418 Acres of Maintenance Support		$128,133	**$128,133**
Total Park DIF Contribution	**$13,143,305**	**$128,133**	**$13,271,438**

If a developer of 1,000 detached dwelling units were to dedicate 11.418 acres of land and develop the parks, they would also need to pay a DIF amount of $128,133 towards the maintenance support vehicles and facilities

Per the example above, the City and a developer could reach agreement on the park obligation in a number of ways. The following are a few examples. Note that each example requires the total $13,143,305 park obligation (in land/improvements or in-lieu payment) required of the 1,000 detached dwelling unit developments in any combination of land, improvements, or fee payment.

Option 1. The developer could make a $13,143,305 Park Land Acquisition and DIF payment and the City could use it (in combination with other parks fees) to construct the park elsewhere in the City. However, most large-scale developers would probably prefer that the park be very near, if not within, the proposed subdivision.

Option 2. The developer could construct and donate a developed park smaller in size, say 2.5 acres and make a payment for the remaining 8.918 acres required of the developer. This option is generally only used when the proposed residential development is in excess of 1,000 residences.

Option 3. The developer could construct an 11.418 acre park and dedicate it to the City. A developed park this size would represent $13,143,305 total acquisition and DIF. This would not likely be an option for the smaller developments resulting in parks less than 3.5 acres in size. A small park of this size generates significant annual maintenance costs, so they are not generally desired.

Option 4. The City could combine other DIFs to the developer's 11.418 acre fee or actual park contribution to create a larger park, assuming the developer agrees to make the larger park parcel available.

Option 5. The developer could donate 22.47 acres of undeveloped land, ($13,143,305 total park fee requirement ÷ by $585,000/acre cost) and then the City could use other DIFs to develop it.

The key to understanding the flexibility of the options above is that each one represents the same amount in terms of a contribution to the City's park system with the result that the same amount has been contributed for each dwelling.

Land Acquisition Cost Adjustment Challenge. As mentioned previously, the use of $639,882 as the park land cost is based upon the assumption that park acreage would likely be close in proximity and thus similar in cost to residential land value of the project the park is intended to serve. However, if the developer or contractor of a dwelling can provide evidence (acceptable to the City) in the form of a recent appraisal of the property they will be developing that the current land value is worth less than the $639,882/acre or $14.69/square foot, the DIF could be adjusted downward accordingly by placing the actual cost of land acquisition into the calculation identified in Schedule 14.1. Again, if the City wishes to adopt such an adjustment, the terms under which the challenge may be made and proved should be included in the Impact Fee Ordinance.

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

Schedule 14.1

City of Ontario
2019 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
Anthony Munoz Hall of Fame Park	18.00	18.00	
Armstrong Community Center Park	1.14	1.14	
Bon View Park	11.70	11.70	
Centennial Park	4.60	4.60	
Creekside Golf Course (LTL)	11.90	0.00	
Creekside Park	5.10	5.10	
Cypress Park	4.70	4.70	
De Anza Park	19.10	19.10	
Del Rancho Park	5.00	5.00	
Euclid Median Park	35.00	35.00	
George Gibbs Park	3.00	3.00	
Grove Memorial Park	4.65	4.65	
Homer Briggs Park	15.00	15.00	
James F. Bryant Park (LTL)	4.46	4.46	
James Galanis Park	5.00	5.00	
John Galvin Park	36.00	36.00	
Kimball Park	7.00	7.00	
Nugent's Park	0.50	0.50	
Ontario Motor Speedway Park	6.10	6.10	
Ontario Soccer Park	23.40	23.40	
Ranch Park	1.80	1.80	
Sam Alba Park	1.00	1.00	
South Bon View Park	5.00	5.00	
Veteran's Memorial Park	7.00	7.00	
Vineyard Park	10.00	10.00	
Town Square (not completed)	0.00	0.00	
Westwind Park	22.00	22.00	
Whispering Lakes Golf Course	176.60	176.60	
Park Equivalent in Fund Balance	8.78	8.78	
Total Acres (Owned/Developed)	453.53	441.63	
Current Population	166,134	166,134	
Population/1,000	166.13	166.13	
Current Standard	2.73	2.66	

Schedule 14.1

City of Ontario
2019 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
Minimum Acres/1,000 Population Standard	3.000	3.000	3.000
Construction Cost per Acre		$500,000	
Land Acquisition Cost per Acre	$585,000		
Grading/Site Preparation	$54,882		
City Yard Improvements per Acre (1)			$6,806
Additional Maintenance Fleet per Acre (2)			$4,416
Total Cost per Acre	$639,882	$500,000	$11,222
Cost X 3.0 Acre/1,000 Residents Standard	$1,919,646.00	$1,500,000	$33,666
Population Served by Standard	1,000.00	1,000.00	1,000.00
Acquisition/Construction Cost per Resident	$1,919.65	$1,500.00	$33.67

	Occupants/ Dwelling	Land Acquisition	Park Construction	Maintenance Requirements	Total Park Costs
Cost per Additional Resident		$1,919.65	$1,500.00	$33.67	$3,453.32
Detached Dwelling Unit	3.806	$7,306	$5,709	$128	$13,143
Attached Dwelling Unit	3.373	$6,475	$5,060	$114	$11,649
High Density Dwelling Unit	2.669	$5,124	$4,004	$90	$9,218
Mobile Home Dwelling Unit	3.175	$6,095	$4,763	$107	$10,965

Chapter 15
Ontario Ranch Species, Habitat Conservation and Open Space Mitigation

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 yellow billed 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

4. 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.

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

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
2019 Development Impact Cost Calculation Update
Open Space Legal Agreement (OR)
(This fee is static, and is not subject to change.)

Line #	Description	Estimated Cost	Cost Distribution for Components I & II: Percent Need	Cost Distribution for Components I & II: Apportioned Dollar Cost	Cost Distribution for Component III: Percent Need	Cost Distribution for Component III: Apportioned Dollar Cost
LS-001	Habitat and Open Space Mitigation	$23,920,445	100.00%	$23,920,445	0.00%	$0
	ESTIMATED GENERAL PLAN SETTLEMENT COSTS	$23,920,445	100.00%	$23,920,445	0.00%	$0
	Existing Fund Balance (Does not reduce mitgation)	$203,619	100.00%	$203,619	0.00%	$0
	Total Lawsuit Contribution	$24,124,064	100.00%	$24,124,064	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
2019 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	3,002.5	18,384	1.0	3,002.52	54.23%	$12,970,887	$4,320	6.12	$706 per Unit
Attached Dwellings	820.1	23,119	1.0	820.09	14.81%	$3,542,789	$4,320	28.19	$153 per Unit
High Density Dwellings	137.9	5,293	1.0	137.85	2.49%	$595,512	$4,320	38.40	$113 per Unit
Commercial Lodging Units	9.0	396	1.0	9.00	0.16%	$38,880	$4,320	44.00	$98 per Unit
Retail/Service Uses	358.9	6,272,000	1.0	358.94	6.48%	$1,550,621	$4,320	17,474	$0.247 per S.F.
Office Uses	308.7	10,274,000	1.0	308.65	5.57%	$1,333,368	$4,320	33,287	$0.130 per S.F.
Business Park Uses	665.9	13,380,000	1.0	665.86	12.03%	$2,876,515	$4,320	20,094	$0.215 per S.F.
Industrial Uses	233.2	6,439,000	1.0	233.23	4.21%	$1,007,554	$4,320	27,608	$0.156 per S.F.
Institutional Use	1.0	21,780	1.0	1.00	0.02%	$4,320	$4,320	21,780	$0.198 per S.F.
TOTAL	**5,537.14**			**5,537.14**	**100.00%**	**$23,920,445**	**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 right-of-ways 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.

2. Due to limited funding, incumbent service providers such as Verizon or Adelphia are not in a position to install "state of the art" telecommunication infrastructure in the OR. 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 right-of-ways 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 *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 $1,250,280.

The *core network* (FO-002) is simply the largest part of the fiber optic cabling. The Master Plan anticipates some 292 miles of trenching, 4,085 hand holes and 16,968 fiber splices. This portion of the program is estimated to cost $8,512,930. There is an implementation model (FO-003) estimated to be $34,000.

The heart of the network is the Distribution Network (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 and is estimated to be just under $18.1 million.

The "*Last mile*" (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 $5,144,300.

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 30 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 30 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 30 Mbps of service to one provider.

Each **detached dwelling** would require its own 30 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 standard 30 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 **commercial use** space will require 20% 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***.

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***.

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 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	1.40
Office Uses	4.44
Business Park Uses	1.24
Industrial Uses	1.10
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 number 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:

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

Table 16-2
Ontario Ranch Fiber Optic Communication
Impact Fee by Land Use

Development Use Category	Allocation of System Improvement Costs	Cost Impact per Unit or Square Foot
Detached Dwelling Units	$12,193,594	$663/Unit
Attached Dwelling Units	$15,334,188	$663/Unit
High Density Dwelling Units	$3,510,699	$663/Unit
Commercial Lodging Units	$26,266	$66/Unit
Retail/Service Uses	$332,963	$0.053/S.F.
Office Uses	$908,683	$0.088/S.F.
Business Park Uses	$545,873	$0.041/S.F.
Industrial Uses	$171,124	$0.027/S.F.
Institutional Uses	$1,990	$0.091/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
2019 Development Impact Cost Calculation Update
Fiber Optics Communication System (OR)
No Changes in 2019

Line #	Description	Estimated Cost	Residential Common System Construction Costs		Non- Residential Common System Construction Costs	
			Percent Need	Apportioned Dollar Cost	Percent Need	Apportioned Dollar Cost
FO-001	Head End Facilities (Points Of Presence System)	$464,992	94.00%	$437,092	6.00%	$27,900
FO-002	Core Network - Planning/Installation - Equipment/Faciliti	$18,736,284	94.00%	$17,612,107	6.00%	$1,124,177
FO-003	Implementation Model (Completed)	$0	0.00%	$0	0.00%	$0
FO-004	Distribution Network - Major Streets Conduit System	$9,819,358	94.00%	$9,230,197	6.00%	$589,161
FO-005	System Distribution Network - Fiber System	$10,630,463	94.00%	$9,992,635	6.00%	$637,828
FO-006	Cabling System - Residential/Non-Residential	$35,684,003	94.00%	$33,542,963	6.00%	$2,141,040
FO-007	Fiber Equipment Within Residential Units	$20,142,321	100.00%	$20,142,321	0.00%	$0
FO-008	Fiber Equipment Within Non-Residential Buildings	$8,702,748	0.00%	$0	100.00%	$8,702,748
	Sub-total Fiber Optic Information System	$104,180,169	87.31%	$90,957,315	12.69%	$13,222,854
	Fiber-Optic DIF Fund Balance	$15,231	100.00%	$15,231	0.00%	$0
	Sub-total - Adjustments	$15,231	100.00%	$15,231	0.00%	$0
	Total	$104,164,938	87.31%	$90,942,084	12.69%	$13,222,854
			Forward to Schedule 16.2		Forward to Schedule 16.2	

NOTES:
1. There are no notes.

Schedule 16.2

City of Ontario - Ontario Ranch
2016-17 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	3,002.5	18,384	1.00	18,384	39.29%	$35,726,970	$11,899	6.12	*$1,943 per Unit*
Attached Dwellings	820.1	23,119	1.00	23,119	49.40%	$44,928,841	$54,785	28.19	*$1,943 per Unit*
High Density Dwellings	137.9	5,293	1.00	5,293	11.31%	$10,286,273	$74,619	38.40	*$1,943 per Unit*
TOTAL - Residential	3,960	--	--	46,796	100.00%	*$90,942,084*	*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	1.32%	$174,798	$19,422	44.00	*$441 per Unit*
Retail/Service Uses	358.9	6,272,000	1.40	502	16.76%	$2,215,874	$6,173	17,474	*$0.353 per S.F.*
Office Uses	308.7	10,274,000	4.44	1,370	45.73%	$6,047,306	$19,593	33,287	*$0.589 per S.F.*
Business Park Uses	665.9	13,380,000	1.24	823	27.47%	$3,632,798	$5,456	20,094	*$0.272 per S.F.*
Industrial Uses	233.2	6,439,000	1.10	258	8.61%	$1,138,836	$4,883	27,608	*$0.177 per S.F.*
Institutional Use	1.0	21,780	2.90	3	0.10%	$13,242	$13,242	21,780	*$0.608 per S.F.*
TOTAL - Non-residential	1,577	--	--	2,996	100.00%	*$13,222,854*	*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	**358.9**	**6,272,000**	**17,474**	**2,500**	**6.990**	**20.00%**	**1.40**
Office Uses	**308.7**	**10,274,000**	**33,287**	**3,000**	**11.096**	**40.00%**	**4.44**
Business Park Uses	**665.9**	**13,380,000**	**20,094**	**6,500**	**3.091**	**40.00%**	**1.24**
Industrial Uses	**233.2**	**6,439,000**	**27,608**	**10,000**	**2.761**	**40.00%**	**1.10**
Institutional Use	**1.0**	**21,780**	**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. 50*, GC Minimal Capital Needs-based Impact Costs*.
- OR – Adopt Schedule 4.4, p. 52, *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.70, *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. 72, 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. 105, *GC - Minimal Capital Needs-based Impact Costs, Table 7-7,* p. 99, and *Equivalent Water meter Size calculation based Upon Minimum Needs-based Impact Fees.*
- OR - Adopt Schedule 7.4, p. 107, *GC - Minimal Capital Needs-based Impact Costs, Table 7-10, p. 101, and Equivalent Water meter Size calculation based Upon Minimum Needs- based Impact Fees.*

Chapter 8 - Sewer Collection Facilities

- GC - Adopt Schedule 8.2, p. 117, *GC - Minimal Capital Needs-based Impact Costs*.
- OR - Adopt Schedule 8.4, p. 119, *OR - Minimal Capital Needs-based Impact Costs*.

Chapter 9 - Refuse Collection Facilities and Equipment

- GC/OR - Adopt Schedule 9.1, parts **A** through **G,** p. 130.

Appendix A - Summary of DIF Recommendations (continued)

Chapter 10 - General Facilities, Vehicles and Equipment

- GC/OR - Adopt Schedule 10.2, p. 137, 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 190, Appendix C.

Chapter 11 - Library Facilities and Collection Items

- GC/OR - Adopt Schedule 11.1, p. 143.

Chapter 12 - Public Meeting (Community Centers) Facilities

- GC/OR - Adopt Schedule 12.1 p. 148.

Chapter 13 – Aquatics Facilities

- Adopt Schedule 13.1, p.152.

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 164, for residential uses requiring the sub-division of land for Quimby Act application.
- GC/OR - Adopt Schedule 14.1, page 164, 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 - Adopt the *Mitigation Fee per Acre* in Schedule 15.2, p. 176, as OR Species, Habitat Conservation and Open Space Land Mitigation Impact Fee.

Chapter 16 - Ontario Ranch - Fiber Optic Communication System

- OR - Adopt Schedule 16.2 - Fiber Optic Communication System Impact Fee, p. 183.

Appendix B

Expanded Land-use Database

Appendix B
Expanded Land-use Database
2019 Development Impact Cost Calculation Update

Total - Land-use Database General City and Ontario Ranch	Existing Development		Potential Development		Total General Plan Build-out	
	Acres	# of Units	Acres	# of Units	Acres	# of Units
Detached Dwellings	4,652.57	25,056	2,889.79	17,774	7,542.36	42,830
Attached Dwellings	836.84	12,045	935.31	27,699	1,772.15	39,744
High Density Dwellings	1.00	40	337.00	13,615	338.00	13,655
Mobile Home Dwellings	193.00	2,511	1.00	13	194.00	2,524
Commercial Lodging Units	38.50	4,338	10.00	436	48.50	4,774
Retail/Service Uses	928.70	9,709,001	506.67	18,064,000	1,435.37	27,773,001
Office Uses	42.00	914,760	583.65	26,386,000	625.65	27,300,760
Business Park Uses	80.00	1,306,800	805.51	16,222,000	885.51	17,528,800
Industrial Uses	6,426.00	125,962,452	877.13	38,484,000	7,303.13	164,446,452
Institutional Use	127.00	2,766,060	2.00	43,560	129.00	2,809,620
Total - City Limits	**13,325.61**		**6,948.06**		**20,273.67**	
Private Residences	**5,683.41**	**39,652**	**4,163.10**	**59,101**	**9,846.51**	**98,753**
Commercial Lodging Rooms	**38.50**	**4,338**	**10.00**	**436**	**48.50**	**4,774**
Business Square Feet	**7,603.70**	**140,659,073**	**2,774.96**	**99,199,560**	**10,378.66**	**239,858,633**

Land-use Database within the 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	4,638.80	24,894	(112.73)	(610)	4,526.07	24,284
Attached Dwellings	827.20	11,870	115.22	4,580	942.42	16,450
High Density Dwellings	1.00	40	199.15	8,322	200.15	8,362
Mobile Home Dwellings	193.00	2,511	1.00	13	194.00	2,524
Commercial Lodging Units	38.50	4,338	1.00	40	39.50	4,378
Retail/Service Uses	928.70	9,709,001	147.73	11,792,000	1,076.43	21,501,001
Office Uses	42.00	914,760	275.00	16,112,000	317.00	17,026,760
Business Park Uses	80.00	1,306,800	139.65	2,842,000	219.65	4,148,800
Industrial Uses	6,426.00	125,962,452	643.90	32,045,000	7,069.90	158,007,452
Institutional Use	127.00	2,766,060	1.00	21,780	128.00	2,787,840
Sub-total - General City	**13,302.20**		**1,410.92**		**14,713.12**	

Land-use Database within the 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	13.77	162	3,002.52	18,384	3,016.29	18,546
Attached Dwellings	9.64	175	820.09	23,119	829.73	23,294
High Density Dwellings	0.00	0	137.85	5,293	137.85	5,293
Mobile Home Dwellings	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0
Commercial Lodging Units	0.00	0	9.00	396	9.00	396
Retail/Service Uses	0.00	0	358.94	6,272,000	358.94	6,272,000
Office Uses	0.00	0	308.65	10,274,000	308.65	10,274,000
Business Park Uses	0.00	0	665.86	13,380,000	665.86	13,380,000
Industrial Uses	0.00	0	233.23	6,439,000	233.23	6,439,000
Institutional Use	0.00	0	1.00	21,780	1.00	21,780
Sub-total - Ontario Ranch	**23.41**		**5,537.14**		**5,560.55**	

Appendix B
Expanded Land-use Database
2019 Development Impact Cost Calculation Update

Land-use Database within the 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	4,638.80	24,894	50.77	179	4,689.57	25,073
Attached Dwellings	827.20	11,870	42.85	1,302	870.05	13,172
High Density Dwellings	1.00	40	199.15	7,527	200.15	7,567
Mobile Home Dwellings	193.00	2,511	1.00	13	194.00	2,524
Commercial Lodging Units	38.50	4,338	1.00	40	39.50	4,378
Retail/Service Uses	928.70	9,709,001	190.50	6,603,000	1,119.20	16,312,001
Office Uses	42.00	914,760	275.00	11,517,000	317.00	12,431,760
Business Park Uses	80.00	1,306,800	83.65	1,681,000	163.65	2,987,800
Industrial Uses	6,426.00	125,962,452	566.00	15,645,000	6,992.00	141,607,452
Institutional Use	127.00	2,766,060	1.00	21,780	128.00	2,787,840
Sub-total - General City	13,302.20		1,410.92		14,713.12	

Land-use Database within the City's General City - Demolition	Existing Development		Potential Development		Total General Plan Build-out	
	Acres	# of Units	Acres	# of Units	Acres	# of Units
Detached Dwellings			(163.50)	(789)	(163.50)	(789)
Attached Dwellings			(333.16)	(5,493)	(333.16)	(5,493)
High Density Dwellings			(46.80)	(889)	(46.80)	(889)
Mobile Home Dwellings			0.00	0	0.00	0
Commercial Lodging Units			0.00	0	0.00	0
Retail/Service Uses			(426.49)	(6,344,000)	(426.49)	(6,344,000)
Office Uses			(219.77)	(3,351,000)	(219.77)	(3,351,000)
Business Park Uses			(106.20)	(1,665,000)	(106.20)	(1,665,000)
Industrial Uses			(2,224.00)	(38,751,000)	(2,224.00)	(38,751,000)
Institutional Use			0.00	0	0.00	0
Sub-total - General City	0.00		(3,519.92)		(3,519.92)	

Land-use Database within General City - Redeveloped	Existing Development		Potential Development		Total General Plan Build-out	
	Acres	# of Units	Acres	# of Units	Acres	# of Units
Detached Dwellings			0.00	0	0.00	0
Attached Dwellings			405.53	8,771	405.53	8,771
High Density Dwellings			46.80	1,684	46.80	1,684
Mobile Home Dwellings			0.00	0	0.00	0
Commercial Lodging Units			0.00	0	0.00	0
Retail/Service Uses			383.72	11,533,000	383.72	11,533,000
Office Uses			219.77	7,946,000	219.77	7,946,000
Business Park Uses			162.20	2,826,000	162.20	2,826,000
Industrial Uses			2,301.90	55,151,000	2,301.90	55,151,000
Institutional Use			0.00	0	0.00	0
Sub-total - General City	0.00		3,519.92		3,519.92	

Appendix C

City Yard Improvement
Cost Estimates and Distribution

Needed City Corporation Yard Improvements Required to Accommodate Added Infrastructure Maintenance Capacity		Convert 84,000 Square Foot Building	Refuse Parking Parking Lot	Restructure Fleet Mtce. Building	Construct Welding Building	Fencing and Security Lighting	
Square or Linear Feet Required of Improvements:		84,000	435,600	15,000	7,200	7,000	
Land Cost/Square Foot or Linear Foot		$275.00	$ 5.00	$ 175.00	$ 300.00	$ 40.00	
	Total	***$23,100,000***	***$2,178,000***	***$2,625,000***	***$2,160,000***	***$280,000***	***$30,343,000***
Sub-total - Project Administration (10%)		$2,310,000	$217,800	$262,500	$216,000	$28,000	***$3,034,300***
Sub-total - Land Acquisition		$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	***$0***
Sub-total - Construction		$23,100,000	$2,178,000	$2,625,000	$2,160,000	$280,000	***$30,343,000***
Sub-total - Contingency		$2,310,000	$217,800	$262,500	$216,000	$28,000	***$3,034,300***
Sub-total - Other @ 5 to 10%		$1,155,000	$108,900	$262,500	$216,000	$14,000	***$1,756,400***
	Total improvements Cost	***$28,875,000***	***$2,722,500***	***$3,412,500***	***$2,808,000***	***$350,000***	***$38,168,000***
General Yard Improvements							
Circulation System Maintenance	5.00%	$1,443,750	$0	$0	$0	$17,500	***$1,461,250***
Storm Drainage Maintenance	5.00%	$1,443,750	$0	$0	$0	$17,500	***$1,461,250***
Parks Maintenance	10.00%	$2,887,500	$0	$0	$0	$35,000	***$2,922,500***
Water System Maintenance	25.00%	$7,218,750	$0	$0	$0	$87,500	***$7,306,250***
Sewer System Maintenance	10.00%	$2,887,500	$0	$0	$0	$35,000	***$2,922,500***
Refuse Maintenance	40.00%	$11,550,000	$0	$0	$0	$140,000	***$11,690,000***
Fire Fleet Maintenance	1.25%	$360,938	$0	$0	$0	$4,375	***$365,313***
Police Fleet Maintenance	1.25%	$360,938	$0	$0	$0	$4,375	***$365,313***
Other General Fund Services	2.50%	$721,875	$0	$0	$0	$8,750	***$730,625***
Sub-Total General Yard Improvements	100.00%	$28,875,000	$0	$0	$0	$ 350,000	$ 29,225,000
Parking Lot Improvements							
Circulation System Maintenance	3.75%	$0	$102,094	$0	$0	$0	***$102,094***
Storm Drainage Maintenance	3.75%	$0	$102,094	$0	$0	$0	***$102,094***
Parks Maintenance	5.00%	$0	$136,125	$0	$0	$0	***$136,125***
Water Maintenance	10.00%	$0	$272,250	$0	$0	$0	***$272,250***
Sewer Maintenance	7.50%	$0	$204,188	$0	$0	$0	***$204,188***
Refuse Maintenance	55.00%	$0	$1,497,375	$0	$0	$0	***$1,497,375***
Fire Fleet	2.50%	$0	$68,063	$0	$0	$0	***$68,063***
Police Fleet	2.50%	$0	$68,063	$0	$0	$0	***$68,063***
Other General Fund Services	10.00%	$0	$272,250	$0	$0	$0	***$272,250***
Sub- Total - Parking Lot	100.00%	$0	$2,722,502	$0	$0	$0	$2,722,502

Needed City Corporation Yard Improvements Required to Accommodate Added Infrastructure Maintenance Capacity		Convert 84,000 Square Foot Building	Refuse Parking Parking Lot	Restructure Fleet Mtce. Building	Construct Welding Building	Fencing and Security Lighting	
Square or Linear Feet Required of Improvements:		84,000	435,600	15,000	7,200	7,000	
Land Cost/Square Foot or Linear Foot		$275.00	$ 5.00	$ 175.00	$ 300.00	$ 40.00	
Total		***$23,100,000***	***$2,178,000***	***$2,625,000***	***$2,160,000***	***$280,000***	***$30,343,000***
Sub-total - Project Administration (10%)		$2,310,000	$217,800	$262,500	$216,000	$28,000	***$3,034,300***
Sub-total - Land Acquisition		$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	***$0***
Sub-total - Construction		$23,100,000	$2,178,000	$2,625,000	$2,160,000	$280,000	***$30,343,000***
Sub-total - Contingency		$2,310,000	$217,800	$262,500	$216,000	$28,000	***$3,034,300***
Sub-total - Other @ 5 to 10%		$1,155,000	$108,900	$262,500	$216,000	$14,000	***$1,756,400***
Total improvements Cost		***$28,875,000***	***$2,722,500***	***$3,412,500***	***$2,808,000***	***$350,000***	***$38,168,000***
Fleet Maintenance Building							
Building and Safety	0.59%	$0	$0	$20,068	$16,513	$0	***$36,582***
City Hall	0.25%	$0	$0	$8,601	$7,077	$0	***$15,678***
Code Enforcement	1.60%	$0	$0	$54,472	$44,822	$0	***$99,294***
Engineering	1.30%	$0	$0	$44,437	$36,566	$0	***$81,003***
Fire Department	12.14%	$0	$0	$414,271	$340,885	$0	***$755,156***
Housing	0.50%	$0	$0	$17,202	$14,154	$0	***$31,356***
Library	0.13%	$0	$0	$4,300	$3,539	$0	***$7,839***
Planning	0.17%	$0	$0	$5,734	$4,718	$0	***$10,452***
Police Department	22.18%	$0	$0	$756,868	$622,794	$0	***$1,379,662***
Police Undercover	3.02%	$0	$0	$103,209	$84,926	$0	***$188,136***
Public Utilities							
Water	7.01%	$0	$0	$239,101	$196,746	$0	***$435,848***
Sewer	3.73%	$0	$0	$127,291	$104,743	$0	***$232,034***
Recreation	0.76%	$0	$0	$25,802	$21,232	$0	***$47,034***
Redevelopment	0.13%	$0	$0	$4,300	$3,539	$0	***$7,839***
Solid Waste	32.34%	$0	$0	$1,103,766	$908,242	$0	***$2,012,007***
Streets/Storm/Parks							
Circulation	5.66%	$0	$0	$193,231	$159,001	$0	***$352,232***
Storm	2.83%	$0	$0	$96,615	$79,501	$0	***$176,116***
Parks	5.66%	$0	$0	$193,231	$159,001	$0	***$352,232***
	100.00%	$0	$0	$3,412,500	$2,808,000	$0	$6,220,500

Needed City Corporation Yard Improvements Required to Accommodate Added Infrastructure Maintenance Capacity	
2012 City Yard Improvements Total	
Circulation System Maintenance	5.02%
Storm Drainage Maintenance	4.56%
Parks Maintenance	8.94%
Water Maintenance	21.00%
Sewer Maintenance	8.80%
Refuse Maintenance	39.82%
Fire Fleet Maintenance	3.11%
Police Fleet Maintenance	5.24%
Other General Government Services	3.51%
TOTAL	100.00%

Convert 84,000 Square Foot Building	Refuse Parking Parking Lot	Restructure Fleet Mtce. Building	Construct Welding Building	Fencing and Security Lighting	
$1,443,750	$102,094	$193,231	$159,001	$17,500	$1,915,576
$1,443,750	$102,094	$96,615	$79,501	$17,500	$1,739,460
$2,887,500	$136,125	$193,231	$159,001	$35,000	$3,410,857
$7,218,750	$272,250	$239,101	$196,746	$87,500	$8,014,348
$2,887,500	$204,188	$127,291	$104,743	$35,000	$3,358,722
$11,550,000	$1,497,375	$1,103,764	$908,242	$140,000	$15,199,380
$360,938	$68,063	$414,271	$340,885	$4,375	$1,188,532
$360,938	$68,063	$860,077	$707,721	$4,375	$2,001,174
$721,875	$272,250	$184,917	$152,160	$8,750	$1,339,952
$28,875,000	$2,722,502	$3,412,498	$2,808,000	$350,000	$38,168,000

2019 City Yard Improvements Adjustments Total	
Circulation System Maintenance	
Storm Drainage Maintenance	
Parks Maintenance	
Water Maintenance	
Sewer Maintenance	
Refuse Maintenance	
Fire Fleet Maintenance	
Police Fleet Maintenance	
Other General Government Services	

2012 Estimate	% Increase	2019 Estimate
$1,915,576	100.0%	$1,915,576
$1,739,460	100.0%	$1,739,460
$3,410,857	118.2%	$4,047,273
$8,014,348	118.2%	$9,472,959
$3,358,722	118.2%	$3,970,009
$15,199,380	118.2%	$17,965,667
$1,188,532	118.2%	$1,404,845
$2,001,174	118.2%	$2,365,388
$1,339,952	118.2%	$1,583,822

Appendix D

New and General City Development Impact Fee Policies

SUB-TABLE OF CONTENTS

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).

2019 DIF No.	General City Regional Projects Circulation System DIF Program Project Description	GC Regional Project Costs		
ST-071	Holt Boulevard Bridge over West Cucamonga Creek	$105,977		
ST-072	Mission Boulevard Bridge over West Cucamonga Creek	$296,734		
ST-074	Francis Street Bridge over West Cucamonga Creek	$95,379		
ST-075	Eighth Street Bridge over West Cucamonga Creek	$816,020		
ST-076	Sixth Street Bridge over Cucamonga Creek	$651,445		
ST-077	Fourth Street Bridge over Cucamonga Creek	$761,530		
ST-079	Holt Boulevard Bridge over Cucamonga Creek	$1,184,445		
ST-081	Mission Boulevard Bridge over Cucamonga Creek	$869,009		
ST-082	Francis Street Bridge over Cucamonga Creek	$794,825		
ST-083	Philadelphia Street Bridge over Cucamonga Creek	$942,569		
ST-084	Riverside Drive Bridge over Cucamonga Creek	$462,869		
ST-085	Archibald Avenue Bridge over Upper Deer Creek	$533,000		
ST-086	Archibald Avenue Bridge over Upper Deer Creek Spillway	$746,200		
ST-087	Inland Empire Boulevard Bridge over Upper Deer Creek	$1,428,134		
ST-091	Grove Avenue Grade Separation under UPRR/Alhambra	$4,678,628		
ST-092	Milliken (N) Grade Separation under UPRR/Alhambra	$234,580		
ST-094	Milliken (S) Grade Separation over UPRR/Alhambra	$20,845,807		
ST-095	Archibald (S) Grade Separation over UPRR/LA	$15,133,355		
ST-096	San Antonio (S) Grade Separation Under UPRR/Alhambra	$10,560,000		
ST-097	Campus (S) Grade Separation under UPRR/Alhambra	$10,560,000		
ST-100	Sultana (S) Grade Separation under UPRR/LA line	$4,200,000		
ST-103	Circulation System Maintenance Vehicles	$1,603,394		
ST-111	I-10 Freeway at Grove and Fourth	$19,193,325		
ST-112	Traffic Signal System Control and Operations Center	$1,100,000		
ST-113	General City Backbone Signal Interconnect	$520,000		
ST-114	I-10 at Euclid Avenue Eastbound On-Ramp	$632,100		
ST-116	I-10 at Vineyard Interchange Reconstruction/Expansion	$1,200,000		
ST-118	Hellman Avenue Bridge over Cucamonga Creek	$2,103,948		
ST-126	Share of City Yard Improvements	$899,924		
ST-129	Fourth Street Under the I-10 Freeway	$10,345,324		**Use**
	Regional Total	**$113,498,521**	**60%**	**60%**
	Total All GC Streets	**$189,749,908**		
	Local Adjacent Streets	**$76,251,387**	**40%**	**40%**

Appendix D

City of Ontario
2019 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 *60%*	*Local/Adjacent DIF* Rounded to *40%*
Detached Dwellings	$2,439	$1,463	$976
Attached Dwellings	$1,629	$977	$652
High Density Dwellings	$1,008	$605	$403
Mobile Home Dwellings	$1,269	$761	$508
Commercial Lodging Units	$1,287	$772	$515
Retail/Service Uses	$4.929	$2.957	$1.972
Office Uses	$2.817	$1.690	$1.127
Business Park Uses	$2.931	$1.759	$1.172
Industrial Uses	$1.510	$0.906	$0.604
Institutional Use	$3.219	$1.931	$1.288

2019 DIF No.	General City Regional Projects Storm Drain DIF Program Project Description	GC Regional Project Costs		
SD-069	Storm Drain Maint. Vehicles	$124,495		
SD-074	San Savaine Channel	$1,807,410		
SD-075	Storm Drain Master Plan update	$44,660		
SD-103	City Yard Improvements	$388,425		**Use**
	Regional Storm Drain Total	**$2,364,990**	**3%**	**5%**
	Total All GC Storm Drain	**$92,637,629**		
	Local Adjacent Storm Drain	**$90,272,639**	**97%**	**95%**

Appendix D

City of Ontario
2019 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	$3,404	$170	$3,234
Attached Dwellings	$1,094	$55	$1,039
High Density Dwellings	$508	$25	$483
Mobile Home Dwellings	$1,449	$72	$1,377
Commercial Lodging Units	$191	$10	$181
Retail/Service Uses	$1.062	$0.053	$1.009
Office Uses	$0.395	$0.020	$0.375
Business Park Uses	$1.092	$0.055	$1.037
Industrial Uses	$1.002	$0.050	$0.952
Institutional Use	$1.028	$0.051	$0.977

2019 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 (New - Previously OMC only)	$5,442,852		
WT-004	Eighth Street - 1212' Zone Transmission lines	$16,186,891		
WT-005	Eighth Street - 1212' Zone Reservoir Site Purchase	$4,800,000		
WT-006	Eighth Street- 1212' Zone Reservoir Construction	$21,932,064		
WT-009	Phillips Zone Extension Mains	$445,114		
WT-018	Reservoir 1010' Zone (2B) Landscaping	$242,730		
WT-027	Water Master Plan Updates	$273,411		
WT-031	Ontario-JCSD Reservoir	$107,731		
WT-034	Water Source Supply	$3,934,694		
WT-037	City Yard Improvements	$1,622,433		**Use**
	Regional Total	**$55,752,390**	**64%**	**65%**
	Total All GC Water	**$86,916,616**		
	Local Adjacent Water	**$31,164,226**	**36%**	**35%**

Appendix D

City of Ontario
2019 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 *65%*	*Local/Adjacent DIF* Rounded to *35%*
Detached Dwellings	$7,473	$4,857	$2,616
Attached Dwellings	$5,109	$3,321	$1,788
High Density Dwellings	$3,447	$2,241	$1,206
Mobile Home Dwellings	$5,109	$3,321	$1,788
Commercial Lodging Units	$2,060	$1,339	$721
Retail/Service Uses	$0.379	$0.246	$0.133
Office Uses	$0.797	$0.518	$0.279
Business Park Uses	$1.485	$0.965	$0.520
Industrial Uses	$0.552	$0.359	$0.193
Institutional Use	$1.387	$0.902	$0.485

2019 DIF No.	General City Regional Projects Sewer Collection System DIF Program Project Description	GC Regional Project Costs		
SW-001	Eastern Trunk Sewer	$266,933		
SW-026	Sewer Maintenance Vehicles	$262,516		
SW-027	Sewer Master Plan update	$148,281		
SW-038	Easement N/O Holt Blvd, E/O Allyn Avenue	$4,034		
SW-046	Holt Sewer Phase A	$935,278		
SW-047	Holt Sewer Phase B	$22,718		
SW-048	Share of Common City Yard Improvements	$1,100,401		**Use**
	Regional Sewer Total	**$2,740,161**	**11%**	**10%**
	Total All GC Sewer	**$25,827,934**		
	Local Adjacent Sewer	**$23,087,773**	**89%**	**90%**

Appendix D

City of Ontario
2019 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	$1,384	$138	$1,246
Attached Dwellings	$1,211	$121	$1,090
High Density Dwellings	$1,038	$104	$934
Mobile Home Dwellings	$1,212	$121	$1,091
Commercial Lodging Units	$807	$81	$726
Retail/Service Uses	$0.065	$0.007	$0.058
Office Uses	$0.295	$0.030	$0.265
Business Park Uses	$0.340	$0.034	$0.306
Industrial Uses	$0.185	$0.019	$0.166
Institutional Use	$0.391	$0.039	$0.352

2019 DIF No.	**Ontario Ranch Regional Projects Circulation System** DIF Program Project Description	OR Regional Project Costs		
ST-025	Non-Developer ROW Frontage Improvements and SCE Pole Relocations	$540,035		
ST-026	Additional SCE Pole Relocations	$2,415,000		
ST-029	OR Offsite Galena Street Widening I-15 to Milliken/Hamner	$2,258,000		
ST-030	OR Offsite Euclid Avenue Improvements Merrill to US-71	$6,252,000		
ST-031	OR Offsite Archibald Bridge over Santa Ana River	$256,000		
ST-032	OR Offsite - Hamner Bridge over the Santa Ana River	$592,000		
ST-089	Archibald Avenue Bridge over Lower Deer Creek Channel	$358,450		
ST-094	Milliken (S) Grade Separation Under UPRR/Alhambra	$3,309,823		
ST-103	Street Maintenance Vehicles	$1,809,586		
ST-104	Archibald Ave. Bridge over Great Park	$4,989,730		
ST-105	SR-60 at Vineyard interchange Reconstruction/Expansion	$28,606,030		
ST-106	SR-60 at Archibald interchange Reconstruction/Expansion	$15,588,293		
ST-107	SR-60 at Euclid interchange Reconstruction/Expansion	$1,524,000		
ST-108	SR-60 at Grove interchange Reconstruction/Expansion	$24,236,370		
ST-109	SR-60 at Mountain Avenue Interchange Reconstruction/Expansion	$3,495,000		
ST-112	Traffic Signal System Control and Operations Center	$1,100,000		
ST-117	NMC Street/Trails Grade Separations	$2,243,472		
ST-119	Riverside Drive Bridge Over Cucamonga Creek	$1,051,974		
ST-120	Chino Avenue Bridge over Cucamonga Creek	$3,187,800		
ST-121	Schaefer Avenue Bridge over Cucamonga Creek	$6,694,380		
ST-122	Schaefer Avenue Bridge over Cucamonga Creek Spillway	$11,901,120		
ST-123	Edison Avenue Bridge over Cucamonga Creek	$17,341,632		
ST-124	Eucalyptus Avenue Bridge over Cucamonga Creek	$12,878,712		
ST-125	Merrill Avenue Bridge over Cucamonga Creek	$13,261,248		
ST-126	Share of City Yard Improvements	$1,015,652		
ST-128	Street Design Studies	$1,074,109		
ST-131	Ontario Ranch Traffic Study	$90,000		**Use**
	Regional Total	**$168,070,416**	**43%**	**40%**
	Total All OR Streets	**$393,181,444**		
	Local Adjacent Streets	**$225,111,028**	**57%**	**60%**

Appendix D

City of Ontario
2019 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 *40%*	*Local/Adjacent DIF* Rounded to *60%*
Detached Dwellings	$4,847	$1,939	$2,908
Attached Dwellings	$3,237	$1,295	$1,942
High Density Dwellings	$2,002	$801	$1,201
Commercial Lodging	$2,556	$1,022	$1,534
Retail/Service Uses	$9.794	$3.918	$5.876
Office Uses	$5.598	$2.239	$3.359
Business Park Uses	$5.824	$2.330	$3.494
Industrial Uses	$3.002	$1.201	$1.801
Institutional Use	$6.396	$2.558	$3.838

2019 DIF No.	**Ontario Ranch Regional Projects Storm Drainage Collection System** DIF Program Project Description	OR Regional Project Costs		
SD-004	County line Channel	$2,500,119		
SD-050	Euclid Avenue Outfall from Chino Connection to Merrill	$19,715,234		
SD-051	Walker Avenue Outfall from Connection to Merrill	$10,600,000		
SD-052	Grove Avenue Outfall from Chino Connection to Merrill	$12,956,885		
SD-069	Storm Drain Maint. Vehicles	$433,025		
SD-075	Storm Drain Master Plan update	$155,340		
SD-103	Share of Common City Yard improvements	$1,351,035		
SD-104	Ontario Ranch System Design Studies	$813,062		
SD-105	Ontario Ranch Storm Drain Study	$1,000,000		**Use**
	Regional Storm Drain Total	**$49,524,700**	**26%**	**25%**
	Total All OR Storm Drain	**$191,995,547**		
	Local Adjacent Storm Drain	**$142,470,847**	**74%**	**75%**

Appendix D

City of Ontario
2019 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 *25%*	*Local/Adjacent DIF* Rounded to *75%*
Detached Dwellings	$5,335	$1,334	$4,001
Attached Dwellings	$1,211	$303	$908
High Density Dwellings	$988	$247	$741
Commercial Lodging	$862	$216	$646
Retail/Service Uses	$2.171	$0.543	$1.628
Office Uses	$1.140	$0.285	$0.855
Business Park Uses	$1.835	$0.459	$1.376
Industrial Uses	$1.450	$0.363	$1.087
Institutional Use	$1.838	$0.460	$1.378

2019 DIF No.	Ontario Ranch Regional Projects Water DIF Program Project Description	OR Regional Project Costs		
WT-002	Eighth Street - 1212' Zone Wells	$3,319,811		
WT-007	Francis Zone Wells	$33,924,835		
WT-008	Phillips Zone Well	$6,647,387		
WT-009	Phillips Zone Extension Mains	$1,169,812		
WT-010	Francis Zone Extension Transmission Lines	$35,524,302		
WT-012	Francis Zone 925' Well Collection System	$11,511,287		
WT-013	Pressure Reducing Stations	$1,778,766		
WT-014	Francis Zone Reservoirs	$62,024,039		
WT-015	Phillips Zone Reservoirs	$9,327,338		
WT-017	Backup Power Supply	$997,013		
WT-027	Water Master Plan Updates	$1,322,965		
WT-030	CDA Facility Modifications	$2,797,348		
WT-031	Ontario-JCSD Reservoir	$538,657		
WT-032	Water Treatment	$15,375,014		
WT-033	Phillips Street 1010' Zone Well Connection System	$5,039,874		
WT-034	Water Supply	$58,614,629		
WT-037	City Yard Improvements	$7,850,526		
WT-038	Water Design Studies	$24,302		**Use**
	Reimbursement for Water System	$4,375,000		
	Regional Total	**$262,162,905**	**68%**	**70%**
	Total All OR Water	**$385,785,859**		
	Local Adjacent Water	**$123,622,954**	**32%**	**30%**

Appendix D

City of Ontario
2019 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 *70%*	*Local/Adjacent DIF* Rounded to *30%*
Detached Dwellings	$8,997	$6,298	$2,699
Attached Dwellings	$4,939	$3,457	$1,482
High Density Dwellings	$2,621	$1,835	$786
Commercial Lodging	$3,780	$2,646	$1,134
Retail/Service Uses	$3.484	$2.439	$1.045
Office Uses	$1.879	$1.315	$0.564
Business Park Uses	$2.662	$1.863	$0.799
Industrial Uses	$2.189	$1.532	$0.657
Institutional Use	$2.167	$1.517	$0.650

2019 DIF No.	**Ontario Ranch Regional Projects Sewer Collection System** DIF Program Project Description	OR Regional Project Costs		
SW-001	Eastern Trunk Sewer	$3,037,144		
SW-002	Western Trunk Sewer	$9,729,242		
SW-026	Sewer Maintenance Vehicles	$684,584		
SW-027	Sewer Master Plan update	$386,686		
SW-048	Share of Common City Yard Improvements	$2,869,608		
SW-049	Ontario Ranch Design Studies	$24,302		Use
	Regional Sewer Total	**$16,731,566**	**38%**	**40%**
	Total All OR Sewer	**$44,070,087**		
	Local Adjacent Sewer	**$27,338,521**	**62%**	**60%**

Appendix D

City of Ontario
2019 Development Impact Cost Calculation Update
OR - Regional/Local Adjacent Distribution
Sewer Collection Facilities

Proposed Land-use	*Proposed Development Impact Fee*	*Regional DIF* Rounded to *40%*	*Local/Adjacent DIF* Rounded to *60%*
Detached Dwellings	$902	$361	$541
Attached Dwellings	$684	$274	$410
High Density Dwellings	$413	$165	$248
Commercial Lodging	$527	$211	$316
Retail/Service Uses	$0.194	$0.078	$0.116
Office Uses	$0.339	$0.136	$0.203
Business Park Uses	$0.224	$0.090	$0.134
Industrial Uses	$0.218	$0.087	$0.131
Institutional Use	$0.262	$0.105	$0.157

2019 DIF No.	**Ontario Ranch Regional Projects** **Fiber Communications** DIF Program Project Description	OR Regional Project Costs		
FO-001	Head End Network Element	$464,992		
FO-002	Core Network	$18,736,284		
FO-005	System Distribution Network - Fiber System	$10,630,463		
				Use
	Regional Fiber Communications Total	**$29,831,739**	**29%**	**30%**
	Total All OR Fiber Communications	**$104,180,169**		
	Local Adjacent Fiber Communications	**$74,348,430**	**71%**	**70%**

Appendix D

City of Ontario - Ontario Ranch
2016-17 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 *30%*	*Local/Adjacent DIF* Rounded to *70%*
Detached Dwellings	$1,943	$583	$1,360
Attached Dwellings	$1,943	$583	$1,360
High Density Dwellings	$1,943	$583	$1,360

Proposed Land-use	*Proposed Development Impact Fee*	*Regional DIF* Rounded to *30%*	*Local/Adjacent DIF* Rounded to *70%*
Commercial Lodging Units	$441	$132	$309
Retail/Service Uses	$0.353	$0.106	$0.247
Office Uses	$0.589	$0.177	$0.412
Business Park Uses	$0.272	$0.082	$0.190
Industrial Uses	$0.177	$0.053	$0.124
Institutional Use	$0.608	$0.182	$0.426

End of Report