

PARK IMPACT FEE NEXUS STUDY UPDATE

OCTOBER 2013
FINAL REPORT

PREPARED FOR:

BOARD OF DIRECTORS
TRUCKEE-DONNER RECREATION AND PARK DISTRICT

PREPARED BY:
SCICOnsultingGroup
4745 MANGELS BOULEVARD
FAIRFIELD, CA 94534
PHONE 707.430.4300
FAX 707.430.4319
www.sci-cg.com



TRUCKEE-DONNER RECREATION AND PARK DISTRICT

Board of Directors
Kristin York, Chair
Erin Casey, Vice Chair
Kevin Murphy, Secretary
Janet Brady, Director
Peter Werbel, Director

General Manager Steve Randall

CLERK OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS
Susan Mitchell

DISTRICT CONSULTANT
Blair Aas, SCI Consulting Group
Jennifer Per Lee, SCI Consulting Group



ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This Park Impact Fee Nexus Study Update was prepared by SCI Consulting Group under contract with the Truckee-Donner Recreation and Park District.

The work was accomplished under the general direction of Steve Randall, General Manager of the Truckee-Donner Recreation and Park District.

We would like to acknowledge the special efforts made by individuals and organizations to this project:

Sue Mitchell, Truckee-Donner Recreation and Park District
Duane Hall, Town of Truckee Planning Division
Nevada County Community Development Agency
Placer County Community Development Department
Marcia Salter, Nevada County Auditor-Controller's Office
Nevada County Assessor's Office
Placer County Assessor's Office



EXECUTIVE SUMMARY
ABOUT THE TRUCKEE-DONNER RECREATION AND PARK DISTRICT OVERVIEW OF THE PARK IMPACT FEE METHODOLOGY / APPROACH NEXUS REQUIREMENTS. SUMMARY OF KEY FINDINGS. SUMMARY OF GENERAL RECOMMENDATIONS.
Service Population
FACILITY DEMAND FACTORSEXISTING AND BUILDOUT SERVICE POPULATIONS
PER CAPITA COST COMPONENTS
PARK DEVELOPMENT COST PER CAPITA
Park Impact Fee Determination1
COST PER CAPITA
NEXUS FINDINGS1
PARK IMPACT FEE PROGRAM IMPLEMENTATION1
ADOPTION REQUIREMENTS
Appendices1
APPENDIX A – NEW PARK CONSTRUCTION ESTIMATE OF COSTS



LIST OF FIGURES

FIGURE 1 – PROPOSED PARK IMPACT FEES	4
FIGURE 2 – FACILITY DEMAND PER HOUSING UNIT	6
FIGURE 3 – EXISTING SERVICE POPULATION	6
FIGURE 4 – BUILDOUT SERVICE POPULATION	7
FIGURE 5 – PARK DEVELOPMENT COST PER CAPITA	8
FIGURE 6 - COMMUNITY USE FACILITIES BUILDOUT LOS STANDARDS	9
FIGURE 7 – New Community Use Facilities Cost Allocation	
FIGURE 8 – COMMUNITY USE FACILITIES COST PER CAPITA	10
FIGURE 9 – COST PER CAPITA	
FIGURE 10 – COST PER UNIT	12
FIGURE 11 – PROPOSED PARK IMPACT FEES	12
FIGURE 12 – NEIGHBORHOOD PARK CONSTRUCTION ESTIMATE OF COST	18
FIGURE 13 – COMMUNITY PARK CONSTRUCTION ESTIMATE OF COST	19
FIGURE 14 – NEW AQUATICS FACILITY ESTIMATE OF COSTS	20
FIGURE 15 – AVERAGE HOUSEHOLD SIZE BY HOUSING TYPE	22
FIGURE 16 – SUMMARY OF DISTRICT PARKS	23



This Park Impact Fees Nexus Study ("Nexus Study") was prepared in accordance with nexus requirements of the "Mitigation Fee Act" as found in Govt. Code § 66000 et seq. The purpose of this Nexus Study is to update the District's district-wide park impact fees ("fees") charged on new residential development within the Truckee-Donner Recreation and Park District ("District").

On December 17, 2007, the District Board of Directors ("District Board") adopted the District's Park Impact Fee Nexus Study which justified park impact fees in the amount of \$2.22 per square for new single-family residential construction and \$3.86 per square foot for new multi-family residential construction. The Board also proposed that the fee increase be implemented in phases over a three year period.

On May 15 2008, the Truckee Town Council adopted the District's new fee program; however the third phase of the fee increase was never implemented. The District's current park impact fees for the Town of Truckee is \$1.31 per square for new single-family residential construction and \$2.13 per square foot for new multi-family residential construction. On January 27, 2009, the County of Nevada Board of Supervisors adopted the District's new fee program; however the second and third phase of the fee increase were never implemented. The District's current park impact fees for Nevada County are \$0.86 per square for new single-family residential construction and \$1.27 per square foot for new multi-family residential construction. The County of Placer Board of Supervisors did not adopt the District's new fee program as requested by the District Board.

ABOUT THE TRUCKEE-DONNER RECREATION AND PARK DISTRICT

The Truckee-Donner Recreation and Park District is the primary park and recreation service provider for the residents of the Town of Truckee and some surrounding unincorporated areas of Nevada County and Placer County. Established in 1963, the District has a current population of 18,449 residents and covers approximately 220 square miles. The District is responsible for the management and maintenance of approximately 106.8 acres of parks and 4 community recreation facilities.



OVERVIEW OF THE PARK IMPACT FEE METHODOLOGY / APPROACH

Since the need for park and recreational services is inherently population-driven, this Nexus Study utilizes a <u>per capita standard-based methodology</u> to calculate the District's park impact fees. Under this method, the cost components are based on level of service ("LOS") standards established by the District. The total per capita costs are then applied to two residential land use categories according their respective average household population, average facility demand and average square footage to establish a cost/fee per square foot.

NEXUS REQUIREMENTS

In order to impose park impact fees, this Nexus Study will demonstrate that a reasonable relationship or "nexus" exists between new development that occurs within the District and the need for additional developed parkland and recreational facilities as a result of new development. More specifically, this Nexus Study will present findings in order to meet the procedural requirements of the Mitigation Fee Act, also known as AB 1600, which are as follows:

- Identify the purpose of the fee;
- Identify the use to which the fee is to be put;
- Determine how there is a reasonable relationship between the fee's use and the type of development project on which the fee is imposed;
- Determine how there is a reasonable relationship between the need for the public facility and the type of development project on which the fee is imposed;
- Determine how there is a reasonable relationship between the amount of the fee and the cost of the public facility or portion of the public facility attributable to the development on which the fee is imposed.



SUMMARY OF KEY FINDINGS

- 1. The District's current park impact fees for the Town of Truckee are \$1.31 per square for new single-family residential construction and \$2.13 per square foot for new multi-family residential construction. The District's current park impact fees for the unincorporated area of District with Nevada County are \$0.86 per square for new single-family residential construction and \$1.27 per square foot for new multi-family residential construction.
- The District's level of service standard for the acquisition and development of neighborhood and community parks is 5.0 acres for every 1,000 residents. The District's LOS standard is consistent with the District's Master Plan, the Town of Truckee General Plan, the Nevada County General Plan and the Placer County General Plan.
- 3. The District is characterized by a high percentage of "second" or "vacation" homes. According to the Town of Truckee General Plan and recent California Department of Finance estimates, approximately 50 percent of existing housing units in the District maintain only seasonal occupancy.
- 4. A part-time resident is generally not considered to have the same demand for or impact upon the District's park and recreational facilities as a permanent resident. Therefore, this Nexus Study utilizes a facility demand factor of 0.212, representing the ratio of the demand one part-time resident will have on the District's park and recreational facilities, as compared to one permanent resident.¹
- 5. For purposes of this Nexus Study, the District's existing service population of 23,187 is projected to grow by 13,101 to a buildout service population of 36,288 by approximately 2030.
- 6. Based on current cost estimates, average park development cost is estimated to be \$379,000 per acre. *Appendix A*
- Estimated construction cost for the District's new aquatics facility is approximately \$7,198,271 million. Additionally, the District issued Certificate of Participation in 2007 for \$24,235,000 to finance the construction of the District's Community Recreation Center. Appendix B and C
- 8. A reasonable relationship or "nexus" exists between new residential development in the District and the need for additional park and recreational facilities as a result of new development.

¹ Source: Truckee-Donner Recreation and Park District 2010 Facility Use Survey conducted in part to determine the facility use of a part-time resident compared to a full-time resident.



SUMMARY OF GENERAL RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on the findings presented in the Nexus Study, the following general recommendations are presented:

 The District should establish new park impact fees to fairly allocate the costs of park development and construction of community use facilities to new residential development. The District proposes the following park impact fees:

FIGURE 1 – PROPOSED PARK IMPACT FEES

Residential Land Use	Proposed Park Impact Fees
	Per Sq. Ft.
Single Family Housing	\$1.71
Muti-Family Housing	\$2.46

- The cost estimates presented in this Nexus Study are in 2013 dollars. The
 ordinance and/or resolution updating the park impact fees should include a
 provision for annual inflationary adjustments based on a District review of an
 appropriate building cost index.
- 3. The District's new park impact fees should be adopted and implemented the Town of Truckee, County of Nevada and County of Placer on behalf of the District in accordance with the applicable provisions of the Mitigation Fee Act (California Govt. Code § 66000 et. seq.)



¹ Single family housing includes includes townhomes and mobile homes.

This Nexus Study uses "service population" as a reasonable indicator of demand for park and recreational services, and therefore for demand for park and recreational facilities required to provide such services. This section examines the District's existing and buildout service population based on projections from the Town of Truckee General Plan, assumptions for growth in the unincorporated portions of the District, the 2010 U.S Census, and the facility demand factor described below.

The planning horizon of the Nexus Study is through 2030 which approximates the estimated buildout of the Town of Truckee.²

FACILITY DEMAND FACTORS

The District is characterized by a high percentage of vacation or "second" homes. According to the Town of Truckee General Plan and recent California Department of Finance estimates, approximately 50 percent of existing housing units in Truckee maintain seasonal occupancy. For planning purposes, this Nexus Study assumes that the current percentage of seasonal occupancy housing will continue through buildout of the District.

Part-time residents from vacation or "second" homes are generally considered to not have the same demand for or impact upon park and recreational facilities as permanent residents. In general, permanent residents can use the District's park and recreation facilities year-round. Conversely, park and recreation facility use by part-time residents is generally limited due to their limited time in the District.

In 2007, the District's Nexus Study utilized a facility demand factor of 0.33 to represent the demand one part-time resident will have on the District's park and recreational facilities in relation to a permanent, full-time resident. In 2010, the District conducted a Facility Use Survey in part to determine the facility use of a part-time resident in relation to a full-time resident. Based on the results of the Facility Use Survey, this Nexus Study uses a facility demand factor of 0.212. Since park impact fees are charged on new residential development, this Nexus Study utilizes a facility demand per new housing unit of 0.602, which represents the average demand for park and recreational facilities generated by one unit of residential development. The calculation of the facility demand per new housing unit may be found on the following page.



² Source: Town of Truckee General Plan

FIGURE 2 - FACILITY DEMAND PER HOUSING UNIT

Housing Occupancy Types	Percentage of Total ¹	Facility Demand Factor ²	Facility Demand per Housing Unit ³
Year-Round Housing	49.54%	1.000	0.495
Seasonal / Vacation Housing	50.46%	0.212	0.107
Total Housing	100.00%		0.602

Notes:

EXISTING AND BUILDOUT SERVICE POPULATIONS

The District's estimated existing service population is presented below. As shown, the District's existing service population is estimated to be 23,187. On the following page, figure 4 presents the buildout service population based on projections from the Town of Truckee General Plan and assumptions for growth for the unincorporated areas of Nevada County and Placer County with the District. By 2030, it is estimated that the District's service population will grow to 36,288 – a 13,101 service population increase.

FIGURE 3 – EXISTING SERVICE POPULATION

	ŀ	lousing Unit	s 1	Facility	Average	Existing
Housing Type	Year- Round	Seasonal	Total Units	Demand Factor ²	Household Size ³	Service Population ⁴
Single-Family Housing	6,899	7,027	13,926	0.602	2.56	21,487
Multi-Family Housing	742	756	1,498	0.602	1.89	1,700
Total	7,641	7,783	15,424	0.602	2.49	23,187



¹ The estimated ratio of year-round and seasonal housing occupancy for future housing growth in the District

⁴ Based on District's 2010 Facility Use Survey which found one part-time resident generates a park and recreational facility demand equal to 0.212 of one permanent resident (2,545 part-time resident users and 11,813 full-time resident users weighted by the percentage of total for each housing occupancy type.)

³ Represents the average demand for park and recreational facilities from a new housing unit.

¹ Estimated housing units in the District assuming 50.46% second homes and 49.54% year-round housing.

² See Figure 2.

³ Based on District census tract figures from the 2010 U.S. Census. See Appendix D.

⁴ Estimated by multiplying total housing units for each housing type by their respective average household size and facility demand factor.

FIGURE 4 – BUILDOUT SERVICE POPULATION

	ŀ	Housing Units ¹			Average	Buildout
Housing Type	Year- Round	Seasonal	Total Units	Demand Factor ²	Household Size ³	Service Population 4
Single-Family Housing	10,680	10,879	21,559	0.602	2.563	33,264
Multi-Family Housing	1,320	1,345	2,665	0.602	1.885	3,024
Total	12,001	12,223	24,224	0.602		36,288

¹ Estimated housing units in the District assuming 50.46% second homes and 49.54% year-round housing.

² See Figure 2.

 $^{^{3}}$ Based on District census tract figures from the 2010 U.S. Census. See Appendix D.

⁴ Estimated by multiplying total housing units for each housing type by their respective average household size and facility demand factor.

As previously discussed, this Nexus Study utilizes a per capita-standard based methodology to determine the park impact fees because the need for / demand for park and recreational services is inherently driven by population. This section presents the per capita cost for park development and construction of the District's two community use facility projects and the debt obligation for the District's Community Recreation Center based on the District's level of service standard for such facilities.³

It is important to note that the District has some park and recreational facilities that will not require expansion or additional facilities to accommodate future population growth. These excluded facilities included the rodeo arena, boat ramps, corporation yard and West End Beach.

PARK DEVELOPMENT COST PER CAPITA

Figure 5 calculates the per capita cost of developing new parks in the District. As presented, the District's 5 acre per 1,000 population level of service standard is multiplied by the estimated average per acre cost for park development to arrive at a per capita cost. The average park development cost per acre shown represents average construction cost (in 2013 dollars) for a combination of neighborhood and community parks needed for new development.⁴ Any facilities other than restrooms, such as community centers, recreation centers, gymnasiums or aquatic facilities are included as separate cost components.

FIGURE 5 – PARK DEVELOPMENT COST PER CAPITA

Cost Component	Acres per 1,000 Population ¹	Acres per Capita ¹	Average Park Development Cost per Acre ²	Cost per Capita
Park Development	5.0	0.0050	\$414,500	\$2,072.50

Source: Truckee-Donner Recreation and Park District

⁴ Appendix B presents the District's neighborhood and community park construction costs. It is assumed that the District will develop 50% 5-acre neighborhood parks and 50% 20-acre community parks.



¹ Based on the 5.0 acres per 1,000 population standard from the District's Facilities Master Plan, the Town of Truckee General Plan, the Nevada County General Plan and the Placer County General Plan.

² The average of the neighborhood and community park construction cost detailed in Appendix A.

³ For purposes of this Nexus Study, per capita refers to both permanent and seasonal residents.

COMMUNITY USE FACILITY COSTS PER CAPITA

In 2009, the District opened their new Community Recreation Center. The 38,500 square foot facility contains an 18,000 square foot double court gymnasium, an indoor running track with fitness equipment, meeting rooms, classrooms and other recreational amenities. The facility was financed with the issuance of a Certificate of Participation for \$24,235,000 in 2007.

Additionally, the District is planning for the future construction of a new aquatics facility. The preliminary budget estimate for the District's 25,840 square foot aquatics facility is approximately \$7.2 million.

In order to determine a per capita cost for these facilities, the buildout LOS standard is used to determine the portion of the new community facilities that will benefit the service population generated by new residential development. Then, the new residential development fair share of the construction cost for the community use facilities and associated debt obligation is determined. Dividing the allocated cost by the service population projected from new residential development creates the per capita cost.

These calculations are shown below and on the following page.

FIGURE 6 - COMMUNITY USE FACILITIES BUILDOUT LOS STANDARDS

Facility	Existing Space (Sq. Ft.)	Planned Space (Sq. Ft.)	Total Space (Sq. Ft.)	Buildout Service Population	Sq. Ft. per 1,000 Service Population
Community Arts Center	10,000	_	10,000		276
Floriston Park Community Building	1,100	-	1,100		30
Activity Center	3,000	-	3,000		83
Veteran's Hall	7,950	-	7,950		219
Community Recreation Center	38,500	-	38,500		1,061
Community Center Facilities	60,550	0	60,550	36,288	1,669
Truckee Donner Swimming Pool	5,400	-	5,400		149
New Aquatics Facility	s=x	25,840	25,840		712
Aquatic Facilities	5,400	25,840	31,240	36,288	861

Source: Truckee-Donner Recreation and Park District



FIGURE 7 - New Community Use Facilities Cost Allocation

6			New Facility Cost Allocation ³		
Community Use Facilities	LOS Standard (Sq. Ft.) ¹	Planned New Facility Space (Sq. Ft.) ²	Existing Service Population	Service Population Growth	
Service Population			23,187	13,101	
Community Recreation Center Aquatic Facilities	1,061 712	38,500 25,840	63.9% 63.9%	36.1% 36.1%	

Source: Truckee-Donner Recreation and Park District

Notes:

FIGURE 8 - COMMUNITY USE FACILITIES COST PER CAPITA

	Total	Future Allocation ¹		Cost per	
Cost Component	Project Cost	% \$		Capita ²	
Community Recreation Center (Debt)	\$24,235,000	36.1%	\$8,749,524	\$667.85	
New Aquatics Facility	\$7,198,271	36.1%	\$2,598,781	\$198.37	
Total	\$31,433,271		\$11,348,305	\$866.22	

Notae.



¹ Level of service per 1,000 service population provided by new community use facilites through buildout of the District.

² Total square footage of new community use facilities.

³ Portion of the new community use facilities allocated to existing development and new residential development.

¹ Cost allocation to new development based on percentage of service population growth.

² Future \$ allocation divided by projected service population growth, rounded.

This section presents the calculation of the park impact fees. The fees are based on the per capita cost for park development and construction of the District's new community use facilities for two residential land uses in the District.

COST PER CAPITA

Figure 9 summaries the two per capita cost components from the previous section. As shown, the cost per capita is \$2,938.72.

FIGURE 9 - COST PER CAPITA

Cost Components	Per Capita Costs
Parkland Development	\$2,072.50
Community Use Facilities	\$866.22
Cost per Capita	\$2,938.72

PARK IMPACT FEE DETERMINATION

The figures on the following page present the determination of the District's park impact fee. Since the demand for / need for park and recreational services is inherently driven by population and since different residential land uses have varying household sizes, it is recommended that different park impact fees be established for single family housing and multi-family housing. To account for the proportion of new residential units in the District that will be used as second homes, an average facility demand per housing unit of 0.602 is applied.

The per unit cost for the two residential land uses are determined by multiplying total per capita cost by their respective average household size and the facility demand per housing unit. In figure 11 shown of the following page, the total cost per unit, which includes 3% for administration, is then divided by the average square footage for single-family and multifamily housing to arrive at a cost/fee per square foot for each.

Since the park impact fee represents new development's "incremental" share of new park and recreational facilities costs, the District's current park impact fee fund balance is excluded from the fee calculation.



FIGURE 10 - COST PER UNIT

Residential Land Use ¹	Cost per Capita ²	Average Household Size ³	Facility Demand per Unit ⁴	Cost per Unit ⁵
Single Family Housing	\$2,938.72	2.56	0.602	\$4,534
Muti-family Housing	\$2,938.72	1.89	0.602	\$3,335

Notes:

FIGURE 11 - PROPOSED PARK IMPACT FEES

Residential Land Use ¹	Cost per Unit	Fee Program Admin. Costs ²	Total Cost Per Unit	Average Square Footage ³	Park Impact Fees (Per Sq. Ft.) ⁴
Single Family Housing	\$4,534	\$136	\$4,670	2,725	\$1.71
Muti-Family Housing	\$3,335	\$100	\$3,435	1,395	\$2.46



¹ Single family housing includes townhomes and mobile homes.

² Total per person cost for park and recreational facilities.

³ Based on District census tract figures from the 2010 US Census Bureau, 2011 American Community Survey 5-year Estimate.

⁴ Average park and recreational facilities demand per new housing unit. See Figure 2.

⁵ Per capita cost for each residential land use multiplied by their respective average household size and facility demand factor, rounded to the nearest dollar.

¹ Single family housing includes townhomes and mobile homes.

² Allowable costs under the Mitigation Fee Act for the administration of the fee program including periodic nexus study updates, collection, accounting and annual reporting costs. Estimated at 3% of the cost per unit.

³ Based on data from the Nevada County Assessor's Office and Placer County Assessor's Office.

⁴ Rounded to the nearest cent.

This section frames the results of this Nexus Study in terms of the legislated requirements to demonstrate the legal justification of the park impact fees ('fees"). The justification of the park impact fees on new development must provide information as set forth in Govt. Code § 66000 et. seq. These requirements are discussed below.

IDENTIFY THE PURPOSE OF THE FEES

The purpose of the park impact fees is to develop parkland and provide recreational, community use facilities to meet the needs of the new service population within the District.

IDENTIFY THE USE OF THE FEES

As outlined in the Nexus Study, the general purpose of the fees is to fund the development of park and recreation facilities. Revenue from fees collected on new development may be used to pay for any of the following:

- Construction of park and recreational facilities including community use facilities;
- Construction of park and recreation support facilities including administrative facilities and maintenance facilities and equipment;
- Park impact fee program costs including District and Town / County administrative costs, nexus studies and park master plan costs;
- Any potential associated financing costs;
- Other facility costs resulting from population growth caused by new residential development.

Revenue from the fees collected may not be used to fund the following:

- District operational costs;
- Park maintenance costs.

DETERMINE HOW THERE IS A REASONABLE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE FEES' USE AND THE TYPE OF DEVELOPMENT PROJECT ON WHICH THE FEES ARE IMPOSED

Since the need for park and recreational services is inherently population-driven, new residential development in the District will generate additional need for new parks and recreational services and the corresponding need for various facilities. The fees will be used to develop and/or expand the District's parks and community use facilities required to serve new development. The fees' use (developing new park and recreational facilities) is therefore reasonably related to the type of project (new residential development) upon which it is imposed.



DETERMINE HOW THERE IS A REASONABLE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE NEED FOR THE PUBLIC FACILITIES AND THE TYPE OF DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS ON WHICH THE FEES ARE IMPOSED

Each new residential development project will generate additional need for park and recreational services and the associated need for additional park and recreational facilities. The District's park standard is 5.0 improved park acres for every 1,000 residents. The level of service standards for community use facilities represent new development's equal share of the added new facility space through buildout of the District. The need is measured in proportion to average household size for two residential land use categories and the average facility demand for a new housing unit to account for lower demand from seasonal occupancy housing.

DETERMINE HOW THERE IS A REASONABLE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE AMOUNT OF THE FEES AND THE COST OF THE PUBLIC FACILITIES OR PORTION OF THE PUBLIC FACILITIES ATTRIBUTABLE TO THE DEVELOPMENT ON WHICH THE FEES ARE IMPOSED

The amount of park and recreational facilities needed to serve a unit of residential development is based on the District's level of service standards for providing such facilities. The cost for park development and construction of community use facilities is defined on a cost per capita basis. These per capita costs are then applied to new single-family homes and multi-family units based on their respective average household size, average square footage, and an average facility demand of 0.602 per housing unit.



This section contains general recommendations for the adoption and administration of the park impact fee program based on the findings of this Nexus Study and for the interpretation and application of the park impact fees recommended herein. Statutory requirements for the adoption and implementation may be found in the Mitigation Fee Act (California Govt. Code § 66000 et. seq.)

ADOPTION REQUIREMENTS

The following are the general requirements for approval and adoption of the Park Impact Fee Nexus Study and proposed park impact fees.

- At least 14 days before the regularly scheduled meeting, mail out notice to any interested party who requests notice of the adoption of new or increased impact fees.
- 2. At least 10 days before the "open and public meeting" the local agency is to make available to the public the Park Impact Fee Nexus Study.
- 3. The local agency shall conduct at least "one open and public meeting" as part of a regularly scheduled meeting.
- 4. Park impact fees take effect 60 days after adoption of the resolution or ordinance.

ACCOUNTING REQUIREMENTS

Proceeds from the park impact fee should be deposited into a separate fund or account so that there will be not commingling of fees with other revenue. The park impact fees should be expended solely for the purpose for which they were collected. Any interest earned by such account should be deposited in that account and expended solely for the purpose for which originally collected.

ANNUAL REPORTING REQUIREMENTS

The following information must be made available to the public within 180 days after the last day of each fiscal year:

- a brief description of the type of fee in the account;
- the amount of the fee;
- the beginning and ending balance of the account;
- the fees collected that year and the interest earned;
- an identification of each public improvement for which the fees were expended and the amount of the expenditures for each improvement;



- an identification of an approximate date by which construction of the improvement will commence if the local agency determines that sufficient funds have been collected to complete financing of an incomplete public improvement;
- a description of each inter-fund transfer or loan made from the account or fund, including the public improvement on which the transferred or loaned fees will be expended, the date on which any loan will be repaid, and the rate of interest to be returned to the account; and
- the amount of money refunded under section 66001.

FIVE-YEAR REPORTING REQUIREMENTS

For the fifth fiscal year following the first receipt of any park impact fee proceeds, and every five years thereafter, the District shall make all of the following findings with respect to that portion of the account or fund remaining unexpended, whether committed or uncommitted:

- Identify the purpose to which the fee is to be put;
- Demonstrate a reasonable relationship between the fee and the purpose for which it is charged;
- Identify all sources and amounts of funding anticipated to complete financing in incomplete improvements;
- Designate the approximate dates on which the funding is expected to be deposited into the appropriate account or fund.



APPENDICES

Appendix A – New Park Construction Costs

Appendix B – Aquatics Facility Estimate of Costs

Appendix C – Debt Schedule for the Community Recreation Center

Appendix D - Average Household Size by Housing Type

Appendix E – Inventory of District Parks



FIGURE 12 - NEIGHBORHOOD PARK CONSTRUCTION ESTIMATE OF COST

Item	Quantity	Unit	Unit Cost 2013 \$s	Total Cost 2013 \$s
Street Frontage	425	LF	\$171	\$72,675
Off street parking per stall	20	EA	\$2,845	\$56,900
Play Structures	1	EA	\$142,250	\$142,250
Soccer Field	1	EA	\$56,900	\$56,900
Basketball Court	1	EA	\$62,590	\$62,590
Restroom	1	EA	\$142,250	\$142,250
Group Shade Structure	2	EA	\$34,140	\$68,280
Picnic/BBQ Areas	2	EA	\$11,380	\$22,760
Players Benches	4	EA	\$569	\$2,276
Bleachers	2	EA	\$3,414	\$6,828
Entry Sign	1	EA	\$6,828	\$6,828
Benches	10	EA	\$910	\$9,100
Subtotal				\$649,637
On Site Work ¹	5	AC	\$192,000	\$960,000
Design, Engineering, Fees, Admin.		18%	\$1,609,637	\$289,735
Total Project Cost (5 acres)			:	\$1,899,372
Average Cost Per Acre (Rounded)				\$379,000

Source: Truckee-Donner Recreation and Park District



¹ Unit costs are from the District's November 2007 Park Impact Fee Nexus Study adjusted by the 13.8% change in the Engineering News and Record Construction Cost Index for San Francisco from January 2007 (9100.68) to January 2013 (10360.84).

² On-site improvements includes site grading, utility connections, soil prep & amendments, automatic irrigation, planting, concrete pathways.

FIGURE 13 - COMMUNITY PARK CONSTRUCTION ESTIMATE OF COST

			Unit Cost	Total Cost
Item	Quantity	Unit	2013 \$s	2013 \$s
Street Frontage	1,500	LF	\$171	\$256,500
Off street parking per stall	150	EA	\$2,845	\$426,750
Play Structures	4	EA	\$142,250	\$569,000
Soccer Fields	8	EA	\$56,900	\$455,200
Baseball Fields	3	EA	\$62,590	\$187,770
Basketball Court	1	EA	\$62,590	\$62,590
Tennis Courts	4	EA	\$91,040	\$364,160
Restroom/Concession Stands	4	EA	\$199,150	\$796,600
Shade Structure	6	EA	\$34,140	\$204,840
Picnic/BBQ Areas	3	EA	\$11,380	\$34,140
Players Benches	8	EA	\$569	\$4,552
Water Spray Play Area	1	EA	\$398,300	\$398,300
Bleachers	4	EA	\$3,414	\$13,656
Entry Sign	1	EA	\$7,397	\$7,397
Benches	10	EA	\$910	\$9,104
Subtotal				\$3,790,559
On Site Work ¹	20	AC	\$192,000	\$3,840,000
Design, Engineering, Fees, Admin.		18%	\$7,630,559	\$1,373,501
Total Project Cost (20 acres)			- 1	\$9,004,060
Average Cost Per Acre (Rounded)				\$450,000

Source: Truckee-Donner Recreation and Park District



¹ Unit costs are from the District's November 2007 Park Impact Fee Nexus Study adjusted by the 13.8% change in the Engineering News and Record Construction Cost Index for San Francisco from January 2007 (9100.68) to January 2013 (10360.84).

² On-site improvements includes site grading, utility connections, soil prep & amendments, automatic irrigation, planting, concrete pathways.

FIGURE 14 – NEW AQUATICS FACILITY ESTIMATE OF COSTS

Project: Truckee Aquatics Facility

Owner: Truckee-Donner Recreation and Park District

Preliminary Budget Estimate Location: Truckee, CA

Variance Report May 23 2013

Variance Report, May 23, 2013			
	Masonry Building	Metal Building	
	26,500 SF	25,840 SF	
	12-Jun-12	23-May-13	Variance
SITEWORK	553,367	553,499	132 13.835
GENERAL CONDITIONS	382,485	396,320	
REINFORCING	67,595	66,060	(1,535)
CAST-IN-PLACE CONCRETE	274,851	283,644	8,793
GROUT, ANCHOR BOLTS	10,135	7,386	(2,749)
MASONRY	646,635	134,852 0	(511,783)
STRUCTURAL METAL FRAMING	229,261		(229,261)
METAL DECKING	99,375	61,260	(38,115)
METAL FABRICATIONS	4,200	4,200	0
ROUGH CARPENTRY	15,332	2,584	(12,748)
WATERPROOFING	7,056	0	(7,056)
EIFS SYSTEM, THERMAL PROTECTION	303,641		(303,641)
SINGLE PLY ROOFING, METAL ROOFING	334,080	310,080	(24,000)
FLASHING & SHEET METAL	18,550	0	(18,550)
FIRE & SMOKE PROTECTION	0	0	0
JOINT SEALERS	14,372	11,458	(2,914)
DOORS, FRAMES, HARDWARE	66,000	81,000	15,000
GLASS & GLAZING	191,010	152,720	(38,290)
DRYWALL & MTL STUDS	4,500	3,900	(600)
PAINTS & COATINGS	92,873	62,132	(30,741)
MISC TENANT IMPROVEMENTS	368,421	231,439	(136,982)
EXTERIOR SPECIALTIES	550	550	0
IDENTIFICATION DEVICES	4,770	2,067	(2,703)
FIRE EXTINGUISHERS	2,565	2,565	0
PRE-ENGINEERED METAL BUILDING SYSTEM	0	987,178	987,178
SWIMMING POOLS	1,689,308	1,658,000	(31,308)
FIRE SUPPRESSION	67,677	63,543	(4,134)
ELEVATORS	0	0	0
PLUMBING	132,500	129,200	(3,300)
HVAC	265,000	258,400	(6,600)
ELECTRICAL	238,500	232,560	(5,940)
SUB-TOTAL	\$6,084,608	\$5,696,597	(\$388,012)
Cost Escalation Contingency	0	0	o
Contractor's General Liability Insurance	48,677	45,573	(3,104)
Contractor's Performance/Payment Bond	61,333	57,422	(3,911)
Contractor's Overhead & Profit	123,892	144,990	21,098
Design/Construction Contingency	325,000	340,000	15,000
Town of Truckee Permits and Fees	w/Arch. Fees	168,500	168,500
Truckee Fire Protection District Fees	w/Arch. Fees	17,500	17,500
Truckee Sanitary District Fees	w/Arch. Fees	12,890	12,890
Tahoe Truckee Sanitation Agency Fees	w/Arch. Fees	128,900	128,900
Truckee Donner PUD - Elect. Fee	w/Arch. Fees	33,479	33,479
Truckee Donner PUD - Water Fee	w/Arch. Fees	36,440	36,440
Tahoe Truckee Unified School District Fee	w/Arch. Fees	0	0
Planning Consultant Fee	w/Arch. Fees	17,500	17,500
Misc. Consultants (Timber, Survey, Solls, Trans.)	w/Arch. Fees		35,000
Architectural and Engineering Design Fees	600,000	463,480	(136,520)
Total Estimated Budget Costs	\$7,243,511	\$7,198,271	(\$45,240)

BOND DEBT SERVICE

Truckee Donner Recreation and Park District 2007 Certificates of Participation Ambac Insured, A- Underlying Rating

Final Pricing Numbers

Period Ending	Principal	Coupon	Interest	Debt Service
09/01/2008			1,166,092.67	1,166,092.67
09/01/2009			1,162,862.50	1,162,862.50
09/01/2010	380,000	4.250%	1,162,862.50	1,542,862.50
09/01/2011	400,000	4.250%	1,146,712.50	1,546,712.50
09/01/2012	415,000	4.500%	1,129,712.50	1,544,712.50
09/01/2013	435,000	4.500%	1,111,037.50	1,546,037.50
09/01/2014	455,000	4.500%	1,091,462.50	1,546,462.50
09/01/2015	475,000	4.500%	1,070,987.50	1,545,987.50
09/01/2016	495,000	4.500%	1,049,612.50	1,544,612.50
09/01/2017	520,000	4.500%	1,027,337.50	1,547,337.50
09/01/2018	545,000	4.250%	1,003,937.50	1,548,937.50
09/01/2019	565,000	4.375%	980,775.00	1,545,775.00
09/01/2020	595,000	4.375%	956,056.26	1,551,056.26
09/01/2021	620,000	4.500%	930,025.00	1,550,025.00
09/01/2022	785,000	4.500%	902,125.00	1,687,125.00
09/01/2023	820,000	4.500%	866,800.00	1,686,800.00
09/01/2024	860,000	4.625%	829,900.00	1,689,900.00
09/01/2025	900,000	4.625%	790,125.00	1,690,125.00
09/01/2026	940,000	5.000%	748,500.00	1,688,500.00
09/01/2027	985,000	5.000%	701,500.00	1,686,500.00
09/01/2028	1,035,000	5.000%	652,250.00	1,687,250.00
09/01/2029	1,090,000	5.000%	600,500.00	1,690,500.00
09/01/2030	1,145,000	5.000%	546,000.00	1,691,000.00
09/01/2031	1,200,000	5.000%	488,750.00	1,688,750.00
09/01/2032	1,260,000	5.000%	428,750.00	1,688,750.00
09/01/2033	1,325,000	5.000%	365,750.00	1,690,750.00
09/01/2034	1,390,000	5.000%	299,500.00	1,689,500.00
09/01/2035	1,460,000	5.000%	230,000.00	1,690,000.00
09/01/2036	1,530,000	5.000%	157,000.00	1,687,000.00
09/01/2037	1,610,000	5.000%	80,500.00	1,690,500.00
	24,235,000		23,677,423.93	47,912,423.93



Since the park impact fees are based on per capita need and level of service, this Nexus Study recommends the allocation of the park impact fees among two residential land use categories (or housing types), since different housing types have different household sizes. Based on 2010 U.S. Census figures that approximate the boundaries of the District, the figure below presents the average household size calculation for two residential land use categories: single-family housing and multi-family housing. The census tracts used in the analysis to approximate the boundaries of the District are found to be representative of the District for the purpose of this analysis.

FIGURE 15 – AVERAGE HOUSEHOLD SIZE BY HOUSING TYPE

Land Use	Total Housing Units	Vacant Housing Units	Occupied Housing Units	Total Number of Occupants	Average Household Size
Single-Family Housing	15,538	8,062	7,476	19,160	2.563
Multi-Family Housing	2,399	1,536	863	1,627	1.885
Average	17,937	9,598	8,339	20,787	2.493

Source: 2010 U.S. Census, American Community Survey 5-Year Estimate



APPENDIX E – INVENTORY OF DISTRICT PARKS

FIGURE 16 - SUMMARY OF DISTRICT PARKS

		Total Park	Total Park Developed	
Facility	Type of Park	Acres	Acres	General Features
Bill Rose Park	Neighborhood	0.3	0.3	Playground, sandbox, picnic tables, and small BBQ.
Meadow Park	Neighborhood	6.1	6.1	Two small ball fields, grass area, picnic area, restrooms,
				and playground.
Floriston Park	Neighborhood	0.3	0.3	Tiny tots playground and a grassy play field.
Shoreline Park	Neighborhood	1.6	1.0	Picnic areas, ADA accessible fishing dock, small craft boat
				launch area, restrooms, picnic area.
Truckee River Regional Park	Community / Regional	63.6	35.0	Large and small ball fields, 4 picnic areas with tables and
				BBQs, a rodeo arena, nature trail, tennis, volleyball and
				basketball courts, amphitheater, tot lot, skateboard park,
				disc golf course, and playground equipment.
West End Beach	Community / Regional	11.5	11.5	Covered pavilion, 7 group picnic sites, family picnic areas,
				basketball court, tennis court, sand & grass volleyball,
				playground areas, horseshoe pits, kayak & paddleboat
				rentals, swimming area, boat parking, fishing area,
				concession stand
Donner Lake Boat Launch Facility Regional	Regional	1.5	1.5	2 lane boat ramp, floating docks, fish cleaning station,
				restrooms, car and boat trailer parking.
Donner Lake Public Piers	Regional	2.5	1.1	37 public piers
River View Sports Park	Sports Park	20.0	9.09	4 sports fields, 1 baseball diamond, BMX track, covered
				BBQ and restrooms.
Truckee Bike Park	Bike Park	1.9	1.9	Dirt jump park, cross-country trails, upper and lower flow trails, lower dirt jumps, progressive drop zone and skills
				area
Total		137.4	106.8	



(THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK)

