CITY OF EL SEGUNDO

PUBLIC FACILITIES IMPACT FEE STUDY

AUGUST 30, 2010

WILLDAN
Financial Services

Table of Contents

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY 4

Background and Study Objectives 4
Demographic Assumptions 4
Facility Standards and Costs of Growth 6
Fee Schedule Summary 6

1. INTRODUCTION 7

Background and Study Objectives 7
Public Facilities Financing in California 7
Public Facilities Financing in El Segundo 8
Public Facility Standards 8
Organization of the report 11

2. DEMOGRAPHIC ASSUMPTIONS 12

Use of Growth Forecasts for Impact Fees 12
Service Population 12
Land Use Types 12
Occupant Densities 13
Demographic Assumptions for City of El Segundo 14

3. POLICE FACILITIES 16

Service Population 16
Facility Standards and Planned Facilities 16
Facility Needs and Costs 17
Fee Schedule 19

4. LIBRARY FACILITIES 20

Service Population 20
Facility Inventories and Standards 20
Facility Needs and Costs 21
Fee Schedule 23

5. FIRE PROTECTION FACILITIES 25

Service Population 25
Facility Inventories, Plans and Standards 26
Facility Needs and Costs 26
Fee Schedule 28

6. PARK AND RECREATION FACILITIES 29

Service Population 29
Facility Standards 30
Fee Schedule 35

7. IMPLEMENTATION 37

Impact Fee Program Adoption Process 37

Inflation Adjustment 37
Reporting Requirements 38
Programming Revenues and Projects with the CIP 38

8. MITIGATION FEE ACT FINDINGS 40

Purpose of Fee 40
Use of Fee Revenues 40
Benefit Relationship 40
Burden Relationship 41
Proportionality 41

APPENDIX A: VEHICLE AND EQUIPMENT INVENTORIES A-1

APPENDIX B: WORKER DEMAND SURVEY FOR PARKS B-1

Park Survey B-1

Executive Summary

This report summarizes an analysis of the need for public facilities and capital improvements to support future development within the City of El Segundo through 2030. It is the City's intent that the costs representing future development's share of these facilities and improvements be imposed on that development in the form of a development impact fee, also known as a public facilities fee. The public facilities and improvements included in this analysis of the City's public facilities fee program are divided into the fee categories listed below.

- Police
- Library
- Fire Protection
- Parks

Background and Study Objectives

The primary policy objective of a public facilities fee program is to ensure that new development pays the capital costs associated with growth. The primary purpose of this report is to complete a comprehensive fee study and determine the maximum justified public facilities fee levels to impose on new development to maintain the City's facilities standard. The City should review and update this report and the calculated fees once every five years to incorporate the best available information.

The City imposes public facilities fees under authority granted by the Mitigation Fee Act, contained in California Government Code Sections 66000 et seq. This report provides the necessary findings required by the Act for adoption of the public facilities fees presented in the fee schedules contained herein.

Demographic Assumptions

To estimate facility needs, this study uses residential and household population data provided by the City of El Segundo, the California Department of Finance (DOF), the U.S. Census, and the Southern California Council of Governments' (SCAG) 2008 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP). Current year population estimates came from the DOF data. Population and residential dwelling unit projections are based on growth rates derived from the City's building permit history. Employment projections for 2030 came from the RTP data. Employment square footage was derived using the RTP data and employment density factors from the Natelson Company Employment Density Study Summary Report. The development projections used in this analysis are summarized in **Table E.1.**

Table E.1: Demographic Assumptions

	2009	2030	Increase
Residents[1]	16,970	17,690	720
Dwelling Units[1]			
Single Family, Two-Family	3,590	3,650	60
Multi-Family	3,770	4,060	290
Caretaker	10	30	20
Total	7,370	7,710	340
Employment[2,3,4]			
Commercial	8,130	9,770	1,640
Office	21,150	25,410	4,260
Industrial	17,920	21,530	3,610
Total	47,200	56,700	9,500
Building Square Feet (000s)[5]			
Commercial	4,020	4,840	820
Office	8,920	10,720	1,800
Industrial	16,000	19,220	3,220
Total	28,940	34,780	5,840

Note: All values rounded to nearest ten; totals may not be exact.

[1] California Department of Finance (DOF).

[2] Excludes local government employment.

[3] Assumes percentage of employees by land use remains constant to total from 2009 to 2030. 2030 estimates based on existing ratio of sector by sector employment and rounded to hundreds to account for error.

[4] Estimates by land use type for 2009 based on employment data provided from EDD by North American Industry Classification System (NAICS) category.

[5] Based on employment by land use and occupant density shown in Table 2.1.

Sources: California Department of Finance (DOF), Table E-5, 2009; Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) 2008 Regional Transportaion Plan Growth Forecast; California Employment Development Department (EDD); Employment Density Study Summary Report, prepared by the Natelson Company, October 2001; Willdan Financial Services.

Permit records in the City of El Segundo show the development of 12 caretaker units during the past 10 years. The SCAG RTP data did not include a projection for caretaker units, so development projections in this land use category are based on the historical permit data from the City. Caretaker units are assumed to continue to develop at the rate of 12 units every 10 years, or approximately 1.2 units per year.

Employment projections for 2030 are based on the assumption that the proportion of employees located in each land use category listed remains consistent with the base year.

Facility Standards and Costs of Growth

This fee analysis uses two different facilities standards to determine the costs to accommodate growth. For the parks and recreation facility category, the City's existing facilities standard is used to determine the costs to accommodate growth. Under this approach, new development funds the expansion of facilities at the same standard currently serving existing development. By definition the existing inventory method results in no facility deficiencies attributable to existing development. This method is often used when a long-range plan for new facilities is not available.

For the police, library and fire facility categories, the system plan facility standard is used. This method is useful when planned facilities need to be analyzed as part of a system that benefits both existing and new development. It is difficult, for example, to allocate a new fire station solely to new development when that station will operate as part of an integrated system of fire stations that together achieve the desired level of service.

The system plan method ensures that new development does not pay for existing deficiencies. This method enables the calculation of the existing deficiency required to bring existing development up to the policy-based standard. The City must secure non-fee funding for that portion of planned facilities required to correct the deficiency to ensure that new development receives the level of service funded by the impact fee.

Fee Schedule Summary

Table E.2 summarizes the schedule of maximum justified public facilities fees based on the analysis contained in this report. The City may adopt any fee up to those shown in the table. If the City adopts a lower fee then it should consider reducing the fee for each land use by the same percentage. This approach would ensure that each new development project would fund the same proportionate share of public facilities costs.

Table E.2: Development Impact Fee Summary

Land Use	Police	Library	Fire	Parks	Total
Residential	*(Fee per Dwelling Unit)*				
Single Family, Two-Family	$ 2,294	$ 2,464	$ 1,037	$ 17,141	**$ 22,936**
Multi-Family	1,527	1,640	691	11,406	**15,264**
Caretaker	990	1,064	448	7,399	**9,901**
Nonresidential	*(Fee per 1,000 Building Square Feet)*				
Commercial	$ 517	N/A	$ 521	$ 2,119	**$ 3,157**
Office	607	N/A	612	2,485	**3,704**
Industrial	287	N/A	289	1,174	**1,750**

Note: Fees per dwelling unit, per 1,000 square feet for nonresidential.

Sources: Tables 3.6, 4.6, 5.6 and 6.8; Willdan Financial Services.

1. Introduction

This report presents an analysis of the need for public facilities to accommodate new development in the City of El Segundo. This chapter explains the study approach and summarizes results under the following sections:

- Background and study objectives;
- Public facilities financing in California;
- Public facilities planning and financing in El Segundo;
- Public facility standards; and,
- Organization of the report.

Background and Study Objectives

The primary policy objective of a public facilities fee program is to ensure that new development pays the capital costs associated with growth. The primary purpose of this report is to complete a comprehensive fee study and determine the maximum justified public facilities fee levels to impose on new development to maintain the City's facility standards. The City should review and update this report, as well as the calculated fees, once every five years to incorporate the best available information.

The City imposes public facilities fees under authority granted by the Mitigation Fee Act, contained in California Government Code Sections 66000 et seq. This report provides the necessary findings required by the Act for adoption of the public facilities fees presented in the fee schedules contained herein.

Public Facilities Financing in California

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

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

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

Public Facilities Financing in El Segundo

The City of El Segundo has a number of existing infrastructure needs, as well as a potential need to expand existing infrastructure to meet the demands of community growth. Existing funding sources have not allowed for master planning at a level sufficient to develop either an exhaustive list of infrastructure projects or a phasing or scheduling plan for such projects. However, preliminary suggestions concerning facility needs are identified and described in the "Facility Needs and Costs" section of each chapter.

There are known infrastructure issues that will best be addressed through master planning efforts. A suggested use of fee revenues would be to fund master planning to more specifically identify capital facilities necessary to serve new development. Fee revenues can fund that portion of master plan costs associated with facilities to serve growth. Upon completion of the master planning effort and the identification of capital facilities needed to accommodate growth, the City should update its public facilities fee program to include these new projects and any financing costs that may be required to construct facilities when needed.

Through the process of preparing master plans, the City may choose to submit planned facilities for consideration of impact fee revenue apportionment. The City of El Segundo has provided a preliminary list of planned facilities, which are accordingly documented in this fee update. New development will pay a fee based on the value of existing *and* planned facilities through the development horizon. However, new development cannot be required to pay for future projects designed to correct deficiencies in existing facilities. The City will have to secure non-fee funding for that portion of planned facilities required to correct any deficiency in existing facilities.

By their nature, public facilities fee programs are constrained by rates of growth and the timing of revenue collection. Since public facilities fees represent a pay-as-you-go system, cities may confront the problem of only being able to partially fund large projects with fee revenues at the time of project implementation. Therefore, facility needs may require alternative financing options in order to implement projects in a timelier manner. The cost of financing (e.g. interest payments) can legitimately be included in the public facilities fee. By using fee revenues to fund a master planning effort and updating the fee to reflect the identified projects and possible financing costs, the City will maximize its ability to maintain its facilities standard and fund the capital facilities necessary to serve new development.

Finally, all fee-funded capital projects should be programmed through the City's Capital Improvement Plan (CIP). Using a CIP can help the City of El Segundo identify and direct its fee revenue to public facilities projects that will accommodate future growth. By programming fee revenues to specific capital projects, the City of El Segundo identifies the use for fee revenues as expressly required by the *Mitigation Fee Act*.

Public Facility Standards

The key public policy issue in public facility fee studies is the identification of facility standards for each category of facilities in a fee program. A facility standard is a public policy that states the amount of facilities required per unit of new development to accommodate the increased service

demand. Examples of facility standards include park acres per capita and wastewater generation per equivalent dwelling unit. Standards also may be expressed in monetary terms such as the total cost of facility investments per capita.

The facility standard assists in documenting statutory findings required for adoption of a public facilities fee. First, the standard documents a reasonable relationship between the type of new development and the total need for new facilities. Where applicable, the same facility standard is applied to both existing and new development to ensure that new development does not fund deficiencies associated with existing development. Second, the facility standard is often used to allocate facility costs to each development project, documenting a reasonable relationship between the amount of the fee and the cost of facilities allocated to each development project.

Types of facility standards and their application in specific situations are discussed below. This section concludes with a description of how facility standards are used in the current study.

Types of Facility Standards

There are three separate components of facility standards:

- **Demand standards** determine the amount of facilities required to accommodate growth, for example, park acres per thousand residents, square feet of library space per capita, or gallons of water per day. Demand standards may also reflect a level of service such as the vehicles-to-capacity (V/C) ratio used in traffic planning.
- **Design standards** determine how a facility should be designed to meet expected demand, for example, park improvement requirements and technology infrastructure for city office space. Design standards are typically not explicitly evaluated as part of an impact fee analysis but can have a significant impact on the cost of facilities. Our approach incorporates current facility design standards into the fee program to reflect the increasing construction cost of public facilities.
- **Cost standards** are an alternate method for determining the amount of facilities required to accommodate growth based on facility costs per unit of demand. Cost standards are useful when demand standards were not explicitly developed for the facility planning process. Cost standards also enable different types of facilities to be analyzed based on a single measure (cost or value), useful when disparate facilities are funded by a single fee program. Examples include facility costs per capita, per vehicle trip, or cost per gallon of water per day.

New Development Facility Needs and Costs

A number of approaches are used to identify facility needs and costs to serve new development. Often there is a two step process: (1) identify total facility needs, and (2) allocate to new development its fair share of those needs.

There are three common methods for determining new development's fair share of planned facilities costs: the existing inventory method, the system plan method, and the planned facilities method. Often the method selected depends on the degree to which the community has engaged in comprehensive facility master planning to identify facility needs.

The formula used by each approach and the advantages and disadvantages of each method is summarized below:

Existing Inventory Method

The existing inventory method allocates costs based on the ratio of existing facilities to demand from existing development as follows:

$$\frac{\textit{Current Value of Existing Facilities}}{\textit{Existing Development Demand}} = \$ \text{ / unit of demand}$$

Under this method new development funds the expansion of facilities at the same standard currently serving existing development. By definition the existing inventory method results in no facility deficiencies attributable to existing development. This method is often used when a long-range plan for new facilities is not available. Only the initial facilities to be funded with fees are identified in the fee study. Future facilities to serve growth are identified through an annual capital improvement plan and budget process, possibly after completion of a new facility master plan. This method is used only in the parks and recreation facility category of this report.

Planned Facilities Method

The planned facilities method allocates costs based on the ratio of planned facility costs to demand from new development as follows:

$$\frac{\textit{Cost of Planned Facilities}}{\textit{New Development Demand}} = \$ \text{ / unit of demand}$$

This method is appropriate when specific planned facilities can be identified that only benefit new development. Examples include street improvements to avoid deficient levels of service or a sewer trunk line extension to a previously undeveloped area. This method is also appropriate when planned facilities would not serve existing development, or if planned facilities represent a level of service that is lower than the current level of service. Under this method new development funds the expansion of facilities at the standards identified by facility planners. This method is not used to calculate any fees in this report.

System Plan Method

This method calculates the fee based on: the value of existing facilities plus the cost of planned facilities, divided by demand from existing plus new development:

$$\frac{\textit{Value of Existing Facilities + Cost of Planned Facilities}}{\textit{Existing + New Development Demand}} = \$ \text{ / unit of demand}$$

This method is useful when planned facilities need to be analyzed as part of a system that benefits both existing and new development. It is difficult, for example, to allocate a new fire station solely to new development when that station will operate as part of an integrated system of fire stations that together achieve the desired level of service. Police substations, civic centers, and regional parks provide examples of similar facilities.

The system plan method ensures that new development does not pay for existing deficiencies. Often facility standards based on policies such as those found in General Plans are higher than existing facility standards. This method enables the calculation of the existing deficiency required

to bring existing development up to the policy-based standard. The local agency must secure non-fee funding for that portion of planned facilities required to correct the deficiency to ensure that new development receives the level of service funded by the impact fee. This method is used to calculate the police, library and fire facilities fees in this report.

Organization of the report

This report is organized as follows:

- Chapter 1, Introduction (this chapter): summarizes facilities financing in California, the history of public facilities impact fees in the City of El Segundo, and the general approach;
- Chapter 2, Demographic Assumptions: describes the growth forecasts used to estimate future demand and the unit costs used to estimate total facility costs;
- Chapter 3, Police Facilities: Summarizes existing police facility inventory, discusses planned police facilities and describes the methodology that underlies the police facilities fee.
- Chapter 4, Library Facilities: Summarizes existing library facility inventory, discusses planned library facilities and describes the methodology that underlies the library facilities fee.
- Chapter 5, Fire Protection Facilities: Summarizes existing fire facility inventory, discusses planned fire facilities and describes the methodology that underlies the fire facilities fee.
- Chapter 6, Park and Recreation Facilities: Summarizes existing parks and recreation facility inventory, discusses planned parks and recreation facilities and describes the methodology that underlies the parks and recreation facilities fee.
- Chapter 7, Implementation: Provides guidelines for the implementation and ongoing maintenance of the public facilities fee program.
- Chapter 8, *Mitigation Fee Act* Findings: summarizes the five statutory findings required for adoption of the proposed public facilities fees in accordance with the *Mitigation Fee Act* (codified in *California Government Code* Sections 66000 through 66025).

2. Demographic Assumptions

Estimates of existing development and new development growth projections are used to assist in determining the appropriate fee structure. The base year used in this study is 2009, and the planning horizon is 2030.

Use of Growth Forecasts for Impact Fees

Estimates of the existing service population and forecasts of growth are critical assumptions used throughout this report. These estimates are used as follows:

- Estimates of existing development in 2009 are used to determine the existing facility standards in the City.
- Estimates of total development at the 2030 planning horizon are used:
  - To determine the total amount of public facilities required to accommodate growth based on the existing facility standards (see Chapter 1), and
  - To estimate total fee revenues.

To measure existing service population and future growth, residential and worker population data are used for all facility categories with the exception of library facilities, which only use population data. These measures are used because the amount of residents and workers is a reasonable indicator of the level of demand for public facilities. The City builds public facilities primarily to serve these populations and, typically, the greater the population the larger the facility required to provide a given level of service.

Service Population

Different types of new development use public facilities at different rates in relation to each other, depending on the services provided. For all fee categories in this study a specific service population is identified to reflect total demand. The service population weights residential land use types against nonresidential land uses based on the relative demand for services between residents and workers.

Land Use Types

To ensure a reasonable relationship between each fee and the type of development paying the fee, growth projections distinguish between different land use classifications. The land use types used in this analysis are defined below per the City of El Segundo Municipal Code.

- **Single-Family, Two-Family**: A single family dwelling unit is a detached dwelling unit with only one kitchen, designed for occupancy by one family. A two-family dwelling unit is a building designed to be occupied by two (2) families living independently, the structure having only two units. For the purpose of assessing impact fees, single-family and two-family units have been grouped into a single category because the probable occupant density of these types of units is the same, as confirmed by the City's Planning Division.
- **Multi-Family**: A building or portion thereof designed for occupancy by three (3) or more families living independently in which they may or may not share common entrances and/or other spaces. Individual dwelling units may be owned as

condominiums, or offered for rent. For the purposes of assessing impact fees, senior housing facilities are also considered multi-family units.

- **Caretaker**: A dwelling unit in the Smoky Hollow specific plan area used for a caretaker of the property on which it is located and limited to five hundred (500) square feet in area.
- **Commercial**: All commercial, retail, educational, and hotel/motel development.
- **Office**: All general, professional, and medical office development.
- **Industrial**: All manufacturing and warehouse development.

Some developments may include more than one land use type, such as an industrial warehouse with living quarters (a live-work designation) or a planned unit development with both single and multi-family uses. In these cases the public facilities fee would be calculated separately for each land use type.

The City should have the discretion to impose the public facilities fee based on the specific aspects of a proposed development regardless of the zoning designation where the project will be located. Should the project be located in an area that is not zoned as any of the above stated land use types, the guideline to use is the probable occupant density of the development, either residents per dwelling unit or workers per building square foot, to determine which fee will be charged. The fee imposed should be based on the land use type that most closely represents the probable occupant density of the development.

Occupant Densities

Occupant densities ensure a reasonable relationship between the increase in service population and amount of the fee. To do this, they must vary by the estimated service population generated by a particular development project. Developers pay the fee based on the number of additional housing units or building square footage of nonresidential development, so the fee schedule must convert service population estimates to these measures of project size. This conversion is done with average occupant density factors by land use type, shown in **Table 2.1**.

The residential occupant density factors are derived from the 2000 U.S. Census Bureau's Tables H-31 through H-33. Table H-31 provides vacant housing units data, while Table H-32 provides information relating to occupied housing. Table H-33 documents the total 2000 population residing in occupied housing. The US Census numbers are adjusted by using the California Department of Finance (DOF) estimates for January 1, 2009, and the most recent State of California data available at the time the research for this report was completed. The occupant density factor for caretaker units was provided by the City of El Segundo.

The nonresidential density factors are based on *Employment Density Study Summary Report*, prepared for the Southern California Association of Governments, October 2001 by The Natelson Company. The factors used here were derived from the Los Angeles County data set. The industrial density factor represents an average for light industrial, heavy industrial, and warehouse uses likely to occur in the City.

Facility demand is estimated based on service population increases. Developers pay the public facilities fee based on the number of additional housing units or building square footage of

nonresidential development, so the fee schedule must convert service population estimates to these measures of project size. This conversion is done with average occupant density factors by land use type, shown in **Table 2.1**.

Table 2.1: Occupant Density

Residential		
Single Family, Two-Family	2.78	Residents per dwelling unit
Multi-Family	1.85	Residents per dwelling unit
Caretaker	1.20	Residents per dwelling unit
Nonresidential		
Commercial	2.02	Employees per 1,000 square feet
Office	2.37	Employees per 1,000 square feet
Industrial	1.12	Employees per 1,000 square feet

Note: Nonresidential occupant density factors derived from Natelson Company data are specific to Los Angeles County.

Sources: 2000 Census, Tables H31-H33; California Department of Finance (DOF); The Natelson Company, Inc., Employment Density Study Summary Report, October 31, 2001, pp. 15-23; City of El Segundo; Willdan Financial Services.

Demographic Assumptions for City of El Segundo

Table 2.2 summarizes the demographic assumptions used in this analysis. The base year for this study is the year 2009. The existing facilities in 2009 will constitute the existing facilities standard in our study.

The base year residential estimate is calculated using the density factor from Table 2.1, multiplied by the dwelling units identified in the California Department of Finance (DOF) January 1, 2009 estimates. Population projections are based on historical building permit data provided by the City. Employment projections for 2030 were derived from the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) data. Employment square footage was derived using the RTP data and the employment density factors displayed in Table 2.1. The development projections used in this analysis are summarized in Table 2.2.

Table 2.2: Demographic Assumptions

	2009	2030	Increase
Residents[1]	16,970	17,690	720
Dwelling Units[1]			
Single Family, Two-Family	3,590	3,650	60
Multi-Family	3,770	4,060	290
Caretaker	10	30	20
Total	7,370	7,710	340
Employment[2,3,4]			
Commercial	8,130	9,770	1,640
Office	21,150	25,410	4,260
Industrial	17,920	21,530	3,610
Total	47,200	56,700	9,500
Building Square Feet (000s)[5]			
Commercial	4,020	4,840	820
Office	8,920	10,720	1,800
Industrial	16,000	19,220	3,220
Total	28,940	34,780	5,840

Note: All values rounded to nearest ten; totals may not be exact.

[1] California Department of Finance (DOF).

[2] Excludes local government employment.

[3] Assumes percentage of employees by land use remains constant to total from 2009 to 2030. 2030 estimates based on existing ratio of sector by sector employment and rounded to hundreds to account for error.

[4] Estimates by land use type for 2009 based on employment data provided from EDD by North American Industry Classification System (NAICS) category.

[5] Based on employment by land use and occupant density shown in Table 2.1.

Sources: California Department of Finance (DOF), Table E-5, 2009; Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) 2008 Regional Transportaion Plan Growth Forecast; California Employment Development Department (EDD); Employment Density Study Summary Report, prepared by the Natelson Company, October 2001; Willdan Financial Services.

Permit records in the City of El Segundo show the development of 12 caretaker units during the past 10 years. Development projections in this land use category are based on the assumption that caretaker dwelling units will continue to develop at the rate of 12 units every 10 years, or approximately 1.2 units per year.

Employment projections for 2030 are based on the assumption that the proportion of employees located in each land use category listed remains constant relative to the base year.

3. Police Facilities

The purpose of the fee is to ensure that new development funds its fair share of police facilities. The City will use fee revenues to expand general facilities to accommodate new development. Police facilities include, but are not limited to: buildings, vehicles, and capital equipment items. A fee schedule is presented based on the cost of these facilities to ensure that new development provides adequate funding to meet its needs.

Service Population

Police facilities serve both residents and businesses. Therefore, demand for both services and associated facilities is based on the City's service population, including residents and workers.

Table 3.1 shows the estimated service population in 2009 and 2030. In calculating the service population, workers are weighted less than residents to reflect a lower per capita service demand. Nonresidential buildings are typically occupied less intensively than dwelling units, so it is reasonable to assume that average per-worker demand for services is less than average per-resident demand. The 0.31-weighting factor for workers is based on a ratio of 40 hours at work to the remaining 128 hours spent outside of work.

Table 3.1: Police Facilities Service Population

	Residents	Workers	Total
Existing (2009)	16,970	47,200	
Weighting factor[1]	1.00	0.31	
Existing Service Population	16,970	14,630	**31,600**
New Development (2009-2030)	720	9,500	
Weighting factor[1]	1.00	0.31	
New Development Service Population	720	2,950	**3,670**
Total 2030 Service Population	17,690	17,580	**35,270**

Note: Totals rounded to nearest ten.

[1] Workers are weighted at 0.31 of residents based on the ratio of 40 working hours per week to 128 non-working hours.

Sources: Table 2.2; Willdan Financial Services.

Facility Standards and Planned Facilities

Police facilities in El Segundo include land, buildings and equipment. **Table 3.2** shows that the City currently owns 2.44 acres of land, which serves as the site of the Civic Center Police Station. This facility consists of approximately 33,000 square feet of building space. The Police

Department owns approximately $6.8 million worth of vehicles, computers and equipment, bringing the total value of police facilities in El Segundo to approximately $18.3 million. Itemized calculations of police facility values appear in **Appendix A**. The inventory of police vehicles is shown in **Appendix Table A.1**. An inventory of computer equipment is shown in **Appendix Table A.2**, and an inventory of communications and miscellaneous equipment is shown in **Appendix Table A.3**.

Table 3.2: Existing Police Facilities

	Inventory		Unit Cost[1]	Units		Value
Land *(acres)* [2]						
Civic Center Police Station	2.44	$	1,630,000	acres	$	3,977,000
Buildings (*square feet*)						
Buildings (square feet)	32,868	$	230		$	7,560,000
Equipment						
Vehicles *(See Appendix A.1)*					$	1,967,000
Computers *(See Appendix A.2)*						628,000
Communications and Miscellaneous *(See Appendix A.3)*						4,211,000
Subtotal - Vehicles, Computers, Communications and Misc.					$	6,806,000
Total Value - Existing Facilities					$	18,343,000

Note: Total values rounded to nearest thousand.
[1] Unit costs based on market value.
[2] Land value of $1.63 million per acre based on a recent appraisal of parcels within the City.

Sources: Tables A.1, A.2 and A.3; City of El Segundo; Willdan Financial Services.

The cost of land per acre is based on the average of two appraisals of similarly located parcels within the City on February 2010. These appraisals were chosen because they are representative of the types of land that the City would purchase in the future.

Facility Needs and Costs

Table 3.3 presents the list of police facility improvements planned for the City of El Segundo, as identified by the City of El Segundo Police Department. Expected police capital infrastructure projects include: adding a new gymnasium to the existing station, the construction of a parking structure for the Police and Fire Departments, and numerous additions to the fleet. Together, planned police facility costs amount to approximately $10.2 million.

Table 3.3: Police Department Planned Facilities

Planned Facility	Quantity	Units	Unit Cost	Total Cost
Gymnasium addition to existing station	3,000	Sq. Ft.	$ 500	$ 1,500,000
Parking Structure for Police, Fire Department	N/A	N/A	N/A	7,000,000
Armored Bearcat (Armored van)	1		400,000	400,000
Trailerable Patrol Boat	1		150,000	150,000
Narcotics detection dog/vehicle	1		50,000	50,000
Explosives detection dog/vehicle	1		50,000	50,000
Flat top DUI patrol Dodge Charger	2		40,000	80,000
SWAT Van	1		300,000	300,000
BMW Motorcycle	3		53,333	160,000
Command Post Vehicle	1		500,000	500,000
Total Cost of Planned Police Facilities				$ 10,190,000

Source: City of El Segundo Police Department.

Planned police facilities are likely to serve both existing residents and new development. As a result, this study uses the system plan approach to calculating new development's fair share of planned facility costs. This is done by taking the total value of existing and planned facilities in 2030 and dividing it by the total 2030 service population to obtain a facility standard per capita. This calculation appears in **Table 3.4**.

Table 3.4: Existing and Planned Police Facilities

Existing Facilities Value	$ 18,343,000
Planned Facilities Costs	10,190,000
Total Facilities Value in 2030	$ 28,533,000
Service Population in 2030	35,270
Cost per Resident	$ 809
Cost per Worker	251

Sources: Tables 3.1, 3.2 and 3.3; City of El Segundo Police Department; Willdan Financial Services.

Table 3.5 shows the estimated fee revenue generated by the police facilities fee. This fee is projected to generate approximately $3 million in revenue by 2030. Projected fee revenue falls short of the total cost of planned police facilities in the City of El Segundo. The remaining $7.2 million in planned facility costs must be funded by non-impact fee sources.

Table 3.5: Estimated Police Facilities Fee Revenue

Cost Per Capita	$ 809
Growth in Service Population (2009-2030)	3,670
Anticipated Fee Revenue	$ 2,969,000
Total Cost of Planned Police Facilities	$ 10,190,000
Additional Funding Required	$ 7,221,000

Note: Anticipated fee revenue rounded to hundreds.

Sources: Tables 3.3 and 3.4; Willdan Financial Services.

Fee Schedule

Table 3.6 shows the police facilities fee schedule, which is based on the assumption that El Segundo will be charging new development no more than its fair share of planned facility costs. The cost per capita is converted to a fee per unit of new development based on dwelling unit and building space densities (persons per dwelling unit (DU) for residential development and workers per 1,000 square feet of building space for nonresidential development). The total fee includes an administrative charge to fund costs that include impact fee related administrative costs, such as: revenue collection, revenue and cost accounting, mandated public reporting, and fee justification analyses.

Table 3.6: Police Facilities Fee

Land Use	*A* Cost Per Capita	*B* Density	*C = A x B* Base Fee[1]	*D* Admin Charge[1, 2]	*E = C + D* Total Fee	*F = E / 1,000* Fee per Sq. Ft.
Residential						
Single Family, Two-Family	$ 809	2.78	$ 2,249	$ 45	$ 2,294	
Multi-Family	809	1.85	1,497	30	1,527	
Caretaker	809	1.20	971	19	990	
Nonresidential						
Commercial	$ 251	2.02	$ 507	$ 10	$ 517	$ 0.52
Office	251	2.37	595	12	607	0.61
Industrial	251	1.12	281	6	287	0.29

Note: Fees rounded to nearest whole dollar.

[1] Fee per dwelling unit, or per 1,000 square feet of nonresidential space.

[2] Administration fee equal to 2.0 percent of base fee to fund impact fee program administrative costs including revenue collection, revenue and cost accounting, mandated public reporting, and fee justification analyses.

Sources: Tables 2.1 and 3.4; Willdan Financial Services.

4. Library Facilities

This chapter provides the documentation to enable the City impose a public facilities fee to fund library facilities. The City would use fee revenues to help fund expanded library facilities to serve new development.

Service Population

Residents are the primary users of libraries in the City of El Segundo. Therefore, demand for libraries and associated facilities are based on the City's residential population, rather than a combined resident-worker service population. Estimates of the existing service population and projected growth are shown in **Table 4.1**.

Table 4.1: Library Facilities Service Population

	Residents
Existing (2009)	16,970
New Development (2009-2030)	720
Total (2030)	**17,690**

Note: Values rounded to nearest ten.

Sources: Table 2.2; Willdan Financial Services.

Facility Inventories and Standards

The City Library is located at Library Park. This land is listed in the parkland inventory in Chapter 6, so the value of that land is not included in this chapter, to avoid double counting. The City of El Segundo currently owns nearly $7 million worth of building and annex facilities. Library collections are also an important component of a library system's facilities and are a significant investment. Collections include books, online databases, audio-visual materials, periodical subscriptions, and other documents. The City owns approximately $6.9 million dollars worth of collections, as shown in **Table 4.2**. Itemized costs for existing library collections and equipment are shown in **Appendix Tables A.4** and **A.5,** respectively.

Table 4.2: Existing Library Facilities

	Inventory	Unit Cost	Units	Total Value
Existing Facilities				
Land[1]	3.40	$ -	acres	$ -
Building + Annex *(sq. ft.)*	30,329	230	sq. ft.	6,976,000
Collections	*(See Appendix A.4)*			6,892,000
Furniture\Shelving\Equipment	*(See Appendix A.5)*			277,000
Total Facilities				$ 14,145,000

Note: Total values rounded to nearest thousand.

[1] The library is located at Library Park, which is included in the parkland inventory in Chapter 6. The value of that land is not included in this inventory to avoid double counting.

Sources: Tables A.4 and A.5; City of El Segundo; Willdan Financial Services.

Facility Needs and Costs

The City of El Segundo plans to expand its library facilities by adding $1.2 million worth of equipment and building expansions through 2030. The planned facilities are shown in **Table 4.3**.

Table 4.3: Planned Library Facilities

Planned Facility	Units	Unit Cost	Total Cost
Expansion to the children's library (approximately 2,000 sq. ft.)	2,000	$ 300	$ 600,000
Additional internet computers	20	2,000	40,000
Tables for internet computers	2	3,500	7,000
Wiring for additional internet computers and expanded Wi-Fi	1	18,000	18,000
Wi-Fi expansion	1	10,000	10,000
Switch for new internet computers	1	8,000	8,000
Additional Envisionware internet licenses	1	20,000	20,000
Chairs for internet computers	20	400	8,000
Online download computers	4	2,000	8,000
Download computer station table	1	2,500	2,500
Chairs for download computer station table	4	400	1,600
E-book readers for checkout	50	250	12,500
E-books for checkout	600	75	45,000
Study rooms (approximately 700 sq. ft.)	700	300	210,000
Tables for study rooms	5	2,000	10,000
Chairs for study rooms	20	750	15,000
Game room stations, inc. game console, TV, security	3	3,000	9,000
Chairs for game room	6	400	2,400
Video game software for game room	25	50	1,250
Additional Children's Library internet computers	5	2,000	10,000
Children's Library early literacy computers	4	2,000	8,000
Stools for Children's Library computers	9	250	2,250
Self-service checkout machine	1	54,000	54,000
Wiring and maintenance for self-service checkout machine	1	5,000	5,000
Radio Frequency Identification (RFID) security system	1	13,000	13,000
RFID library material tags for checkout	1	105,000	105,000
RFID library material tag protectors	1	7,000	7,000
Total			$ 1,232,500

Source: City of El Segundo Public Library.

These improvements are likely to benefit both members of the existing service population and new development, since both groups will be using the existing and new facilities. Accordingly, this study uses the system plan approach to calculate new development's fair share of new library facilities. This is done by dividing the total value of existing and planned facilities in 2030 by the total 2030 service population to calculate a standard per resident. This calculation appears in **Table 4.4**.

Table 4.4: Existing and Planned Library Facilities

Existing Facility Value	$ 14,145,000
Planned Facility Costs	1,232,500
Total Facility Value in 2030	$ 15,377,500
Service Population in 2030	17,690
Cost per Capita	$ 869

Sources: Table 6.1; City of El Segundo Public Library; Willdan Financial Services.

Table 4.5 shows the total revenue that the library facilities fee is expected to generate through the 2030 planning horizon. Multiplying the per capita facility standard by the growth in service population produces an estimated $626,000 in revenue. It is important to note that this revenue estimate falls short of the City's $1.2 million in planned facilities. As a result, approximately $607,000 worth of library facilities will have to be funded by non-impact fee sources, or new development will have paid too high a fee.

Table 4.5: Estimated Library Facilities Fee Revenue

Cost Per Capita	$ 869
Growth in Service Population (2009-2030)	720
Anticipated Fee Revenue	$ 625,700
Total Cost of Planned Library Facilities	$ 1,232,500
Additional Funding Required	$ 606,800

Note: Total anticipated fee revenue rounded to nearest hundred.

Sources: Tables 4.1, 4.3 and 4.4; Willdan Financial Services.

Fee Schedule

Table 4.6 presents the library facilities fee schedule based on the planned facilities method. The cost per capita is converted to a fee per unit of new development based on dwelling unit densities. The total fee includes an administrative charge to fund costs that include: revenue collection, revenue and cost accounting, mandated public reporting, and fee justification analyses.

Table 4.6: Library Facilities Fee

Land Use	A Cost Per Capita	B Density	C = A x B Base Fee	D Admin Charge[1]	E = C + D Total Fee
Residential					
Single Family, Two-Family	$ 869	2.78	$ 2,416	$ 48	$ 2,464
Multi-Family	869	1.85	1,608	32	1,640
Caretaker	869	1.20	1,043	21	1,064

Note: Fees rounded to nearest whole dollar.

[1] Administration fee equal to 2.0 percent of base fee to fund impact fee program administrative costs including revenue collection, revenue and cost accounting, mandated public reporting, and fee justification analyses.

Sources: Tables 2.1 and 4.4; Willdan Financial Services.

5. Fire Protection Facilities

The purpose of this development impact fee is to ensure that new development funds its fair share of fire protection facilities. A fee schedule is presented based on the facilities needed to ensure that new development fund its fair share of the City's facility needs.

Service Population

Fire protection facilities serve both residents and businesses. Therefore, demand for services and associated facilities are based on the City's service population including residents and workers.

Table 5.1 shows the estimated service population for 2009 and 2030. In calculating the service population, residents are given a weight of 1.0 and workers are weighted at 0.69 to reflect lower per capita service usage. Nonresidential buildings are typically occupied less intensively than dwelling units, so it is reasonable to assume that average per-worker usage of services is less than average per-resident usage.

Table 5.1: Fire Facilities Service Population

	Residents	Workers	Total
Existing (2009)	16,970	47,200	
Weighting factor[1]	1.00	0.69	
Existing Service Population	16,970	32,570	**49,540**
New Development (2009-2030)	720	9,500	
Weighting factor[1]	1.00	0.69	
New Development Service Population	720	6,560	**7,280**
Total 2030 Service Population	**17,690**	**39,130**	**56,820**

[1] Workers are weighted at 0.69 of residents based on an survey of worker demand on fire services conducted in the City of Phoenix. Totals rounded to nearest ten.

Sources: *Specific Infrastructure Financing Plan: Equivalent Land Use Derivation and Projection* , City of Phoenix Planning Department, November 6, 1996; Table 2.2; Willdan Financial Services.

The 0.69 per-worker weighting used here is derived from a study carried out in the City of Phoenix. This study is one of the best sources of this data currently available. Data from that study was used to calculate a per capita factor that is independent of land use patterns. Relative demand for fire service between residents and workers does not vary substantially on a per capita basis across communities, ensuring that this data can be used for all of the communities which must document a public facilities fee for fire stations.

Facility Inventories, Plans and Standards

Table 5.2 shows existing fire facilities in the City of El Segundo. The City owns 2.19 acres of land and two fire stations totaling almost 32,000 square feet. In addition to land and buildings, the City of El Segundo owns approximately $6.9 million worth of vehicles and equipment. **Appendix Tables A.6**, **A.7** and **A.8** summarize the inventories of fire suppression, administration, paramedics and prevention equipment and vehicles, respectively.

Table 5.2: Existing Fire Facilities Standard

	Inventory	Unit Cost	Value
Land *(acres)* [1]			
Fire Station #1	1.32	$ 1,630,000	$ 2,151,600
Fire Station #2 Complex	0.87	1,630,000	1,418,100
Subtotal	2.19		$ 3,569,700
Buildings *(sq. ft.)*			
Fire Station #1	17,800	$ 230	$ 4,094,000
Hose Tower	105	230	24,200
Fire Station #2 Complex	13,959	230	3,210,600
Subtotal	31,864		$ 7,328,800
Fire Department Vehicles *(See Appendix Table A.6)*			$ 5,177,800
Fire Department Computer Equipment *(See Appendix Table A.7)*			$ 237,900
Fire Department Communications Equipment *(See Appendix Table A.7)*			$ 423,100
Fire Department Misc. Equipment *(See Appendix Table A.8)*			$ 1,017,400
Total Existing Facilities			$17,754,700

Note: Total values rounded to nearest hundred.

[1] Land value of $1.63 million per acre based on an recent appraisal of parcels within the City.

Sources: Tables A.6, A.7 and A.8; City of El Segundo.

Facility Needs and Costs

The City of El Segundo plans to add approximately $3 million worth of fire facilities to its inventory by 2030. These facility expansions are summarized in **Table 5.3**, and include additions to Fire Station #1, along with new equipment and furnishings.

Table 5.3: Fire Department Planned Facilities

Planned Facility	Quantity	Units	Unit Cost	Total Cost
Addition to Fire Station #1 for offices and storage	3,100	Sq. Ft.	$ 500	$ 1,550,000
Addition to Fire Station #1 apparatus bay	2,800	Sq. Ft.	500	1,400,000
Sedans with radios and emergency warning devices	2		35,000	70,000
Computers	3		2,000	6,000
Office furniture sets	3		4,000	12,000
Total Cost of Planned Fire Facilities				$ 3,038,000

Source: City of El Segundo Fire Department.

These improvements are likely to benefit both members of the existing service population and new development, since both groups will be placing calls to the expanded station. Accordingly, this study uses the system plan approach to calculate new development's fair share of new fire facilities. This is done by dividing the total value of existing and planned facilities in 2030 by the total 2030 service population to calculate a standard per resident and per worker. This calculation appears in **Table 5.4**.

Table 5.4: Existing and Planned Fire Facilities

Existing Facility Value	$	17,754,700
Planned Facility Costs		3,038,000
Total Facility Value in 2030	$	20,792,700
Service Population in 2030		56,820
Cost per Resident	$	366
Cost per Worker		253

Sources: Tables 5.1, 5.2 and 5.3; City of El Segundo Fire Department; Willdan Financial Services.

Table 5.5 shows the total revenue that the fire facilities fee is expected to generate through the 2030 planning horizon. Multiplying the per capita facility standard by the growth in service population produces an estimated $2.7 million in revenue. It is important to note that this revenue estimate falls short of the City's $3 million in planned facilities. As a result, approximately $374,000 worth of fire protection facilities will have to be funded by non-impact fee sources, or new development will have paid too high a fee.

Table 5.5: Estimated Fire Facilities Fee Revenue

Cost Per Capita	$	366
Growth in Service Population (2009-2030)		7,280
Anticipated Fee Revenue	$	2,664,500
Total Cost of Planned Fire Facilities	$	3,038,000
Additional Funding Required	$	373,500

Note: Total anticipated fee revenue rounded to nearest hundred.

Sources: Tables 5.1, 5.3 and 5.4; Willdan Financial Services.

Fee Schedule

Table 5.6 shows the fire facilities fee schedule based on the existing standard. The cost per capita is converted to a fee per unit of new development based on dwelling unit and building space densities (persons per dwelling unit (DU) for residential development and workers per 1,000 square feet of building space for nonresidential development). The total fee includes an administrative charge to fund impact fee program administrative costs including: revenue collection, revenue and cost accounting, mandated public reporting, and fee justification analyses.

Table 5.6: Fire Facilities Fee

Land Use	A Cost Per Capita	B Density	C = A x B Base Fee[1]	D Admin Charge[1, 2]	E = C + D Total Fee	F = E / 1,000 Fee per Sq. Ft.
Residential						
Single Family, Two-Family	$ 366	2.78	$ 1,017	$ 20	$ 1,037	
Multi-Family	366	1.85	677	14	691	
Caretaker	366	1.20	439	9	448	
Nonresidential						
Commercial	$ 253	2.02	$ 511	$ 10	$ 521	$ 0.52
Office	253	2.37	600	12	612	0.61
Industrial	253	1.12	283	6	289	0.29

Note: Fees rounded to nearest whole dollar.

[1] Fee per dwelling unit, or per 1,000 square feet of nonresidential space.

[2] Administration fee equal to 2.0 percent of base fee to fund impact fee program administrative costs including revenue collection, revenue and cost accounting, mandated public reporting, and fee justification analyses.

Sources: Tables 2.1 and 5.5; Willdan Financial Services.

6. Park and Recreation Facilities

The purpose of the fee is to ensure that new development funds its fair share of park facilities. The City will use fee revenues to expand park facilities to serve new development. This analysis documents fees based on the guidelines set forth in the *Mitigation Fee Act*.

Service Population

Facility standards for parks are typically expressed as a ratio of park facilities per 1,000 residents. Recognizing that park facilities within the City are used by workers as well as residents, the City of El Segundo conducted a survey to determine the level of park facility use by nonresidents, and found that workers in the City used City parks at approximately 17 percent of the rate of resident use. The survey was conducted by asking users of the Campus El Segundo Fields and Recreation Park facilities whether they worked in the City, lived in the City or both on both. The survey was repeated for weekdays and weekends; levels of park use were weighted accordingly. Accordingly demand for parks and associated facilities are based on the City's combined resident-worker service population. A detailed summary of the survey can be found in **Appendix B**.

Table 6.1 provides estimates of the resident and worker population with a projection for the year 2030.

Table 6.1: Parks Service Population

	Residents	Workers	Total
Existing (2009)	16,970	47,200	
Weighting factor[1]	1.00	0.17	
Existing Service Population	16,970	8,020	**24,990**
New Development (2009 - 2030)	720	9,500	
Weighting factor[1]	1.00	0.17	
New Development Service Population	720	1,620	**2,340**
Total 2030 Service Population	**17,690**	**9,640**	**27,330**

Note: Service population totals rounded to nearest ten.

[1] Workers are weighted at 0.17 of residents based on a survey of use at Recreation Park and Campus El Segundo Fields submitted by the City.

Sources: City of El Segundo; Tables 2.1 and B.1; Willdan Financial Services.

Facility Standards

The City owns and operates various park and recreation facilities throughout the City. The City's inventory of parks facilities includes a total of 74.76 acres, and is summarized in **Table 6.2**. An inventory of existing recreation facilities is shown below in **Table 6.3**.

Table 6.2: Parkland Inventory

Name	Acres
Parkland (acres)	
Recreation Park	20.40
Hilltop Park	1.20
Campus El Segundo Athletic Fields	4.96
Candy Cane Park	0.10
Acacia Park	0.50
Library Park	3.40
Camp Eucalyptus	0.30
The Lakes Golf Course	28.00
Holly Kansas Park	0.40
Holly Valley Park	0.20
Dog Park	1.90
Cutlers Park	0.10
Imperial Parkway: Memory Row	7.70
Imperial Parkway: Btw Dog Park and Main	4.80
Sycamore Parkette	0.80
Total	74.76

Source: City of El Segundo.

Table 6.3: Recreation Facilities Inventory

Facility	Square Feet
Checkout Building	3,880
Urho Saari Swim Stadium	16,270
Camp Eucalyptus Building	1,815
The Lakes Facility	7,552
Clubhouse	11,623
Concession Stand	584
Scorer's Booth	100
Main Complex	510
Joslyn Center	7,667
Elevator Tower and Shed	510
Office and Shop	510
Campus El Segundo Athletic Fields Facility	1,442
Teen Center	5,480
Raquetball Courts	1,870
Announcer's Booth	110
Hardball Concession Stand	1,000
Softball Concession Stand	640
Total Recreation Facilities	61,563

Source: City of El Segundo.

Table 6.4 shows the existing standard of parkland per person served in the City of El Segundo.

Table 6.4: Parkland Standards

	---------- Existing (2009) ----------	
Type of Acreage	**Acres**	**Standard per 1,000 service population**
Acres of Parkland	74.76	
Existing Service Population	24,990	
Standard (acres per 1,000 service population)		2.99

Note: Facility standard rounded to the hundredths.

Sources: Tables 6.1 and 6.2; Willdan Financial Services.

Park Facility Standards

Park facility standards establish a reasonable relationship between new development and the need for expanded park facilities. Information regarding the City's existing inventory of existing parks facilities was obtained from City staff.

The most common measure used to calculate new development's demand for parks is the ratio of park acres per resident. In general, facility standards may be based on the *Mitigation Fee Act* (using a city's existing inventory of park facilities), or an adopted policy standard contained in a master facility plan or general plan.

Mitigation Fee Act

The *Mitigation Fee Act* does not dictate use of a particular type or level of facility standard for public facilities fees. To comply with the findings required under the law, facility standards must not burden new development with any cost associated with facility deficiencies attributable to existing development.[1] A simple and clearly defensible approach to calculating a facility standard is to use the city's existing ratio of park acreage per 1,000 residents. Under this approach, new development is required to fund new park facilities at the same level as existing residents have provided those same types of facilities to date.

Unit Costs for Land Acquisition and Improvements

Unit costs represent the land costs and level of improvements that existing development has provided to date. Using unit costs to determine a facility standard ensures that the cost of facilities to serve new development is not artificially increased, and that new development is not unfairly burdened relative to existing development.

The unit costs used to estimate the total investment in parkland facilities are shown in **Table 6.5**. All costs are expressed in 2009 dollars. Land acquisition costs and improvement costs are based on the City's experience with park development and information from a recent market analysis of land values in El Segundo.

[1] See the *benefit* and *burden* findings in *Chapter 8, Mitigation Fee Act Findings*.

Table 6.5: Parkland Unit Costs

			Cost Per Acre	Share
Park Improvements				
Special Use Facilities[1]				
Urho Saari Swim Stadium		$ 5,369,000		
Subtotal		$ 5,369,000		
Golf Course Building				
Building Sq. Ft.	5,500			
Cost per Sq. Ft.	$ 189			
Subtotal		$ 1,039,500		
Camp Eucalyptus				
Building Sq. Ft.	1,270			
Cost per Sq. Ft.	$ 189			
Subtotal		$ 240,000		
Recreation Facilities (Checkout Building, Clubhouse, Scorer's Booth, Office, Racquetball Courts, Announcer's Booth, Hardball and Softball Concession Stands, Offices and Concession Stands at Campus El Segundo Athletic Fields, Teen Center, Concession stand, Main Complex, Joslyn Center, Elevator Tower)				
Building Sq. Ft.	35,926			
Cost per Sq. Ft.	$ 189			
Subtotal		$ 6,790,000		
Park Equipment and Vehicles *(Table A.9)*		$ 887,600		
Total Special Use Facilities		$ 14,326,100		
Improved Park Acres		74.76		
Special Use Facilities Cost per Improved Acre			$ 191,600	
Standard Park Improvements[2]			200,000	
Park Improvements Per Acre Subtotal			$ 391,600	19%
Land Acquisition[3]			$ 1,630,000	81%
Total			$ 2,021,600	100%

Note: Total facility cost estimates rounded to nearest hundred.

[1] Recreation facilities only include special use facilities (such as recreation centers and pools) that are not part of standard park improvements.

[2] Improvement costs are estimated at $200,000 per acre for site improvements (curbs, gutters, water, sewer, and electrical access), plus basic park and school field amenities such as basketball or tennis court, restroom, parking, tot lot, irrigation, turf, open green space, pedestrian paths, and picnic tables. Excludes special use facilities such as recreation centers and pools.

[3] Land value of $1.63 million per acre is based on a recent appraisal of parcels within the City.

Sources: Tables 6.2 and 6.3; City of El Segundo; Willdan Financial Services.

Total Needs and Costs

The total investment in park facilities needed to serve growth is calculated by multiplying the facility standards developed in Table 6.5 by growth in residents. The total value of the needs for park facilities is based on the average unit costs for land acquisition and improvements shown in Table 6.5. To accommodate the increase in service population through 2030 at the existing standard, new development would need to fund facilities estimated to cost approximately $14.1 million as shown in **Table 6.6**.

Table 6.6: Park Facilities to Accommodate New Development

		Mitigation Fee Act
Parkland		
Facility Standard (acres/1,000 service population)	2.99	
Service Population Growth (2009-2030)	2,340	
Facility Needs (acres)	7.00	
Average Unit Cost (per acre)	$ 1,630,000	
Total Cost of Facilities		$ 11,410,000
AND		
Improvements		
Facility Standard (acres/1,000 service population)	2.99	
Service Population Growth (2009-2030)	2,340	
Facility Needs (acres)	7.00	
Average Unit Cost (per acre)	$ 391,600	
Subtotal - Improvements		$ 2,741,000
Total Facilities		$ 14,151,000

Note: Total facility cost estimates rounded to thousands.

Sources: Tables 6.1, 6.4, and 6.5; Willdan Financial Services.

The $14.1 million in facility improvements must be used to enhance, upgrade, or expand new park facilities. Intensifying development of existing parks is another reasonable method for accommodating growth that could be used in conjunction with the expansion of improved park acreage. The use of fee revenues would be identified through planned parkland acquisition and improvement projects described in the most recently adopted version of annual capital improvement budget.

The City anticipates that the park fees would be the primary revenue source to fund new development's investment in park facilities. Expected parks capital infrastructure projects include the development of new and improved parkland facilities and the construction of a new aquatics center. **Table 6.7** shows the share of costs that could be allocated on a per capita basis for both

land acquisition and improvement.

Table 6.7: Park Facilities Investment Per Capita

Parkland		
Parkland Investment (per acre)	$	1,630,000
Facility Standard (acres per 1,000 service population)		2.99
Total Investment Per 1,000 capita	$	4,874,000
		1,000
Investment Per Resident	$	4,874
Investment Per Worker		829
Improvements		
Parkland Improvements (per acre)		391,600
Facility Standard (acres per 1,000 service population)		2.99
Total Investment Per 1,000 capita	$	1,171,000
		1,000
Investment Per Resident	$	1,171
Investment Per Worker		199

Note: Total investment estimates rouned to nearest thousand. Investment per capita rounded to nearest whole dollar.

Sources: Tables 6.5, and 6.6; Willdan Financial Services.

Fee Schedule

In order to calculate fees by land use type, the investment in park facilities is determined on a per resident basis for both land acquisition and improvement. These investment factors (shown in Table 6.7) are based on the unit cost estimates and facility standards.

Table 6.8 shows the park facilities fee based on the existing standard. The fee includes a component for park improvements based on the City's existing standard. The investment per capita is converted to a fee per dwelling unit. The total fee includes an administrative charge of two percent (2%) to fund costs that include revenue collection, revenue and cost accounting, mandated public reporting, and fee justification analyses.

Table 6.8: Park Facilities Fee Schedule

Land Use	A Cost Per Capita	B Density	C = A x B Base Fee[1]	D Admin Charge[1, 2]	E = C + D Total Fee[1]	F = E / 1,000 Fee per Sq. Ft.
Residential						
Single Family, Two-Family						
Parkland	$ 4,874	2.78	$ 13,550	$ 271	$ 13,821	
Improvements	1,171	2.78	3,255	65	3,320	
Total					$ 17,141	
Multi-Family						
Parkland	$ 4,874	1.85	$ 9,017	$ 180	$ 9,197	
Improvements	1,171	1.85	2,166	43	2,209	
Total					$ 11,406	
Caretaker						
Parkland	$ 4,874	1.20	$ 5,849	$ 117	$ 5,966	
Improvements	1,171	1.20	1,405	28	1,433	
					$ 7,399	
Nonresidential						
Commercial						
Parkland	$ 829	2.02	$ 1,675	$ 34	$ 1,709	$ 1.71
Improvements	199	2.02	402	8	410	0.41
					$ 2,119	$ 2.12
Office						
Parkland	$ 829	2.37	$ 1,965	$ 39	$ 2,004	$ 2.00
Improvements	199	2.37	472	9	481	0.48
					$ 2,485	$ 2.49
Industrial						
Parkland	$ 829	1.12	$ 928	$ 19	$ 947	$ 0.95
Improvements	199	1.12	223	4	227	0.23
					$ 1,174	$ 1.17

Note: Fees rounded to nearest whole dollar.

[1] Fee per dwelling unit, or per 1,000 square feet of nonresidential space.

[2] Administration fee equal to 2.0 percent of base fee to fund impact fee program administrative costs including revenue collection, revenue and cost accounting, mandated public reporting, and fee justification analyses.

Sources: Tables 2.1 and 6.7; Willdan Financial Services.

7. Implementation

Impact Fee Program Adoption Process

Impact fee program adoption procedures are found in the *California Government Code* section 66016. Adoption of an impact fee program requires the City Council to follow certain procedures including holding a public meeting. Data, such as an impact fee report, must be made available at least 10 days prior to the public meeting. The City's legal counsel should be consulted for any other procedural requirements as well as advice regarding adoption of an enabling ordinance and/or a resolution. After adoption there is a mandatory 60-day waiting period before the fees go into effect.

Inflation Adjustment

The City has kept its impact fee program up to date by periodically adjusting the fees for inflation. Such adjustments should be completed regularly to ensure that new development will fully fund its share of needed facilities. To maintain consistency with other City documents, we recommend that the fees be adjusted for inflation annually, concurrent with the time frame when City staff presents the preliminary CIP to the City Council.

There are no inflation indices that are specific to City of El Segundo. We recommend that the following indices be used for adjusting fees for inflation:

- Buildings, Improvements – Engineering News Record's Building Cost Index (BCI) – Los Angeles, CA
- Equipment – Consumer Price Index, All Items, 1982-84=100 for All Urban Consumers (CPI-U) – for the West Urban Region, Size B/C

Due to the highly variable nature of land costs, there is no particular index that captures fluctuations in land values. We recommend that the City adjust land values based on a periodic appraisal of the type of land comparable to the City's existing inventory.

While fee updates using inflation indices are appropriate for periodic updates to ensure that fee revenues keep up with increases in the costs of public facilities, the City will also need to conduct more extensive updates of the fee documentation and calculation (such as this study) when significant new data on growth forecasts and/or facility plans become available. Note that decreases in index value will result in decreases to fee amounts.

The steps necessary to update fees for inflation are explained below:

For all of the fee categories except the park facilities fees, the steps are as follows:

1. For each facility type (land, buildings, equipment), identify the percent change in facility value since the last update, based on changes in each inflation index or for each type of land.
2. Modify the value of each facility, existing and planned (if applicable) by the percent change identified in Step 1.
3. Depending on fee methodology for each particular fee category calculate the total value of existing facilities (existing inventory method), the value of existing facilities

plus planned facilities (system plan method), or the value of planned facilities (planned facilities method) using the updated figures from Step 2.

4. Recalculate the cost per capita for each fee category by dividing the results of Step 3 by either the existing service population if the fee is calculated using the existing inventory method, by the future service population if the fee is calculated using the system plan method, or by the growth in service population if the fee is calculated using the planned facilities method. Both the existing and future service populations are identified in the first table of every chapter in this report.
5. Calculate the cost per worker (if applicable) for fee categories that are charged to nonresidential development. The cost per worker is equal to the cost per capita calculated in Step 4 multiplied by 0.31 for police, by 0.69 for fire and by 0.17 for parks.
6. Update the fee schedule by multiplying the cost per capita and the cost per worker calculated in Step 5 by the density factors listed in Table 2.1 to determine the base fee for each land use.

To update the park facility fees for inflation, the steps are as follows:

1. For each facility type (land, improvements), identify the percent change in facility value since the last update, based on changes in each inflation index or for each type of land.
2. Modify the value of land acquisition and improvements shown in Table 6.6 by the percent change identified in Step 1.
3. Using Table 6.6 as a guide, recalculate the cost per resident and cost per worker using the adjusted values for land acquisition and improvements calculated in Step 2.
4. Update the fee schedule by multiplying the costs per capita calculated in Step 3 by the density factors listed in Table 2.1 to determine the base fee for each land use. The total fee for a given land use is equal to the cost per capita for land (from step three) multiplied by the occupant density, added to the cost per capita for improvements (also from step three) multiplied by the occupant density. See Table 6.8 for reference.

Once all of the fees have been inflated, multiply the sum of all the fees, per land use, by two percent (2%) to determine the administrative charge. Future updates to the fee program should review the administrative fee to ensure that it fully covers the cost of administering the fee program.

Reporting Requirements

The City complies with the annual and five-year reporting requirements of the Mitigation Fee Act found in Government Code Sections 66001 and 66006. For facilities to be funded by a combination of public fees and other revenues, identification of the source and amount of these non-fee revenues is essential. Identification of the timing of receipt of other revenues to fund the facilities is also important.

Programming Revenues and Projects with the CIP

The City maintains a ten-year Capital Improvements Program (CIP) to plan for future infrastructure needs. The CIP identifies costs and phasing for specific capital projects. The use of the CIP in this manner documents a reasonable relationship between new development and the use of those revenues.

The City may decide to alter the scope of the planned projects or to substitute new projects as long as those new projects continue to represent an expansion of the City's facilities. If the total cost of facilities varies from the total cost used as a basis for the fees, the City should consider revising the fees accordingly.

8. Mitigation Fee Act Findings

Public facilities fees are one-time fees typically paid when a building permit is issued and imposed on development projects by local agencies responsible for regulating land use (cities and counties). To guide the widespread imposition of public facilities fees the State Legislature adopted the *Mitigation Fee Act* (the *Act*) with Assembly Bill 1600 in 1987 and subsequent amendments. The *Act*, contained in *California Government Code* Sections 66000 through 66025, establishes requirements on local agencies for the imposition and administration of fee programs. The *Act* requires local agencies to document five findings when adopting a fee.

The five statutory findings required for adoption of the maximum justified public facilities fees documented in this report are presented in this chapter and supported in detail by the report that follows. All statutory references are to the *Act*.

Purpose of Fee

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

Development impact fees are designed to ensure that new development will not burden the existing service population with the cost of facilities required to accommodate growth per Policy LU7-1.2 of the 1992 General Plan. The purpose of the fees proposed by this report is to implement this policy by providing a funding source from new development for capital improvements to serve that development. The fees advance a legitimate City interest by enabling the City to provide services to new development.

Use of Fee Revenues

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

Fees proposed in this report, if enacted by the City, would be used to fund expanded facilities to serve new development. Facilities funded by these fees are designated to be located within the City. Fees addressed in this report have been identified by the City to be restricted to funding the following facility categories: police, library, fire, and parks and recreation.

Benefit Relationship

- *Determine the reasonable relationship between the fees' use and the type of development project on which the fees are imposed (§66001(a)(3) of the Act).*

We expect that the City will restrict fee revenue to the acquisition of land, construction of facilities and buildings, and purchase of related equipment, furnishings, and vehicles used to serve new development. Facilities funded by the fees are expected to provide a citywide network of facilities accessible to the additional residents and workers associated with new development. Under the Act, fees are not intended to fund planned facilities needed to correct existing deficiencies. Thus,

a reasonable relationship can be shown between the use of fee revenue and the new development residential and non-residential use classifications that will pay the fees.

Burden Relationship

- *Determine the reasonable relationship between the need for the public facilities and the types of development on which the fees are imposed (§66001(a)(4) of the Act).*

Facilities need is based on a facility standard that represents the demand generated by new development for those facilities. Facilities demand is determined as follows:

- *The service population is established based upon the number of residents and workers, which correlates to the demand for police facilities, fire protection facilities, and parks and recreation facilities; and,*
- *The service population for library facilities is established solely on the number of residents, as worker demand on these facilities is nominal.*

For each facility category, demand is measured by a single facility standard that can be applied across land use types to ensure a reasonable relationship to the type of development. For most facility categories service population standards are calculated based upon the number of residents associated with residential development and the number of workers associated with non-residential development. To calculate a single, per capita standard, one worker is weighted less than one resident based on an analysis of the relative use demand between residential and non-residential development.

The standards used to identify growth needs are also used to determine if planned facilities will partially serve the existing service population by correcting existing deficiencies. This approach ensures that new development will only be responsible for its fair share of planned facilities, and that the fees will not unfairly burden new development with the cost of facilities associated with serving the existing service population.

Chapter 2, Demographic Assumptions provides a description of how service population and growth forecasts are calculated. Facility standards are described in the Facility Standards sections of each facility category chapter.

Proportionality

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

The reasonable relationship between each facilities fee for a specific new development project and the cost of the facilities attributable to that project is based on the estimated new development growth the project will accommodate. Fees for a specific project are based on the project's size. Larger new development projects can result in a higher service population resulting in higher fee revenue than smaller projects in the same land use classification. Thus, the fees ensure a reasonable relationship between a specific new development project and the cost of the facilities attributable to that project.

See *Chapter 2, Demographic Assumptions*, or the *Service Population* section in each facility category chapter for a description of how service populations is determined for different types of land uses. See the Fee Schedule section of each facility category chapter for a presentation of the proposed facilities fees.

Appendix A: Vehicle and Equipment Inventories

All vehicle and equipment inventories in this appendix document replacement cost, as provided by City of El Segundo in 2009.

Table A.1: Police Vehicle Inventory

Description	Unit	Year Acquired	Replacement Cost
Sedan Patrol, Crown Victoria	4	04/05	$ 132,800
Speed Monitoring & Traffic Safety Equip.	1	05/06	45,000
2001 Ford Truck (Animal Control)	1	00/01	64,000
Sport Utility, Chevrolet Suburban (donated)	1	05/06	102,000
Mutual Aid Emergency Resp Veh.	1	06/07	320,000
Sedan, Grand Marquis	1	06/07	29,000
Dodge Caravan	1	06/07	20,000
Jeep Wrangler Sport RH-Drive	1	06/07	24,000
Ford 500 SEL, Blue Metalic	1	06/07	25,000
Ford 500 SEL, Black w/Shale cloth	2	06/07	50,000
Sedan , Impala 9C3 Blue/Ntrl	1	06/07	23,000
Sedan , Impala 9C3 Black/Ebony	1	06/07	23,000
Sedan , Impala 9C3 Silverton/Ebony	1	06/07	23,000
Sport Utility, Dodge Durango	2	06/07	52,000
2009 Ford F-150	1	08/09	32,500
Sedan, Chevy Impala	2	04/05	60,000
2009 Ford Explorer	3	08/09	84,000
2009 Nissan Altima Hybrid	2	08/09	60,000
Sport Utility, Ford Explorer	1	02/03	29,000
Motorcycle, BMW R1200	5	06/07	126,000
2008 Sedan, Crown Victoria	9	08/09	270,000
Utility Parking Enforcement	1	02/03	5,000
Sedan, RSVP	2	02/03	12,000
Sedan Patrol K-9	1	00/01	6,500
Buick Regal LS	2	02/03	45,100
Sedan, Ford Escort	1	88/89	24,000
Sedan, Buick Regal	2	94/95	52,000
Crime Scene Van (Chevrolet)	1	95/96	29,000
Van-12 passenger, Ford	1	96/97	35,000
Swat Van (Grumman)	1	93/94	64,500
Police Vehicles Funding	1	05/06	100,000
Total			$ 1,967,400

Note: Figures have been rounded.

Sources: City of El Segundo Equipment Replacement Schedule, 09/10; City of El Segundo.

Table A.2: Police Computer Equipment Inventory

Description	Units	Year Acquired	Unit Cost	Total Replacement Cost
Multi-Function machine, HP OfficeJet 9130	1	05/06	$ 1,200	$ 1,200
Printer, HP Color LaserJet 3800N	1	06/07	1,800	1,800
Scanners, Dell FI-5220c Color Workgroup	1	07/08	1,500	1,500
Switch, Dell PowerConnect 5324	1	05/06	2,000	2,000
Printer, Epson Stylus Pro4800	1	05/06	2,000	2,000
Printer, HP4200N w/Duplexer	6	04/05	1,800	10,800
Computer, Dell Optiplex 755 Ultra Small	36	07/08	1,800	64,800
Computer, Dell Optiplex 760	8	08/09	1,800	14,400
Dell Optiplex 755 /Evidence Mgmt	1	07/08	1,800	1,800
Computer, Dell Optiplex GX620 19"flat	7	05/06	1,800	12,600
Dell, Latitude D820 w/1.0GB	1	06/07	2,500	2,500
Dell, Latitude E5500	5	08/09	2,500	12,500
Server rack for above	1	01/02	6,000	6,000
Auto cite computer/software	3	08/09	6,667	20,000
Dell Precision M90	1	06/07	3,400	3,400
Computer, Laptop	1	07/08	4,000	4,000
Switch, Asante 99-00748-01	1	03/04	4,200	4,200
Mobile data-2 K-9/Animal Control	1	00/01	14,000	14,000
Printer, Color, Xerox Phaser 6250DX	1	04/05	4,600	4,600
Tabletop Live-Scan System	1	06/07	11,000	11,000
Video System in PD vehicle	1	04/05	4,900	4,900
Server, Dell Power Edge 1850	1	05/06	6,000	6,000
Switch, PowerConnect 5324 (5ea)	1	06/07	6,500	6,500
Dell Optiplex GX270T, 20" Panel	7	04/05	4,400	30,800
Superloader Quantum	1	03/04	8,200	8,200
Dual Quad Core Xeon E5430 Server	1	08/09	10,000	10,000
Mobile Data Computer M5 (1)	1	05/06	12,000	12,000
Software, Accident Reconstruction	1	06/07	8,500	8,500
Server, Dell Power Edge 2650	2	04/05	10,000	20,000
Server Module, AVL Status Mapping	1	03/04	17,000	17,000
Mobile Data Computer (16)	1	08/09	100,000	100,000
Mobile Data Computer (15)	1	03/04	108,000	108,000
Printer, HP LaserJet 4050N	3	99/00	1,600	4,800
Image Master copying system	1	01/02	1,800	1,800
Printer, HP LaserJet 4000 TN	1	98/99	2,000	2,000
Fax machine	2	99/00	2,400	4,800
Switch, Dell 24-Port	5	02/03	2,500	12,500
LCD 20" monitor (Doc. Imaging)	1	01/02	3,600	3,600
MDC, Sierra wireless (3)	1	01/02	4,400	4,400
Scanners, Tabletop Fujitsu (4)	1	01/02	5,000	5,000
Server, Dell Power Edge 2500	1	01/02	8,000	8,000
Server, Dell Power Edge 2650 (2)	1	02/03	10,000	10,000
Mainframe-IBM AS/400	1	93/94	44,000	44,000
Total				$ 627,900

Note: Figures have been rounded.

Sources: City of El Segundo Equipment Replacement Schedule, 09/10; City of El Segundo.

Table A.3: Police Communications and Miscellaneous Equipment Inventory

Description	Units	Year Acquired	Unit Cost	Total Replacement Cost
Refrigerator - Whirlpool (22 cf)	1	03/04		1,100
Refrigerator - Amana	1	99/00		1,600
Range - Maytag	1	99/00		1,800
Freezer - True Food Reach In	1	08/09		3,500
Numb John Mobile Platform	1	07/08		4,000
Benelli LE M4 Shotgun (2)	1	06/07		3,500
Refrigerator - True Food Refrig./Freezer	1	08/09		4,500
Remington 700 w/Rail & accessories	2	08/09		4,800
Toshiba 20" DVD/VHS TV (7)	1	06/07		3,000
Duplex Card Printer/ID Card Maker	1	08/09		4,900
Alcohol Analyzers w/memory & printer	1	05/06		4,000
E/Z Rider K-9 Kennel	1	07/08		5,200
Animal Catch Kit	1	08/09		1,800
Helmet Radio Kit (5)	1	03/04		9,000
Benchtop Downdraft Workstation	1	07/08		5,800
Nikon D300 2 Cameras/accessories	1	08/09		10,000
M-3 Tactical lights/pouches (75)	1	01/02		10,000
Shotguns (Border Patrol model)	1	01/02		8,000
Forensic Evidence Drying Cabinet	1	07/08		7,000
Personal Escape Masks (CBRN) (72)	1	04/05		12,000
Digital Flash CAM-880	1	07/08		7,700
Video Camera /Dispatch Ctr.	1	99/00		20,000
Wheel Loader Weigher	1	07/08		9,600
Gas Masks, Advantage (75)	1	01/02		13,000
Reflectorless Total Station Bluetooth	1	06/07		10,000
Taser Gun X26E w/Audio-Video (6)	1	06/07		12,000
Surveillance wires & system	1	01/02		14,000
Chair, Dispatch (8) Black Galaxy Style 5000	1	07/08		11,400
Bullet Trap	1	96/97		65,000
Prolaser III (traffic - 4)	1	07/08		18,000
Glock 21 guns/magazines (85)	1	01/02		47,000
Communications Generator	1	98/99		100,000
Cardiovascular Machines	1	05/06		40,000
Taser Gun X26E w/Audio-Video (20)	1	06/07		34,000
Mobile ALPR System	1	06/07		35,000
SWAT Bulletproof Vests (16)	1	06/07		40,000
Taser Gun X26E w/Audio-Video (40)	1	07/08		65,800
Video/Digital Evidence Mgmt. System	1	08/09		180,000
Typewriter	3	90/91		3,000
VCR-Encore "Go Video"	1	94/95		1,000
Multisort Satellite Station	1	99/00		1,800
Cutting Torch - Steely	1	94/95		3,500
Sights/mounts-SWAT (8)	1	01/02		3,500
Security Camera-East Lot	1	98/99		4,000
Chartprinter	1	90/91		4,800
Shredder	1	92/93		5,000
Walk-Through Metal Detector	1	94/95		5,000
Elliptical , PRECOR	1	02/03		5,000
Lab Vent - Labconco	1	95/96		6,000
Scott Air Packs (2)	1	96/97		7,000
Projector, Toshiba LCD	1	96/97		8,500
Sony Color Monitors (11)	1	99/00		9,000
Taser guns (22)	1	01/02		9,500
Video Camera System	1	97/98		20,000
Mobile Radios- (1) Motorola XTL5000	1	05/06		5,000
Mobile Radios (1), Motorola XTL 5000 UHF	1	06/07		6,000
Mobile Radios (3), Motorola XTL 5000 UHF	1	06/07		14,000
Mobile Radios (3), Motorola XTS 5000 UHF	1	06/07		14,000
Motorcycle Radio (5), Motorola	1	03/04		17,500
Mobile Radios (5), Motorola XTS 5000 UHF	1	06/07		26,000
Mobile Radios (5), Motorola XTL 5000 UHF	1	06/07		28,000
Mobile Radios (9), Motorola XTL 5000 UHF	1	06/07		35,000
Mobile Radios- (9) Motorola	1	04/05		40,600
Mobile Radios (12), Motorola XTS 5000	1	05/06		44,000
Airlink GSM Modems	1	08/09		25,000
Mobile Radios (13), Motorola XTL 5000 UHF	1	06/07		50,000
Mobile Radios (15), Motorola XTS5000 UHF	1	06/07		64,000
Mobile Radios (18), Motorola XTS 5000	1	05/06		64,000
Mobile Radios (19), Motorola XTS 5000 UHF	1	06/07		80,000
Motorola XTS3000 Portables (75)	1	00/01		225,000
Motorola Spectra A3	1	98/99		2,500
Mobile	2	89/90		6,500
Cordless XLT Headsets (10 sets)	1	01/02		4,500
Radio Workstation	1	02/03		35,000
Motorola Wireless Dispatch Sys.	1	99/00		2,500,000
Total Equimpent				$ 4,211,200

Note: Figures have been rounded to nearest hundred.

Sources: City of El Segundo Equipment Replacement Schedule, 09/10; City of El Segundo.

Table A.4: Library Collections

Item	Average Price	Total Collection	Collection's Value
DVD	$ 30	7,000	$ 210,000
VHS	20	500	10,000
Music CD	17	2,600	44,200
Book on Tape	80	890	71,200
Book on CD	45	916	41,200
Magazine or Journal Print	5	5,880	29,400
Newspaper Print	1.00	1,800	1,800
Microfilm or Microfiche	7	80,822	565,800
Maps, Pamphlets, Photos	10	27,500	275,000
Reference Books	200	6,500	1,300,000
Fiction Books	30	27,000	810,000
Non-Fiction Books	88	23,000	2,024,000
Children's Books	26	56,325	1,464,500
Electronic Database Subscriptions	3,000	15	45,000
Total - Library Collections		240,748	$ 6,892,100

Note: Total values rounded to nearest hundred.

Source: El Segundo Public Library.

Table A.5: Library Equipment and Furnishings

Description	Units	Year Acquired	Unit Cost	Total Replacement Cost
Projector, Epson	1	05/06	$ 2,600	$ 2,600
Projector, LCD Multimedia (Panasonic)	1	07/08	1,600	1,600
Media Return, M700-R	1	03/04	2,169	2,200
Audio System/Matsui Room	1	03/04	8,000	8,000
Tables	1	06/07	8,000	8,000
Reading Chairs	15	06/07	733	11,000
3M Security System	1	02/03	14,000	14,000
Canon Microfilm Scanner	1	08/09	9,000	9,000
Audio Visual Material Return	1	93/94	1,650	1,700
Audio Visual System	1	91/92	23,595	23,600
Printer, Dell 3100CN Laser Color	1	06/07	1,600	1,600
Printer, HP LserJet 2055DN	1	08/09	1,600	1,600
Bar Code Scanner & Resensitier	1	03/04	1,600	1,600
Printer, Canon Fileprint	1	08/09	2,000	2,000
Computer, Dell Optiplex 755 Ultra Small	40	07/08	1,818	72,700
Laptop, Dell Latitude D630	1	07/08	1,800	1,800
Computer, Dell Optiplex GX620 19"flat	13	05/06	1,800	23,400
Bar Code Scanners (17)	1	07/08	2,500	2,500
Computer, Dell Optiplex GX280T, 17"	1	04/05	1,600	1,600
Computer, Dell Optiplex GX620 Mini Tower a	1	06/07	2,400	2,400
Computer, Gateway Profile 5MX-C	1	04/05	2,000	2,000
Switch, PowerConnect 5324 (3ea)	1	06/07	3,500	3,500
Millennium System Expansion Software	1	02/03	50,000	50,000
Battery backup RS232 - (2)	1	02/03	1,700	1,700
Cisco Firewall PIX	1	00/01	4,500	4,500
OCLC Interfaces (2)	1	92/93	9,000	9,000
OPAC Web Server	1	00/01	13,500	13,500
Total - Library Equipment				$ 277,100

Note: Total replacement cost figures rounded to nearest hundred.

Sources: City of El Segundo Equipment Replacement Schedule, 09/10; City of El Segundo.

Table A.6: Fire Department Vehicles

Description	Unit	Year Acquired	Replacement Cost
Vehicles			
Sedan, Crown Victoria	1	06/07	$ 28,000
Truck, crew cab	1	97/98	50,000
Generator, Tempest Honda 2000 Watt	2	07/08	3,600
Generator (TR)	1	00/01	3,500
Hydraulic Rescue (Jaws of Life)	2	00/01	58,000
Aerial Ladder	1	94/95	921,400
Fire Engine (E33)	1	08/09	771,000
Ford Excursion/Command Center	1	02/03	105,000
Fire Engine (E34)	1	92/93	448,000
Truck, USAR	1	05/06	800,000
Fire Engine (E31)	1	99/00	575,000
Fire Engine (E32)	1	92/93	448,000
Truck, Communications	1	89/90	-
Power Blower (E33)	1	00/01	1,800
Generator	1	00/01	2,200
Power Blower (T32)	1	91/92	2,600
Generator, Honda	1	96/97	3,500
Sedan	2	98/99	31,500
Technical Rescue Truck	1	95/96	320,000
Rescue Ambulance (R31)	1	03/04	251,100
Rescue Ambulance	1	96/97	179,500
Truck, Ford Super Cab	2	00/01	59,000
2008 Ford Escape Hybrid	1	08/09	35,000
Sedan, Grand Marquis	1	00/01	26,300
Crew Cab Truck	1	99/00	52,000
Generator	1	99/00	1,800
Total - Equipment and Apparatus			$ 5,177,800

Note: Equipment replacement costs rounded to nearest hundred.

Sources: City of El Segundo Equipment Replacement Schedule, 09/10; City of El Segundo.

Table A.7: Fire Department Computer, Communications Equipment

Description	Unit	Year Acquired	Replacement Cost
Communications			
Portable XTL5000 VHF Radios (2)	1	06/07	$ 10,000
Portable XTS5000 UHF Radios (8)	1	06/07	40,000
Portable XTS5000 UHF Radios (12)	1	06/07	45,000
Portable XTL5000 VHF Radios (17)	1	06/07	60,000
Portable XTS5000 UHF Radios (18)	1	03/04	72,000
Portable XTS5000 UHF Radios (16)	1	03/04	118,000
Portable VHF (18)	1	varies	33,600
Motorola portable UHF radio (3)	1	02/03	11,000
Satellite Phone Portable Kits (7)	1	08/09	14,000
Emergency Advisory Radio	1	02/03	17,000
UHF Repeater System	1	98/99	2,500
Subtotal - Communications Equipment			423,100
Computer Equipment			
Fax, Panafax UF-8000	1	07/08	$ 1,500
Computer, Dell Optiplex GX620 19"flat	8	05/06	14,400
Laptop, Dell Latitude C810	2	04/05	6,000
Printer, HP LJ 4200DTN	3	02/03	6,300
Computer, Dell File Server	1	02/03	6,000
Computer, Dell Optiplex 755 Ultra Small	8	07/08	14,400
Switch, PowerConnect 5224	1	03/04	2,500
Laptop, Dell Precision M6300	1	07/08	3,100
Mobile Data Computer (1) M5	1	06/07	7,500
Mobile Data Computer (1) M15	1	05/06	11,000
Mobile Data Computer (13)	1	03/04	111,000
Pipeline 130 IDSN/T1	1	98/99	1,300
Scanner	1	93/94	1,600
Laptop, Dell Latitude D510 Celeron M	16	05/06	24,000
Printer, Xerox Phaser 6259/DP color	1	04/05	2,600
Computer, Gateway 5MX-C Delux (EOC)	2	04/05	4,800
Server, Dell PowerEdge 1800 esweb03	1	05/06	4,500
Laptop, Dell Latitude C810 w/docking st	1	04/05	3,000
Computer, Dell Optiplex 755 "EMWIN"	1	07/08	4,000
Printer, HY LJ 2200DN (EOC)	2	01/02	2,800
Panafax 990 Fax Machine (EOC)	2	01/02	5,600
Subtotal - Computer Equipment			$ 237,900

Note: Equipment replacement costs rounded to nearest hundred.

Sources: City of El Segundo Equipment Replacement Schedule, 09/10; City of El Segundo.

Table A.8: Fire Department Other Misc. Equipment

Description	Unit	Year Acquired	Replacement Cost
Other Equipment			
Automatic Defibrillator S2-Lifepak (2)	1	04/05	$ 5,600
Automatic Defibrillator (4)	1	04/05	10,700
Typewriter	2	92/93	2,000
Porta Count System Model #8028	1	08/09	1,200
Ventilation Chain Saw (E33)	1	99/00	1,300
Turbo Water Vac 17 gallon	1	03/04	2,700
Sharp 2000 Zoom Projector	1	03/04	2,100
ESFD Station #1 Console	1	05/06	5,500
ESFD Station #2 Console	1	05/06	5,500
Pro Tread Treadmill (St. 1)	1	08/09	5,400
Asset Management System	1	05/06	3,000
Washer Extractor	1	93/94	10,800
Personal Protective Equipment	2	04/05	7,500
Recliner, Lander (10)	1	08/09	8,000
Helmets w/eye protection (60)	1	04/05	13,600
Ballistic Body Armor (19 sets)	1	07/08	10,000
SCBA Bottles (22)	1	06/07	20,000
Headsets (33)	1	03/04	8,500
Emergency Vehicle Intercom Sys. (10ea)	1	03/04	11,000
Communications Generator (1/4)	1	98/99	50,000
Personal Escape Mask (CBRN) (75)	1	04/05	13,000
Heavy USAR Equipment	1	07/08	40,000
SCBA CBRN Mask	1	04/05	18,000
Hose (300 sections)	1	varies	-
SCBA Bottles (40)	1	04/05	36,000
Protective Clothing (60)	1	varies	-
SCBA Units (26)	1	04/05	145,200
SCBA Voice Amplifiers (55)	1	02/03	13,300
Typewriter	1	90/91	1,000
Ab Bench - Icarian (ST2)	1	02/03	1,000
Submersible Pump (TR)	1	94/95	1,300
Pump	1	98/99	1,400
Pump (TR)	1	98/99	1,400
Submersible Pump (ST2)	2	98/99	2,800
Rotary saw (2) (TR)	1	98/99	1,400
3-way Suction Siamese (T32)	1	97/98	1,500
Rotary hammer (TR)	1	98/99	1,500
Ventilation Chain Saw (T32)	1	92/93	1,800
Cutquick Power Saw	1	93/94	2,100
Water Vacuum	1	94/95	2,200
Gas Detector (TR)	1	96/97	2,500
Gas Detector (TR)	1	96/97	2,500
MSA Alarm (2) (TR)	1	96/97	3,000
Leg Extensions (ST2)	1	99/00	3,000
Leg Curls (ST2)	1	99/00	3,000
Automated Defibrillator (E31)	1	00/01	4,000
Automated Defibrillator (E33)	1	00/01	4,000
Automated Defibrillator (E32)	1	00/01	4,000
Step Mill 7000 (ST2)	1	98/99	4,000
Precor EFX 5.23 Crosstrainer (ST2)	1	02/03	4,000
Precor Fitness Crosstrainer (ST1)	1	98/99	4,500
Thermal imaging camera (E31)	1	02/03	25,000
Thermal imaging camera (E33)	1	02/03	25,000
Thermal imaging camera (E32)	1	02/03	25,000
SCBA Bottles (77)	1	varies	57,200
SCBA (26)	1	varies	61,300
Victory trailer	4	08/09	22,100
Defibrillator, E Series ACLS Manual	1	07/08	19,500
Monitor/Defibrillator Life Pak 12 (2)	1	04/05	36,700
Defibrillator, 3-E Series/2-M Series Manual	1	06/07	59,000
Monitor/Defibrillator	1	97/98	13,000
Mobile radio (#3361)	1	00/01	2,100
Mobile radio (#3360)	1	00/01	2,100
HNU Toxic Detector	1	03/04	3,700
Combo Gas/Oxygen Indicator	1	03/04	3,900
CBRN Detection Equipment	2	04/05	15,000
Five Step Analysis Kit (#3348)	1	99/00	2,200
Combustible Gas Indicator	1	91/92	5,400
Mobile Mini Storage 10'	2	97/98	6,500
Mobile Mini Storage 20'	1	95/96	4,400
Projector, LCD "2" (EOC)	1	06/07	5,200
Biological/Chemical Detection Kit	1	04/05	5,300
Upholstered Chairs (35)	1	08/09	25,000
SE Inspector Survey Meter	1	03/04	25,000
Chemical & Biological Agent Detection Kit	1	04/05	15,000
Emerg. food (mutual aid/City empl.)	1	07/08	20,000
Emergency food	1	07/08	25,000
Subtotal - Other Equipment			$ 1,017,400

Note: Equipment replacement costs rounded to nearest hundred.

Sources: City of El Segundo Equipment Replacement Schedule, 09/10; City of El Segundo.

Table A.9: Parks Equipment and Vehicles

Description	Units	Year Acquired	Unit Cost	Total Replacement Cost
Printer, Zebra P330i & Cards	1	FY05-06	$ 6,600	$ 6,600
Program registration Printer & Cards	1	FY04-05	6,600	6,600
System 5 Timer (Saari Pool)	1	FY00-01	35,000	35,000
Vacuum Sweeper	1	FY02-03	3,500	3,500
Board, Maxiflex 16'- Stand	1	FY01-02	7,500	7,500
Pool automatic chlorinator	1	FY98-99	2,500	2,500
Portable Radio (8), Motorola	8	FY03-04	438	3,500
Rototiller	1	FY98-99	1,300	1,300
16" Sod Cutter	1	FY98-99	3,600	3,600
Tractor, Garden	1	FY98-99	8,500	8,500
Genie Aerial Lift	1	FY00-01	8,100	8,100
Delta 5 HP Unisaw	1	FY07-08	5,000	5,000
Sedan, Crown Victoria	1	FY06-07	8,000	8,000
Showmobile trailer	1	FY01-02	130,000	130,000
Lawnair Aerator	1	FY86-87	1,700	1,700
Cushman	1	FY99-00	21,000	21,000
GEM, Utility Cart	1	FY02-03	6,000	6,000
Mower/Trimmer	2	FY02-03	1,700	3,400
Truck, Chevy	6	FY02-03	29,133	174,800
John Deer 220B Greens mower	1	FY03-04	5,000	5,000
Planer, Powermatic	1	FY99-00	2,000	2,000
Roller Turf	1	FY91-92	4,000	4,000
Stump Cutter	1	FY99-00	36,000	36,000
Truck, Ford	2	FY91-92	17,350	34,700
Truck, GMC TC7500 w/Arbortech 12" Chipper	1	FY08-09	98,000	98,000
Aerial Tower Truck	1	FY97-98	130,000	130,000
Utility Vehicle, John Deere HPX Gator	1	FY04-05	10,200	10,200
Truck	1	FY92-93	28,000	28,000
Utility Trailer	3	FY02-03	5,433	16,300
Wood Chipper	1	FY01-02	33,000	33,000
Generator	1	FY92-93	2,000	2,000
Line Striper, Jiffy 7500	1	FY03-04	1,800	1,800
Lawn Comber	1	FY97-98	1,500	1,500
Mower	1	FY98-99	4,200	4,200
Computer, Optiplex GX280, 17" panel	1	FY04-05	1,800	1,800
Computer, Dell Optiplex 755 Ultra Small	14	FY07-08	1,800	25,200
Computer, Dell; printer; firewall	1	FY07-08	3,600	3,600
Computer, GX520 Minitowers	2	FY05-06	2,300	4,600
Printer, HP2200DN	1	FY02-03	1,200	1,200
Printer, HP LaserJet 4000TN	1	FY98-99	1,800	1,800
Fax, Panafax DX2000	1	FY03-04	2,600	2,600
HP 2200DTN Printer	1	FY02-03	1,700	1,700
Computer, Dell Optiplex GX620 19"flat	1	FY05-06	1,800	1,800
Total Equipment and Vehicles				$ 887,600

Note: Totals replacement costs rounded to nearest hundred.

Sources: City of El Segundo Equipment Replacement Schedule, 08/09; City of El Segundo.

Appendix B: Worker Demand Survey for Parks

The worker demand weighting for parks and recreation facilities were developed during various user intercept surveys carried out by staff at the City of El Segundo in March 2010. The following appendix describes the methodology used to arrive at the worker demand weighting factors.

Park Survey

The parks intercept survey was administered to all willing park-goers at Campus El Segundo Fields and Recreation Park on Tuesday, March 16th, Wednesday, March 17th, and Sunday, March 21st. On the two weekdays, the survey was administered during the interval from 11:45AM to 1:15PM and then the interval from 6:00PM to 7:00PM. On Sunday, the survey was administered from 9:15AM-10:15AM, from 12:15PM-1:15PM and from 6:30PM to 7:30PM. The parks surveyed are listed in the table below. Park users were asked if they came to the park that day because of proximity to work, home, both or neither.

The staff at the City of El Segundo initially tabulated the results of the survey. The results of the weekday surveys (Tuesday, March 16th and Wednesday, March 17th) need to be multiplied by five to weight the results to represent the five weekdays. Results from the weekend survey (Sunday, March 21st) need to be multiplied by two in order to represent total visits for both weekend days.

Willdan Financial Services constructed weights by considering worker and resident responses alone. Respondents suggesting that they were at the parks for both or neither reasons were not included in the total. The resulting estimate of total proximity to work responses were then divided by the current estimate of employees working within the City of El Segundo to derive park visits per employee. Park visits per resident were estimated by dividing the responses by the current resident population. The resulting weighting factor for worker park use based on survey results is estimated at 0.17.

The tabulation of survey results appears in **Table B.1** below.

Table B.1: City Of El Segundo Park Users Survey

	Number of patrons at park because of:			
	Work	**Residence**	**Both**	**Neither**
Survey Date: Tuesday, March 16, 2010, 11:45 am to 1:15 pm				
Recreation Park	37	30	13	19
Campus El Segundo Fields	6	1	-	10
Total	43	31	13	29
Survey Date: Tuesday, March 16, 2010, 6:00 pm to 7:00 pm				
Recreation Park	5	15	12	6
Campus El Segundo Fields	3	52	10	28
Total	8	67	22	34
Survey Date: Wednesday, March 17, 2010, 11:45 am to 1:15 pm				
Recreation Park	28	12	6	15
Campus El Segundo Fields	7	2	1	23
Total	35	14	7	38
Survey Date: Wednesday, March 17, 2010, 6:00 pm to 7:00 pm				
Recreation Park	12	41	11	37
Campus El Segundo Fields	8	83	3	42
Total	20	124	14	79
Adjustment Factor	5	5	5	5
Weighted Weekday Visits	133	295	70	225
Survey Date: Sunday, March 21, 2010, 9:15 am to 10:15 am				
Recreation Park	-	25	7	14
Campus El Segundo Fields	8	7	2	37
Total	8	32	9	51
Survey Date: Sunday, March 21, 2010, 12:15 pm to 1:15 pm				
Recreation Park	5	38	12	36
Campus El Segundo Fields	6	26	8	129
Total	11	64	20	165
Survey Date: Sunday, March 21, 2010, 6:30 pm to 7:30 pm				
Recreation Park	2	34	6	32
Campus El Segundo Fields	10	6	5	209
Total	12	40	11	241
Adjustment Factor	2	2	2	2
Weighted Weekend Visits	21	91	27	305
Weekend and Weekday Weighted Visits	153	386	97	
Allocation of "Both" Response	48	48		
	202	434		
Employees or Residents	47,200	17,000		
1,000 Visits per worker or resident	4.27	25.53		

	1,000 Visits Per Capita
Workers	4.27
Residents	25.53
Worker Weighting Factor	0.17

Note: These parks were selected based on their similarity to future parks to be built.

Sources: City of El Segundo; Willdan Financial Services.