Meeting Date: 6/26/07

ACTION	TYPE OF ITEM
☐ Approved Recommendation	☐ Info/Consent
☐ Ord. No(s). _____	☐ Report
☐ Res. No(s). _____	■ Public Hearing
☐ Other _____	☐ Other _____

Prepared By: Jason M. Samonte Agenda Item No. L-5

Reviewed By: City Manager City Attorney Public Works Director Finance Director SW

DATE: June 19, 2007

TO: City Council

FROM: Jason M. Samonte, Traffic Engineer
Public Works Department

SUBJECT: Adjustment to Planned Traffic Circulation Facilities Fees

RECOMMENDATION

That City Council adopt a resolution establishing interim planned traffic circulation facilities fees of $730 per vehicle trip to be effective until the 2020 General Plan update is complete and City Council considers a fee based on a new master plan of traffic circulation facilities.

DISCUSSION

Planned traffic circulation facilities fees (traffic fees) are paid by developers in proportion to the trips generated to fund the construction of the City's traffic circulation system. The traffic fees allow the cost of the transportation system to be spread fairly to all new development. Monies are collected and applied to large street improvement projects. Developments that front on major highways widen the street and get a credit against their traffic fees.

Previous Ventura County ballot measures to increase the funds for transportation through taxation have failed. Because of the tremendous backlog of street maintenance, the existing gas tax monies available to the City are fully committed to maintenance and not available for widening roads.

The traffic fees have not changed since January 1994 at which time the City Council lowered them to stimulate the local economy that was in a recession.

The methodology to arrive at the interim fee is as follows:

The attached 1992 Public Works Department report was the last comprehensive calculation of the fee necessary to complete the planned traffic circulation system. The total cost of improvements to the City of Oxnard was found to be $348,533,000 ("Net Cost of Improvements" in Attachment 1). The number of additional daily trips at build out as projected in 1992 was 672,821 trips. The cost per trip of $518.01 was computed by dividing the cost of improvements by the number of trips.

The interim fee is a function of adjusting the "Net Cost of Improvements" for inflation since the 1992 study and using more recent data when available. Five interchange projects have either been completed or have new engineering estimates since the 1992 report: (a) Rice Avenue/101Freeway interchange, (b) Rose Avenue/101 Freeway interchange, (c) Del Norte Boulevard/101Freeway interchange, (d) Route 1/Rice Avenue Interchange/Rice Extension and (e) 101 Freeway—Vineyard Avenue to Johnson Drive. The new information was utilized in computing the fee adjustment.

The Rose Avenue interchange was completed at total cost of $21,300,000. The current cost estimate for the Rice Avenue interchange is $76,800,000 and the estimate for Del Norte Boulevard interchange is $39,000,000. The City's contribution to 101 freeway— Vineyard Avenue to Johnson Drive increased to $18,00,000. These new estimates are used in "Net Cost of Improvements" for the interim fee. The City contribution to the Route 1/Rice Interchange/Rice Extension remains unchanged.

An inflation factor of 31% (change in Construction Cost Index as published by Engineering News Record) was applied to the remaining items in the 1992 computation after subtracting the cost estimates for these five interchange projects. The assumed general fund contribution of $5,700,000 and "Federal Aid to Urban Roads" (FAU) contribution of $13,290,000 were backed out of the fee computation because those funds are committed to other uses. Attachment 2 summarizes the interim fee computation.

The new "Net Cost of Improvements" is $556,500,000. Spreading this cost to the 672,821 trips yields a fee of $827 per daily trip. To ensure a conservative methodology, the computed value was reduced by approximately 10% and rounded down to arrive at the proposed interim traffic fee of $730.

The proposed adjustment is temporary until a new engineering study can be completed after the adoption of an updated 2020 General Plan. Staff anticipates that the list of needed transportation improvements and the costs of construction will change from what was determined in 1992.

FINANCIAL IMPACT

Currently the FY '08 budget anticipates approximately $2,000,000 of Traffic Impact Fees will be collected at the current rate of $173.90 per vehicle trip. The fee increase will result in another $6,396,000 being collected. Failure to adjust the traffic impact fee will result in an increased call on general funds to complete the transportation system.

Attachments

1. Traffic Impact Fee Methodology-1992
2. Interim Fee Calculation
3. Resolution

JMS/JAG

TRAFFIC IMPACT FEE METHODOLOGY

Development Unit

Development is converted to a common unit which can most equitably measure the impact of a given project on the requirement for infrastructure. These units for the traffic fee are average vehicular trips per day. An estimate is made of the gross total number of development units expected to be realized in the City through build-out. Previous fee calculations included an adjustment downward to the total number of traffic vehicular trips to accommodate the public project factor under the assumption that some public projects may be exempt from the payment of traffic infrastructures fees. However, the City has negotiated payments in lieu of fees from several public projects. Because the City intends to recover as much of the cost of infrastructure as possible through negotiation, it is proposed that the adjustment for public projects be discontinued. The number of public projects exempt from fees and with which payments in lieu of fees cannot be negotiated is deemed to be negligible.

Reimbursements Policies

Reimbursement Interest Costs. Developers who construct master plan facilities are eligible for reimbursement of costs in excess of the fees levied on their development. Current policy allows the reimbursements to occur over a period of up to ten years depending on the size of the reimbursement. Up to now most reimbursements have been paid in a lump sum once the amount of credit received was known and the amount of reimbursement could be calculated. However, reimbursements are beginning to be spread over more than one year when sufficient funds are not available in the first year. It is proposed that interest rate be paid on the outstanding reimbursements. The rate paid will be tied to the Local Agency Investment Fund (LAIF) average rate for the fiscal year. The current projection of the average LAIF rate is 8%. The interest has been added to the total cost of providing the required facilities. The estimate of interest costs as a percent of the total cost of required facilities is 3.74%. The calculation of this estimate is shown in Attachment No. 1.

Reimbursement Processing Fee. The engineering time required to process reimbursements is considerable. This service is provided by the Engineering Development Section of the Public Works Department and charged to the developer reimbursement budget of the Traffic Circulation System Improvement Fund, since the processing of the reimbursements is a cost of providing the required facilities. The cost of the reimbursement processing is estimated to be 0.65% of the total cost of required facilities. This cost has been added to the cost of required facilities. The calculation of these estimates is provided in Attachment No. 1.

Reimbursements Policies. Improvements built and dedicated will be reimbursed based on the policies in effect at the time of map recordation. Developments with development agreements which freeze fees or limit fee increases to an inflation index will be reimbursed based on the policy in effect at the time of the agreement.

ATTACHMENT #1
1 OF 14

Turn lanes and traffic signals located on master planned roadways but which are not master planned facilities (eg. local intersections and driveways) are not eligible for reimbursement.

The cost of severance for parcels which lose their economic viability due to dedication of right-of-way and the cost of relocation or buying of businesses which must be condemned to obtain right-of-way are not currently in the cost basis of the traffic impact fee nor are they eligible for reimbursement costs. At the request of representatives of the development community, staff will develop cost estimates for including these costs in the next revision of the traffic impact fee.

It is proposed that the method of calculating a developer's cost of providing master planned facilities be changed. These costs are calculated for the purpose of providing reimbursement for the portion of the costs that exceed the amount of the fees payable by that development which provided the master planned facilities. Currently the cost is estimated by requiring that the developer provide three bids from contractors for the construction of the facilities. The lowest bid is used as the cost estimate for the facilities. The drawbacks of this method are that the bids are not provided through an actual bidding process and the actual construction of the facilities is not necessarily provided by the three bidders. The construction of the master planned facilities are generally part of a larger construction project for the developer. The cost estimates resulting from this method vary greatly from project to project and generally result in higher costs than those estimates upon which the infrastructure fees are based.

It is proposed that the cost estimate for reimbursement of master planned facilities provided by developers be based on a unit cost calculation. Lists of unit costs for construction of master planned facilities will be maintained by the Public Works Department (Attachment No. 5) and used both as the basis for estimating the basis of the infrastructure facilities fees and as the basis for reimbursing developers for the provision of those facilities. The accuracy of the list of unit costs will be monitored and adjusted as needed to maintain its validity as a method of cost estimating. When the unit cost list will be adjusted for both the basis of calculating the infrastructure fee and for calculating reimbursements to developers.

Also, the resolution on credit and reimbursement policies has the added stipulation that credits and reimbursements are processed upon written request from the person eligible for a credit or reimbursement. This has been the practice and is added to the resolution for clarity.

Planned Traffic Circulation Facilities Fees

In February of 1985, the City Council imposed planned traffic circulation facilities fees, sometimes called the Circulation System Improvement Fee (CSIF). The fee was amended in July, 1985. The purpose of the fee is to fund roadway improvements that are necessary due to new development and to spread the cost of these improvements fairly among the new developments.

ATTACHMENT #1
PAGE 2 OF 14

Basic Assumption. The basic assumption is that beginning with the inception of the fee in 1985, there are certain circulation system improvement costs which are expected to be incurred, a portion of which is the responsibility of new development. All new developments in the City after 1985 should share proportionately in that cost.

Development Time Frame. The CSIF has been adjusted to reflect the information in the recently adopted 2020 General Plan.

Required Circulation System Improvements. The list of required improvements to be funded by the CSIF has been adjusted in the following ways:

1. The roadway cross-section has been increased where necessary to accommodate estimated increases in the traffic load.

2. Roadway improvements have been added where necessary to maintain a Level of Service "C" as adopted in the 2020 General Plan.

3. Required improvements to secondary and collector roadways have been added to the list of arterial roadways in order to spread the cost of the complete Circulation System. Previously, secondary and collector roadways were not included in the master plan. Only the cost of arterial roadway improvements was spread to all developers through the CSIF. The cost of providing secondary and collector roadways was the responsibility of the adjacent developments. By adding secondary and collector roadway improvements to the fee these costs can be distributed to other developments that benefit from the construction of the secondary and collector roadways.

4. The cost of acquiring right-of-way for off-site or City built improvements but not the developer's cost of dedicating right-of-way required for the circulation system improvements has been added to the fee calculation. Previously, the total cost of right-of-way was borne by the developments conditioned to build the improvements or by other resources if the City built the improvements. By including the cost of off-site right-of-way in the basis of the fee, these costs can be distributed more fairly to all developments which benefit from the roadway improvements. Although the fee increases greatly due to the inclusion of right-of-way costs, those developers providing off-site right-of-way will now be eligible for reimbursement of right-of-way costs in excess of the fees paid.

Other Sources of Funding. A portion of the cost of the required facilities is offset by other sources of revenue. Only the unfunded portion of the cost of required facilities will be distributed to future development through the CSIF. Each revenue source is discussed below:

1. City General Fund.

An average of $180,000 in General Fund money has been appropriated to eligible CSIF projects during the five years following implementation of the fee (FY

1985-86 through 1989-90). The General Fund contribution to the Circulation System Improvement Program is therefore estimated to be $190,000 per year during the period from 1991 through build-out in the year 2020. The total estimated contribution is $5.7 million.

2. Federal Funds (Federal Aid to Urban Roads FAU).

The City's average annual funding from FAU is $443,000. The FAU contribution for the 30 year period through build-out is estimated to be $13.29 million. FAU funding has not been reauthorized by Congress. It is expected that a new Federal program will replace it. Once a new program is adopted it may be necessary to revise the estimate of funding from Federal sources.

3. State Funding and Project Cost Sharing with the Port of Hueneme and the City of Ventura.

Outlined below are the proposed funding assumptions regarding five major projects which are eligible for State funding cost sharing with the Port of Hueneme and the City of Ventura:

(1) Rice Bypass (86% State - 14% City).

The Rice Bypass Project consists of the conversion of Rice Avenue from a point south of Fifth Street to US-101 from a six-lane arterial to a freeway. This includes the construction of a grade separation at the Southern Pacific Railroad (100% state funded), a freeway to freeway interchange at US-101 (100% state funded), two local interchanges at Gonzales Road and at Colonia Road (50% state funded, 50% local funded) and roadway improvements (100% state funded). The total project cost is estimated at $61,300,000 of which $52,600,000 will be provided by the state and $8,700,000 by the City.

(2) Rice/101 Interchange (0% State - 100% City).

Because of the high accident rate and congestion levels, the Rice/Highway 101 Interchange has been identified by Caltrans as an interchange which is a State responsibility to reconstruct. While the reconstruction is all State responsibility, the current lack of State funding and the projected need for a reconstructed facility within the next five years will probably mean that local funds will be required to complete this project in a time frame which meets City needs. Therefore, it is assumed that the City will provide the total project cost currently estimated at $20,000,000.

(3) Rose/101 Interchange (0% State - 100% City).

At the present time, the reconstruction of the Rose/Highway 101 Interchange has been identified by Caltrans as a local responsibility because of its low accident rate and congestion levels. As the congestion levels and accident rates increase, by the mid-1990's this facility's reconstruction will be required. Therefore, it is assumed that the City will provide the total project cost currently estimated at $16,300,000.

ATTACHMENT #1
PAGE 4 OF 14

(4) Route 1/Rice Avenue/Pleasant Valley Road Interchange (89% State - 8% Port of Hueneme - 3% City).

The reconstruction of the Route 1/Rice Avenue/Pleasant Valley Road Interchange has been programmed in the State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) for construction in the 1996-97. $31,900,000 of the cost is being funded by Caltrans. The extension of Rice Avenue to Hueneme Road will be necessary for the expansion of the Port of Hueneme and the construction of the Ormond Beach development. It is estimated that $3,000,000 of the $3,915,000 will be provided by the Port of Hueneme for this project. The total project cost is $35,815,000 of which $31,900,000 will be provided by the State, $3,000,000 by the Port of Hueneme and $915,000 by the City. The following table summarizes the funding assumptions.

Route 1/Rice Avenue/Pleasant Valley Road Funding

	Project Estimate	State Share	Port Share	Oxnard Share
Construction and Engineering	$35.8	$31.9	$3.0	$0.9

(5) Route 101-Vineyard to Johnson (50% State - 20% Ventura - 30% City).

The reconstruction of the Highway 1/101 Interchange is by definition a State responsibility, since it is a state-to-state facility and an adopted freeway agreement exists for the improvements (although some modifications are being proposed). While this project is included as the Ventura County Transportation Commission's (VCTC) top priority, local funding will probably be required by the State, partially because of the perceived "developer benefits." Also, this project has been combined with the widening of Route 101, including the widening of the Santa Clara River Bridge, which is a very costly project. The Caltrans Project Study Report estimates construction cost at $38 million. Caltrans has committed to a 50% share with a $19 million cap on construction funding with adjustments for inflation. The DKS consultant report suggests a local cost split of 60% Oxnard and 40% Ventura. The following table summarizes the resulting funding shares.

Route 101 - Vineyard Avenue to Johnson Drive Funding

	Project Estimate	State Share	Ventura Share	Oxnard Share
Construction	$38.0	$19.0	$7.6	$11.4
Engineering	3.8	1.9	0.8	1.1
Total	$41.8	$20.9	$8.4	$12.5

ATTACHMENT #1
PAGE 5 OF 14

(6) Del Norte/Route 101 Interchange (100% City).

The current interchange will need to be replaced with a partial cloverleaf interchange as the Northeast Industrial Area approaches build-out. Since the need for a new interchange is primarily due to increased development, it is assumed that the City will provide the total project cost currently estimated at $12,000,000.

Based on all of the revenue projections outlined above, the estimated funding gap for projects identified by the Circulation System Improvement Program is computed as follows (See Attachment Nos. 2 and 3).

Total Estimated CSIF Cost		$484,323,000
Less:	Generated Fund Contribution	(5,700,000)
	FAU Contribution	(13,290,000)
	State Share of Projects	(105,400,000)
	Port of Hueneme Share of Projects	(3,000,000)
	City of Ventura Share of Projects	(8,400,000)
Funding From Other Sources		($135,790,000)
Net Revenue Requirement		$348,533,000

Development Estimate: Trip Generation. The information used to estimate average daily trips per acre and trips per unit and per 1,000 square foot floor space is based on the current industry standards from the Institute of Transportation Engineers Trip Generation Report, 4th Edition.

To establish the total average daily trips projected, these trip generation factors are applied to the undeveloped units and floor area as shown in the 2020 General Plan. The trips for retail land uses and hotel/motel are adjusted for peak trips (see Attachment No. 4). The total resulting trips are 672,821.

Computation. By dividing the total estimated revenue requirement of $348,533,000 by 672,821 trips, the resulting base fee is $518.01 per vehicular trip. While this represents a 104.1 percent increase over the current fee of $253.76, staff believes that the adjustment is balanced by the increased reimbursement for right-of-way and collector roadway improvements.

JEF:DWB:ek
Attachments
#1 - Interest on Reimbursement & Reimbursement Processing Fees
#2 - Traffic Primary, Secondary & Collector Improvements
#3 - Circulation System Improvements
#4 - Trip Generation
#5 - Eligible Items & Unit Costs for Reimbursement and Cost Basis of Facility Fees

ATTACHMENT #1
PAGE 6 OF 14

TRAFFIC IMPACT FEES

	STREET	CONSTRUCTION CITY PRIMARY IN $1000 S	CONSTRUCTION CITY SECONDARY IN $1000 S	CONSTRUCTION CITY COLLECTOR IN $1000 S	CONSTR. TOTAL IN $1000 S	R.O.W. CITY PRIMARY IN $1000 S	R.O.W. CITY SECONDARY IN $1000 S	R.O.W. CITY COLLECTOR IN $1000 S	R.O.W. TOTAL IN $1000 S	GRAND TOTAL IN $1000 S
1	BARD ROAD	$0	$1,730	$502	$2,232	$0	$227	$0	$227	$3,566
2	"C" STREET	$0	$250	$0	$250	$0	$145	$0	$145	$573
3	CHANNEL ISLAND BL.	$0	$3,730	$0	$3,730	$0	$689	$0	$689	$6,408
4	COLONIA ROAD	$6,365	$0	$0	$6,365	$2,073	$0	$0	$2,073	$12,235
5	DEL NORTE BL.	$1,290	$0	$1,310	$2,600	$881	$200	$0	$1,081	$5,337
6	DORIS AVE.	$0	$1,010	$0	$1,010	$0	$429	$49	$478	$2,158
7	ELEVAR STREET	$0	$1,796	$0	$1,796	$0	$1,904	$0	$1,904	$5,7[illegible]
8	EMERSON AVENUE	$0	$1,203	$0	$1,203	$0	$523	$0	$523	$2,[illegible]
9	ETTING ROAD	$0	$0	$1,770	$1,770	$0	$0	$1,145	$1,145	$4,227
10	FIFTH STREET	$7,730	$7,270	$0	$15,000	$4,525	$249	$0	$4,774	$28,672
11	GONZALES ROAD	$21,300	$0	$0	$21,300	$4,000	$0	$0	$4,000	$36,685
12	"H" STREET	$0	$160	$0	$160	$0	$554	$0	$554	$1,035
13	HARBOR BL.	$0	$10,575	$0	$10,575	$670	$0	$0	$670	$16,305
14	HEMLOCK STREET	$0	$0	$140	$140	$0	$0	$43	$43	$265
15	HOBSON WAY	$0	$90	$0	$90	$0	$4	$0	$4	$136
16	HUENEME ROAD	$4,301	$0	$0	$4,301	$2,608	$0	$0	$2,608	$10,018
17	"J" STREET	$0	$0	$100	$100	$0	$0	$0	$0	$145
18	LATIGO AVENUE	$0	$4,118	$0	$4,118	$0	$4,826	$0	$4,826	$12,969
19	LOMBARD STREET	$0	$4,050	$0	$4,050	$0	$4,991	$0	$4,991	$13,109
20	OXNARD BL. - RERT.	$2,000	$0	$0	$2,000	$0	$0	$0	$0	$2,900
21	PACIFIC AVENUE	$0	$390	$0	$390	$0	$1,201	$0	$1,201	$2,307
22	PATTERSON ROAD	$0	$1,400	$0	$1,400	$0	$650	$0	$650	$2,973
23	PLEASANT VALLEY RD.	$5,950	$0	$0	$5,950	$3,628	$0	$0	$3,628	$13,888
24	RICE AVENUE	$1,201	$0	$0	$1,201	$200	$0	$0	$200	$2,031
25	ROSE AVENUE	$10,205	$0	$0	$10,205	$6,198	$0	$0	$6,198	$23,784
26	SANTA CLARA AVE.	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0
27	SAVIERS ROAD	$1,825	$0	$0	$1,825	$2,574	$0	$0	$2,574	$6,3[illegible]
28	SECOND STREET	$0	$55	$0	$55	$0	$0	$0	$0	
29	STATHAM BL.	$0	$50	$0	$50	$0	$524	$0	$524	$832
30	STROUBE STREET	$0	$2,800	$0	$2,800	$0	$145	$0	$145	$4,270
31	STURGIS ROAD	$0	$1,215	$0	$1,215	$0	$753	$0	$753	$2,854
32	TEAL CLUB ROAD	$0	$1,800	$0	$1,800	$0	$375	$0	$375	$3,154
33	THIRD STREET	$0	$50	$0	$50	$0	$0	$0	$0	$73
34	VENTURA BL.	$0	$2,220	$0	$2,220	$0	$2,573	$0	$2,573	$6,950
35	VENTURA ROAD	$8,005	$0	$0	$8,005	$1,267	$0	$0	$1,267	$13,444
36	VIA DEL NORTE	$0	$50	$0	$50	$0	$0	$0	$0	$73
37	VICTORIA AVENUE	$1,770	$0	$0	$1,770	$0	$644	$0	$644	$3,500
38	VINEYARD AVENUE	$3,090	$2	$0	$3,092	$0	$0	$0	$0	$4,483
39	WAGON WHEEL ROAD	$0	$0	$2,100	$2,100	$0	$0	$1,000	$1,000	$4,495
40	WOOLEY ROAD	$3,210	$3,100	$0	$6,310	$3,031	$545	$0	$3,576	$14,335
41	NO NAME STREET	$0	$1,620	$0	$1,620	$0	$1,939	$0	$1,939	$5,161
	SUBTOTAL				$134,898				$57,982	$279,676
	CONTINGENCY 20%	$15,648	$10,147	$1,184	$26,980	$6,331	$4,818	$447	$11,596	
	A&E 25%	$19,561	$12,684	$1,481	$33,725	$7,914	$6,023	$559	$14,496	
	TOTAL	$113,451	$73,564	$8,587	$195,602	$45,900	$34,931	$3,244	$84,074	$279,676

000159

ATTACHMENT 4

PAGE 1 OF 14

CIRCULATION SYSTEM IMPROVEMENTS

		Current Estimate CCI = 6080
Highway Improvements		
1 Rice Bypass		$61,300,000
2 Rice/101 Interchange		$20,000,000
3 Rose/101 Interchange		$16,300,000
4 Route 1/Rice Interchange/Rice Extension		$35,815,000
5 Route 101 -- Vineyard to Johnson		$41,800,000
6 Del Norte/101 Interchange		$12,000,000
	Total Highway Improvements	$187,215,000

	Cost Base Construction	Cost Base Right of Way	Less % Dedicated	CCI = 5988 Right of Way	
Interior Roadways					
Primary	$113,451,000	$45,900,000	44%	$25,704,000	
Secondary	73,564,000	34,931,000	44%	$19,561,360	
Collector	8,587,000	3,244,000	44%	$1,816,640	
Subtotals	$195,602,000	$84,075,000		$47,082,000	
			Total Interior Roadways	$242,684,000	$246,413,000
Drainage Facilities (Non-Master Planned) within Master Planned Streets					$25,632,000
Traffic Signals		CCI = 5988		$12,095,000	$12,281,000
Reimbursement Interest Cost		3.74% X		$284,326,000	$10,634,000
Reimbursement Processing Cost		0.65% X		$284,326,000	$1,848,000
Periodic Masterplan Updates					$300,000
TOTAL COST OF IMPROVEMENTS					$484,323,000
Other Sources of Funding					
1 General Fund Contribution					($5,700,000)
2 FAU Contribution					(13,290,000)
3 State Share of Projects					(105,400,000)
4 Port of Hueneme					(3,000,000)
5 City of Ventura Share of Projects					(8,400,000)
	Total Other Sources				($135,790,000)
NET COST OF IMPROVEMENTS					$348,533,000
Total Number of Trips to Buildout					672,821
COST PER TRIP					$518.01

	Sources of Funding				
Highway Improvements	Oxnard	State	Port	Ventura	Total
1 Rice Bypass	8,700,000	52,600,000			61,300,000
2 Rice/101 Interchange	20,000,000				20,000,000
3 Rose/101 Interchange	16,300,000				16,300,000
4 Route 1/Rice Interchange/Rice Extension	915,000	31,900,000	3,000,000		35,815,000
5 Route 101 -- Vineyard to Johnson	12,500,000	20,900,000		8,400,000	41,800,000
6 Del Norte/101 Interchange	12,000,000				12,000,000
Total	70,415,000	105,400,000	3,000,000	8,400,000	187,215,000

06-Jul-92 TRIP GENERATION -- CITY OF OXNARD -- 2020 GENERAL PLAN C:\123DATA\DATADEV\TRIPS.WK1

USE	1989 AM	1989 PM	1989 ADT	2020 AM	2020 PM	2020 ADT	CHANGE FROM 1989 TO 2020 AM	CHANGE PM	CHANGE ADT	PM/ADT	GROUP PM/ADT	RATIO OF GROUP PM/ADT TO TOTAL PM/ADT	ADJUSTED ADT
1 Res - Low (SFD)	26,304	32,150	321,497	29,616	36,198	361,977	3,312	4,048	40,480	10.00%			40,480
2 Res - Medium (SFA)	2,355	2,944	25,318	6,824	8,530	73,358	4,469	5,586	48,040	11.63%			48,040
3 Res - Medium /High	4,374	4,374	44,361	5,161	5,161	52,348	787	787	7,987	9.85%			7,987
4 Apartments	6,409	7,477	69,433	6,670	7,781	72,254	261	304	2,821	10.78%			2,821
5 Elderly Residential	419	419	3,458	499	499	4,118	80	80	660	12.12%			660
6 Mobile Homes	1,459	1,345	13,733	1,639	1,510	15,422	180	165	1,689	9.77%			1,689
7 Office (0-99 TSF)	689	690	5,988	948	948	6,997	259	258	1,009	25.57%			1,009
8 Office (100 TSF+)	1,218	1,195	10,116	9,461	9,319	64,903	8,243	8,124	54,787	14.83%			54,787
9 Government Office	1,889	1,889	23,468	2,002	2,002	23,468	113	113	0				0
10 Medical Office	183	1,165	17,344	270	1,252	17,344	87	87	0				0
11 General Commercial	1,986	14,233	167,488	2,563	18,369	216,156	577	4,136	48,668	8.50%	6.99%	61.3%	29,831
12 Regional Commercial	611	2,757	30,910	1,673	4,940	84,694	1,062	2,183	53,784	4.06%	6.99%	61.3%	32,966
13 Communitycommercial	2,330	7,695	103,426	3,328	10,990	147,707	998	3,295	44,281	7.44%	6.99%	61.3%	27,142
14 Nghbrhd Commercial	503	1,823	21,071	1,414	5,129	59,288	911	3,306	38,217	8.65%	6.99%	61.3%	23,425
15 Cnvnc Commercial	236	938	9,313	245	973	9,667	9	35	354	9.89%	6.99%	61.3%	217
16 Restaurant	378	2,274	27,735	438	2,634	32,134	60	360	4,399	8.18%			4,399
17 Fast-Food Restaurant	4,159	2,477	47,080	4,583	2,730	51,884	424	253	4,804	5.27%			4,804
18 Motel	526	458	7,575	525	462	7,171	(1)	4	(404)	-0.99%			(404)
19 Hotel	997	819	12,600	1,944	1,631	23,457	947	812	10,857	7.48%	7.48%	65.6%	7,119
20 Auto Dealer	1,331	1,936	19,269	1,331	1,936	19,269	0	0	0				0
21 Business Park	814	588	6,270	19,224	15,032	116,574	18,410	14,444	110,304	13.09%			110,304
22 Warehouse	27	40	270	41	54	270	14	14	0				0
23 Light Ind (Exist)	5,503	5,996	38,427	7,554	8,031	37,159	2,051	2,035	(1,268)	-160.49%			(1,268)
24 Light Ind (Future)	1,654	1,588	18,875	31,150	30,260	253,944	29,496	28,672	235,069	12.20%			235,069
25 Industrial	1,928	2,698	20,930	4,257	5,258	27,193	2,329	2,560	6,263	40.87%			6,263
26 Agriculture	47	47	468	32	32	315	(15)	(15)	(153)	9.80%			(153)
27 Elementary School	2,727	545	18,541	3,657	731	24,865	930	186	6,324	2.94%			6,324
28 Junior High School	755	151	5,137	2,045	409	13,909	1,290	258	8,772	2.94%			8,772
29 High School	1,804	1,336	9,285	4,720	3,496	24,297	2,916	2,160	15,012	14.39%			15,012
30 College	816	576	7,440	816	576	7,440	0	0	0				0
31 Golf Course	60	60	1,663	60	60	1,663	0	0	0				0
32 Civic Auditorium	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0				0
33 Church	0	0	797	0	0	1,314	0	0	517	0.00%			517
34 Park	0	0	1,039	0	0	2,235	0	0	1,196	0.00%			1,196
35 Harbor Related	622	1,188	3,533	622	1,188	3,533	0	0	0				0
36 Hospital	840	1,099	11,354	751	945	8,482	(89)	(154)	(2,872)	5.36%			(2,872)
37 Health Club	328	737	8,190	274	616	6,840	(54)	(121)	(1,350)	8.96%			(1,350)
38 Transportation Cntr	66	64	420	66	64	420	0	0	0				0
39 Theatre	0	169	1,540	0	121	1,100	0	(48)	(440)	10.91%			(440)
40 Airport	30	30	300	30	30	300	0	0	0				0
41 Service Station	378	450	13,464	399	475	14,212	21	25	748	3.34%			748
42 Bank	311	1,166	13,135	311	1,166	13,135	0	0	0				0
43 Cemetary	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0				0
44 Car Wash	63	75	2,244	63	75	2,244	0	0	0				0
45 Self-Storage	45	61	424	75	100	697	30	39	273	14.29%			273
46 Auto Repair	633	791	7,910	633	791	7,910	0	0	0				0
47 Edison Power Plant	71	71	159	71	71	159	0	0	0				0
48 Landfill	0	0	550	0	0	550	0	0	0				0
49 Beach	0	202	1,686	0	202	1,686	0	0	0				0
50 Marina	0	0	0	3	5	84	3	5	84	5.95%			84
51 Day Care Center	0	0	0	1,251	1,353	7,370	1,251	1,353	7,370	18.36%			7,370
52 Cultural/Perf Arts	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0				0
TOTAL	77,878	108,786	1,175,234	159,239	194,135	1,923,516	81,361	85,349	748,282	11.41%			672,821

000161

ATTACHMENT 11
PAGE 1 OF 14

(ENR = 6080)

UNIT COST FOR REIMBURSEMENT

IMPROVEMENT COSTS

BY PROJECT SIZE

		UNIT COST	UNIT	PROJECT SIZE
1	CONC. CURB	$10.00	L.F.	
2	CONC. CURB & GUTTER	$10.00	L.F.	SMALL : SUM COST < $200,000 ALLOW 10% ABOVE,
3	MEDIAN CURB	$10.00	L.F.	
4	CONC. SIDEWALK	$3.00	SQ. FT.	
5	PVMT. AC. (PER IN. TH.)	$0.25	SQ. FT.	
	PVMT. BASE (PER IN. TH.) (EARTHWORK NOT INCLUDED)	$0.15	SQ. FT.	MEDIUM : $200,000 ≤ SUM COST & SUM COST ≤ $1,000,000 USE THESE UNIT COSTS.
6	LANDSCAPING & IRRIGATION	$6.46	SQ. FT.	
7	BOMANITE	$8.00	SQ. FT.	
8	TRAFFIC SIGNAL INTERCONNECT	$10.00	L.F.	LARGE : SUM COST > $1,000,000 ALLOW 20% UNDER,
9	SIGNS & STRIPES	$3.50	L.F. OF ST.	
10	LIGHTING & TRENCHING	$10.00	L.F.	

ATTACHMENT #1
PAGE 10 OF 14

(ENR = 6080)

UNIT COST FOR REIMBURSEMENT

SEWER IMPROVEMENT COSTS

	PIPE SIZE	UNIT COST	UNIT
1	10" V.C.P.	$25.00	L.F.
2	12" V.C.P.	$30.00	L.F.
3	15" V.C.P.	$37.50	L.F.
4	18" V.C.P.	$45.00	L.F.
5	21" V.C.P.	$52.50	L.F.
6	24" V.C.P.	$60.00	L.F.
7	FT. MANHOLE PRECAST 48" DIAM. $200 PER VERT. FT. (ADD $20/FT. FOR DROP M.H.)		EACH
8	MANHOLE RING & COVER (CAST IRON)	$400.00	EACH

FOR PIPE INSTALLATION IN UNPAVED (NEW) STREETS & OTHER AREAS, REDUCE UNIT COST BY 25%.

ATTACHMENT # 1
PAGE 11 OF 14

(ENR = 6080)

UNIT COST FOR REIMBURSEMENT

WATER IMPROVEMENT COSTS

	SIZE	UNIT COST	UNIT
1	10" PIPE, IN PLACE	$27.00	L.F.
2	12" PIPE, IN PLACE	$32.00	L.F.
3	14" PIPE, IN PLACE	$36.00	L.F.
4	16" PIPE, IN PLACE	$42.00	L.F.
5	20" PIPE, IN PLACE	$52.00	L.F.
6	10" TEE, IN PLACE	$400.00	EACH
7	12" TEE, IN PLACE	$500.00	EACH
8	16" TEE, IN PLACE	$1,400.00	EACH
9	20" TEE, IN PLACE	$2,000.00	EACH
10	10" CROSS, IN PLACE	$550.00	EACH
11	12" CROSS, IN PLACE	$650.00	EACH
12	16" CROSS, IN PLACE	$1,500.00	EACH
13	20" CROSS, IN PLACE	$2,200.00	EACH
14	12"x10" REDUCER, IN PLACE	$250.00	EACH
26	16"x10" REDUCER, IN PLACE	$1,000.00	EACH
27	20"x10" REDUCER, IN PLACE	$1,500.00	EACH
28	2" BLOW-OFF, IN PLACE	$400.00	EACH
29	6" BLOW-OFF, IN PLACE	$1,200.00	EACH
30	10" ELL 90 OR 45 DEG., IN PLACE	$300.00	EACH
31	12" ELL 90 OR 45 DEG., IN PLACE	$350.00	EACH
32	16" ELL 90 OR 45 DEG., IN PLACE	$1,000.00	EACH
33	20" ELL 90 OR 45 DEG., IN PLACE	$1,500.00	EACH
34	10" VALVE, IN PLACE	$800.00	EACH
35	12" VALVE, IN PLACE	$900.00	EACH
36	16" VALVE, IN PLACE	$2,000.00	EACH
37	20" VALVE, IN PLACE	$3,000.00	EACH
38	1" AIR RELEASE	$400.00	EACH

FOR INSTALLATION OF ALL NEW ITEMS
IN UNPAVED (NEW) STREETS& OTHER AREAS,
REDUCE COST BY 25%.

(ENR = 6080)

UNIT COST FOR REIMBURSEMENT

UNIT COST FOR REIMBURSEMENT

DRAINAGE IMPROVEMENT COSTS

	PIPE SIZE	UNIT COST	UNIT
1	18" R.C.P., IN PLACE	$45.00	L.F.
2	21" R.C.P., IN PLACE	$50.00	L.F.
3	24" R.C.P., IN PLACE	$60.00	L.F.
4	30" R.C.P., IN PLACE	$75.00	L.F.
5	36" R.C.P., IN PLACE	$83.00	L.F.
6	42" R.C.P., IN PLACE	$97.00	L.F.
7	42" R.C.P., IN PLACE	$110.00	L.F.
8	60" R.C.P., IN PLACE	$132.00	L.F.
9	72" R.C.P., IN PLACE	$150.00	L.F.
10	STANDARD MANHOLE	$2,500.00	EACH
11	JUNCTION STRUCTURES	$1,500.00	EACH
12	STANDARD CATCH BASIN	$3,000.00	EACH
13	CLASS A REINFORCED CONC. (MORE THAN 100 C.Y.) (INCLUDES REINFORCEMENT)	$320.00	CU. YD.
14	CLASS A REINFORCED CONC. (LESS THAN 100 C.Y.) (INCLUDES REINFORCEMENT)	$380.00	CU. YD.

FOR PIPE INSTALLATION IN UNPAVED (NEW) STREETS & OTHER AREAS, REDUCE UNIT COST BY 25%.

ATTACHMENT # 1
PAGE 13 OF 14

(ENR = 6080)

UNIT COST FOR REIMBURSEMENT

RIGHT - OF - WAY COSTS

	LAND USE	COST PER ACRE		COST PER SQ.FT.
1	AGRICULTURAL	$110,000		$2.53
2	RESIDENTIAL	$220,000		$5.05
3	LIGHT MANUFACTURING	$275,000		$6.31
4	COMMERCIAL	$475,000		$10.90
5	COASTAL DEVELOPEMENT	$330,000		$7.58

ABOVE COSTS INCLUDE APPRAISAL COSTS, LEGAL COSTS, & CONDEMNATION COSTS, IF ANY.

ATTACHMENT #1
PAGE 14 OF 14

June 18, 2007

Interim Traffic Fee Calculation

City Contribution To Freeway Improvements	**1992 Study**	**Inflation**	**2007**
1. Rice Bypass freeway	$8.7 million	X 1.31	$11.4 million
2. Rice/101			$76.8
3. Rose/101			$21.3
4. Route1/Rice/Pl Valley			$0.9
5. Route 101/Santa Clara Bridge			$18.0
6. Del Norte/101			$39.0
		Total Freeways	$167.4 million
Roadways	$246.4 million	X 1.31	$322.8 million
Other Costs	$50.6 million	X 1.31	$66.3 million
		Total Cost of Improvements	$556.5 million
Total Number of Trips to Buildout (as of 1992)			672,821 trips
COST PER TRIP			$827 preliminary
Deduct 11% and round down			**$730 per daily trip**

ATTACHMENT #2
PAGE 1 OF 1

CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF OXNARD

RESOLUTION NO.

A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF OXNARD ADOPTING A NEGATIVE DECLARATION, SETTING INTERIM PLANNED TRAFFIC CIRCULATION FACILITIES FEES AND STATING THE URGENCY THEREOF

WHEREAS, Division 5 of Article VI of Chapter 15 of the Oxnard City Code imposes planned traffic circulation facilities fees on development projects producing additional vehicle trips, such fees to be set by resolution; and

WHEREAS, the Public Works Director has presented to the City Council a report entitled "Adjustment of Planned Circulation Facilities Fees", dated June 18, 2007, which sets forth the basis of the fees adopted by this resolution; and

WHEREAS, the City Council desires to adopt this interim resolution in order to cause the subject fees to be effective on June 27, 2007; and

WHEREAS, in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act, the Planning and Environmental Services Manager provided public notice of the intent of the City to adopt a negative declaration for this project, and the City Council has considered the proposed negative declaration, together with any comments received during the public review process, and finds on the basis of the whole record before it (including the initial study and any comments received) that there is no substantial evidence that the project will have a significant effect on the environment, and further finds that the negative declaration reflects the independent judgment of the City, and adopts the negative declaration; and

WHEREAS, the City Council finds that the fees adopted herein satisfy the requirements of law, including the Oxnard City Code.

NOW, THEREFORE, the City Council of the City of Oxnard resolves as follows:

1. Development Projects. All development projects producing additional vehicle trips shall pay the planned traffic circulation facilities fees established by this resolution.

2. Staff Report.

a. The staff report dated June 18, 2007, is attached hereto as Exhibit A and is hereby approved and incorporated herein by this reference. Such report provides the basis for the City Council's determination that there is a reasonable relationship between the amount of the planned traffic circulation facilities fees ("fees") established herein and the cost of the traffic circulation facilities or portion thereof attributable to the development project on which the fees are imposed.

b. The methodology for determining the fee is to estimate the costs associated with each new vehicle trip that is created by development. This is accomplished by first

estimating the costs to acquire necessary rights-of-way and construct improvements in the City's traffic circulation facilities that are consistent with the City's 2020 General Plan. Such costs are then divided by the estimated number of new vehicle trips such improvements will serve. The resulting quotient is the estimated costs per each new vehicle trip added by development within the City. Such fee per vehicle trip is then multiplied by the estimated number of new vehicle trips associated with a specific development. The estimated number of new vehicle trips is based upon trip generation rates developed by the Institute of Transportation Engineers and published in its Trip Generation Report, 7th Edition for all uses except single family detached residential uses. The San Diego Association of Governments ("SANDAG") Traffic Generation Rates are used for single family detached residential uses.

c. The number of new vehicle trips served by the improvements to the City's traffic circulation facilities is 672,821 trips. This number was arrived at by a traffic study completed in 1992 that estimated the number of new vehicle trips the improvements would serve.

d. The estimated costs for the acquisition of rights-of-way and construction of the traffic circulation facilities are also a function of the traffic study that was completed in 1992. The costs were updated in the following manner:

(1.) The traffic circulation facilities improvements for the Rose Avenue/Highway 101 interchanges have been completed and the actual costs incurred were $21.3 million. These costs were used in the calculation.

(2.) The traffic circulation facilities improvements for Highway 101 – Vineyard Avenue to Johnson Drive are nearing completion and the City's share of the costs will be $18.0 million. These costs were used in the calculation.

(3.) The engineer's estimate for the traffic circulation facilities improvements for the Rice Avenue/Highway 101 interchange has been updated and is $76.8 million. This updated estimate was used in the calculation.

(4.) The engineer's estimate for the traffic circulation facilities improvements for Del Norte Boulevard/Highway 101 interchange has been updated and is $39.0 million. This updated estimate was used in the calculation.

(5.) The engineer's estimate for the City's contribution towards the traffic circulation facilities improvements for the Highway 1/ Rice Avenue Interchange/ Rice Avenue extension remains unchanged from the 1992 study. This estimate was used in the calculation.

(6.) The remaining estimates have been adjusted for inflation by using the current Construction Cost Index and dividing by the estimated Construction Cost Index used to make the estimates used in the 1992 study. This resulted in multiplying the remaining estimates by a factor of 1.31.

e. The fee per additional vehicle trip was then further reduced to reflect a conservative methodology and rounded down to a fee of $730 per each new vehicle trip.

f. Such fee is further refined by using specific traffic generation factors associated with specific types of development.

g. The resulting fees preserve a reasonable relationship between the need for traffic circulation facilities improvements and the development projects on which the fees will be imposed because such development projects cause traffic congestion on a citywide basis that the traffic circulation facilities improvements mitigate or will mitigate.

h. There is a reasonable relationship between the fees' use and development projects on which the fees will be imposed because the fees will only fund that portion of the improvements allocable to congestion caused by those development projects.

i. The City Council further determines that there is a reasonable relationship between the use of the fees and the type of development project on which the fee is imposed, and between the need for traffic circulation facilities and the type of development project on which the fee is imposed. The master plan of traffic circulation, the Circulation Element of the 2020 General Plan, the report referred to in subsection (a) of this section, and the provisions of Division 5 of Article VI of Chapter 15 of the Oxnard City Code provide the basis for such determination.

3. Fees. The total fee per additional trip is $730.

4. Calculation of Fees. The fees imposed on each development project will be calculated as follows:

a. The Public Works Director shall be responsible for calculating the fees imposed on each development project.

b. Development projects subject to the fees include modifications or additions to existing buildings that generate more average daily vehicle trips than can be reasonably attributed to the current size, condition or use of the property. The Public Works Director shall consider changes in use of the property and/or additions to the gross floor area.

c. For non-office commercial land uses, the total number of trips generated shall be adjusted using the peak to average trip ratio for commercial uses divided by the same statistic for all other land uses. This adjustment shall be made to account for the fact that the commercial uses generate proportionately less peak time travel than other uses and, therefore, such uses impact the circulation system to a lesser degree than would be suggested from use of unadjusted average trip date. The City Council finds that the peak to average trip ratio is found to be 6.99 percent for general commercial uses and 7.48 percent for hotels, while the peak to average trip ration for other uses is determined to be 11.41 percent. The adjustment factor is, therefore, 6.99/11.41 = 0.613 for general non-office commercial and 7.48/11.41 = 0.656 for hotel/motel uses.

d. Trip generation rates have been prepared based upon statistical data collected and analyzed by the Institute of Transportation Engineers and published in its Trip Generation Report, 7th Edition and SANDAG Traffic Generation Rates.

e. Trip generation rates and the resulting fees shall be as follows for specific types of development projects:

(1) Residential.

(a) Single Family Detached

11.0 Trips/Unit x $730/Trip = $8,030/ Unit

(b) Condominium

8.6 Trips/Unit x $730/Trip = $6,278/ Unit

(c) Apartment

6.5 Trips/Unit x $730/Trip = $4,745/ Unit

(d) Mobile Home

5.0 Trips/Unit x $730/Trip = $3,650/ Unit

(2) Commercial

(a) General Retail and Service

27.1 Trips/1,000 gross square feet of floor area x $730/Trip = $19,783/1,000 gross square feet of floor area.

Note: This trip estimate has been modified pursuant to section 4.c, above.

(b) General Office

15 Trips/1,000 gross square feet of floor area x $730/Trip = $10,950/1,000 gross square feet of floor area.

(c) Medical Office

36.1 Trips/1,000 gross square feet of floor area x $730/Trip = $26,353/1,000 gross square feet of floor area.

(d) Motel/Hotel

6.5 Trips/room x $730/Trip = $4,745/room

(3) Industrial

(a) Research and Development (B-R-P Zone)

11.40 Trips/1,000 gross square feet of floor area x $730/Trip = $8,322/1,000 gross square feet of floor area.

(b) Light Industrial

6.96 Trips/1,000 gross square feet of floor area x $730/Trip = $5,081/1,000 gross square feet of floor area.

(c) Warehousing

4.96 Trips/1000 gross square feet of floor area x $730/Trip= $3,621/1000 gross square feet of floor area

(4) Special Projects

Traffic generation rates for developments and redevelopments not adequately represented above shall be determined according to the most similar current designation for which the Institute of Transportation Engineers provides trip generation statistics, or a project specific study acceptable to the Public Works Director.

5. Pursuant to Government Code section 66017, the fees imposed by this resolution are effective on August 26, 2007.

6. Government Code section 66017(b), however, authorizes City Council upon making certain findings by a 4/5 vote to order the fees to be effective immediately for a period of thirty days. Section 66017(b) also authorizes City Council to extend the effective date of this urgency resolution for an additional thirty days after notice and a public hearing.

7. This resolution is adopted pursuant to Government Code section 66017(b) because its passage is required for the immediate preservation of the public health, welfare and safety. The facts constituting this urgency are that: (a) there is a pressing need for infrastructure that will service new developments, (b) the provision of this essential infrastructure is dependant upon the availability of revenues from the fee imposed by this resolution, and (c) in order to ensure that the developers of all new developments proposed at this time in the City be responsible for paying their fair share of infrastructure costs. These facts constitute a current and immediate threat to the public health, welfare and safety. Accordingly, the City Council determines and finds that it is necessary for this resolution to be effective immediately on June 27, 2007.

8. The City Council orders that this urgency resolution be effective and the subject fee be imposed effective June 27, 2007.

9. Resolution No. 10,673 is superseded upon the effective date of this resolution.

10. If any provision, section, paragraph, sentence or word of this resolution, or the application thereof to any person or circumstance, is rendered or declared invalid by any court of competent jurisdiction, the remaining provisions, sections, paragraphs, sentences or words of this resolution, and their application to other persons or circumstances, shall not be affected thereby and shall remain in full force and effect and, to that end, the provisions of this resolution are severable.

PASSED AND ADOPTED THIS ___ day of _____, 2007 by the following vote:

AYES:

NOES:

ABSENT:

_____
Dr. Thomas E. Holden, Mayor

ATTEST:

_____
Daniel Martinez, City Clerk

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

Gary Gillig 06-21-07
Gary L. Gillig, City Attorney