CITY OF SELMA

DEVELOPMENT IMPACT FEE NEXUS STUDY UPDATE

FINAL

NOVEMBER 20, 2024

Oakland Office
66 Franklin Street
Suite 300
Oakland, CA 94607
Tel: (510) 832-0899

Corporate Office
27368 Via Industria
Suite 200
Temecula, CA 92590
Tel: (800) 755-6864
Fax: (888) 326-6864

Other Regional Offices
Aurora, CO
Orlando, FL
Phoenix, AZ
Plano, TX
Seattle, WA
Washington, DC

www.willdan.com

This page intentionally left blank.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Executive Summary

This report summarizes an analysis of development impact fees needed to support future development in the City of Selma through 2050. It is the City's intent that the costs representing future development's share of public facilities and capital 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 are divided into the fee categories listed below:

- Law Enforcement
- Fire Suppression
- Circulation
- Storm Drainage
- Wastewater
- City Facilities
- Public Use (Community Center) Facilities
- Parks

Background and Study Objectives

The primary policy objective of a development impact fee program is to ensure that new development pays the capital costs associated with growth. The primary purpose of this report is to calculate and present fees that will enable the City to expand its inventory of public facilities, as new development creates increases in service demands.

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

The *Mitigation Fee Act* findings required to implement impact fees in California demonstrate the *essential nexus* between new development and a fee to fund facilities needed to serve that development. The term *essential nexus* refers to the relationship between new development and the need for facilities (and corresponding impact fees) to serve that development. The findings also require that this study demonstrates *rough proportionality* of the fees- meaning that the amount of the exactions must roughly correspond to the burden placed on the government, resulting from the proposed development project. To ensure that fees are roughly proportional to demand for facilities from new development, this study first allocates facilities costs to new development using the allocation methods described below, then to individual units of new development based on the demand characteristics of each unit, by land use type. This is described in detail in each chapter and summarized in Chapter 13.

All development impact fee-funded capital projects should be programmed through the City's five-year Capital Improvement Plan (CIP). Using a CIP can help the City 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 can help ensure a reasonable relationship between new development and the use of fee revenues as required by the *Mitigation Fee Act*.

Facility Standards and Costs

This study uses two approaches to calculate facilities standards and allocate the costs of planned facilities to accommodate growth in compliance with the *Mitigation Fee Act* requirements.

The **planned facilities** approach allocates costs based on the ratio of planned facilities that serve new development to the increase in demand associated with new development. This approach is appropriate when specific planned facilities that only benefit new development can be identified, or when the specific share of facilities benefiting new development can be identified. Examples

include street improvements to avoid deficient levels of service or a sewer trunk line extension to a previously undeveloped area. This approach is used for all of the fee calculations, except for the park facilities impact fee category in this report.

The **existing inventory** approach is based on a facility standard derived from the City's existing level of facilities and existing demand for services. This approach results in no facility deficiencies attributable to existing development. Future facilities to serve growth will be identified through the City's annual capital improvement plan and budget process. This approach is to calculate the park facilities fees in this report.

Use of Fee Revenues

The Mitigation Fee Act requires that this analysis "Identify the use to which the fee is to be put. If the use is financing public facilities, the facilities shall be identified. That identification may, but need not, be made by reference to a capital improvement plan as specified in Section 65403 or 66002, may be made in applicable general or specific plan requirements, or may be made in other public documents that identify the public facilities for which the fee is charged."[1] Each chapter in this report identifies the appropriate use of impact fee revenues for each particular impact fee category.

Impact fee revenue must be spent on new facilities or expansion of current facilities to serve new development. Facilities can be generally defined as capital acquisition items with a useful life greater than five years. Impact fee revenue can be spent on capital facilities to serve new development, including but not limited to land acquisition, construction of buildings, infrastructure, the acquisition of vehicles or equipment, information technology, software licenses and equipment.

Development Impact Fee Schedule Summary

Table E.1 summarizes the development impact fees that meet the City's identified needs and comply with the requirements of the *Mitigation Fee Act*. The City's current impact fee schedule is summarized in **Table E.2.**

1 *California Government Code* §66001 (a) (2).

E.1: Maximum Justified Development Impact Fee Schedule

Land Use	Law Enforcement	Fire Suppression	Circulation Facilities	Storm Drainage	Wastewater	Wastewater (Amberwood)	City Facilities	Public Use Facilities	Parks[1]	Total (Citywide)	Total (Amberwood)
Residential											
per Square Foot	$ 0.38	$ 0.93	$ 1.35	$ 1.13	$ 2.11	$ 0.90	$ 0.35	$ 0.43	$ 3.71	$ 10.39	$ 9.18
per Average Sized Unit	950	2,325	3,375	2,825	5,275	2,250	875	1,075	9,275	25,975	22,950
Nonresidential - per Square Foot											
Commercial	$ 0.20	$ 0.53	$ 5.90	$ 2.54	$ 0.95	$ 0.41	$ 0.18	$ -	$ -	$ 10.30	$ 9.76
Office	0.30	0.81	6.18	2.01	0.95	0.41	0.28	-	-	10.53	9.99
Industrial	0.11	0.29	3.58	2.70	1.11	0.47	0.10	-	-	7.89	7.25
Commercial Lodging Room	$ 52	$ 140	$ 2,351	$ 1,384	$ 526	$ 226	$ 47	$ -	$ -	$ 4,500	$ 4,200

[1] Quimby Act Fee shown for development occurring in subdivisions. Refer to Table 10.7 for infill fee schedule.

Sources: Tables 3.6, 4.6, 5.5, 6.5, 7.5, 8.6, 9.6 and 10.7.

E.2: Existing Development Impact Fee Schedule

Land Use	Law Enforcement	Fire Suppression	Circulation Facilities	Storm Drainage	Wastewater	City Facilities	Public Use Facilities	Parks	Open Space	Total
Residential - per Dwelling Unit										
Single Family	$ 533	$ 531	$ 1,894	$ 5,998	$ 770	$ 585	$ 2,097	$ 7,165	$ 209	$ 19,781
Multifamily	1,504	1,838	1,264	1,688	731	585	1,994	6,814	199	16,619
Nonresidential - per Square Foot										
Commercial	$ 0.46	$ 0.08	$ 4.31	$ 0.79	$ 0.09	$ 0.10	$ -	$ -	$ 0.02	$ 5.85
Office	0.46	0.08	3.25	1.19	0.09	0.10	-	-	0.02	5.19
Industrial	0.00	0.01	2.61	0.61	0.09	0.10	-	-	0.01	3.44
Commercial Lodging Room	$ 511	$ 1,128	$ 565	$ 1,037	$ 317	$ 146	$ -	$ -	$ 22	$ 3,726

Source: City of Selma.

Other Funding Needed

Impact fees may only fund the share of public facilities related to new development in Selma. They may not be used to fund the share of facility needs generated by existing development or by development outside of the City. As shown in **Table E.3,** approximately $138.6 million in additional funding will be needed to complete the facility projects the City currently plans to develop. The "Additional Funding Required" column shows non-impact fee funding required to fund a share of the improvements partially funded by impact fees. Non-fee funding is needed because these facilities are needed partially to remedy existing deficiencies and partly to accommodate new development.

The City will need to develop alternative funding sources to fund existing development's share of the planned facilities. Potential sources of revenue include but are not limited to existing or new general fund revenues, existing or new taxes, special assessments, and grants.

Table E.3: Non-Impact Fee Funding Required

Fee Category	Total Project Cost	Existing Fund Balance	Development Fee Revenue	Additional Funding Required
Law Enforcement	$ 24,795,000	$ 107,371	$ 24,687,629	$ -
Fire Suppression	61,033,000	186,843	60,846,157	-
Circulation Facilities	331,562,900	1,974,372	193,130,483	136,458,045
Storm Drainage	128,682,800	203,285	126,295,465	2,184,050
Wastewater	114,459,578	447,144	114,012,434	-
Wastewater (Amberwood)	11,227,361	-	11,227,361	-
City Facilities	22,687,000	319,836	22,367,164	-
Public Use Facilities	23,500,000	168,177	23,331,823	-
Parks	199,450,000	-	199,450,000	-
	$ 917,397,639	$ 3,407,028	$ 775,348,516	$ 138,642,095

Sources: Tables 3.5, 4.5, 5.3, 5.4, 6.3, 6.4, 7.3, 7.4, 8.5, 9.5 and 10.5.

1. Introduction

This report presents an analysis of the need for public facilities to accommodate new development in the City of Selma. This chapter provides background for the study and explains the study approach under the following sections:

- Public Facilities Financing in California;
- Study Objectives;
- Fee Program Maintenance;
- Study Methodology; and,
- Organization of the Report.

Public Facilities Financing in California

The changing fiscal landscape in California during the past 45 years has steadily undercut the financial capacity of local governments to fund infrastructure. Four 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;
- Unfunded state and federal mandates; and,
- Steep reductions in federal and state assistance.

Faced with these trends, many cities and counties have had to adopt a policy of "growth pays its own way." This policy shifts the burden of funding infrastructure expansion from existing ratepayers 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 the approval of property owners and are appropriate when the funded facilities are directly related to the developing property. Development impact fees, on the other hand, are an appropriate funding source for facilities that benefit all development jurisdiction-wide. Development impact fees need only a majority vote of the legislative body for adoption.

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. *Policy 2.37* of the City's General Plan states "The City will continue to collect development impact fees for the circulation system (streets, signals and bridges) and shall revise and update the development impact fees as needed." *Policy 6.1* of the City's General Plan states "Coordinate City-wide sewer, water, and storm drainage master plans which implement adopted land use goals, objectives and policies and Federal and State regulations. These master plans shall be updated as needed and implemented through various funding mechanisms including assessment district, property owner's association's user fees, development impact fees, mitigation payments, reimbursement agreements and/or other mechanisms which provide for equitable distribution of development and maintenance costs."

The primary purpose of this report is to update the City's impact fees based on the most current available facility plans and growth projections. The proposed fees will enable the City to expand

its inventory of public facilities as new development leads to increases in service demands. This report supports the General Plan policies stated above.

The City imposes public facilities fees under authority granted by the Mitigation Fee Act (the Act), contained in California Government Code Sections 66000 et seq. This report provides the necessary findings required by the Act to demonstrate the *essential nexus* between new development and the impact fees needed to support that development. The findings demonstrate that the fees are proportional to demand for facilities from new development and are necessary to allow the City to adopt the fee schedules presented in this report.

Selma is forecast to have significant growth through this study's planning horizon of 2050. This growth will create an increase in demand for public services and the facilities required to deliver them. Given the revenue challenges described above, Selma has decided to use a development impact fee program to ensure that new development funds the share of facility costs associated with growth. This report makes use of the most current available growth forecasts and capital facilities planning documents to update the City's existing fee program to ensure that the fee program accurately represents the facility needs resulting from new development.

Fee Program Maintenance

Once a fee program has been adopted it must be properly maintained to ensure that the revenue collected adequately funds the facilities needed by new development. To avoid collecting inadequate revenue, the inventories of existing facilities and costs for planned facilities must be updated periodically for inflation, and the fees recalculated to reflect the higher costs. The use of established indices for each facility included in the inventories (land, buildings, and equipment), such as the *California Construction Cost Index*, is necessary to accurately adjust the impact fees.

While fee updates using inflation indices are appropriate for annual or periodic updates to ensure that fee revenues keep up with increases in the costs of public facilities, it is recommended 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. For further detail on fee program implementation, see Chapter 12.

Study Methodology

Development impact fees are calculated to fund the cost of facilities required to accommodate growth. The six steps followed in this development impact fee study include:

1. **Estimate existing development and future growth:** Identify a base year for existing development and a growth forecast that reflects increased demand for public facilities;
2. **Identify facility standards:** Determine the facility standards used to plan for new and expanded facilities;
3. **Determine facilities required to serve new development:** Estimate the total amount of planned facilities, and identify the share required to accommodate new development;
4. **Determine the cost of facilities required to serve new development:** Estimate the total amount and the share of the cost of planned facilities required to accommodate new development;
5. **Calculate fee schedule:** Allocate facilities costs per unit of new development to calculate the development impact fee schedule; and
6. **Identify alternative funding requirements:** Determine if any non-fee funding is required to complete projects.

The key public policy issue in development impact fee studies is the identification of facility standards (step #2, above). Facility standards document a reasonable relationship between new development and the need for new facilities. Standards ensure that new development does not fund deficiencies associated with existing development.

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 vehicle volume-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 the cost of planned facilities built to satisfy the City's facility design standards.
- *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) and are useful when different facilities are funded by a single fee program. Examples include facility costs per capita, cost 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. This is often a two-step process: (1) identify total facility needs, and (2) allocate to new development its fair share of those needs.

This study uses two common methods for determining new development's fair share of planned facilities costs: the **planned facilities method,** and the **existing inventory method**. The formula used by each approach and the advantages and disadvantages of each method is summarized below:

Planned Facilities Method

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

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

This method is appropriate when planned facilities will entirely serve new development, or when a fair share allocation of planned facilities to new development can be estimated. An example of the former is a Wastewater trunk line extension to a previously undeveloped area. An example of the latter is a portion of a roadway that has been identified as necessary to mitigate the impact from new development through traffic modeling analysis. Under this method new development will fund the expansion of facilities at the standards used in the applicable planning documents. This approach is used for all fees except for the park facilities fees in this report.

Existing Inventory Method

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

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

Under this method new development will fund 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 approach is to calculate the park facilities fees in this report.

Organization of the Report

The determination of a public facilities fee begins with the selection of a planning horizon and development of growth projections for population and employment. These projections are used throughout the analysis of different facility categories and are summarized in Chapter 2.

Chapters 3 through 10 identify facility standards and planned facilities, allocate the cost of planned facilities between new development and other development, and identify the appropriate development impact fee for each of the following facility categories:

- Law Enforcement
- Fire Suppression
- Circulation
- Storm Drainage
- Wastewater
- City Facilities
- Public Use (Community Center) Facilities
- Parks

Chapter 11 describes how this study complies with the requirements of AB 602.

Chapter 12 details the procedures that the City must follow when implementing a development impact fee program. Impact fee program adoption procedures are found in *California Government Code* Sections 66016 through 66018.

The five statutory findings required for adoption of the proposed public facilities fees in accordance with the Mitigation Fee Act are documented in Chapter 13.

2. Growth Forecasts

Growth projections are used as indicators of demand to determine facility needs and allocate those needs between existing and new development. This chapter explains the source for the growth projections used in this study based on a 2024 base year and a planning horizon of 2050.

Estimates of existing development and projections of future growth are critical assumptions used throughout this report. These estimates are used as follows:

- The estimate of existing development in 2024 is used as an indicator of existing facility demand and to determine existing facility standards.
- The estimate of total development in 2050 is used as an indicator of future demand to determine total facilities needed to accommodate growth and remedy existing facility deficiencies, if any.
- Estimates of growth from 2024 through 2050 are used to (1) allocate facility costs between new development and existing development, and (2) estimate total fee revenues.

The demand for public facilities is based on the service population, dwelling units or nonresidential development creating the need for the facilities.

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 types. The land use types that impact fees have been calculated for are defined below.

- **Residential:** All residential dwelling units. Fees charged per square foot of living space.
- **Commercial:** All commercial, retail, educational, and service development.
- **Office:** All general, professional, and medical office development.
- **Industrial:** All manufacturing, warehouse, distribution, and other industrial development.
- **Commercial Lodging:** All hotel, motel, resort and commercial lodging development. Fees charged per room.

Some developments may include more than one land use type, such as a mixed-use development with both residential and commercial uses. Another similar situation would be a warehousing facility that contains office space. In those cases, the facilities fee would be calculated separately for each land use type included within the building.

The City has the discretion to determine which land use type best reflects a development project's characteristics for purposes of imposing an impact fee and may adjust fees for special or unique uses to reflect the impact characteristics of the use.

Existing and Future Development

City staff characterized parcels within the City's General Plan Planning Area into four development tiers as follows:

- **Primary**: Within or directly adjacent to the City limits with a development proposal (application) or previously approved entitlement. Likely to develop within three years.

- **Tier 1**: Properties interested in developing, Specific Plans that are slated for development, parcels within the City Limits that are without development proposals, or key areas identified by the City. Development anticipated within three to nine years.
- **Tier 2**: No imminent application. Existing areas that need service adjacent to City Limits or other Specific Plans (area designated for urban development), generally outside of the sphere of influence. Development anticipated prior to 2050.
- **Tier 3**: Remaining undeveloped land in planning area. Development anticipated beyond 2050.

This nexus study assumes that parcels within the primary, tier 1, tier 2 areas of the City will develop by 2050, which is the planning horizon of this study. GIS analysis was used to identify parcels within each tier. General plan land use designations were applied to each parcel to estimate the number of dwelling units or nonresidential building square feet that could be accommodated in the City by 2050.

Table 2.1 shows the estimated number of residents, dwelling units, employees, and building square feet in Selma, both in 2024 and in 2050. The base year estimates of residents and dwelling units come from the California Department of Finance. The projection of total dwelling units in 2050 is based on the development tier GIS analysis described above. Total dwelling units in 2050 is then used to estimate population at building by multiplying the count of units by the occupant densities of 3.45 residents per single family unit and 2.49 residents per multifamily unit, based on data for Selma from the American Community Survey.

Base year employees were estimated based on data obtained from the U.S. Census Bureau's OnTheMap Application. Estimated building square feet in 2024 was calculated based on the current employment count and density factors in Table 2.2. Building square feet in 2050 is estimated based on the development tier GIS analysis described above.

Table 2.1: Demographic Assumptions

	2024	2050	Increase
Residents[1]	24,190	94,667	70,477
Dwelling Units[2]			
Single Family	5,807	21,406	15,599
Multifamily	1,475	8,166	6,691
Total	7,282	29,572	22,290
Employment[3]			
Commercial	3,033	32,265	29,232
Office	945	1,138	193
Industrial	1,907	14,966	13,059
Total	5,885	48,369	42,484
Building Square Feet (000s)[4]			
Commercial	1,431	15,219	13,789
Office	290	349	59
Industrial	1,644	12,901	11,257
Total	3,365	28,470	25,106

[1] Current household population from California Department of Finance. Projection based on GIS analysis of development potential within primary, tier 1 and tier 2 areas. Assumes 3.45 residents per single family unit and 2.49 residents per multifamily unit, per American Community Survey data.
[2] Current values from California Department of Finance. Projection based on GIS analysis of development potential within primary, tier 1 and tier 2 areas.
[3] Current estimates of primary jobs from the US Census' OnTheMap. Projection based on GIS analysis of development potential within primary, tier 1 and tier 2 areas, and occupancy density factors in Table 2.2.
[4] Estimated existing building square feet estimated based on current employment county and density factors in Table 2.2. Increase in building square feet estimated based on GIS analysis of development potential within primary, tier 1 and tier 2 areas.

Sources: California Department of Finance, Table E-5, 2024; OnTheMap Application, http://onthemap.ces.census.gov; City of Selma; Table 2.2, Willdan Financial Services.

Occupant Densities

All fees in this report are calculated based on building square feet, or commercial lodging rooms. Occupant density assumptions ensure a reasonable relationship between the size of a development project, the increase in service population associated with the project, and the amount of the fee. The densities ensure that the fee per unit of new development is roughly proportional to the demand for facilities from various types of development.

Occupant densities (residents per dwelling unit or workers per building square foot or per commercial lodging room) are the most appropriate characteristics to use for most impact fees.

The fee imposed should be based on the land use type that most closely represents the probable occupant density of the development.

The average occupant density factors used in this report are shown in **Table 2.2.** The residential density factor was calculated using the most recent data from the American Community Survey specifically for the City of Selma across all residential product types. The nonresidential occupancy factors are derived from data from the Institute of Traffic Engineers Trip Generation Manual, 11th Edition for all land uses.

Table 2.2: Occupant Density

Residential - All Units	3.19	Residents per dwelling unit
Nonresidential		
Commercial	2.12	Employees per 1,000 square feet
Office	3.26	Employees per 1,000 square feet
Industrial	1.16	Employees per 1,000 square feet
Commercial Lodging Units	0.56	Employees per Room

Sources: U.S. Census Bureau, 2022 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates, Tables B25024 and B25033; ITE Trip Generation Manual, 11th Edition; Willdan Financial Services.

3. Law Enforcement Facilities

The purpose of the law enforcement impact fee is to fund the law enforcement facilities needed to serve new development. A maximum justified fee is presented based on the planned facilities standard of law enforcement facilities per capita. The *essential nexus* for this facility category is between the demand for new law enforcement facilities from the projected increase in service population and the additional law enforcement facilities needed to meet those service demands. The fees are roughly proportional to demand because they ensure that new development will pay no more than its proportionate share of the identified planned facilities needed to serve the City through the planning horizon, and the fees are scaled based on the number of residents occupying a new dwelling unit, or the number of jobs associated with nonresidential land uses.

Service Population

Law enforcement 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 3.1 shows the existing and future projected service population for law enforcement facilities. While specific data is not available to estimate the actual ratio of demand per resident to demand by businesses (per worker) for this service, it is reasonable to assume that demand for these services is less for one employee compared to one resident, because nonresidential buildings are typically occupied less intensively than dwelling units. This study makes use of a worker weighting factor to estimate different levels of demand between residential and nonresidential land uses. The 0.31-weighting factor for workers is based on a 40-hour workweek divided by the total number of non-work hours in a week (128) and reflects the degree to which nonresidential development are typically occupied less intensively than dwelling units and consequently create a lesser demand for facilities.

Table 3.1: Law Enfoncement Facilities Service Population

	A Persons	B Weighting Factor	A x B = C Service Population
Residents			
Existing (2024)	24,190	1.00	24,190
New Development	70,477	1.00	70,477
Total (2050)	94,667		94,667
Workers			
Existing (2024)	5,885	0.31	1,824
New Development	42,484	0.31	13,170
Total (2050)	48,369		14,994
Combined Residents and Weighted Workers			
Existing (2024)			26,014
New Development			83,647
Total (2050)			109,661

[1] Workers are weighted at 0.31 of residents based on a 40 hour work week out of a possible 128 non-work hours in a week (40/128 = 0.31)

Sources: Table 2.1; Willdan Financial Services.

Facility Inventories and Standards

This section describes the City's law enforcement facility inventory and facility standards.

Existing Inventory

Police services in the City of Selma are presently based out of two facilities. **Table 3.2** summarizes the City's current inventory of law enforcement land, buildings and equipment. The assumed cost of land acquisition of $100,600 per acre is based on land sales comparisons from the previous five years, as reported by CoStar and is used consistently through this report to value land acquisition for each impact fee category. The replacement cost of buildings and equipment included in the inventory come from the City's insured property schedule.

Table 3.2: Existing Law Enforcement Facilities Inventory

	Quantity	Units	Unit Cost	Replacement Cost
Land (acres)				
New Police Station	0.54	Acres	$100,600	$ 54,324
Old Police Station	0.62	Acres	100,600	62,372
Subtotal	1.16	Acres		$ 116,696
Buildings (square feet)				
New Police Station	10,300	Sq. Ft	$ 545	$ 5,609,000
Police Station	14,000	Sq. Ft	745	10,424,236
Old Police Station - Storage	7,811	Sq. Ft	449	3,508,884
Old Police Station - Tool Shed	96	Sq. Ft	45	4,300
Subtotal	32,207	Sq. Ft		$ 19,546,420
Equipment				
New Police Station -Comm Tower			$ 78,700	$ 78,700
Old Police Station - Generator			160,100	160,100
Old Police Station - Comm Tower			24,800	24,800
Animals - 3 Police Dogs				37,500
Subtotal				$ 301,100
Total Value - Existing Facilities				$ 19,847,520

Sources: City of Selma.

Planned Facilities

Table 3.3 summarizes the planned law enforcement facilities needed to serve the City through the planning horizon of this study. The City plans to design and construct two police substations, fence in the parking lot and acquire various equipment, as identified in the City's draft CIP. New facilities costs are estimated to total $24.8 million through the planning horizon of this study.

Table 3.3: Planned Law Enforcement Facilities

	Cost
Northeast Police Substation	$13,000,000
Southwest Police Substation	11,000,000
PD Parking Lot Fence	250,000
Cellbright Tower	150,000
Surveillance Enhancements (LPR, etc.)	75,000
Tasers	120,000
Portable Radios	200,000
Total	$24,795,000

Source: City of Selma Draft FY2023-24 Capital Improvement Program.

Cost Allocation

Existing Level of Service

Table 3.4 expresses the City's current law enforcement facilities level of service in terms of an existing cost per capita. This cost per capita is not used in the fee calculation, rather it is shown here for informational purposes only.

Once the planned facilities have been constructed and new development has increased the City's service population the resulting facility cost per capita will be lower than the cost per capita shown in Table 3.4, thus new development can fully fund the identified planned facilities.

Table 3.4: Existing Level of Service

Value of Existing Facilities	$	19,847,520
Existing Service Population		26,014
Cost per Capita	$	763
Facility Standard per Resident	$	763
Facility Standard per Worker[1]		237

[1] Based on a weighing factor of 0.31.

Sources: Tables 3.1 and 3.3.

Future Level of Service

Table 3.5 shows new development's cost per capita needed to fully fund the planned facilities. The level of service indicated by the planned facility is lower than the existing standard. This level of service drives the fee calculation. This value is calculated by dividing the cost of planned facilities by the increase in service population. The value per capita is multiplied by the worker weighting factor of 0.31 to determine the value per worker.

Table 3.5: Law Enforcement Facilities Planned Facilities Standard

Cost of Planned Facilities	$	24,795,000
Less Exsting Fund Balance		107,371
Net Cost of Planned Facilities	$	24,687,629
Growth in Service Population (2024 to 2050)		83,647
Cost per Capita	$	295
Cost Allocation per Resident	$	295
Cost Allocation per Worker[1]		91

[1] Based on a weighting factor of 0.31.

Sources: Tables 3.1 and 3.3.

Use of Fee Revenue

The City can use law enforcement facilities fee revenues for the construction or purchase of buildings, land, and equipment that are part of the system of law enforcement facilities serving new development. A list of planned facilities is included in Table 3.3. The projected fee revenue is equal to the cost of planned facilities, net of existing impact fee fund balances.

Fee Schedule

Table 3.6 shows the maximum justified law enforcement facilities fee schedule. The cost per capita is converted to a fee per unit of new development based on dwelling unit and employment densities (persons per dwelling unit or employees per 1,000 square feet of nonresidential building space). The fee per average sized dwelling unit is converted into a fee per square foot by dividing the fee per dwelling unit by the assumed average square footage of a dwelling unit.

The total fee includes a two percent (2%) administrative charge to fund costs that include: (1) legal, accounting, and other administrative support and (2) impact fee program administrative costs including revenue collection, revenue, and cost accounting, mandated public reporting, and fee justification analyses.

Table 3.6: Law Enforcement Facilities Fee Schedule

Land Use	A Cost Per Capita	B Density	C = A x B Base Fee[1]	D = C x 0.02 Admin Charge[1, 2]	E = C + D Total Fee	F = E / Average Fee per Sq. Ft.
Residential Dwelling Unit	$ 295	3.19	$ 941	$ 19	$ 960	$ 0.38
Nonresidential - per 1,000 Sq. Ft.						
Commercial	$ 91	2.12	$ 193	$ 4	$ 197	$ 0.20
Office	91	3.26	297	6	303	0.30
Industrial	91	1.16	106	2	108	0.11
Commercial Lodging Units	91	0.56	51	1	52	n/a

[1] Fee per average sized dwelling unit or per 1,000 square feet of nonresidential building space.
[2] Administrative charge of 2.0 percent for (1) legal, accounting, and other administrative support and (2) impact fee program administrative costs including revenue collection, revenue and cost accounting, mandated public reporting, and fee justification analyses.
[3] Assumes an average of 2,500 square feet of livable space per unit, based on the City's building permit records since 2022.

Sources: Tables 2.2 and 3.5.

4. Fire Suppression Facilities

The purpose of the fire suppression impact fee is to fund the fire suppression facilities needed to serve new development. A maximum justified fee schedule is presented based on the planned facilities standard of fire facilities per capita. The *essential nexus* for this facility category is between the demand for new fire suppression facilities from the projected increase in service population and the additional fire suppression facilities needed to meet those service demands. The fees are roughly proportional to demand because they ensure that new development will pay no more than its proportionate share of the identified planned facilities needed to serve the City through the planning horizon, and the fees are scaled based on the number of residents occupying a new dwelling unit, or the number of jobs associated with nonresidential land uses.

Service Population

Fire facilities are used to provide services to both residents and businesses. The service population used to determine the demand for fire facilities includes both residents and workers. **Table 4.1** shows the current fire facilities service population and the estimated service population at the planning horizon of 2050.

The use of a worker demand factor of 0.34 for workers in Selma is based on an analysis of fire department call data, categorized by land use. Average annual incidents at residential land uses were divided by the residential population to yield an average annual incidents-per-capita factor. Dividing average annual incidents at nonresidential areas by average annual employment in the City yielded a comparable per-capita factor. The ratio of the worker per capita factor to the resident per capita factor is the worker demand factor used in the analysis.

Table 4.1: Fire Suppression Facilities Service Population

	A **Persons**	*B* **Weighting Factor**	*A x B = C* **Service Population**
Residents			
Existing (2024)	24,190	1.00	24,190
New Development	70,477	1.00	70,477
Total (2050)	94,667		94,667
Workers [1]			
Existing (2024)	5,885	0.34	2,001
New Development	42,484	0.34	14,445
Total (2050)	48,369		16,446
Combined Residents and Weighted Workers			
Existing (2024)			26,191
New Development			84,922
Total (2050)			111,113

[1] Workers are weighted at 0.34 of residents based on an analysis of fire call data.

Sources: Table 2.1; Willdan Financial Services.

Facility Inventories and Standards

This section describes the City's fire facility inventory and facility standards.

Existing Inventory

Table 4.2 summarizes the City's current inventory of land, apparatus and vehicles. Fire protection services are provided from two stations located within the City. The assumed cost of land acquisition of $100,600 per acre is based on land sales comparisons from the previous five years, as reported by CoStar and is used consistently through this report to value land acquisition for each impact fee category. The replacement cost for the station buildings is based Willdan's recent experience in other jurisdictions. The replacement costs of vehicles, apparatus and equipment were provided by the City for use in this analysis.

Table 4.2: Existing Fire Suppression Facilities Land and Building Inventory

	Quantity	Units	Unit Cost	Replacement Cost
Land (acres)				
Fire Station #1	0.16	acres	$100,600	$ 16,096
Fire Station #2 North Parcel	0.17	acres	100,600	17,102
Fire Station #2 South Parcel	0.22	acres	100,600	22,132
Fire Admin Bldg and parking lot	0.47	acres	100,600	47,282
Old Corporate Yard Fire Building[1]	0.07	acres	100,600	7,042
Subtotal - Land	1.09			$ 109,654
Buildings (square feet)				
Fire Station 1	3,310	Sq. Ft	$ 1,050	$ 3,475,500
Fire Station 2	2,932	Sq. Ft	1,050	3,078,600
Logistics Center	2,000	Sq. Ft	600	1,200,000
Fire Admin Building	3,680	Sq. Ft	800	2,944,000
Fire Training Facility	4,000	Sq. Ft	1,050	4,200,000
Subtotal - Buildings	15,922	Sq. Ft		$ 14,898,100
Vehicles				
Engine 110				$ 1,200,000
Engine 111				1,200,000
Engine 112				1,200,000
Truck 111				2,600,000
Squad 111				500,000
C-110				120,000
BC-110				120,000
BC-111				120,000
FM-110				120,000
Sup-550				120,000
M551				280,000
M552				280,000
M553				280,000
M554				280,000
M555				280,000
Subtotal - Vehicles				$ 8,700,000
Equipment				
Fire Station 2 Generator				$ 134,600
SCBA Compressor				100,000
O2 Compressor				120,000
Fire Apparatus Assigned Equipment				800,000
SCBA (30)				240,000
Firefighter Assigned Equipment				300,000
Extrication Equipment				180,000
EMS Gurneys (5)				200,000
EMS Cardiac Monitors (6)				300,000
Subtotal - Equipment				$ 2,374,600
Total Value - Existing Facilities				$ 26,082,354

[1] Proportional share of Old Corporate Yard acreage associated with fire building included here. Remainder included in General Facilities Inventory.

Sources: City of Selma; Willdan Financial Services.

Planned Facilities

Table 4.3 summarizes the planned facilities needed to serve the City through the planning horizon of this study, as identified by City staff. Primarily, the City plans to expand its two current fire stations, and build two new fire stations, in addition to acquiring various apparatus, vehicles and equipment. New facilities costs are estimated to total approximately $61 million through the planning horizon of this study.

Table 4.3: Planned Fire Suppression Facilities

	Description	Cost
FS-001	Station 1 Rebuild/Expand	$ 6,016,500
FS-002	Station 2 Rebuild/Expand	6,016,500
FS-003	Station 3 - Acquisition/Construction	15,000,000
FS-004	Station 4 - Acquisition/Construction	9,000,000
FS-005	EMS Facility - Acquisition/Construction	5,000,000
FS-006	Training Facility - Acquisition/Construction	6,000,000
FS-007	Logistics CenterRebuild/Expand	2,000,000
FS-008	Firefighter Assigned Equipment	540,000
FS-009	Response Engines (5)	6,000,000
FS-010	Aerial Fire Apparatus	2,600,000
FS-011	Battalion Chief Vehicles (3)	360,000
FS-012	Chief/Deputy Chief Vehicles(2)	240,000
FS-013	Admin Vehicles (3)	240,000
FS-014	EMS Response Vehicles (6)	1,680,000
FS-015	SCBA Compressor	100,000
FS-016	SCBA(30)	240,000
Total		$61,033,000

Source: City of Selma Draft FY2023-24 Capital Improvement Program.

Cost Allocation

Existing Level of Service

Table 4.4 expresses the City's current fire facilities level of service in terms of an existing cost per capita. This cost per capita is not used in the fee calculation, rather it is shown here for informational purposes only.

Table 4.4: Existing Level of Service

Value of Existing Facilities	$	26,082,354
Existing Service Population		26,191
Cost per Capita	$	996
Facility Standard per Resident	$	996
Facility Standard per Worker[1]		339

[1] Based on a weighing factor of 0.31.

Sources: Tables 4.1 and 4.3.

Future Level of Service

Table 4.5 shows new development's cost per capita needed to fully fund the planned facilities. The level of service indicated by the planned facility is lower than the existing standard. This level of service drives the fee calculation. This value is calculated by dividing the cost of planned facilities by the increase in service population. The value per capita is multiplied by the worker weighting factor of 0.34 to determine the cost per worker.

Table 4.5: Fire Suppression Facilities Planned Facilities Standard

Cost of Planned Facilities	$	61,033,000
Less Exsting Fund Balance		186,843
Net Cost of Planned Facilities	$	60,846,157
Growth in Service Population (2024 to 2050)		84,922
Cost per Capita	$	716
Cost Allocation per Resident	$	716
Cost Allocation per Worker[1]		244

[1] Based on a weighting factor of 0.34.

Sources: Tables 4.1 and 4.3.

Use of Fee Revenue

The City can use fire facilities fees for the construction or purchase of buildings, land, vehicles, apparatus and fire suppression equipment that are part of the system of fire facilities needed to serve new development. A list of planned facilities is included in Table 4.3. The projected fee revenue is equal to the cost of planned facilities, net of existing impact fee fund balances.

Fee Schedule

Table 4.6 shows the maximum justified fire suppression facilities fee schedule. The cost per capita is converted to a fee per unit of new development based on dwelling unit and employment densities (persons per dwelling unit or employees per 1,000 square feet of nonresidential building space). The fee per dwelling unit is converted into a fee per square foot by dividing the fee per dwelling unit by the assumed average square footage of a dwelling unit.

The total fee includes a two percent (2%) administrative charge to fund costs that include: (1) legal, accounting, and other administrative support and (2) impact fee program administrative costs including revenue collection, revenue, and cost accounting, mandated public reporting, and fee justification analyses.

Table 4.6: Fire Suppression Facilities Fee Schedule

	A	*B*	*C = A x B*	*D = C x 0.02*	*E = C + D*	*F = E / Average*
Land Use	**Cost Per Capita**	**Density**	**Base Fee[1]**	**Admin Charge[1, 2]**	**Total Fee**	**Fee per Sq. Ft.**
Residential Dwelling Unit	$ 716	3.19	$ 2,286	$ 46	$ 2,332	$ 0.93
Nonresidential - per 1,000 Sq. Ft.						
Commercial	$ 244	2.12	$ 517	$ 10	$ 527	$ 0.53
Office	244	3.26	795	16	811	0.81
Industrial	244	1.16	283	6	289	0.29
Commercial Lodging Unit	244	0.56	137	3	140	n/a

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

[2] Administrative charge of 2.0 percent for (1) legal, accounting, and other administrative support and (2) impact fee program administrative costs including revenue collection, revenue and cost accounting, mandated public reporting, and fee justification analyses.

[3] Assumes an average of 2,500 square feet of livable space per unit, based on the City's building permit records since 2022.

Sources: Tables 2.2 and 4.5.

5. Circulation Facilities

This chapter summarizes an analysis of the need for various circulation improvements to accommodate new development. The *essential nexus* for this facility category is between the demand for new circulation facilities from the projected increase in vehicle trips and the additional circulation facilities needed to meet those service demands. The fees are roughly proportional to demand because they ensure that new development will pay no more than its proportionate share of the identified planned facilities needed to serve the City through the planning horizon, and the fees are scaled based on the number trips generated by residential and nonresidential land uses.

Trip Demand

The need for circulation facilities is based on the trip demand placed on the system by development. A reasonable measure of demand is the number of PM peak hour vehicle trips, adjusted for pass-by trips. Vehicle trip generation rates are a reasonable measure of demand on the City's system of circulation facilities across all modes because alternate modes (transit, bicycle, pedestrian) often substitute for vehicle trips. Pass-by trips are deducted from the trip generation rate. Pass-by trips are intermediates stops between an origin and a final destination that require no diversion from the route, such as stopping to get gas on the way to work.

Table 5.1 shows the calculation of trip demand factors by land use category based on the pass-by trip adjustment described above. The data for trip rates, and the pass-by trip assumption all come from the latest data available from the Institute of Traffic Engineers.

Table 5.1: Trip Demand Factors

	Pass-by Trips[1]	Primary and Diverted Trips	Average Trip Length[2]	Adjust-ment Factor[3]	ITE Category	PM Peak Hour Trips[4]	Trip Demand Factor[5]
	A	*B = 1 - A*	C	*D = B x C / Avg.*		*E*	*F = D x E*
Residential - per Dwelling Unit							
Single Family	3%	97%	7.9	1.11	Single Family Housing (210)	0.99	1.10
Multifamily	3%	97%	7.9	1.11	Multifamily Housing (Low-Rise) (220)	0.57	0.63
Nonresidential - per 1,000 Sq. Ft.							
Commercial	22%	78%	3.6	0.41	Shopping Center (820)	4.09	1.68
Office	4%	96%	8.8	1.22	General Office (710)	1.44	1.76
Industrial	2%	98%	9.0	1.28	General Light Industrial (110)	0.80	1.02
Commercial Lodging Unit	0%	100%	7.6	1.10	Hotel (310)	0.61	0.67

[1] Percent of total trips. A pass-by trip is made as an intermediate stop on the way from an origin to a primary trip destination without a route diversion. Pass-by trips are not considered to add traffic to the road network. Based on SANDAG data.
[2] In miles. Based on SANDAG data.
[3] The trip adjustment factor equals the percent of non-pass-by trips multiplied by the average trip length and divided by the systemwide average trip length of 6.9 miles.
[4] Trips per dwelling unit or per 1,000 building square feet.
[5] The trip demand factor is the product of the trip adjustment factor and the trip rate.

Sources: Institute of Traffic Engineers, Trip Generation Manual, 11th Edition; Institute of Traffic Engineers, San Diego Association of Governments, Brief Guide of Vehicular Traffic Generation Rates for the San Diego Region, April 2002; Willdan Financial Services.

Trip Growth

The planning horizon for this analysis is 2050. **Table 5.2** lists the 2024 and 2050 land use assumptions used in this study. The trip demand factors calculated in Table 5.1 are multiplied by the existing and future dwelling units and building square feet to determine the increase in trips caused by new development.

Table 5.2: Land Use Scenario and Total Trips

Land Use	Trip Demand Factor	2024 Units / 1,000 SF	2024 Trips	Growth 2024 to 2050 Units / 1,000 SF	Growth 2024 to 2050 Trips	Total - 2050 Units / 1,000 SF	Total - 2050 Trips
Residential - per Dwelling Unit							
Single Family	1.10	5,807	6,388	15,599	17,159	21,406	23,547
Multifamily	0.63	1,475	929	6,691	4,216	8,166	5,145
Subtotal		7,282	7,317	22,290	21,375	29,572	28,692
Nonresidential - per 1,000 Sq. Ft.							
Commercial	1.68	1,431	2,404	13,789	23,165	15,219	25,569
Office	1.76	290	510	59	105	349	615
Industrial	1.02	1,644	1,677	11,257	11,482	12,901	13,159
Subtotal		3,365	4,591	25,106	34,752	28,470	39,343
Total			11,908		56,127		68,035
			17.5%		82.5%		100%

Sources: Tables 2.1 and 5.1.

Project Costs

Cost estimates are summarized in **Table 5.3** and were sourced from the City's prior development impact fee study in 2015 and adjusted for inflation to 2024 dollars. The prior study allocated 100% of all projects (except for the interchange project) to new development. City staff reviewed and revised the allocation of each project to each new development to reflect the share of each project required to accommodate new development. City staff also identified the share of each project associated with development within each development tier discussed in Chapter 2. Table 5.3 allocates the costs of each project to each development tier.

Table 5.3: Planned Circulation Facilities and Cost Allocation to New Development

Project No.	Project Name	Project Cost (2024$)	Allocation to New Development	Primary	Tier 1	Tier 2	Tier 3	Primary	Tier 1	Tier 2	Tier 3
Bridges											
ST-001	New Bridge - DeWolf At Dinuba	$ 1,828,800	50%	0%	0%	0%	50%	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 914,400
ST-004	Widen Bridge - Floral At Orange	132,100	100%	0%	100%	0%	0%	-	132,100	-	-
ST-006	New Bridge - Leonard At 0.5 North Dinuba	2,000	50%	0%	0%	0%	50%	-	-	-	1,000
ST-007	New Bridge - Nebraska At Bethel 0.2 West	762,000	50%	0%	0%	0%	50%	-	-	-	381,000
ST-008	New Bridge - Saginaw At Bethel 0.2 West	914,400	50%	0%	0%	0%	50%	-	-	-	457,200
ST-010	New Bridge - Whitson At Dinuba 0.2 North	711,200	50%	0%	0%	0%	50%	-	-	-	355,600
Subtotal		$ 4,350,500						$ -	$ 132,100	$ -	$ 2,109,200
Railroad Crossings											
ST-012	Railroad Crossing At Dinuba	50,800	100%	0%	0%	100%	0%	$ -	$ -	$ 50,800	$ -
ST-014	Railroad Crossing At Floral	50,800	100%	0%	100%	0%	0%	-	50,800	-	-
ST-015	Railroad Crossing At Highland	50,800	100%	0%	100%	0%	0%	-	50,800	-	-
ST-017	Railroad Crossing At Mountain View	50,800	50%	0%	0%	0%	50%	-	-	-	25,400
ST-018	Railroad Crossing At Nebraska	50,800	50%	0%	0%	0%	50%	-	-	-	25,400
ST-019	Railroad Crossing At Saginaw	50,800	100%	100%	0%	0%	0%	50,800	-	-	-
ST-020	Railroad Crossing At Second	50,800	20%	0%	20%	0%	0%	-	10,160	-	-
ST-021	Railroad Crossing At Thompson	50,800	20%	0%	20%	0%	0%	-	10,160	-	-
Subtotal		$ 406,400						$ 50,800	$ 121,920	$ 50,800	$ 50,800
Street Segments											
ST-022	Amber - Dinuba/Manning	$ 2,200,000	100%	0%	30%	0%	70%	$ -	$ 660,000	$ -	$ 1,540,000
ST-023	Amber - Floral/Nebraska	3,576,000	100%	100%	0%	0%	0%	3,576,000	-	-	-
ST-024	Amber - Nebraska/Mountain View	3,576,000	100%	100%	0%	0%	0%	3,576,000	-	-	-
ST-025	Bethel - Dinuba/Floral	3,576,000	50%	0%	0%	0%	50%	-	-	-	1,788,000
ST-026	Bethel - Floral/Rose	1,805,700	100%	0%	0%	0%	100%	-	-	-	1,805,700
ST-027	Bethel - Manning/Dinuba	3,540,600	100%	0%	0%	0%	100%	-	-	-	3,540,600
ST-028	Bethel - Nebraska/Mountain View	1,770,300	100%	0%	0%	0%	100%	-	-	-	1,770,300
ST-029	Bethel - Rose/Nebraska	1,805,700	100%	0%	0%	0%	100%	-	-	-	1,805,700
ST-030a	Del-Rey - Saginaw/Floral	3,353,500	100%	0%	70%	30%	0%	-	2,347,450	1,006,050	-
ST-030b	Del-Rey - Dinbua/Manning	2,235,600	100%	0%	25%	0%	75%	-	558,900	-	1,676,700
ST-031	DeWolf - Dinuba/Mountain View	7,081,300	100%	100%	0%	0%	0%	7,081,300	-	-	-
ST-032	DeWolf - Springfield/SR99	7,045,900	100%	0%	0%	100%	0%	-	-	7,045,900	-
ST-033	Dinuba - Amber/Bethel	4,107,100	100%	0%	100%	0%	0%	-	4,107,100	-	-
ST-034	Dinuba - Amber/Dockery	8,816,200	100%	0%	100%	0%	0%	-	8,816,200	-	-

Sources: City of Selma; Willdan Financial Services.

Table 5.3: Circulation Facilities Project Costs Continued

Project No.	Project Name	Project Cost (2024$)	Allocation to New Development	Primary	Tier 1	Tier 2	Tier 3	Primary	Tier 1	Tier 2	Tier 3
ST-036	Dinuba - Highland/Whitson	764,800	100%	0%	0%	100%	0%	-	-	764,800	-
ST-042	Dockery - Manning/Dinuba	1,487,100	100%	0%	30%	0%	70%	-	446,130	-	1,040,970
ST-043	Dockery - SR99/Mountain View	793,100	100%	100%	0%	0%	0%	793,100	-	-	-
ST-044	Floral-Amber/Bethel	5,665,000	100%	0%	0%	0%	100%	-	-	-	5,665,000
ST-045	Floral-Dockery/Bethel	5,204,700	100%	25%	25%	0%	50%	1,301,175	1,301,175	-	2,602,350
ST-046	Floral-Dockery/Mccall	965,600	50%	0%	50%	0%	0%	-	482,800	-	-
ST-049	Floral-SR99/DeWolf	8,639,200	100%	100%	0%	0%	0%	8,639,200	-	-	-
ST-051	Floral-Whitson/SR99	1,700,000	100%	100%	0%	0%	0%	1,700,000	-	-	-
ST-052	Highland-Dinuba/Manning	1,430,400	100%	0%	0%	100%	0%	-	-	1,430,400	-
ST-053	Highland-Whitson/Dinuba	892,200	100%	0%	100%	0%	0%	-	892,200	-	-
ST-054	Huntsman-Orange/Bethel	2,138,500	100%	0%	50%	0%	50%	-	1,069,250	-	1,069,250
ST-055	Leonard-Manning/Dinuba	1,416,200	50%	0%	0%	0%	50%	-	-	-	708,100
ST-056	McCall-Barbara/Dinuba	1,216,700	50%	50%	0%	0%	0%	608,350	-	-	-
ST-057	McCall-Dinuba/Manning	1,931,300	100%	50%	0%	0%	50%	965,650	-	-	965,650
ST-058	McCall-Floral/Arrants	753,200	50%	0%	50%	0%	0%	-	376,600	-	-
ST-059	McCall-Floral/Barbara	733,900	50%	0%	50%	0%	0%	-	366,950	-	-
ST-061	McCall-Mill/Arrants	424,900	50%	0%	50%	0%	0%	-	212,450	-	-
ST-062	McCall-Nebraska/Mountain View	2,726,300	100%	0%	100%	0%	0%	-	2,726,300	-	-
ST-063	McCall-Whitson/Nebraska	495,700	50%	0%	50%	0%	0%	-	247,850	-	-
ST-064	Mitchell-Nebraska/Mountain View	1,416,200	100%	100%	0%	0%	0%	1,416,200	-	-	-
ST-065	Mountain View-Highland/Dewolf	11,587,500	100%	0%	0%	100%	0%	-	-	11,587,500	-
ST-066	Mountain View-McCall/Highland	5,793,800	100%	0%	0%	100%	0%	-	-	5,793,800	-
ST-067	Nebraska-Amber/Bethel	5,275,600	100%	0%	50%	0%	50%	-	2,637,800	-	2,637,800
ST-068	Nebraska-Mitchell/Highland	883,900	100%	100%	0%	0%	0%	883,900	-	-	-
ST-069	Nebraska-Second/Thompson	96,600	50%	0%	50%	0%	0%	-	48,300	-	-
ST-070	Nebraska-SR43/DeWolf	7,081,300	100%	25%	50%	0%	25%	1,770,325	3,540,650	-	1,770,325
ST-071	Nebraska-Thompson/Mitchell	442,600	50%	0%	50%	0%	0%	-	221,300	-	-
ST-072	Nebraska-Whitson/Dockery	1,062,200	50%	0%	50%	0%	0%	-	531,100	-	-
ST-073	Nebraska-Dockery/Bethel	3,788,500	100%	0%	50%	50%	0%	-	1,894,250	1,894,250	-
ST-074	Rorden-Country View/Amber	1,076,300	100%	0%	50%	50%	0%	-	538,150	538,150	-
ST-075	Rose-Del Rey/Bethel	4,750,000	100%	0%	25%	25%	50%	-	1,187,500	1,187,500	2,375,000
ST-076	Rose-SR43/DeWolf	7,081,300	100%	50%	0%	0%	50%	3,540,650	-	-	3,540,650

Sources: City of Selma; Willdan Financial Services.

Table 5.3: Circulation Facilities Project Costs Continued

Project No.	Project Name	Project Cost (2024$)	Allocation to New Development	Primary	Tier 1	Tier 2	Tier 3	Primary	Tier 1	Tier 2	Tier 3
ST-077	Rose-Young/Highland	984,900	50%	0%	50%	0%	0%	-	492,450	-	-
ST-078	Saginaw-Bethel/Whitson	1,855,300	100%	0%	0%	100%	0%	-	-	1,855,300	-
ST-079	Saginaw-SR43/DeWolf	2,832,500	100%	100%	0%	0%	0%	2,832,500	-	-	-
ST-080	Second-East Front/Whitson	231,800	50%	50%	0%	0%	0%	115,900	-	-	-
ST-081	Second-Whitson/Young	270,400	50%	50%	0%	0%	0%	135,200	-	-	-
ST-082	Second-Young/Nebraska	560,100	50%	50%	0%	0%	0%	280,050	-	-	-
ST-083	Springfield - McCall/Bethel	2,804,200	50%	0%	0%	0%	50%	-	-	-	1,402,100
ST-084	Springfield - McCall/Highland	2,761,700	100%	50%	0%	0%	50%	1,380,850	-	-	1,380,850
ST-087	Thompson - Dinuba/Manning	1,416,200	100%	50%	0%	0%	50%	708,100	-	-	708,100
ST-088	Thompson - Floral/Dinuba	1,416,200	50%	0%	50%	0%	0%	-	708,100	-	-
ST-089	Thompson - Nebraska/Mountain View	1,416,200	100%	50%	0%	50%	0%	708,100	-	708,100	-
Subtotal		$ 160,754,000						$ 42,012,550	$ 36,410,955	$ 33,811,750	$ 39,793,145
Traffic Signals											
ST-094	Bethel & Manning	$ 619,800	10%	0%	0%	0%	10%	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 61,980
ST-095	De Wolf & Mountain View	619,800	10%	0%	0%	10%	0%	-	-	61,980	-
ST-096	Dinuba & Bethel	619,800	10%	0%	0%	0%	10%	-	-	-	61,980
ST-097	Amber & Floral	619,800	100%	0%	100%	0%	0%	-	619,800	-	-
ST-098	Floral & De Wolf	619,800	50%	0%	0%	50%	0%	-	-	309,900	-
ST-099	McCall & Mountain View	619,800	100%	0%	0%	100%	0%	-	-	619,800	-
ST-100	Nebraska & Bethel	619,800	10%	0%	0%	0%	10%	-	-	-	61,980
ST-101	Rose & Amber	619,800	100%	0%	0%	0%	100%	-	-	-	619,800
ST-102	Rose & Bethel	619,800	10%	0%	0%	0%	10%	-	-	-	61,980
ST-103	Dinuba & Orange	589,300	100%	0%	100%	0%	0%	-	589,300	-	-
ST-104	McCall & Whitson	589,300	50%	0%	0%	50%	0%	-	-	294,650	-
ST-105	Rose & Dockery	589,300	50%	0%	0%	50%	0%	-	-	294,650	-
ST-106	Dinuba & Amber	619,800	50%	0%	50%	0%	0%	-	309,900	-	-
ST-107	Dinuba & Del Rey	619,800	100%	0%	100%	0%	0%	-	619,800	-	-
ST-108	Dinuba & Dockery	619,800	100%	0%	100%	0%	0%	-	619,800	-	-
ST-109	Dinuba & Highland	619,800	100%	0%	0%	100%	0%	-	-	619,800	-
ST-111	Floral & Del Rey	619,900	100%	0%	100%	0%	0%	-	619,900	-	-
ST-112	Floral & Orange	619,800	100%	100%	0%	0%	0%	619,800	-	-	-
ST-113	Floral & Thompson	619,800	50%	0%	50%	0%	0%	-	309,900	-	-
ST-114	Floral & Wright	619,800	50%	0%	50%	0%	0%	-	309,900	-	-

Sources: City of Selma; Willdan Financial Services.

Table 5.3: Circulation Facilities Project Costs Continued

Project No.	Project Name	Project Cost (2024$)	Allocation to New Development	Primary	Tier 1	Tier 2	Tier 3	Primary	Tier 1	Tier 2	Tier 3
ST-115	Manning & Amber	619,800	10%	0%	0%	0%	10%	-	-	-	61,980
ST-116	Manning & DeWolf	589,300	10%	0%	0%	0%	10%	-	-	-	58,930
ST-117	Manning & Dockery	589,300	10%	0%	0%	0%	10%	-	-	-	58,930
ST-118	Manning & Duke	589,300	10%	0%	0%	0%	10%	-	-	-	58,930
ST-119	Manning & Highland	589,300	10%	0%	0%	0%	10%	-	-	-	58,930
ST-120	Manning & Leonard	619,800	10%	0%	0%	0%	10%	-	-	-	61,980
ST-121	Manning & McCall	619,800	10%	0%	0%	0%	10%	-	-	-	61,980
ST-122	Manning & Thompson	619,800	10%	0%	0%	0%	10%	-	-	-	61,980
ST-123	Nebraska & Dockery	619,800	100%	0%	100%	0%	0%	-	619,800	-	-
ST-124	Nebraska & Mitchell	619,800	100%	0%	100%	0%	0%	-	619,800	-	-
ST-125	Rose & DeWolf	619,800	10%	0%	0%	0%	10%	-	-	-	61,980
ST-126	Rose & Highland	619,800	100%	100%	0%	0%	0%	619,800	-	-	-
ST-127	Thompson & Nebraska	619,800	100%	0%	100%	0%	0%	-	619,800	-	-
ST-128	Whitson & McCall	619,800	50%	0%	50%	0%	0%	-	309,900	-	-
ST-129	Whitson & Saginaw	619,800	100%	100%	0%	0%	0%	619,800	-	-	-
Subtotal		$ 21,479,600						$ 1,859,400	$ 6,167,600	$ 2,200,780	$ 1,413,340
Interchanges											
ST-130	Dinuba & 99	$ 144,572,400	50%	0%	50%	0%	0%	$ -	$ 72,286,200	$ -	$ -
Total		$ 331,562,900						$ 43,922,750	$ 115,118,775	$ 36,063,330	$ 43,366,485

Sources: City of Selma; Willdan Financial Services.

Fee per Trip Demand Unit

Every impact fee consists of a dollar amount, or the cost of projects that can be funded by a fee, divided by a measure of development. In this case, all fees are first calculated as a cost per trip demand unit. Then these amounts are translated into housing unit (cost per dwelling unit) and employment space (cost per 1,000 building square feet) by multiplying the cost per trip by the trip generation rate for each land use category. These amounts become the fee schedule.

Table 5.4 calculates the cost per trip demand unit by dividing the total project costs attributable to new development within the primary, tier 1 and tier 2 development categories, by the total growth in trips calculated in Table 5.2.

Table 5.4: Cost per Trip to Accommodate Growth

	Primary, Tier 1 and Tier 2
Bridges	$ 132,100
Railroad Crossings	223,520
Street Segments	112,235,255
Traffic Signals	10,227,780
Interchanges	72,286,200
Total Cost Allocated To New Development	$195,104,855
Less Existing Fund Balance	1,974,372
Net Cost of Planned Facilities	$193,130,483
Growth in Trip Demand (2024 to 2050)	56,127
Cost per Trip	$ 3,441

Sources: Tables 5.2 and 5.3.

Fee Schedule

Table 5.5 shows the maximum justified circulation fee schedule, be fee component. The maximum justified fees are based on the costs per trip shown in Table 5.4. The cost per trip is multiplied by the trip demand factors in Table 5.1 to determine a fee per unit of new development. The fee per average sized dwelling unit is converted into a fee per square foot by dividing the fee per dwelling unit by the assumed average square footage of a dwelling unit.

The total fee includes a two percent (2%) administrative charge to fund costs that include: (1) legal, accounting, and other administrative support and (2) impact fee program administrative costs including revenue collection, revenue, and cost accounting, mandated public reporting, and fee justification analyses.

Table 5.5: Circulation Facilities Impact Fee Schedule

Land Use	A Cost Per Trip	B Trip Demand Factor	C = A x B Base Fee[1]	D = C x 0.02 Admin Charge[1, 2]	E = C + D Total Fee[1]	E / 1,000 Fee per Sq. Ft.
Residential Dwelling Unit	$ 3,441	0.96	$ 3,303	$ 66	$ 3,369	$ 1.35
Nonresidential - per 1,000 Sq. Ft.						
Commercial	$ 3,441	1.68	$ 5,781	$ 116	$ 5,897	$ 5.90
Office	3,441	1.76	6,056	121	6,177	6.18
Industrial	3,441	1.02	3,510	70	3,580	3.58
Commercial Lodging Unit	3,441	0.67	2,305	46	2,351	n/a

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

[2] Administrative charge of 2.0 percent for (1) legal, accounting, and other administrative support and (2) impact fee program administrative costs including revenue collection, revenue and cost accounting, mandated public reporting, and fee justification analyses.

[3] Assumes an average of 2,500 square feet of livable space per unit, based on the City's building permit records since 2022.

[4] Average trip demand factor per residential dwelling unit weighted by projected single family and multifamily development.

Sources: Tables 5.1 and 5.4.

6. Storm Drainage Facilities

This chapter summarizes an analysis of the need for storm drain facilities to accommodate growth within the City of Selma. This chapter documents a reasonable relationship between new development and a storm drain fee calculated using the planned facilities standard approach to fund storm drain facilities that serve new development. The *essential nexus* for this facility category is between the demand for storm drainage facilities from the projected increase in impervious surface generated by new development and the additional storm drains needed to meet those service demands. The fees are roughly proportional to demand because they ensure that new development will pay no more than its proportionate share of the identified planned facilities needed to serve the City through the planning horizon, and the fees are scaled based on the amount of impervious surface generated by different types of development.

Storm Drain Demand

Most new development generates storm water runoff that must be controlled through storm drain facilities by increasing the amount of land that is impervious to precipitation. **Table 6.1** shows the calculation of equivalent dwelling unit (EDU) demand factors based on impervious surface coefficient by land use category. The impervious surface coefficients are based on data from the California Environmental Protection Agency. EDU factors relate demand for storm drain facilities in terms of the demand created by a single-family dwelling unit. Use of EDU factors to estimate demand and allocate fees ensures that the fees are roughly proportional to the impervious surface generated by each unit of new development.

Table 6.1: Storm Drain Facilities Equivalent Dwelling Units

Land Use Type	DU or KSF per acre[1]	Impervious Surface Coefficient	Equivalent Dwelling Unit (EDU)
Residential Dwelling Unit			
Single Family	9.00	0.58	1.00
Multifamily	19.00	0.66	0.54
Nonresidential - per 1,000 Sq. Ft.			
Commercial	17.42	0.86	0.77
Office	17.42	0.69	0.61
Industrial	15.25	0.81	0.82
Commercial Lodging Unit	17.42	0.86	0.42

[1] Units per acre for residential or 1,000 square feet per acre for nonresidential. Residential and nonresidential densities are based on typical densities for each land use from the General Plan. Nonresidential densities are based on floor-area-ratios of 0.4 for commercial, 0.4 for office and 0.35 for industrial. Assumes 550 square feet of building space per commercial lodging room.

Sources: User's Guide for the California Impervious Surface Coefficients, Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment California Environmental Protection Agency, December 2010; Willdan Financial Services.

EDU Generation by New Development

Table 6.2 shows the estimated EDU generation from new development through 2050. New development will generate approximately 39,096 new EDUs, representing 80.9 percent of total storm drain demand in 2050.

Table 6.2: Storm Drain Demand Projections

		2024		Growth 2024 to 2050		Total - 2050	
Land Use	EDU Factor	Units / 1,000 SF	EDUs	Units / 1,000 SF	EDUs	Units / 1,000 SF	EDUs
Residential - per Dwelling Unit							
Single Family	1.00	5,807	5,807	15,599	15,599	21,406	21,406
Multifamily	0.54	1,475	797	6,691	3,613	8,166	4,410
Subtotal		7,282	6,604	22,290	19,212	29,572	25,816
Nonresidential - per 1,000 Sq. Ft.							
Commercial	0.77	1,431	1,102	13,789	10,617	15,219	11,719
Office	0.61	290	177	59	36	349	213
Industrial	0.82	1,644	1,348	11,257	9,231	12,901	10,579
Subtotal		3,365	2,627	25,106	19,884	28,470	22,511
Total			9,231		39,096		48,327
			19.1%		80.9%		100%

Sources: Tables 2.1 and 6.1.

Planned Facilities

Table 6.3 identifies the planned storm drain facilities and allocates a share of those facilities to new development. The projects were sourced from the City's prior development impact fee study in 2015 and adjusted for inflation to 2024 dollars. The prior study allocated 100% of all projects to new development. City staff reviewed and revised the allocation of each project to each new development to reflect the share of each project required to accommodate new development. City staff also removed projects from the list that were not necessary to mitigate runoff from projected development within the primary, tier 1 and tier 2 areas of the City.

Table 6.3: Planned Storm Drain Facilities

Project Number	Project Name	Project Cost (2024$)	Allocation to New Development	Cost Allocated to New Development
SD-005	Basin 2A	$ 20,351,500	100%	$ 20,351,500
SD-007	Basin 2C	2,602,000	100%	2,602,000
SD-011	Basin 3C	11,286,800	100%	11,286,800
SD-012	Basin 3D	865,200	100%	865,200
SD-013	Basin 4A	2,943,300	50%	1,471,650
SD-014	Basin 4B	3,428,000	100%	3,428,000
SD-016	Basin 4D	9,925,200	100%	9,925,200
SD-017	Basin 5A	6,655,500	100%	6,655,500
SD-018	Basin 5B	3,377,700	100%	3,377,700
SD-019	Basin 5C	4,246,400	100%	4,246,400
SD-020	Basin 5D	4,836,800	100%	4,836,800
SD-021	Basin 6B	6,229,000	100%	6,229,000
SD-022	Basin 6C	6,619,200	100%	6,619,200
SD-023	Basin 6D	11,666,200	100%	11,666,200
SD-024	Basin 7A	7,259,800	100%	7,259,800
SD-025	Basin 7B	3,697,800	100%	3,697,800
SD-026	Basin 7C	4,328,300	100%	4,328,300
SD-027	Basin 7D	6,541,600	100%	6,541,600
SD-028	Basin 8A	1,424,800	50%	712,400
SD-030	Basin 9A	3,762,600	100%	3,762,600
SD-035	Basin 12B	6,635,100	100%	6,635,100
Total		$ 128,682,800		$ 126,498,750

Sources: City of Selma.

Cost per Equivalent Dwelling Unit

The planned facilities cost per EDU that drives the fee schedule is calculated by dividing the cost of the planned facilities from Table 6.3 by the projected increase in storm drain EDUs identified in Table 6.2. This cost per EDU drives the fee calculation.

Table 6.4: Planned Facilities Cost per EDU

Cost Allocated to New Development	$ 126,498,750
Less Existing Fund Balance	203,285
Net Cost Allocated to New Development	$ 126,295,465
Growth in EDUs (2024 to 2050)	39,096
Cost per EDU	$ 3,230

Sources: Tables 6.2 and 6.3.

Projected Fee Revenue

Under the planned facilities approach, the projected fee revenue is equal to the cost of the planned facilities identified in **Table 6.3.**

Fee Schedule

The maximum justified fee for storm drain facilities is shown in **Table 6.5.** The City can adopt any fee up to this amount. The cost per EDU from Table 6.4 is converted to a fee per unit of new development based on the EDU factors shown in Table 6.1.

The total fee includes a two percent (2%) administrative charge to fund costs that include: (1) legal, accounting, and other administrative support and (2) impact fee program administrative costs including revenue collection, revenue, and cost accounting, mandated public reporting, and fee justification analyses.

Table 6.5: Storm Drain Facilities Impact Fee Schedule

	A Cost Per EDU	*B* EDU Factor	*C = A x B* Base Fee[1]	*D = C x 0.02* Admin Charge[1, 2]	*E = C + D* Total Fee[1]	*E / Average* Fee per Sq. Ft.[3]
Residential Dwelling Unit[4]	$ 3,230	0.86	$ 2,778	$ 56	$ 2,834	$ 1.13
Nonresidential - per 1,000 Sq. Ft.						
Commercial	$ 3,230	0.77	$ 2,487	$ 50	$ 2,537	$ 2.54
Office	3,230	0.61	1,970	39	2,009	2.01
Industrial	3,230	0.82	2,649	53	2,702	2.70
Commercial Lodging Unit	3,230	0.42	1,357	27	1,384	n/a

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

[2] Administrative charge of 2.0 percent for (1) legal, accounting, and other administrative support and (2) impact fee program administrative costs including revenue collection, revenue and cost accounting, mandated public reporting, and fee justification analyses.

[3] Assumes an average of 2,500 square feet of livable space per unit, based on the City's building permit records since 2022.

[4] Average EDU factor per residential dwelling unit weighted by projected single family and multifamily development.

Sources: Tables 6.1 and 6.4.

7. Wastewater Facilities

This chapter details an analysis of the need for sewer facilities to accommodate growth within the City of Selma. The projects and associated costs in this chapter were identified in the Draft Selma-Kingsburg-Fowler (SKF) County Sanitation District 2024 Collection System Master Plan Update (2024). The *essential nexus* for this facility category is between the demand for sewer facilities from the projected increase in sewer flow and the additional sewer facilities needed to meet those convey that flow to the SKF wastewater treatment plant. The fees are roughly proportional to demand because they ensure that new development will pay no more than its proportionate share of the identified planned facilities needed to serve the City through the planning horizon, and the fees are scaled based on the amount of wastewater flow generated by residential and nonresidential land uses.

Wastewater Demand

Estimates of new development and its consequent increased sewer demand provide the basis for calculating the sewer facilities fee. The need for sewer facilities improvements is based on the sewer demand placed on the system by development. A typical measure of demand is a flow generation rate, expressed as the number of gallons per day generated by a specific type of land use. Flow generation rates are a reasonable measure of demand on the City's system of sewer improvements because they represent the average rate of demand that will be placed on the system per land use designation.

Table 7.1 shows the calculation of equivalent dwelling unit (EDU) demand factors based on flow generation by land use category. The flow generation estimates based on data from the City's Wastewater Master Plan. EDU factors express water flow from each land use in terms of the flow generated by a single family dwelling unit. Use of EDU factors to estimate demand and allocate fees ensures that the fees are roughly proportional to the sewer demand generated by each unit of new development.

Table 7.1: Wastewater Demand by Land Use

Land Use Type	Flow Generation[1]	Density[2]	Average Flow Generation per DU, 1,000 Sq. Ft. or Room	Equivalent Dwelling Unit (EDU)
Residential Dwelling Unit				
Single Family			230.00	1.00
Multifamily			230.00	1.00
Nonresidential - per 1,000 Sq. Ft.				
Commercial	725	17.42	41.61	0.18
Office	725	17.42	41.61	0.18
Industrial	725	15.25	47.55	0.21
Commercial Lodging Unit	725	17.42	22.89	0.10

[1] Gallons per acre per day.

[2] 1,000 building square feet per acre for nonresidential. Nonresidential densities are based on floor-area-ratios of 0.4 for commercial, 0.4 for office and 0.35 for industrial. Assumes 550 square feet of building space per commercial lodging room.

Sources: City of Selma; Table 4-5, Draft SKF County Sanitation District 2024 Collection System Master Plan Update; Willdan Financial Services.

EDU Generation by New Development

Table 7.2 shows the estimated EDU generation from new development through 2050. The EDU factors from Table 7.1 are multiplied by the land use assumptions from Table 2.1 to estimate total EDUs in the base year, at the planning horizon and for new development. New development will generate approximately 22,118 new EDUs through 2050, comprising 73.6% of sewer demand in the City at that time.

Table 7.2 also identifies the land use scenario and corresponding EDUs associated with the Amberwood trunk main area of benefit. Note that the Amberwood land use scenario is excluded from the Citywide scenario. This was done to create a separate fee for the Amberwood area of benefit, which will fully fund the trunk main needed to serve development within the area of benefit.

Table 7.2: Wastewater Facilities Equivalent Dwelling Units

Land Use	EDU Factor	2024 Units / 1,000 SF	2024 EDUs	Growth 2024 to 2050 Units / 1,000 SF	Growth 2024 to 2050 EDUs	Total - 2050 Units / 1,000 SF	Total - 2050 EDUs
Citywide (Excluding Amberwood)							
Residential - per Dwelling Unit							
Single Family	1.00	5,807	5,807	10,949	10,949	16,756	16,756
Multifamily	1.00	1,475	1,475	6,691	6,691	8,166	8,166
Subtotal		7,282	7,282	17,640	17,640	24,922	24,922
Nonresidential - per 1,000 Sq. Ft.							
Commercial	0.18	1,431	258	13,631	2,453	15,061	2,711
Office	0.18	290	52	59	11	349	63
Industrial	0.21	1,644	345	9,411	1,977	11,055	2,322
Subtotal		3,365	655	23,102	4,441	26,466	5,096
Total			7,937		22,081		30,018
			26.4%		73.6%		100%
Amberwood							
Residential - per Dwelling Unit							
Single Family	1.00	-	-	4,650	4,650	4,650	4,650
Nonresidential - per 1,000 Sq. Ft.							
Commercial	0.18	-	-	158	28	158	28
Industrial	0.21	-	-	1,846	388	1,846	388
Subtotal		-	-	2,004	416	2,004	416
Total			-		5,066		5,066

Sources: Table 2-1, Amberwood Specific Plan; Tables 2.1 and 7.1, Willdan Financial Services.

Facility Needs and Costs

Error! Reference source not found. identifies the planned sewer facilities to be funded by the fee. The new sewer facilities were all identified in the Draft SKF Master Plan. That document identified particular projects needed to serve each of the development tiers used in this nexus analysis.

This analysis also includes the financing costs associated with the Amberwood area of benefit trunk main improvements. The present value of future interest payments are included in the Amberwood project costs. See Appendix Table A.1 for more detail.

Table 7.3: Wastewater Facilities Costs and Allocation to New Development

Project	Total	Allocation to New Development	Cost Allocated to New Development
Gravity Main CIP			
Primary	$ 42,890,000	100.0%	$ 42,890,000
Tier 1	2,727,000	100.0%	2,727,000
Tier 2	64,315,000	100.0%	64,315,000
Total	$ 109,932,000		$ 109,932,000
Lift Station CIP			
Primary	$ 3,364,000	100.0%	$ 3,364,000
Tier 2	8,205,000	100.0%	8,205,000
Total	$ 11,569,000		$ 11,569,000
Amberwood Costs			
Principal	$ 7,041,422	100.0%	$ 7,041,422
Present Value of Future Interest Payments	4,185,939	100.0%	4,185,939
Total	$ 11,227,361		$ 11,227,361

Sources: Tables 8-1 and 8-1, Draft SKF County Sanitation District 2024 Collection System Master Plan Update; City Manager's/Staff's Report April 1, 2024 Subject: Consideration of a Resolution Awarding Contract to Dawson-Mauldin, LLC for the Amberwood Specific Plan Sanitary Sewer Improvement Project; Appendix Table A.1, Willdan Financial Services.

Cost per EDU

The cost of planned facilities allocated to new development, net of available fund balances, is divided by the total growth in EDUs to determine a cost per EDU. **Table 7.4** displays this calculation.

Table 7.4: Cost per EDU

	Citywide	Amberwood
Cost Allocated to New Development		
Gravity Mains	$ 109,932,000	$ 11,227,361
Lift Stations	11,569,000	-
Total	$ 121,501,000	$ 11,227,361
Less Existing Fund Balance	447,144	-
Less Amberwood Principal	7,041,422	-
Net Cost Allocated to New Development	$ 114,012,434	$ 11,227,361
Growth in EDUs (2024 to 2050)	22,081	5,066
Cost per EDU	$ 5,163	$ 2,216

Sources: Tables 7.2 and 7.3.

Fee Schedule

The maximum justified fee for wastewater facilities is shown in **Table 7.5.** The cost per EDU is converted to a fee per unit of new development based on the EDU factors shown in Table 7.1. The fee per average dwelling unit is converted into a fee per square foot by dividing the fee per dwelling unit by the assumed average square footage of a dwelling unit. Fees are shown for the Amberwood area of benefit, and for the rest of the City.

The total fee includes a two percent (2%) administrative charge to fund costs that include: (1) legal, accounting, and other administrative support and (2) impact fee program administrative costs including revenue collection, revenue, and cost accounting, mandated public reporting, and fee justification analyses.

Table 7.5: Maximum Justified Wastewater Facilities Fee Schedule

	A Cost Per EDU	*B* EDU Factor	*C = A x B* Base Fee[1]	*D = C x 0.02* Admin Charge[1, 2]	*E = C + D* Total Fee[1]	*E / Average* Fee per Sq. Ft.[3]
Citywide (Excluding Amberwood)						
Residential Dwelling Unit[4]	$ 5,163	1.00	$ 5,163	$ 103	$ 5,266	$ 2.11
Nonresidential - per 1,000 Sq. Ft.						
Commercial	$ 5,163	0.18	$ 929	$ 19	$ 948	$ 0.95
Office	5,163	0.18	929	19	948	0.95
Industrial	5,163	0.21	1,084	22	1,106	1.11
Commercial Lodging Unit	5,163	0.10	516	10	526	n/a
Amberwood						
Residential Dwelling Unit[4]	$ 2,216	1.00	$ 2,216	$ 44	$ 2,260	$ 0.90
Nonresidential - per 1,000 Sq. Ft.						
Commercial	$ 2,216	0.18	$ 399	$ 8	$ 407	$ 0.41
Office	2,216	0.18	399	8	407	0.41
Industrial	2,216	0.21	465	9	474	0.47
Commercial Lodging Unit	2,216	0.10	222	4	226	n/a

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

[2] Administrative charge of 2.0 percent for (1) legal, accounting, and other administrative support and (2) impact fee program administrative costs including revenue collection, revenue and cost accounting, mandated public reporting, and fee justification analyses.

[3] Assumes an average of 2,500 square feet of livable space per unit, based on the City's building permit records since 2022.

[4] Average EDU factor per residential dwelling unit weighted by projected single family and multifamily development.

Sources: Tables 7.1 and 7.4.

8. City Facilities

The purpose of the city facilities impact fee is to fund the city facilities needed to serve new development. A maximum justified fee is presented based on the planned facilities standard of city facilities per capita. The *essential nexus* for this facility category is between the demand for new city facilities from the projected increase in service population and the additional city facilities needed to meet those service demands. The fees are roughly proportional to demand because they ensure that new development will pay no more than its proportionate share of the identified planned facilities needed to serve the City through the planning horizon, and the fees are scaled based on the number of residents occupying a new dwelling unit, or the number of jobs associated with nonresidential land uses.

Service Population

City 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 8.1 shows the existing and future projected service population for city facilities. While specific data is not available to estimate the actual ratio of demand per resident to demand by businesses (per worker) for this service, it is reasonable to assume that demand for these services is less for one employee compared to one resident, because nonresidential buildings are typically occupied less intensively than dwelling units. This study makes use of a worker weighting factor to estimate different levels of demand between residential and nonresidential land uses. The 0.31-weighting factor for workers is based on a 40-hour workweek divided by the total number of non-work hours in a week (128) and reflects the degree to which nonresidential development are typically occupied less intensively than dwelling units and consequently create a lesser demand for facilities.

Table 8.1: City Facilities Service Population

	A Persons	B Weighting Factor	A x B = C Service Population
Residents			
Existing (2024)	24,190	1.00	24,190
New Development	70,477	1.00	70,477
Total (2050)	94,667		94,667
Workers			
Existing (2024)	5,885	0.31	1,824
New Development	42,484	0.31	13,170
Total (2050)	48,369		14,994
Combined Residents and Weighted Workers			
Existing (2024)			26,014
New Development			83,647
Total (2050)			109,661

[1] Workers are weighted at 0.31 of residents based on a 40 hour work week out of a possible 128 non-work hours in a week (40/128 = 0.31)

Sources: Table 2.1; Willdan Financial Services.

Facility Inventories and Standards

This section describes the City's public facility inventory and facility standards.

Existing Inventory

The City's public facility inventory consists of City Hall, Corporate Yard, Old Corporate Yard and Animal Shelter. **Table 8.2** summarizes the City's current inventory of land, buildings, vehicles and equipment. The assumed cost of land acquisition of $100,600 per acre is based on land sales comparisons from the previous five years, as reported by CoStar and is used consistently through this report to value land acquisition for each impact fee category. The replacement cost of buildings and equipment included in the inventory come from the City's insured property schedule.

Table 8.2: Existing City Facilities Inventory

	Quantity	Units	Unit Cost	Replacement Cost
Land (acres)				
Old Corporate Yard	0.22	Acres	100,600	$ 29,174
City Hall	0.16	Acres	100,600	16,096
Corporate Yard	4.11	Acres	100,600	413,466
Animal Shelter	0.90	Acres	100,600	90,069
Subtotal - Land	5.39	Acres		$ 548,805
Buildings (square feet)				
Old Corporate Yard				
Public Works Storage Building	4,400	Sq. Ft	$ 125	$ 551,800
Tool Shed	100	Sq. Ft	45	4,500
Storage Building	1,400	Sq. Ft	127	178,200
Metal Storage Shed	105	Sq. Ft	118	12,400
Subtotal	6,005	Sq. Ft		$ 746,900
City Hall				
City Hall	5,832	Sq. Ft	$ 385	$ 2,245,361
City Hall Annex	3,360	Sq. Ft	319	1,070,761
Subtotal	9,192	Sq. Ft		$ 3,316,122
Corporate Yard				
Maintenance Office	6,048	Sq. Ft	$ 242	$ 1,466,361
Storage Container #1	320	Sq. Ft	29	9,400
Storage Container #2	320	Sq. Ft	29	9,400
Storage Container #3	320	Sq. Ft	29	9,400
Storage Container #4	320	Sq. Ft	29	9,400
Storage Container #5	320	Sq. Ft	29	9,400
Tool Shed	112	Sq. Ft	46	5,200
Storage Building	532	Sq. Ft	134	71,500
Art Center Storage	4,370	Sq. Ft	95	414,600
Storage Building	3,430	Sq. Ft	138	473,000
Subtotal	16,092	Sq. Ft		$ 2,477,661
Solar				
Tucker Street Solar Panel	84	Sq. Ft	$ 542	$ 45,500
East Front St Solar Panel	126	Sq. Ft	361	45,500
Solar Power Charging Station #1	240	Sq. Ft	180	43,300
Solar Power Charging Station #2	200	Sq. Ft	166	33,100
Subtotal	650	Sq. Ft		$ 167,400
Animal Shelter				
Animal Shelter	2,400	Sq. Ft	$ 207	$ 496,500
Storage Building	120	Sq. Ft	92	11,000
Animal Kennels #1	529	Sq. Ft	85	45,000
Animal Kennels Canopy #1	570	Sq. Ft	98	55,700
Animal Kennels Canopy #2	1,159	Sq. Ft	98	113,200
Animal Kennels #2	280	Sq. Ft	188	52,600
Storage Container	160	Sq. Ft	29	4,700
Subtotal	5,218	Sq. Ft		$ 778,700
Equipment and Vehicles				
Contractor's Equipment	1	Unit	$ 896,464	$ 896,464
Vehicles	34	Units	243,694	8,285,604
City Hall Generator (150 KW)	1	Unit	134,600	134,600
City Hall Generator (95 KW)	1	Unit	104,900	104,900
Subtotal Equipment and Vehicles				$ 9,421,568
Total Value - Existing Facilities				$ 17,457,156

[1] Proportional share of Old Corporate Yard acreage associated with public works buildings included here. Remainder included in Fire Facilities Inventory.

Sources: City of Selma; Willdan Financial Services.

Planned Facilities

Table 8.3 summarizes the planned city facilities needed to serve the City through 2050. The City plans for a new City Hall and expansion of the Corporate Yard, and acquisition of a variety of vehicles and equipment. New facilities costs are estimated to total approximately $22.7 million through 2050.

Table 8.3: Planned City Facilities

	Cost
New City Hall	$ 18,000,000
Downtown Improvements	1,000,000
Public Works Corporation Yard Building Expansion	600,000
PEMB (Old Corporation Yard)	375,000
Front End Loader	350,000
Vermeer LP573SDT Pothole Machine	102,000
RowerX CCTV Equipment	140,000
Hakker Vactor Truck	800,000
CAT 242D3 Skid Steer	70,000
MF 4708 Closed Cab (Weed Abatement)	65,000
Three Ton Roller (Paving)	170,000
CAT 420 Closed Cab Backhoe	180,000
144" Mower	100,000
Transfer Truck (Material Hauler)	400,000
Information Boards (Events)	35,000
Boom Truck	300,000
Total	$ 22,687,000

Source: City of Selma Draft FY 2023-24 Capital Improvement Program.

Cost Allocation

Existing Level of Service

Table 8.4 expresses the City's current city facilities level of service in terms of an existing cost per capita. This cost per capita is not used in the fee calculation, rather it is shown here for informational purposes only. Once the planned facilities have been constructed and new development has increased the City's service population the resulting facility cost per capita will be lower than the cost per capita shown in Table 8.4.

Table 8.4: Existing Level of Service

Value of Existing Facilities	$	17,457,156
Existing Service Population		26,014
Cost per Capita	$	671
Facility Standard per Resident	$	671
Facility Standard per Worker[1]		208

[1] Based on a weighing factor of 0.31.

Sources: Tables 8.1 and 8.3.

Future Level of Service

Table 8.5 shows new development's cost per capita needed to fully fund the planned facilities. The level of service indicated by the planned facility is lower than the existing standard. This level of service drives the fee calculation. This value is calculated by dividing the cost of planned facilities by the increase in service population. The value per capita is multiplied by the worker weighting factor of 0.31 to determine the cost per worker.

Table 8.5: Public Facilities Planned Facilities Standard

Cost of Planned Facilities	$	22,687,000
Less Exsting Fund Balance		319,836
Net Cost of Planned Facilities	$	22,367,164
Growth in Service Population (2024 to 2050)		83,647
Cost per Capita	$	267
Cost Allocation per Resident	$	267
Cost Allocation per Worker[1]		83

[1] Based on a weighting factor of 0.31.

Sources: Tables 8.1 and 8.3.

Use of Fee Revenue

The City can use city facilities fee revenues for the construction or purchase of buildings, land, and equipment that are part of the system of city facilities serving new development. A list of planned facilities is included in Table 8.3. The projected fee revenue is equal to the cost of planned facilities, net of existing impact fee fund balances.

Fee Schedule

Table 8.5 shows the maximum justified city facilities fee schedule. The cost per capita is converted to a fee per unit of new development based on dwelling unit and employment densities (persons per dwelling unit or employees per 1,000 square feet of nonresidential building space). The fee per average sized dwelling unit is converted into a fee per square foot by dividing the fee per dwelling unit by the assumed average square footage of a dwelling unit.

The total fee includes a two percent (2%) administrative charge to fund costs that include: (1) legal, accounting, and other administrative support and (2) impact fee program administrative costs including revenue collection, revenue, and cost accounting, mandated public reporting, and fee justification analyses.

Table 8.6: City Facilities Fee Schedule

	A	*B*	*C = A x B*	*D = C x 0.02*	*E = C + D*	*F = E / Average*
Land Use	**Cost Per Capita**	**Density**	**Base Fee[1]**	**Admin Charge[1, 2]**	**Total Fee**	**Fee per Sq. Ft.**
Residential Dwelling Unit	$ 267	3.19	$ 853	$ 17	$ 870	$ 0.35
Nonresidential - per 1,000 Sq. Ft.						
Commercial	$ 83	2.12	$ 176	$ 4	$ 180	$ 0.18
Office	83	3.26	271	5	276	0.28
Industrial	83	1.16	96	2	98	0.10
Commericial Lodging Unit	83	0.56	46	1	47	n/a

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

[2] Administrative charge of 2.0 percent for (1) legal, accounting, and other administrative support and (2) impact fee program administrative costs including revenue collection, revenue and cost accounting, mandated public reporting, and fee justification analyses.

[3] Assumes an average of 2,500 square feet of livable space per unit, based on the City's building permit records since 2022.

Sources: Tables 2.2 and 8.5.

9. Public Use (Community Center) Facilities

The following chapter documents the nexus analysis, demonstrating the need for new public use facilities demanded by new development. A maximum justified fee schedule is presented based on the planned facilities standard of public use facilities per capita. The *essential nexus* for this facility category is between the demand for new public use facilities from the projected increase in residents and the additional public use facilities needed to meet those service demands. The fees are roughly proportional to demand because they ensure that new development will pay no more than its proportionate share of the identified planned facilities needed to serve the City through the planning horizon, and the fees are scaled based on the number of residents occupying a new dwelling unit.

Service Population

Public use facilities in Selma primarily serve residents. Therefore, demand for services and associated facilities is based on the City's residential population. **Table 9.1** shows the existing and future projected service population for public use facilities.

Table 9.1: Public Use Facilities Service Population

	Residents
Existing (2024)	24,190
New Development	70,477
Total (2050)	94,667

Sources: Table 2.1; Willdan Financial Services.

Existing Public Use Facilities Inventory

The City of Selma owns various public use facilities, including the Pioneer Village Museum, Salazar Center, Senior Citizens Center, Performing Arts Center, and Skate Park. **Table 9.2** summarizes the City's existing public use facilities inventory. The replacement cost of buildings and equipment included in the inventory come from the City's insured property schedule.

Table 9.2: Existing Public Use Facilities

	Quantity	Units	Unit Cost	Replacement Cost
Pioneer Village Museum Building	2,881	Sq. Ft	$ 268	$ 771,100
Pioneer Village Entry Building	3,000	Sq. Ft	249	746,500
Senior Citizens Center	5,418	Sq. Ft	303	1,642,800
Salazar Center	3,360	Sq. Ft	294	988,900
Performing Arts Center	12,080	Sq. Ft	400	4,832,867
Berry Park Skate Park				478,421
Emergency Generator at Senior Center				134,600
Total Value - Existing Facilities				$ 9,595,188

Sources: City of Selma.

Planned Public Use Facilities

The City has identified two planned public use facilities in its CIP: a new community center and improvements to Pioneer Village. In total, the City has identified $23.5 million worth of new public use facilities to serve existing and new development. **Table 9.3** details the City's planned public use facilities.

Table 9.3: Planned Public Use Facilities

New Community Center	$ 18,500,000
Pioneer Village Improvements	5,000,000
Total	$ 23,500,000

Source: City of Selma Draft FY2023-24 Capital Improvement Program.

Cost Allocation

Existing Level of Service

Table 9.4 expresses the City's current public use facilities level of service in terms of an existing cost per capita. This cost per capita is not used in the fee calculation, rather it is shown here for informational purposes only. Once the planned facilities have been constructed and new development has increased the City's service population the resulting facility cost per capita will be lower than the cost per capita shown in Table 9.4.

Table 9.4: Existing Level of Service

Value of Existing Facilities	$ 9,595,188
Existing Service Population	24,190
Cost per Resident	$ 397

Sources: Tables 9.1 and 9.3.

Future Level of Service

Table 9.5 shows new development's cost per capita needed to fully fund the planned facilities. The level of service indicated by the planned facility is lower than the existing standard. This level of service drives the fee calculation. This value is calculated by dividing the cost of planned facilities by the increase in service population.

Table 9.5: Public Use Facilities Planned Facilities Standard

Cost of Planned Facilities	$ 23,500,000
Less Exsting Fund Balance	168,177
Net Cost of Planned Facilities	$ 23,331,823
Growth in Service Population (2024 to 2050)	70,477
Cost per Resident	$ 331

Sources: Tables 9.1 and 9.3.

Use of Fee Revenue

The City can use public use facilities fee revenues for the construction or purchase of buildings, land, vehicles and equipment that are part of the system of public use facilities serving new development. A list of planned facilities is included in Table 9.3. The projected fee revenue is equal to the cost of planned facilities, net of existing impact fee fund balances.

Fee Schedule

Table 9.6 shows the maximum justified public use facilities fee schedule. The cost per capita is converted to a fee per unit of new development based on dwelling unit densities (persons per dwelling). The fee per average sized dwelling unit is converted into a fee per square foot by dividing the fee per dwelling unit by the assumed average square footage of a dwelling unit.

The total fee includes a two percent (2%) administrative charge to fund costs that include: (1) legal, accounting, and other administrative support and (2) impact fee program administrative costs including revenue collection, revenue, and cost accounting, mandated public reporting, and fee justification analyses.

Table 9.6: Public Use Facilities Fee Schedule

Land Use	A Cost Per Capita	B Density	C = A x B Base Fee[1]	D = C x 0.02 Admin Charge[1, 2]	E = C + D Total Fee	F = E / Average Fee per Sq. Ft.
Residential Dwelling Unit	$ 331	3.19	$ 1,056	$ 21	$ 1,077	$ 0.43

[1] Fee per average sized dwelling unit.

[2] Administrative charge of 2.0 percent for (1) legal, accounting, and other administrative support and (2) impact fee program administrative costs including revenue collection, revenue and cost accounting, mandated public reporting, and fee justification analyses.

[3] Assumes an average of 2,500 square feet of livable space per unit, based on the City's building permit records since 2022.

Sources: Tables 2.2 and 9.5.

10. Park Facilities

The purpose of the park facilities impact fee is to fund the park facilities needed to serve new development. The maximum justified impact fee is presented based on the existing standard of park facilities per capita. Fee revenue would be used to expand the provision of parks to meet demand from future development. The *essential nexus* for this facility category is between the demand for City parks from the projected increase in residents and the additional parks needed to meet those service demands. The fees are roughly proportional to demand because they ensure that new development can maintain the City's existing ratio of park acres to residents, and the fees are scaled based on the number of residents occupying a new dwelling unit. A fee in-lieu of parkland dedication charged under the Quimby Act is also included in this chapter.

Service Population

Park and recreation facilities in Selma primarily serve residents. Therefore, demand for services and associated facilities is based on the City's residential population. **Table 10.1** shows the existing and future projected service population for park facilities.

Table 10.1: Park Facilities Service Population

	Residents
Existing (2024)	24,190
New Development	70,477
Total (2050)	94,667

Source: Table 2.1.

Existing Parkland and Park Facilities Inventory

The City of Selma maintains several parks throughout the city. **Table 10.2** summarizes the City's existing parkland inventory in 2024. All facilities are owned by the City. In total, the inventory includes a total of 67.2 acres of City-owned parkland, 56.63 of which are improved with park amenities.

Table 10.2: Park Land Inventory

Name	Developed Acres	Undeveloped Acres	Total
Active Parkland			
Berry Park	1.22	-	1.22
Brentlinger Park	10.62	-	10.62
Dog Park	4.37	-	4.37
Lincoln Park	1.72	-	1.72
Pioneer Park	13.17	-	13.17
Ringo Park	3.73	-	3.73
Salazar Park	1.67	-	1.67
Shafer Park	20.13	-	20.13
Thompson Park	-	10.57	10.57
Total	56.63	10.57	67.20

Source: Selma Parks Master Plan.

Parkland and Park Facilities Unit Costs

Table 10.3 displays the unit costs necessary to develop parkland in Selma. The cost of improving an acre of parkland with standard park improvements is based on a bid the City received to improve Thompson Park. The assumed cost of land acquisition of $100,600 per acre is based on land sales comparisons from the previous five years, as reported by CoStar and is used consistently through this report to value land acquisition for each impact fee category. In total, this analysis assumes that it costs $1.2 million to acquire and develop an acre of parkland in Selma.

Table 10.3: Park Facilities Unit Costs

	Cost Per Acre
Standard Park Improvements[1]	$1,089,000
Land Acquisition	100,600
Total Cost per Acre	$1,189,600

[1] Assumes improvement cost of $25 per square foot based on a bid for Thompson Park construction.

Sources: City of Selma.

Parkland and Park Facility Standards

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

The most common measure in calculating 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 parkland and park facilities), or an adopted policy standard contained in a master facility plan or general plan. Facility standards may also be based on a land

dedication standard established by the Quimby Act.[2] In this case, the City will use the Mitigation Fee Act to impose park impact fees for development not occurring in subdivisions and will use the Quimby Act for development occurring in subdivisions.

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.[3] In this case, the fees will be set to maintain the City's existing parkland standard of acres per 1,000 residents.

Quimby Act

The Quimby Act specifies that the dedication requirement must be a minimum of 3.0 acres and a maximum of 5.0 acres per 1,000 residents. A jurisdiction can require residential developers to dedicate above the three-acre minimum if the jurisdiction's existing park standard at the time it adopted its Quimby Act ordinance justifies the higher level (up to five acres per 1,000 residents). The standard used must also conform to the jurisdiction's adopted general or specific plan standards.

The Quimby Act only applies to land subdivisions. The Quimby Act would not apply to residential development on future approved projects on single parcels, such as apartment complexes and other multifamily development.

The Quimby Act allows payment of a fee in lieu of land dedication. The fee is calculated to fund the acquisition of the same amount of land that would have been dedicated.

The Quimby Act allows use of in-lieu fee revenue for any park or recreation facility purpose. Allowable uses of this revenue include land acquisition, park improvements, and rehabilitation of existing parks.

City of Selma Parkland and Park Facilities Standards

Table 10.4 shows the existing standard for improved park acreage per 1,000 residents based on the type of parkland. Once accounting for impact fee fund balances, the City has an existing parkland standard of 2.80 acres per 1,000 residents, which is less than the minimum Quimby standard of 3.0 acres per 1,000 residents. The impact fee analysis in this report will be based on maintaining the City's 2.80 acre per 1,000 resident standard as new development adds demand for parks in Selma. Fees in-lieu of land dedication for subdivisions are calculated at the minimum *Quimby* standard of 3.0 acres of developed parkland per 1,000 residents. Fees for the improvement of parkland will be set on maintaining the City's existing improved park standard of 2.34 acres per 1,000 residents.

[2] *California Government Code* §66477.

[3] See the *Benefit* and *Burden* findings in *Background Report*.

Table 10.4: Park Standards

	Land	Improvements
City Owned Acreage	67.20	56.63
Fund Balance Equivalent[1]	0.53	0.53
Total Equivalent Park Acres	67.73	57.16
Existing Service Population (2024)	24,190	24,190
Existing Standard (Acres per 1,000 Residents)	2.80	2.34
Quimby Act Standard (Acres per 1,000 Residents)	3.00	

[1] Existing park impact fee fund balance of $633,276 divided by total cost per acre from Table 10.3 to determine equivalent improved park acres.

Sources: Tables 10.1 and 10.2.

Facilities Needed to Accommodate New Development

Table 10.5 shows the park land needed to accommodate new development at the existing standard and Quimby standard. To achieve the standard by the planning horizon, depending on the amount of development subject to the Quimby Act, new development must fund the acquisition of between 197.34 and 211.43 parkland acres, at a total cost ranging between $19.9 and $21.3 million. New development will fund the improvement of 164.92 acres of parks at a total cost of $179.6 million

The facility standards and resulting fees under the Quimby Act are higher because development will be charged to provide 3.0 acres of parkland per 1,000 residents, and 2.34 acres of improvements, whereas development not subject to the Quimby Act will be charged to provide only 2.80 acres of parkland per 1,000 residents, and 2.34 acres of improvements. Since the exact amount of development that will be subject to the Quimby fees is unknown at this time, **Error! Reference source not found.** presents the range of total land and improvement costs that may be incurred depending on the amount of development subject to the Quimby Act.

Table 10.5: Park Facilities to Accommodate New Development

	Calculation	Parkland	Improvements	Total Range[1]
Parkland (Quimby Act), Improvements (Mitigation Fee Act)[2]				
Facility Standard (acres/1,000 capita)	*A*	3.00	2.34	
Growth in Service Population (2024 to 2050)	*B*	70,477	70,477	
Facility Needs (acres)	*C = A x B/1000*	211.43	164.92	
Average Unit Cost (per acre)	*D*	$ 100,600	$ 1,089,000	
Total Cost of Facilities	*E = C x D*	$ 21,270,000	$ 179,598,000	$ 200,868,000
Parkland and Improvements - Mitigation Fee Act[3]				
Facility Standard (acres/1,000 capita)	*A*	2.80	2.34	
Growth in Service Population (2024 to 2050)	*B*	70,477	70,477	
Facility Needs (acres)	*C = A x B/1000*	197.34	164.92	
Average Unit Cost (per acre)	*D*	$ 100,600	$ 1,089,000	
Total Cost of Facilities	*E = C x D*	$ 19,852,000	$ 179,598,000	$ 199,450,000

Note: Totals have been rounded to the thousands.

[1] Values in this column show the range of the cost of parkland acquisition and development should all development be either subject to the Quimby Act, or to the Mitigation Fee Act, respectively.

[2] Cost of parkland to serve new development shown if all development is subject to the Quimby Act (Subdivisions of 50 units or more). Parkland charged at 3.0 acres per 1,000 residents; improvements charged at the existing standard.

[3] Cost of parkland to serve new development shown if all development is subject to the Mitigation Fee Act. Parkland and improvements are charged at the existing standard.

Sources: Tables 10.1, 10.4, and 10.5.

Park Facilities Cost per Capita

Table 10.6 shows the cost per capita of providing new parkland and park facilities at the existing facility standard, and at the Quimby standard. The cost per capita is shown separately for land and improvements. The cost per capita is shown separately for land and improvements. The costs per capita in this table will serve as the basis of three fees:

- A Quimby Act Fee in-lieu of land dedication. This fee is payable by residential development occurring in subdivisions.
- A Mitigation Fee Act Fee for land acquisition. This fee is payable by residential and nonresidential development not occurring in subdivisions.
- A Mitigation Fee Act Fee for park improvements. This fee is payable by all development.

A development project pays either the Quimby Act Fee in-lieu of land dedication, or the Mitigation Fee Act Fee for land acquisition, not both. All development projects pay both Mitigation Fee Act fees for park improvements.

Table 10.6: Cost per Capita

		Land				Improvements
	Calculation	Quimby Fee	OR	Impact Fee	AND	Impact Fee
Parkland Investment (per acre)	*A*	$ 100,600		$ 100,600		$ 1,089,000
Existing Standard (acres per 1,000 capita)	*B*	3.00		2.80		2.34
Total Cost per 1,000 capita	*C = A x B*	$ 301,800		$ 281,700		$ 2,548,300
Cost per Resident	*D = C / 1,000*	$ 302		$ 282		$ 2,548

Sources: Tables 10.4 and 10.5.

Use of Fee Revenue

The City plans to use parkland and park facilities fee revenue to purchase parkland or construct improvements to add to the system of park facilities that serves new development. The City may only use impact fee revenue to provide facilities and intensify usage of existing facilities needed to serve new development.

Fee Schedule

To calculate fees by land use type, the investment in park facilities is determined on a per capita basis for both land acquisition and improvement. These cost factors (shown in Table 10.6) are cost per capita based on the unit cost estimates and facility standards. The fee per average sized dwelling unit is converted into a fee per square foot by dividing the fee per dwelling unit by the assumed average square footage of a dwelling unit.

Table 10.7 shows the maximum justified park fees based on the Quimby Act standard and based on the existing park standards under the Mitigation Fee Act, respectively.

The total fee includes a two percent (2%) administrative charge to fund costs that include: (1) legal, accounting, and other administrative support and (2) impact fee program administrative costs including revenue collection, revenue, and cost accounting, mandated public reporting, and fee justification analyses.

Table 10.7: Park Facilities Fee Schedule

Land Use	A Cost Per Capita	B Density	C = A x B Base Fee[1]	D = C x 0.02 Admin Charge[1, 2]	E = C + D Total Fee	F = E / Average Fee per Sq. Ft.[3]
Quimby Act - Subdivisions						
Parkland	$ 302	3.19	$ 963	$ 19	$ 982	$ 0.39
Improvements	2,548	3.19	8,128	163	8,291	3.32
Total	$ 2,850		$ 9,091	$ 182	$ 9,273	$ 3.71
Mitigation Fee Act - Infill						
Parkland	$ 282	3.19	$ 900	$ 18	$ 918	$ 0.37
Improvements	2,548	3.19	8,128	163	8,291	3.32
Total	$ 2,830		$ 9,028	$ 181	$ 9,209	$ 3.69

[1] Fee per average sized dwelling unit.

[2] Administrative charge of 2.0 percent for (1) legal, accounting, and other administrative support and (2) impact fee program administrative costs including revenue collection, revenue and cost accounting, mandated public reporting, and fee justification analyses.

[3] Assumes an average of 2,500 square feet of livable space per unit, based on the City's building permit records since 2022.

Sources: Tables 2.2 and 10.8.

11. AB 602 Requirements

On January 1, 2022, new requirements went into effect for California jurisdictions implementing impact fees. Among other changes, AB 602 added Section 66016.5 to the Government Code, which set guidelines for impact fee nexus studies. Four key requirements from that section which concern the nexus study are reproduced here:

66016.5. (a) (2) When applicable, the nexus study shall identify the existing level of service for each public facility, identify the proposed new level of service, and include an explanation of why the new level of service is appropriate.

66016.5. (a) (4) If a nexus study supports the increase of an existing fee, the local agency shall review the assumptions of the nexus study supporting the original fee and evaluate the amount of fees collected under the original fee.

66016.5. (a) (5) A nexus study adopted after July 1, 2022, shall calculate a fee imposed on a housing development project proportionately to the square footage of proposed units of the development. A local agency that imposes a fee proportionately to the square footage of the proposed units of the development shall be deemed to have used a valid method to establish a reasonable relationship between the fee charged and the burden posed by the development.

66016.5. (a) (6) Large jurisdictions shall adopt a capital improvement plan as a part of the nexus study.

Compliance with AB 602

The following sections describe this study's compliance with the new requirements of AB 602.

66016.5. (a) (2) - Level of Service

1. For fees calculated under the existing standard methodology, the fees are calculated such that new development funds facilities at the existing level of service. The park fees in this nexus study are calculated using this approach. The existing level of service in terms of the existing facility investment per capita is shown in Table 10.6.
2. For fees calculated under the planned facilities methodology, the fees are calculated to ensure that the level of service does not fall to unacceptable levels. The fees calculated under this approach are the circulation, wastewater facilities, storm drain facilities, City facilities, law enforcement facilities, fire suppression facilities and public use facility fees. Transportation projects included in these fees met the City's congestion level of service standards at the time they were added to the impact fee program. Impact fees charged under this program will serve to ensure that the LOS does not fall to unacceptable levels. The wastewater facilities needed to serve new development were identified in the draft SKF Master Plan as necessary to serve new development at an acceptable level of service.

66016.5. (a) (4) – Review of Original Fee Assumptions

Willdan extensively reviewed the City's prior impact fee studies while conducting this fee analysis. Notable this study differs from the 2015 study in several ways:

1. This study uses a planning horizon of 2050, compared to the buildout planning horizon used in the 2015 study. City staff identified parcels within the City's planning area that were likely to develop within the planning horizon, and then modified the identified project

lists so that only capacity expanding projects necessary to serve growth within the planning horizon were included in the analysis.

2. Cost assumptions have been updated to current dollars. The costs in the 2015 study were considerably lower than current market costs for construction of new facilities and the acquisition of land.
3. This study made use of the most current project lists, inventories of existing facilities, and comprehensive master planning where relevant.

Table 11.1 displays an accounting of annual revenue collected over the last five fiscal years for the impact fees included in this analysis.

Table 11.1: Annual Collected Impact Fee Revenue

Fee Category	FY 20-21	FY 21-22	FY 22-23	FY 23-24	FY24-25 (Partial)
Circulation Facilities	$ 293,462	$ 89,188	$ 9,471	$ 84,040	$ 22,721
Law Enforcement Facilities	34,957	47,978	2,666	19,874	6,399
Fire Suppression Facilities	34,917	100,838	2,654	17,967	6,369
City Facilities	93,988	25,561	2,926	20,373	7,002
Storm Drainage Facilities	68,053	88,176	18,168	162,903	68,005
Sewer Facilities	3,413	-	-	11,543	6,917
Parks	113,798	16,000	35,823	236,484	78,846
Wastewater Collection	42,526	32,921	3,848	14,621	1,539
Public Use Facilities	-	-	-	37,746	20,970

Source: City of Selma.

66016.5. (a) (5) – Residential Fees per Square Foot

Impact fees for residential land uses are calculated per square foot for all fee categories and comply with AB 602.

66016.5. (a) (6) – Capital Improvement Plan

The Capital Improvement Plan for this nexus study is comprised of the identified planned facilities within each facility fee chapter. Planned facilities identified in this document are sourced from the City's current draft CIP, master plans and other relevant documents. Adoption of this nexus study would approve the planned facilities identified herein as the Capital Improvement Plan for this nexus study.

12. 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 hearing. The impact fee nexus study must first be adopted at a public hearing to comply with AB 602. That public hearing must be noticed at least 30 days in advance. Data, such as an impact fee report, must be made available at least 10 days prior to the public hearing. 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 can keep 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. We recommend that the California Construction Cost Index (CCCI) be used for adjusting fees for inflation.

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.

Reporting Requirements

The City complies with the annual and five-year reporting requirements of the *Mitigation Fee Act*. 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 Capital Improvement 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.

Impact Fee Credits

Developers occasionally construct and dedicate facilities as part of their development project that are included in the nexus study project lists. If a developer builds a facility whose costs exceed the development's impact fee obligation, then that developer can be credited for the amount of facilities created above and beyond that development's impact. We recommend that the City' credit the difference based on a) the costs identified in the most recent CIP, and b) at the time

that the City would be building the improvement had the development not occurred. By following these guidelines, the City will not be unfairly burdened with unanticipated costs.

13. 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 *Mitigation Fee Act* findings required to implement impact fees in California demonstrate the *essential nexus* between new development and a fee to fund facilities needed to serve that development. The term *essential nexus* refers to the relationship between new development and the need for facilities (and corresponding impact fees) to serve that development. The findings also require that this study demonstrates *rough proportionality* of the fees- meaning that the amount of the exaction must roughly correspond to the burden placed on the government, resulting from the proposed development project. To ensure that fees are roughly proportional to from new development, this study first allocates facilities costs to new development using the allocation methods described in the preceding chapters, then to individual units of new development based on the demand characteristics of each unit.

The five statutory findings required for adoption of the public facilities fees documented in this report are presented in this chapter and supported in detail by the preceding chapters. 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. The purpose of the fees proposed by this report is to provide 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 public facilities to serve 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's sphere of influence. Fees addressed in this report have been identified by the City to be restricted to funding the following facility categories: law enforcement facilities, fire suppression facilities, circulation facilities, storm drainage facilities, wastewater facilities, city facilities, public use facilities and parks.

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).*

The City will restrict fee revenue to the acquisition of land, construction of facilities and buildings, and purchase of related equipment, furnishings, vehicles, and services 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. 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.

For circulation facilities demand standards are based on trip generation by various categories of new development. For storm drainage facilities demand is based on impervious surface generated by development. For wastewater facilities demand is based on increased wastewater flow generated by new 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, Growth Forecasts 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, Growth Forecasts,* or the *Service Population* sections in each facility category chapter for a description of how service populations or other factors are 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

Appendix Table A.1: Present Value of Interest on Future Wastewater Debt Issuance - Amberwood Trunk Line

Date	Payment	Principal	Interest Payment (nom. dollars)	Discount Factor[1]	Interest Payment (real dollars)
2025	452,125	137,000	315,125	0.97	$ 305,946
2026	514,249	162,000	352,249	0.94	332,028
2027	514,262	170,000	344,262	0.92	315,048
2028	514,881	179,000	335,881	0.89	298,426
2029	514,056	187,000	327,056	0.86	282,122
2030	514,837	197,000	317,837	0.84	266,184
2031	514,125	206,000	308,125	0.81	250,534
2032	513,969	216,000	297,969	0.79	235,220
2033	514,320	227,000	287,320	0.77	220,207
2034	514,129	238,000	276,129	0.74	205,466
2035	514,396	250,000	264,396	0.72	191,005
2036	514,071	262,000	252,071	0.70	176,797
2037	514,154	275,000	239,154	0.68	162,852
2038	514,597	289,000	225,597	0.66	149,146
2039	514,349	303,000	211,349	0.64	135,657
2040	514,411	318,000	196,411	0.62	122,397
2041	514,734	334,000	180,734	0.61	109,347
2042	514,268	350,000	164,268	0.59	96,490
2043	514,013	367,000	147,013	0.57	83,839
2044	513,920	385,000	128,920	0.55	71,380
2045	513,939	404,000	109,939	0.54	59,098
2046	514,022	424,000	90,022	0.52	46,982
2047	514,119	445,000	69,119	0.51	35,022
2048	514,180	467,000	47,180	0.49	23,209
2049	514,157	490,000	24,157	0.48	11,538
Total					$ 4,185,939

[1] Assumes 3% annual discount rate.

Sources: City of Selma; Willdan Financial Services.