

CITY OF HEALDSBURG

TRAFFIC AND STORM DRAIN FACILITIES DEVELOPMENT IMPACT FEE UPDATE

FINAL

JANUARY 4, 2021



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	1
Background and Study Objectives	1
Use of Fee Revenues	1
Facility Standards and Costs	1
Fee Schedule	2
Other Funding Needed	2
1. INTRODUCTION.....	3
Public Facilities Financing in California	3
Study Objectives	3
Study Methodology	4
Types of Facility Standards	4
New Development Facility Needs and Costs	4
Impact Fees for Accessory Dwelling Units	5
Calculating Impact Fees for Accessory Dwelling Units	5
Fee Program Maintenance	5
Organization of the Report	6
2. GROWTH FORECASTS.....	7
Land Use Types	7
Existing and Future Development	7
3. TRAFFIC IMPACT MITIGATION FEE ANALYSIS	9
Trip Demand	9
Growth in Trip Demand	10
Cost Allocation to New Development	11
Cost per Trip	13
Maximum Justified Impact Fee Schedule	13
4. STORM DRAIN FACILITIES.....	14
Storm Drain Demand	14
EDU Generation by New Development	14
Existing Inventory	15
Cost per Equivalent Dwelling Unit	16
Projected Fee Revenue	16
Onsite Stormwater Mitigation	16
Maximum Justified Impact Fee Schedule	16
5. IMPLEMENTATION	18
Impact Fee Program Adoption Process	18
Inflation Adjustment	18
Reporting Requirements	19
Programming Revenues and Projects with the CIP	21
6. MITIGATION FEE ACT FINDINGS	22
Purpose of Fee	22
Use of Fee Revenues	22
Benefit Relationship	22

Burden Relationship	22
Proportionality	23
APPENDIX	24

Executive Summary

This report summarizes an analysis of the need for traffic and storm drain facilities to support future development within the City of Healdsburg as growth occurs. It is the City's intent that the costs representing future development's share of these facilities and improvements be imposed on that development in the form of a development impact fee, also known as a public facilities fee.

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 transportation and storm drain facilities – and therefore maintain its facilities standards – as new development leads to service population increases.

The City imposes traffic impact fees and storm drain impact fees Citywide 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 schedule contained herein.

Use of Fee Revenues

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 construction of traffic facilities and storm drain infrastructure.

Facility Standards and Costs

There are three approaches typically used 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 the traffic facilities fees 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. This approach is often used when a long-range plan for new facilities is not available. Future facilities to serve growth will be identified through the City's annual capital improvement plan and budget process and/or completion of a new facility master plan. This approach is used to calculate the storm drain facilities fees in this report.

The **system plan** approach is based on a master facilities plan in situations where the needed facilities serve both existing and new development. This approach allocates existing and planned facilities across existing and new development to determine new development's fair share of facility needs. This approach is used when it is not possible to differentiate the benefits of new facilities between new and existing development. Often the system plan is based on increasing facility standards, so the City must find non-impact fee revenue sources to fund existing development's fair share of planned facilities. This approach is not used in this report.

Fee Schedule

Table E.1 summarizes the schedule of maximum justified traffic and storm drain impact mitigation fees based on the analysis contained in this report.

Table E.1: Maximum Justified Impact Fee Schedule

	Traffic Facilities	Storm Drain Facilities	Total
<i>Residential - per Dwelling Unit</i>			
Single Family	\$ 4,275	\$ 5,724	\$ 9,999
Multifamily	2,850	2,290	5,140
<i>Nonresidential - per 1,000 Building Sq. Ft. or Hotel Room</i>			
Commercial	\$ 5,362	\$ 1,602	\$ 6,964
Office	6,824	2,576	9,400
Industrial	4,049	2,461	6,510
Hotel Room	2,512	1,889	4,401

Sources: Tables 3.5 and 4.6.

Other Funding Needed

Impact fees may only fund the share of public facilities related to new development in Healdsburg. They may not be used to fund the share of facility needs generated by existing development. As shown in **Table E.2**, approximately \$17.8 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.

Table E.2: Projected Impact Fee Revenue

Fee Category	Total Project Cost	Impact Fee Revenue	Additional Funding Required
Traffic Facilities	\$ 26,035,500	\$ 8,241,562	\$ 17,793,939
Storm Drain Facilities	4,747,752	4,747,752	-
Total	\$ 30,783,252	\$ 12,989,314	\$ 17,793,939

Sources: Tables 3.3 and 4.5.

1. Introduction

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

- Public Facilities Financing in California
- Study Objectives;
- Study Methodology;
- Impact Fees for Accessory Dwelling Units;
- Fee Program Maintenance; and
- Organization of the Report.

Public Facilities Financing in California

The changing fiscal landscape in California during the past 40 years has steadily undercut the financial capacity of local governments to fund infrastructure. Three dominant trends stand out:

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

Faced with these trends, many cities and counties have 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 an impact fee program is to ensure that new development pays the capital costs associated with growth. Guiding principle 2B of the Healdsburg 2030 General Plan Policy Document’s *Guiding Principles* states “Ensure that infrastructure and services keep pace with development.” This report supports this policy by updating the City’s traffic and storm drain impact fees to ensure that they will adequately fund new development’s fair share of these types of infrastructure.

The City imposes impact 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 City of Healdsburg is forecast to experience moderate growth through the General Plan planning horizon. This growth will create an increase in demand for public services and the City facilities required to deliver them. Given the revenue challenges that are common to most cities and counties in California; the City 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, facility plans, and engineering studies to ensure that the City's traffic impact mitigation fee program is representative of the transportation facility needs resulting from new development.

Study Methodology

Traffic impact fees are calculated to fund the cost of transportation facilities required to accommodate growth. The five steps followed in a public facilities 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 transportation 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 and their costs:** Estimate the total amount and cost of planned facilities, and identify the share required to accommodate new development;
4. **Identify alternative funding requirements:** Determine if any non-fee funding is required and/or available to complete projects; and,
5. **Calculate fee schedule:** Allocate facilities costs per unit of new development to calculate the public facilities fee schedule.

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*, *design standards* and *cost standards*. *Demand standards* determine the amount of facilities required to accommodate growth. In this case, the impact fee seeks to maintain a specific level of service on its roadways. *Design standards* determine how a facility should be designed to meet expected demand, and directly related to the costs of planned facilities. The projects included in the traffic impact mitigation fee have all been designed to meet state and City engineering standards. Finally, *cost standards* are a method for determining the amount of facilities required to accommodate growth based on facility costs per unit of demand.

The traffic impact mitigation fee analysis contained in this report converts project costs to serve growth (identified by *demand* and *design standards*), into a *cost standard* (cost per trip from new development), which is then used as the basis of the fee. A fee for a particular land use is equal to the cost per trip, multiplied by the trip generation rate (trip demand factor) for that land use.

New Development Facility Needs and Costs

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

There are three common methods for determining new development's fair share of planned facilities costs: the **planned facilities method**, the **existing inventory method**, and the **system plan method**.

Planned Facilities Method

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

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

This method is appropriate when specific planned facilities can be identified that only benefit new development. Examples include street improvements to avoid deficient levels of service or a sewer trunk line extension to a previously undeveloped area. This method is also appropriate when to use in this analysis because the specific planned facilities that benefit new development have been identified through traffic level of service analysis. Under this method new development funds the expansion of facilities needed to ensure that traffic operates at an acceptable level of service. **This method is used to calculate the traffic impact 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:

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

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 CIP and budget process, possibly after completion of a new facility master plan. **This approach is used to calculate the storm drain facilities fees in this report.**

System Plan Method

The **system plan method** calculates the fee based on the value of existing facilities plus the cost of planned facilities, divided by demand from existing plus new development. This method is useful when planned facilities need to be analyzed as part of a system that benefits both existing and new development. This method is not used in this study.

Impact Fees for Accessory Dwelling Units

The California State Legislature recently amended requirements on local agencies for the imposition of development impact fees on accessory dwelling units (ADU) with Assembly Bill AB 68 in 2020. The amendment to California Government Code §65852.2(f)(2) stipulates that local agencies may not impose any impact fees on ADU less than 750 square feet. ADU greater than 750 square feet can be charged impact fees in proportion to the size of the primary dwelling unit.

Calculating Impact Fees for Accessory Dwelling Units

For ADUs greater than 750 square feet, impact fees can be charged as a percentage of the single family fire and dispatch fee. The formula is:

$$\frac{\text{ADU Square Feet}}{\text{Primary Residence Square Feet}} \times \text{Single Family Impact Fee} = \text{ADU Impact Fee}$$

In the case of an 800 square foot ADU and a 1,600 square foot primary residence, the fire and dispatch fees would be 50 percent (800 square feet / 1,600 square feet = 50%) of the single family dwelling unit fee.

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. Impact fee levels must be adjusted frequently to account for inflation. Should the cost of facilities rise more quickly than the fee amounts collected, the facilities needed to serve new development will be underfunded. To avoid collecting inadequate revenue, costs for planned facilities must be updated periodically for inflation, and the fees recalculated to reflect the higher costs. The use of established construction cost indices, such as those published by the Engineering News Record, are necessary to accurately adjust the impact fees for inflation. For a list of recommended indices, and step-by-step instructions for adjusting fees for inflation, see Chapter 5.

While fee updates using inflation indices are appropriate for periodic updates to ensure that fee revenues keep up with increases in the costs of traffic 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 5.

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 and 4 identify facility standards, allocate the cost of planned facilities between new development and other development, and identify the appropriate development impact fee for traffic facilities and storm drain facilities, respectively.

Chapter 5 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 6.

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 2020 base year and a planning horizon of buildout.

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 2020 is used as an indicator of existing facility demand and to determine existing facility standards.
- The estimate of total development at buildout 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 2020 through buildout 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 for which impact fees have been calculated for are defined below.

- **Single family:** Detached and attached one-unit dwellings (Includes single family homes and townhomes)
- **Multifamily:** All attached multifamily dwellings including duplexes and condominiums
- **Commercial:** All commercial, retail, educational, institutional, and service development
- **Office:** All general, professional, and medical office development
- **Industrial:** All warehouse, distribution, manufacturing, and other industrial development
- **Lodging/Hotel:** All commercial lodging establishments.

Some developments may include more than one land use type, such as a mixed-use development with both multifamily and commercial uses. In those cases, the facilities fee would be calculated separately for each land use type.

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. If a project results in the intensification of use, at its discretion, the City can charge the project the difference in fees between the existing low intensity use and the future high intensity use.

Existing and Future Development

Table 2.1 shows the estimated number of residents, dwelling units, employees, and building square feet in Healdsburg, both in 2020 and at buildout. The base year estimates of household residents and dwelling units comes from the California Department of Finance. Estimates of

housing units at buildout were based on the number of dwelling units in the development pipeline, provided by City staff. The increase in residents to buildout was estimated by multiplying the increase in dwelling unit by residents per dwelling unit assumptions of 2.40 for single family dwelling units and 1.61 for multifamily dwelling units. These assumptions were derived from 2018 American Community Survey data.

Base year nonresidential building square footage, by land use type was estimated using GIS analysis of an existing building footprints shapefile from Sonoma County GIS overlaid with the City's existing zoning. The increase in nonresidential square feet was based on potential development that could be accommodated in the 2030 General Plan Update Revised Draft EIR.

Table 2.1: Citywide Demographic Assumptions

	2020	Projected Buildout	Increase
Residents ¹	12,034	13,445	1,411
Dwelling Units ²			
Single Family	3,949	4,078	129
Multifamily	1,110	1,794	684
Total	5,059	5,872	813
Building Square Feet (000s) ³			
Commercial	1,221	1,910	689
Office	365	385	20
Industrial	2,319	2,637	318
Total	3,904	4,931	1,027
Lodging/Hotel Rooms	634	949	315

¹ Current population from California Department of Finance (DOF). Projection based on increase of dwelling units in development pipeline, multiplied by current residents per dwelling unit of 2.40 for single family dwelling units and 1.61 for multifamily dwelling units calculated using 2018 American Community Survey data.

² Current values from DOF. Increase in dwelling units based on single family and multifamily dwelling units currently in the development pipeline.

³ Base year nonresidential building square feet by land use estimated using GIS analysis of building footprints shapefile from Sonoma County GIS, and existing City zoning. Increase in nonresidential square feet based on Healdsburg Planning Area Potential Development from Healdsburg 2030 General Plan Update Revised Draft EIR.

Sources: City of Healdsburg; City of Healdsburg General Plan Update Revised Draft EIR; California Department of Finance (DOF), Table E-5, 2020; Sonoma County GIS "Sonoma_County_Building_Outlines-shp"; Willdan Financial Services.

3. Traffic Impact Mitigation Fee Analysis

This chapter summarizes an analysis of the need for traffic facilities, including roadway and intersection improvements, to accommodate increased trip demand from new development. The chapter documents a reasonable relationship between new development and an impact fee for funding of these facilities.

Trip Demand

The need for transportation facilities is based on the trip demand placed on the system by development. A reasonable measure of demand is the number of average daily vehicle trips, adjusted for the type of trip. Vehicle trip generation rates are a reasonable measure of demand on the City's system of street improvements across all modes because alternate modes (transit, bicycle, pedestrian) often substitute for vehicle trips.

The two types of trips adjustments made to trip generation rates to calculate trip demand are described below:

- 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.
- The trip generation rate is adjusted by the average length of trips for a specific land use category compared to the average length of all trips on the street system.

These adjustments allow for a holistic quantification of trip demand that takes trip purpose and length into account for fee calculation purposes.

Table 10.1 shows the calculation of trip demand factors by land use category based on the adjustments described above. Data is based on extensive and detailed trip surveys conducted in the Institute of Traffic Engineers (ITE) and by the San Diego Association of Governments (SANDAG). The surveys provide one of the most comprehensive databases available of trip generation rates, pass-by trips factors, and average trip length for a wide range of land uses. It should be noted that the projections of current and future trip generation in this report are based on data specific to the City of Healdsburg.

Table 3.1: Trip Demand Adjustment Factors

	Primary and Diverted		Average Trip Length ²	Adjustment Factor ³	ITE Category	PM Peak Hour Trips ⁴	Trip Demand Factor ⁵
	Pass-by Trips ¹	Trips					
	A	B = 1 - A	C	$D = B \times C / \text{Avg.}$		E	F = D x E
<u>Residential - per Dwelling Unit</u>							
Single Family	0%	100%	7.9	1.14	Single Family Housing (210)	1.00	1.14
Multifamily	0%	100%	7.9	1.14	Multifamily Housing (Low-Rise) (220)	0.67	0.76
<u>Nonresidential - per 1,000 Sq. Ft. or Hotel Room</u>							
Commercial	34%	66%	3.6	0.34	Shopping Center (820)	4.21	1.43
Office	0%	100%	8.8	1.28	General Office (710)	1.42	1.82
Industrial	0%	100%	9.0	1.30	General Light Industrial (110)	0.83	1.08
Hotel Room	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. Assumption based on ITE Trip Generation Handbook 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, 10th Edition; Institute of Traffic Engineers, Trip Generation Handbook, 3rd Edition; Willdan Financial Services.

Growth in Trip Demand

Table 3.2 estimates trip demand in 2020 and at buildout. The trip demand factors from Table 3.1 are multiplied by estimates of existing and future development from Table 2.1 to determine existing and future demand for traffic facilities. Based on the demand factors and development projections, new development will comprise approximately 17.3% of trip demand at buildout.

Table 3.2: Land Use Scenario and Trip Generation

	Trip Demand Factor	2020		Growth 2020 to Planning Horizon		Total	
		Units/ 1,000 Sq. Ft.	Trips	Units/ 1,000 Sq. Ft.	Trips	Units/ 1,000 Sq. Ft.	Trips
<i>Residential - Dwelling Units</i>							
Single Family	1.14	3,949	4,502	129	147	4,078	4,649
Multifamily	0.76	1,110	844	684	519	1,794	1,363
Subtotal		5,059	5,346	813	666	5,872	6,012
<i>Nonresidential - 1,000 Square Feet</i>							
Commercial	1.43	1,221	1,745	689	986	1,910	2,731
Office	1.82	365	665	20	36	385	701
Industrial	1.08	2,319	2,504	318	343	2,637	2,847
Subtotal		3,904	4,914	1,027	1,365	4,931	6,279
Hotel Rooms	0.67	634	425	315	211	949	636
Total			10,685		2,242		12,927
			82.7%		17.3%		100%

Sources: Tables 2.1 and 3.1.

Cost Allocation to New Development

City staff identified projects needed to accommodate new development. These projects have also been incorporated into the City's CIP. For all projects except project number 4003, the impact fee will fund a share of the total project costs corresponding with new development's share of trip demand at buildout calculated in Table 3.2. This is because the projects will serve both existing and new development. Existing development will be responsible for fully funding the projects through any funding source other than impact fees.

For project 4003, new development will fund 71.9% of the project through this impact fee. This project would not be pursued, but to accommodate new development. Approximately \$1.9 million of developer contributions and County funding have been netted out of the total project cost allocated to new development, resulting in the 71.9% allocation.

Table 3.3: Traffic Facilities Project List

Plan ID	Project Name	Location	Description	Project Cost	Allocation to New Development	Cost Allocated to Impact Fee
			Reconstruct and partially widen Dry Creek to implement street curbs, sidewalks, enhanced safety pedestrian crossing class 1 pathway and lane reconfiguration;			
4003	Dry Creek Road Improvements	Dry Creek Road: from Healdsburg Avenue intersection to Hwy 101 interchange under-crossing.	reconstruct and widen north half of Grove St/Dry Creek Rd intersection.	\$ 6,840,000	71.9%	\$ 4,920,740
	Healdsburg Avenue Complete Street Improvement	Within existing public Right-of-Way, from Powell Avenue to the Northern City Limits.	Road diet, bicycle facilities, pedestrian improvements, enhanced safety, and streetscape. Complete street project.	8,000,000	17.3%	1,384,000
4546	N City Limits		The Northbound 101 offramp crosses Southbound Healdsburg Avenue (stop sign) creating a unique traffic situation. The Central Healdsburg Area Plan calls for a roundabout at this location.	7,435,500	17.3%	1,286,342
	US-101 Central Healdsburg Offramp Improvements	Northbound US 101 offramp at Central Healdsburg				
2036	Healdsburg Avenue-Mill Street Improvements	Healdsburg Avenue: from Mill St/Vine St (5-way intersection) to Exchange Ave. Mill Street: from Healdsburg Ave/Vine St (5-way intersection) to Hwy 101 under-crossing	Reconstruct Healdsburg Avenue to re-align street curbs, reduce number of vehicle lanes, implement parking, landscaped center medians, sidewalks and other pedestrian features. Mill Street reconstruction and partial widening to implement street curbs, sidewalks, and possibly lane reconfiguration.	960,000	17.3%	166,080
	Grove Street Neighborhood Plan Implementation - Complete Streets	Grove Street between Grant Street and Dry Creek Road.	Road improvements including curb, gutter, sidewalk, and bike facilities. Complete street project.	2,800,000	17.3%	484,400
	Total			\$26,035,500		\$ 8,241,562

Source: City of Healdsburg.

Cost per Trip

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

Table 3.4 calculates the cost per trip demand unit by dividing the total project costs attributable to new development summarized in Table 3.3, by the total growth in trips calculated in Table 3.2.

Table 3.4: Cost per Trip

Costs Allocated to New Development	\$	8,241,562
Growth in Trip Demand		2,242
Cost per Trip	\$	3,676

Sources: Tables 3.2 and 3.3.

Maximum Justified Impact Fee Schedule

Table 3.5 presents the maximum justified traffic impact mitigation fee schedule. The cost per trip is multiplied by the trip demand factor for each land use to determine the fee per dwelling unit or per 1,000 square feet of nonresidential building space.

Table 3.5: Traffic Facilities Impact Fee Schedule - All Projects

Land Use	A	B	C = A x B		D = C x 0.02	E = C + D	E / 1,000
	Cost Per Trip	Trip Demand Factor	Base Fee ¹	Admin Charge ^{1, 2}	Total Fee ¹	Fee per Sq. Ft.	
<i>Residential - per Dwelling Unit</i>							
Single Family	\$ 3,676	1.14	\$ 4,191	\$ 84	\$ 4,275		
Multifamily	3,676	0.76	2,794	56	2,850		
<i>Nonresidential - per Building Square Feet or Hotel Room</i>							
Commercial	\$ 3,676	1.43	\$ 5,257	\$ 105	\$ 5,362	\$ 5.36	
Office	3,676	1.82	6,690	134	6,824	6.82	
Industrial	3,676	1.08	3,970	79	4,049	4.05	
Hotel Room	3,676	0.67	2,463	49	2,512	n/a	

¹ Fee per dwelling unit, per 1,000 square feet of nonresidential or per hotel room.

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.

Sources: Tables 3.1 and 3.4; Willdan Financial Services.

4. Storm Drain Facilities

This chapter summarizes an analysis of the need for storm drain facilities to accommodate growth within the City of Healdsburg. This chapter documents a reasonable relationship between new development and a storm drain fee to fund storm drain facilities that serve new development.

Storm Drain Demand

New development generates storm water runoff. This runoff must be controlled through storm drainage facilities. Storm drain demand is measured by impervious surface. The more impervious surface a land use creates, the more demand for storm drain facilities it creates. **Table 4.1** shows the calculation of equivalent dwelling unit (EDU) demand factors for storm drain facilities based on impervious surface area by land use category. Dwelling unit and thousand square feet per acre assumptions are from the City’s General Plan. The area percent impervious factors are from the California Environmental Protection Agency.

Table 4.1: Storm Drain Equivalent Dwelling Units

	A	B	$C = (43,560 / A) \times B$	$D = C / \text{Single Family}$
	DU, 1,000 Sq. Ft. or Hotel Rooms per acre ¹	Average Percent Impervious per Acre	Impervious Square feet per DU, 1,000 Sq. Ft. or Hotel Room	Equivalent Dwelling Unit (EDU) ²
<i>Residential - per Dwelling Unit</i>				
Single Family	6.00	52%	3,775	1.00
Multifamily	20.00	70%	1,525	0.40
<i>Nonresidential - per 1,000 Square Feet or per Hotel Room</i>				
Commercial	34.85	86%	1,075	0.28
Office	21.78	85%	1,700	0.45
Industrial	21.78	81%	1,620	0.43
Hotel Room	30.00	86%	1,249	0.33

Note: Figures have been rounded.

¹ Dwelling units for residential and thousand building square feet for non-residential. Based on General Plan density assumptions and minimum FAR of 0.8 for commercial, 0.5 for office and 0.5 for light industrial.

² EDUs per dwelling unit for residential development and per thousand square feet for nonresidential development.

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

EDU Generation by New Development

Table 4.2 shows the estimated EDU generation from new development through buildout. New development will generate approximately 846 new EDUs, representing 12.2-percent of total storm drain demand at buildout.

Table 4.2: Land Use Scenario and EDU Generation

	EDU Factor	2020		2020 to Buildout		Buildout	
		Units/ 1,000 Sq. Ft./Rooms	EDUs	Units/ 1,000 Sq. Ft./Rooms	EDUs	Units/ 1,000 Sq. Ft./Rooms	EDUs
<i>Residential - Dwelling Units</i>							
Single Family	1.00	3,949	3,949	129	129	4,078	4,078
Multifamily	0.40	1,110	444	684	274	1,794	718
Subtotal		5,059	4,393	813	403	5,872	4,796
<i>Nonresidential - 1,000 Square Feet or Hotel Room</i>							
Commercial	0.28	1,221	342	689	193	1,910	535
Office	0.45	365	164	20	9	385	173
Industrial	0.43	2,319	997	318	137	2,637	1,134
Hotel Rooms	0.33	634	209	315	104	949	313
Subtotal		4,538	1,712	1,342	443	5,880	2,155
Total			6,105		846		6,951
			87.8%		12.2%		100%

Sources: Tables 2.1 and 4.1.

Existing Inventory

Table 4.3 summarizes the existing inventory of storm drainage facilities, along with the facilities' estimated replacement value. City staff estimated the quantities of the facilities included in the inventory based on GIS analysis. City staff also estimated the replacement value for all facilities included in the inventory. In total, the inventory of storm drainage facilities in Healdsburg is valued at approximately \$34.3 million. Refer to **Appendix Tables A.1 and A.2** for detailed storm drain facilities inventories.

Table 4.3: Storm Drain Inventory

Category	Replacement Cost
Storm Drain Mains	\$ 25,310,450
Storm Drain Inlets	5,540,000
Storm Drain Junction Boxes	120,000
Storm Drain Manholes	2,040,000
Storm Water Detention	1,250,000
Total Replacement Cost	\$ 34,260,450

Sources: City of Healdsburg, Appendix Tables A.1 and A.2.

Cost per Equivalent Dwelling Unit

This chapter uses the existing facilities standard approach to calculate the storm drain facilities cost standard. The replacement cost of the City’s existing system is divided by the existing demand from the City’s existing EDUs to determine an existing cost standard per EDU. **Table 4.4** shows the facility cost standard for storm drain facilities.

Table 4.4: Storm Drain Facilities Cost Per EDU

Storm Drain Facilities Inventory Replacement Cost	\$	34,260,450
Existing EDUs		6,105
Cost per EDU	\$	5,612

Sources: Tables 4.2 and 4.3.

Projected Fee Revenue

Table 4.5 estimates projected fee revenue by multiplying the cost per EDU from Table 4.4 by the projected growth in EDUs from Table 4.2. The City will need to identify approximately \$4.7 million in facilities to serve new development through buildout. Impact fee revenue should be programmed to specific projects through the City’s annual budgeting and CIP process to ensure that it complies with the Mitigation Fee Act.

Table 4.5: Projected Fee Revenue

Cost per EDU	\$	5,612
Growth in EDUs		846
Projected Fee Revenue	\$	4,747,752

Sources: Tables 4.2 and 4.4.

Onsite Stormwater Mitigation

If a development project mitigates stormwater runoff onsite and does not contribute runoff to the City’s storm drain infrastructure, then it is eligible to be exempt from paying the storm drain facilities impact fee. The City engineer is responsible for reviewing stormwater mitigation plans and determining if a project is exempt from the storm drain facilities impact fee.

Maximum Justified Impact Fee Schedule

The maximum justified fee for storm drain facilities is shown in **Table 4.6**. The City can adopt any fee up to this amount. The cost per EDU from Table 4.4 is converted to a fee per unit of new development based on the EDU factors shown in Table 4.1. The total fee includes a two-percent (2.0%) administrative charge to fund costs that include: a standard overhead charge applied to all City programs for legal, accounting, and other departmental and administrative support, and fee

program administrative costs including revenue collection, revenue and cost accounting and mandated public reporting.

In Willdan’s experience with impact fee programs, two percent of the base fee adequately covers the cost of fee program administration. The administrative charge should be reviewed and adjusted during comprehensive impact fee updates to ensure that revenue generated from the charge sufficiently covers, but does not exceed, the administrative costs associated with the fee program.

Table 4.6: Maximum Justified Storm Drain Facilities Fee Schedule

	A	B	C = A x B		D = C x 0.02	E = C + D	
	Cost Per	EDU	Base	Admin	Total	Fee per	
	EDU	Factor	Fee ¹	Fee ^{1,2}	Fee ¹	Sq. Ft.	
<i>Residential - per Dwelling Unit</i>							
Single Family	\$ 5,612	1.00	\$ 5,612	\$ 112	\$ 5,724		
Multifamily	5,612	0.40	2,245	45	2,290		
<i>Nonresidential - per 1,000 Square Feet.</i>							
Commercial	\$ 5,612	0.28	\$ 1,571	\$ 31	\$ 1,602	\$ 1.60	
Office	5,612	0.45	2,525	51	2,576	2.58	
Industrial	5,612	0.43	2,413	48	2,461	2.46	
Hotel Room	5,612	0.33	1,852	37	1,889	n/a	

¹ Fee per dwelling unit, per 1,000 square feet of nonresidential.

²Administrative 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 analysis.

Sources: Tables 4.1 and 4.4; Willdan Financial Services.

5. Implementation

Impact Fee Program Adoption Process

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

Inflation Adjustment

The City should 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 fees be adjusted for inflation annually.

There are no inflation indices that are specific to the City of Healdsburg. We recommend that the Engineering News Record's Construction Cost Index be used for adjusting fees for inflation.

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

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

To update the traffic impact mitigation fee for inflation, the steps are as follows:

1. Identify the percent change in planned facilities cost since last update based on changes in the Engineering News Record's Construction Cost Index (CCI).
2. Modify the cost each planned facility (the cost allocated to the traffic impact mitigation fee in Table 3.3) by the percent change identified in Step 1.
3. Divide the total cost of projects allocated to the fee calculated in Step 2, by the growth in trips identified in Table 3.2 to determine the updated cost per trip.
4. Multiply the cost per trip calculated in Step 3 by the trip demand factors identified in Table 3.1 to determine the fee for each land use.

To update the storm drain impact mitigation fee for inflation, the steps are as follows:

1. Identify the percent change in planned facilities cost since last update based on changes in the Engineering News Record's Construction Cost Index (CCI).
2. Modify the cost the existing inventory from Table 4.3 by the percent change identified in Step 1.
3. Divide the adjusted replacement cost of the existing inventory calculated in Step 2, by the existing EDUs identified in Table 4.2 to determine the updated cost per EDU.
4. Multiply the cost per EDU calculated in Step 3 by the EDU factors identified in Table 4.1 to determine the fee for each land use.

Reporting Requirements

The City will comply 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.

Table 5.1 summarizes the annual and five-year reporting requirements identified in the *Mitigation Fee Act*.

Table 5.1: Mitigation Fee Act - Annual and Five-year Administrative Requirements

CA Gov't Code Section	Timing	Reporting Requirements ¹	Recommended Fee Adjustment
66001. (d)	The fifth fiscal year following the first deposit into the account or fund, and every five years thereafter	(A) Identify the purpose to which the fee is to be put. (B) Demonstrate a reasonable relationship between the fee and the purpose for which it is charged. (C) Identify all sources and amounts of funding anticipated to complete financing in incomplete improvements. (D) Designate the approximate dates on which supplemental funding is expected to be deposited into the appropriate account or fund.	Comprehensive Update
66006. (b)	Within 180 days after the last day of each fiscal year	(A) A brief description of the type of fee in the account or fund. (B) The amount of the fee. (C) The beginning and ending balance of the account or fund. (D) The amount of the fees collected and the interest earned. (E) An identification of each public improvement on which fees were expended including share funded by fees. (F) An identification of an approximate date by which the construction of the public improvement will commence. (G) A description of any potential interfund transfers. (H) The amount of refunds made (if any).	Inflationary Adjustment

¹ Edited for brevity. Refer to the government code for full description.

Sources: California Government Code §6601 and §6606.

Programming Revenues and Projects with the CIP

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

The City may decide to alter the scope of the planned projects or to substitute new projects if those new projects continue to represent an expansion of the City's facilities needed to mitigate demand from new development. 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.

6. Mitigation Fee Act Findings

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

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

Purpose of Fee

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

Development impact fees are designed to ensure that new development will not burden the existing service population with the cost of facilities required to accommodate growth. Guiding principle 2B of the Healdsburg 2030 General Plan Policy Document's *Guiding Principles* states "Ensure that infrastructure and services keep pace with development." The purpose of the fees documented in this report is to implement this policy by providing a funding source from new development for to fund the traffic and storm drain facilities necessary to accommodate new development as new development adds demand for these facilities to the City's infrastructure.

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 traffic and storm drain facilities to serve new development. Facilities funded by these fees are designated to be located within the City.

Benefit Relationship

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

We expect that the City will restrict fee revenue to the acquisition of land, construction of infrastructure, and purchase of related equipment, 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 the traffic impact mitigation fee, 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. In this case, the fee program seeks to ensure all new development funds its fair share cost per trip generated of the identified projects needed to accommodate new development. For storm drain facilities, the fee is calculated such that new development contributes to storm drain facilities at the same cost per equivalent dwelling unit that existing development has funded to date.

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 and the corresponding increase in the number of vehicle trips. Larger new development projects result in higher trip generation 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 the *Trip Demand* section in Chapter 3 or the *Storm Drain Demand* section in Chapter 4 for a description of how trip demand factors and storm drain equivalent dwelling units are determined for different types of land uses. See the *Maximum Justified Fee Schedule* section the same chapter for a presentation of the fees.

Appendix

Appendix Table A.1: Stormwater Mains

Material	Size	Length	Cost per Foot	Total Replacement Cost
ADS	30	49	\$ 150	\$ 7,350
ADS	36	439	150	65,850
ADS	Unknown	49	150	7,350
AsbestosCement	12	1,087	75	81,525
AsbestosCement	15	699	100	69,900
AsbestosCement	18	300	150	45,000
AsbestosCement	24	29	150	4,350
BOX	36	151	500	75,500
BOX	48	223	500	111,500
BOX	65	51	500	25,500
BOX	66	126	500	63,000
BOX	68	132	500	66,000
BOX	72	969	500	484,500
BOX	96	718	500	359,000
BOX	120	870	750	652,500
BOX	144	67	750	50,250
BOX	174	53	750	39,750
BOX	180	58	750	43,500
BOX	240	315	750	236,250
BOX	Unknown	486	625	303,750
CI	15	48	100	4,800
CI	18	24	150	3,600
CONC	6	403	75	30,225
CONC	8	520	75	39,000
CONC	10	100	75	7,500
CONC	12	2,819	75	211,425
CONC	15	1,373	100	137,300
CONC	18	2,802	150	420,300
CONC	21	226	150	33,900
CONC	24	3,089	150	463,350
CONC	30	1,356	150	203,400
CONC	36	247	150	37,050
CONC	54	2,990	200	598,000
CONC	60	519	200	103,800
CONC	72	86	200	17,200
CONC	Unknown	131	150	19,650
CorrugatedMetal	6	40	75	3,000
CorrugatedMetal	8	18	75	1,350
CorrugatedMetal	10	19	75	1,425
CorrugatedMetal	12	1,588	75	119,100
CorrugatedMetal	14	14	75	1,050
CorrugatedMetal	15	157	100	15,700
CorrugatedMetal	18	1,644	150	246,600
CorrugatedMetal	24	427	150	64,050
CorrugatedMetal	30	195	150	29,250
CorrugatedMetal	36	806	150	120,900

Source: City of Healdsburg.

Appendix Table A.1: Stormwater Mains Continued

Material	Size	Length	Cost per Foot	Total Replacement Cost
CorrugatedMetal	48	86	\$ 150	\$ 12,900
CorrugatedMetal	58	567	200	113,400
CorrugatedMetal	Unknown	10	150	1,500
CuredInPlace	12	289	75	21,675
CuredInPlace	24	924	150	138,600
CuredInPlace	30	1,329	150	199,350
CuredInPlace	36	1,217	150	182,550
CuredInPlace	42	185	150	27,750
CuredInPlace	48	1,583	150	237,450
CuredInPlace	60	5,178	200	1,035,600
DuctileIron	12	139	75	10,425
DuctileIron	16	60	100	6,000
DuctileIron	18	40	150	6,000
DuctileIron		87	150	13,050
HighDensityPolyethylene	18	122	150	18,300
HighDensityPolyethylene	24	52	150	7,800
HighDensityPolyethylene	36	386	150	57,900
LOCATION?	12	343	75	25,725
LOCATION?	15	591	100	59,100
LOCATION?	18	170	150	25,500
LOCATION?	24	784	150	117,600
LOCATION?	Unknown	21	150	3,150
PERF	8	152	75	11,400
PolyvinylChloride	4	359	75	26,925
PolyvinylChloride	6	213	75	15,975
PolyvinylChloride	7	34	75	2,550
PolyvinylChloride	8	5	75	375
PolyvinylChloride	10	395	75	29,625
PolyvinylChloride	12	1,891	75	141,825
PolyvinylChloride	15	454	100	45,400
PolyvinylChloride	18	103	150	15,450
PolyvinylChloride	30	69	150	10,350
PolyvinylChloride	Unknown	352	150	52,800
ReinforcedConcrete	6	59	75	4,425
ReinforcedConcrete	8	231	75	17,325
ReinforcedConcrete	10	353	75	26,475
ReinforcedConcrete	12	8,706	75	652,950
ReinforcedConcrete	15	12,952	100	1,295,200
ReinforcedConcrete	18	18,363	150	2,754,450
ReinforcedConcrete	21	2,354	150	353,100
ReinforcedConcrete	24	8,840	150	1,326,000
ReinforcedConcrete	27	146	150	21,900
ReinforcedConcrete	30	8,820	150	1,323,000
ReinforcedConcrete	33	49	150	7,350
ReinforcedConcrete	36	7,209	150	1,081,350
ReinforcedConcrete	42	4,147	175	725,725
ReinforcedConcrete	48	2,511	175	439,425
ReinforcedConcrete	54	721	200	144,200
ReinforcedConcrete	60	306	200	61,200
ReinforcedConcrete	72	390	200	78,000

Source: City of Healdsburg.

Appendix Table A.1: Stormwater Mains Continued

Material	Size	Length	Cost per Foot	Total Replacement Cost
ReinforcedConcrete	76	407	\$ 200	\$ 81,400
ReinforcedConcrete	83	189	200	37,800
ReinforcedConcrete	84	49	200	9,800
ReinforcedConcrete	Unknown	477	150	71,550
SUBDRAIN	4	3,324	75	249,300
SUBDRAIN	6	821	75	61,575
SUBDRAIN	8	100	75	7,500
SUBDRAIN		287	150	43,050
SUBDRAIN	Unknown	779	150	116,850
	4	83	75	6,225
	6	709	75	53,175
	8	1,702	75	127,650
	10	504	75	37,800
	12	4,509	75	338,175
	15	3,429	100	342,900
	18	7,455	150	1,118,250
	21	934	150	140,100
	24	3,996	150	599,400
	30	2,502	150	375,300
	33	363	150	54,450
	36	3,593	150	538,950
	42	393	175	68,775
	54	1,089	200	217,800
	60	821	200	164,200
	120	543	200	108,600
	Unknown	5,677	150	851,550
		5,180	150	777,000
Total				\$ 25,310,450

Source: City of Healdsburg.

Table A.2: Additional Storm Drain Facilities Inventory

Item	Count	Cost per Unit	Total Replacement Cost
<u><i>Storm Drain Inlets</i></u>			
Catch Basin	342	5,000	\$ 1,710,000
Curb Inlet	766	5,000	<u>3,830,000</u>
Total			\$ 5,540,000
<u><i>Storm Drain Junction Boxes</i></u>			
	24	5,000	\$ 120,000
<u><i>Storm Drain Manholes</i></u>			
	272	7,500	\$ 2,040,000
<u><i>Storm Water Detention</i></u>			
North Detention Basin (does not include land value)			\$ 750,000
South Detention Basin (does not include land value)			<u>500,000</u>
Total			\$ 1,250,000

Source: City of Healdsburg.
