

Development Impact Fee Calculation and Nexus

Report For the City of Lompoc,

California

March 2025





March 3, 2025

Mr. Dean Albro, City Manager  
City of Lompoc – City Hall  
100 Civic Center Plaza  
Lompoc, CA 93436

**RE: City of Lompoc 2025-26 Development Impact Fee Calculation, Nexus Report, and Master Facilities Plan Update**

City Manager Albro:

In 2020, Revenue and Cost Specialists, L.L.C., was contracted to undertake a comprehensive identification of the capital projects and capital acquisitions necessary to preserve the existing Levels of Service (LOS) that were then currently offered to and enjoyed by (after having been paid for by) the existing community. The construction of these additional projects is necessary to eliminate the eventual diminution of the existing *Levels of Service* due to the addition of new residential and business development in the City of Lompoc. The 2020 Report also calculated the development impact fees (DIFs) necessary to fund those projects. However, it is prudent to continually reassess and update these fees, especially considering the high inflation due to the COVID-19 Pandemic. So, in 2024, Revenue and Cost Specialists were again contacted by the City to update the 2020 report.

City Council and staff, responsible for providing services to a continually expanding residential and business community, must recognize that the magnitude of the DIFs is a direct function of the nearly \$82.20 million cost of capital projects identified as development generated in the *Master Facilities Plan* (MFP). Approximately \$75.64 million of the \$82.20 million will be financed by impact fees from future development. An additional \$15.47 will come from development with entitlements that limit the application of the existing lower DIF Schedule. There is a net negative total DIF fund balance of \$8.91 million (for all infrastructures). The negative \$8.91 million results when combining the negative \$16.42 million in fund balance in the water and wastewater utilities with the positive total of \$7.51 million in fund balances from the City's remaining infrastructures.

The following DIF Report recalculates and updates the DIFs for the City of Lompoc, based on the aforementioned changes and the City's recently amended General Plan and its effect upon requirements for public safety, circulation, storm drainage collection, utilities, refuse collection and disposal and the quality-of-life facilities (public use facilities, parks, etc.). The adoption of the updated DIFs will enable this City Council and succeeding Councils to continue to ensure that the City can meet the *basic* infrastructure needs of new growth without unduly burdening the existing

population and business community for these development-generated capital costs. Adopting the maximum DIFs contained herein and imposition upon the remaining development opportunities in Lompoc would generate approximately \$75.64 million in a combination of public improvement dedications and revenues limited for use on the many development-generated capital expansion projects.

A significant element in this Report is the *proportional analysis*, or comparison of what is being asked of future residents and businesses, in the form of dedicated public improvements or in lieu of impact fee payments, with the replacement cost of the City's existing infrastructure (land, improvement, facilities, and equipment), contributed by the existing population and business community. The dedications, taxes, and assessments contributed to date by the existing community over numerous decades of development have generated just over \$1.87 billion in infrastructure assets or capital improvements for the City. Approximately \$362.64 million of this total is non-depreciable land, leaving about \$1.51 billion in depreciable assets. Be advised that the \$1.51 billion is limited to spine infrastructure (high-capacity systems that support the City's core functions and connectivity) and does not include local (i.e., neighborhood streets and storm and utility pipes) which, if included, would increase that figure by an estimated \$923.96 million for a total depreciable capital replacement cost of \$2.80 billion. The following table identifies the existing spine infrastructure capital improvement equity by infrastructure.

<b>Infrastructure</b>	<b>Existing Spine Improvements</b>
Law Enforcement, Vehicles and Equipment	\$36,497,424
Fire Suppression, Vehicles and Equipment	\$32,306,535
Circulation System et al.	\$698,625,160
Electric Source and Distribution System	Not Included
Water Treatment and Distribution System	\$287,292,046
Wastewater Collection System and Treatment	\$480,601,964
Refuse Collection Vehicles and Barrels	Not Available
General Government, Vehicles, and Equipment	\$35,539,860
Library Collection/Public Use Computers	\$3,812,201
Public Use Facilities	\$45,613,568
Aquatics Facilities	\$27,919,637
Park Land Acquisition and Improvements et al.	\$219,892,540
Total	\$1,868,100,935
Less Non-Depreciable Land	\$362,636,194
Net Depreciable Spine Assets	\$1,505,464,741

The recommended DIF schedules will not address all of the City's capital needs, as identified in this Report's various schedules. As per Government Code §66000 et. seq. and fairness, DIFs cannot address existing capital deficiencies. The proposed DIFs will recognize and accommodate the needs generated by the City's growing population and business community. However, with the continued adoption of DIFs, other City discretionary revenue resources that may have been used to meet growth-generated needs for expanded services and facilities will remain available for those accumulating replacement and rehabilitation projects.

The DIFs contained herein calculate only the costs of infrastructure required to support services provided only by the City of Lompoc. They do not include development impact fees imposed by the school district, any County agencies, or any other local government agency or district. The information required to develop the City's capital costs and equity data was generated by the Lompoc staff; without their help and cooperation, this report would have been impossible to complete. In addition to your assistance in direction and in communicating to the staff the highest priority of this project, the following management and technical personnel were instrumental in working, in some cases on a near daily basis, with RCS to generate the information and data so critically necessary for the legal support of the DIFs.

**Christie Donnelly – Management Services Director**  
**Greg Stones – Principal Planner**  
**Robert Cross – Financial Services Manager**

Without their hard work and willingness to provide the best data available, this Report could not have been completed to the degree of accuracy that it has. I can state without contradiction that the City of Lompoc has clearly increased the quality of information over the previous Report. We would like to express our appreciation to the Planning staff for their diligent efforts to provide us with the most accurate land-use database possible. We would also like to highlight the assistance of Management Services Director Christie Donnelly for her timely responses to RCS's many requests for financial information and in coordinating the many meetings with the above-named staff. Her efforts directly improved the quality of information and resulting calculation.

The *Development Impact Fee Calculation and Nexus Report* and the *Master Facilities Plan* are submitted for your review and consideration. RCS is prepared to assist in increasing the Council's and community's understanding of this very significant part of the City's revenue structure.

Sincerely,



Gregory Brown  
Vice President



Scott Thorpe  
Principal

CITY OF LOMPOC  
DEVELOPMENT IMPACT FEE  
CALCULATION AND NEXUS REPORT

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTERS	PAGES
Chapter 1 – Background and Introduction	1
Chapter 2 – Demographics and Findings	11
<i>Proposed Development Impact Fees/Summary Schedules</i>	20
Chapter 3 – Law Enforcement Facilities and Equipment	22
Chapter 4 – Fire Suppression/Rescue Facilities, Vehicles, and Equipment	31
Chapter 5 - Circulation (Streets, Signals and Bridges) Facilities	40
Chapter 6 – Electric Distribution System	53
Chapter 7 – Water Treatment, Storage and Distribution Facilities	54
Chapter 8 - Wastewater Collection Facilities	66
Chapter 9 – Refuse Collection Vehicles and Barrels	74
Chapter 10 - General Facilities, Vehicles, and Equipment	77
Chapter 11 - Library Collections Items and Facilities	83
Chapter 12 - Public Use Facilities	88
Chapter 13 – Aquatic Facilities	93
Chapter 14 - Parkland Acquisition, Facilities Improvements, and Open Space Land Acquisition	97
Appendix A - Summary of Recommendations	109
Appendix B - Detailed Land Use Database	112
Appendix C - AB-602 Justification	115
Appendix D - Application of Accessory Dwelling Unit as a Function of Detached Dwelling	121
Appendix E - Gov Code 66016.5(a)(4) Requirement	123

## Chapter 1 Background and Introduction

---

In 2024-25, the City of Lompoc retained Revenue and Cost Specialists (RCS) to comprehensively calculate the future development impact costs for the City. The development impact cost calculations are intended to identify the cost of additional infrastructure necessary to accommodate continued development within the City's existing limits in such a fashion as not to decrease the levels of service currently enjoyed by the City's existing residents and businesses. The development impact cost calculations are then formalized as a set of Development Impact Fee (henceforth referred to as DIF) schedules by the City Council.

The last Nexus Report and Development Impact Fee calculation completed for the City was in 2003 by Maximus, Inc. Although the previous Development Impact Fees have served the City well for the past 22 years, it is both appropriate and warranted to recalculate the DIFs in light of not only inflation but numerous other development factors, such as updating all capital project costs, to ensure that the City collects sufficient monies to construct the additional infrastructure needed to accommodate the anticipated growth of new residents and businesses expected to be developed in the City. For this and other reasons, the City has entered into an exhaustive effort to update the cost of the existing DIFs.

This *Development Impact Fee Calculation and Nexus Report* effort remains consistent with the older report's intent to quantify development costs. This document includes a greater amount of detail, such as a complete list of all 92 projects to be financed by the DIF schedules and infrastructure, as well as a comparison with the existing community's commitment. Each project identified within the DIF report has a corresponding detail page in the supporting *Master Facilities Plan*, which informs the reader where additional information can be found regarding that project.

The *Master Facilities Plan* is a separate and companion document that includes an expanded amount of information about each project while allowing the *Development Impact Fee Calculation and Nexus Report* to remain more focused on allocating and distributing capital costs to the remaining new development. A *Master Facilities Plan* with this level of detail is generally not offered by other DIF consultants, and the City is to be commended for recognizing the importance of this information to the reader and committing to the additional effort to generate it. The combined *Development Impact Fee Calculation and Nexus Report* and the *Master Facilities Plan* offer greater information for the Council to make policy decisions, greater understanding by the development community, and an easier tracking (and updating) system for the staff.

The *Master Facilities Plan* also serves to inform the users that collected DIFs are committed per §66000 of the Government Code. The DIF receipts that are collected over five years (and kept in fund balances during that period) may not necessarily reach the amount necessary to construct a needed project per the *Master Facilities Plan*. This does not mean the projects are no longer needed. Including those projects in the *Master Facilities Plan* indicates the continued importance of that project over time, certainly over a five-year period. In addition to that, it also acts as a backup for the annual DIF Collection and Use Report and an audit trail for future department heads who were not necessarily involved in this recalculation process.

The Importance of Capital Infrastructure. The Levels of Service (LOS) of any one of the City's infrastructures are based upon and (limited by) the capacity of that infrastructure to support the users, residents, or businesses. The design of any municipal project has a finite capacity, such as a four-lane road, a 30" storm drainage pipe, or a 10,000-square-foot library. Each can only

meet the needs of a defined number of users. A four-lane street segment can only handle so many vehicles per hour, especially at a speed that makes it worth using for driving over longer distances. A storm drainage pipe that is 30" cannot handle storm flows twice its capacity. A library can hold just so many collection items and serve only so many people. A municipality with 0.40 square feet per resident of library space will be able to serve more residents than a municipality with only 0.10 square feet standard per resident of library space. The following is a more precise example; we will use law enforcement to illustrate the example.

Considering the labor-intensive service of law enforcement, regardless of the quality and capabilities of the City's sworn police officers, the Department remains highly dependent upon its infrastructure capacity. A police station of 11,250 square feet will have the capacity to support roughly thirty sworn police officers at about 375 square feet per officer. If the station size remains the same at 11,250 square feet but the sworn complement doubles to sixty police officers, the station will become exceedingly dysfunctional at 187.5 square feet per officer. The same holds true for police response vehicles and law enforcement specialty equipment. If a City adds thirty additional officers but cannot add station space, vehicles, and specialty equipment, the City has dealt with only half of the service equation. They have achieved little.

Further, if you add 30 police officers:

- But the agency does not add police response vehicles, the calls-for-service responses will be very poor.
- If the agency does not create any additional station square foot space, the calls-for-service responses will be dysfunctional and unpredictable.
- But the agency does not provide the sworn officers with the required personal and specialty equipment, the calls-for-service responses will be dangerous, certainly for the new police officers.

Conversely, if you add all of the above capital needs but do not add additional sworn officers, the result would probably be limited to a minor improvement in response times. Good municipal service takes a balance of staff and infrastructure. However, make no mistake about it: the amount of and complexity of any infrastructure defines (in part or all) the level of service (LOS). This makes the one-time DIF financing of any city's infrastructure much more important. It takes balance to accommodate development with the police responses within the desired standard. It will take additional properly equipped officers, law enforcement station space, response and support vehicles, and specialty equipment. The importance of having a properly calculated and documented DIF schedule to accommodate development-related demands cannot be overstated. The same concept holds true for the two labor-intensive public safety services and the infrastructure-intensive services such as circulation, storm drainage collection, water distribution et al., and wastewater collection et al. Of course, the DIFs can only be used for capital acquisitions; the ongoing labor staffing costs will need to come from other sources.

### **Sheetz v. County of El Dorado and the Nollan/Dolan Standards**

The Nollan/Dolan Standards require a public entity to show that a fee bears an "essential nexus" and "rough proportionality" directly related to the impact of the development being charged the fee. The standard or *test* is derived from two separate court cases and was the root issue in the recent *Sheetz v. County of El Dorado* Supreme Court case. Every impact fee calculated in this Nexus Study follows the Nollan/Dolan standards and is in compliance with the *Sheetz v. County of El Dorado* Supreme Court ruling.

The first case was *Nollan v. California Coastal Commission* in 1986. This established the “essential nexus” or the first part of the Standard. In this particular case, the Nollans wanted to tear down their dilapidated bungalow and build a larger new home. The California Coastal Commission stated that since the larger house would block the public’s view of the ocean, the Nollans would need to dedicate a strip of their land along the beach to allow the public to pass along the beach for 20 years. The United States Supreme Court ruled in favor of the Nollans and found no clear relationship/nexus between the public’s view of the ocean and the California Coastal Commission’s requirement that the Nollans dedicate a part of their land for public access to the ocean.

The second case was *Dolan v. City of Tigard* in 1993. This case established the “rough proportionality,” the second part of the Standard. In the case of *Dolan v. City of Tigard*, Dolan owned a plumbing supply store and wanted to expand the store and parking lot. The City of Tigard’s planning commission granted conditional approval of the expansion, dependent on Dolan dedicating 10% of her land to a public greenway along an adjacent creek and constructing a bicycle and pedestrian pathway. The case went to the Supreme Court, which ruled in favor of Dolan. The Supreme Court found that although an “essential nexus” (in this case, an increase of impervious surfaces resulting in an increase in runoff) was established, there was no clear proportionality between the expansion of Dolan’s store and the City of Tigard requiring Dolan to dedicate 10% of her land to a public greenway. Furthermore, the Supreme Court questioned the City’s requirement for Dolan to construct a bike pathway to counteract increased traffic due to her store’s expansion.

These cases combined resulted in the Nollan/Dolan Standards. The first part of the Standard is the “essential nexus.” When applied to Impact Fees, this means that each fee must have a nexus directly related to that development’s impact on a city’s infrastructure. For example, it would make sense to have development contribute to increasing the capacity of the water conveyance system in the city since all new developments will increase the water demand. However, it would not make much sense to have development across the entire city contribute to a reverse osmosis plant that would only benefit a few industrial land uses.

The second part of the Standard is “rough proportionality.” As it relates to Impact Fees, this means that the fee charged to new development must be proportional to the impact that the new development will make on the city’s infrastructure. For example, the construction of one detached home would not result in that one home funding an entirely new water treatment plant. Instead, one detached home would contribute to funding the water treatment plant based on a gallons per day nexus. This way, the detached home contributes to its impact on the city’s water system and does not unfairly finance an entire water treatment plant.

Above all else, the intention of Impact Fees is to be fair while simultaneously ensuring the level of service in a city does not drop due to new development. The Nollan/Dolan Standards ensure that Impact Fees are fair to the city, the residents and businesses within the city, and the developer.

### **PROPORTIONAL ANALYSIS REGARDING NEW AND EXISTING INFRASTRUCTURE**

A helpful component of this Report is the proportional analysis of the infrastructure needs required to accommodate the City’s continued development compared to the existing infrastructure generated through years of taxes and other contributions currently serving the existing community. This proportional analysis is intended to recognize and reconcile the difference between the City’s desired level of service required for new development, per statements in the

various General Plan elements, with that of the *de facto* or actual level of service provided to the existing community. Including the proportional analysis will assist the City Council in adopting a DIF structure that recognizes inter-generational equity and assists the Council in making difficult policy decisions regarding the required capital additions needed to accommodate new development by increasing the layperson's understanding of *fairness*.

The proportional analysis is important, if for no other reason than for community inter-generational equity, i.e., fairness in the infrastructure investment that existing residents and businesses have made with those of new residents and businesses that wish to use the existing infrastructure. For example, new development may be required to expand the number of arterial and collector lane miles in the City, but new development also benefits from the immediate use of Pine Avenue constructed so many years ago, just as an existing citizen can use a newly constructed arterial street segment. In short, previous generations of businesses and residents have contributed to the development of the City's infrastructure, and future residents and businesses should recognize this fact by contributing a similar capacity toward completing the various infrastructure systems.

Identifying the many public improvement projects needed through build-out is one thing. It is entirely different to assume that all of the identified improvements are required to meet the demands of the new development. Clearly, some projects will *replace* the existing infrastructure, while others will be *capacity-increasing* projects. A more detailed explanation of each example is as follows;

1. Projects dealing with existing deficiencies, i.e., projects required, regardless of whether there is additional development or not. An example would be a traffic intersection currently controlled by stop signs that would meet demand warrants based upon continued development.
2. Projects are required to accommodate future development. An example of this would be a signal that is currently controlled quite adequately by stop signs but will ultimately need to be signalized because of development in the near and *downstream* areas.

This Report documents the City's costs, which serve as the basis for calculating DIFs. The updated DIF Schedules and related information can be found in Chapters 3 through 8 and Appendices A, C, and E of this Report.

RCS staff has worked with Finance, Planning, Engineering, and the Parks and Recreation infrastructure management staff to generate and review the supporting data that form the Development Impact Fee schedules calculation. The results of this review can be found in the schedules at the end of each chapter.

Development Impact Fee Structure. The General Plan provides a range of potential densities for residential development; as such, the DIFs for residential uses need to be calculated on a per-dwelling unit basis to reflect more accurately the impacts of a specific development.<sup>1</sup> For example, a property zoned as a detached dwelling residential development may contain from three to six units per acre. If fees are calculated on an acreage basis, the developer proposing three units per acre would pay the same amount as a developer constructing six units per acre. Similarly, fees are calculated on a square footage basis for business parcels (retail/service, office

---

1. Appendix E, AB-602 Justification, will address this topic in much more detail.

and industrial, etc.) to reflect the impacts of different building intensities for these types of development. Some of the infrastructures have optional fee structures recommended for unusual developments, such as a parking structure, which in itself does not create demand beyond additional storm drainage run-off, whereas the structure requiring additional parking does.

A second reason for the proposed DIF fee structure recommended in this Report involves building expansion or intensifying retail, office, and industrial areas. For example, suppose a property owner of commercial or industrial property proposes an expansion to their building. In that case, the question exists about how to charge this proposed expansion for its impact on the City's streets, storm drainage system, and other infrastructures. A fee calculated on a building square footage (and an average **Floor Area Ratio**) basis simplifies this calculation.

### CALCULATION OF DEVELOPMENT IMPACT FEES

In California, State legislation sets certain legal and procedural parameters for charging these fees. The California Legislature passed AB1600, which is now codified as California Government Code Sections 66000 through 66009. This State law went into effect on January 1, 1989.

Government Code §66000 requires documentation of projects to be financed by Development Impact Fees prior to their levy and collection and that the monies collected be committed within five years to a project of direct benefit to the development which paid the fees. Many states have such controlling statutes. Specifically, Government Code §66000 requires the following process:

1. Delineation of the purpose of the fee.
2. Determination of the use of the fee.
3. Determination of the relationship between the use of the fee and the type of development paying the fee.
4. Determination of the relationship between the need for the facility and the type of development project. **NOTE: Numbers 2 & 4 will be reversed throughout the chapters in this Report because it is apparent that *need* should be identified before *use*.**
5. Determination of the relationship between the amount of the fee and the cost of the portion of the facility attributed to the specific development project.

This Report, with some additions, utilizes the basic methodology consistent with the above requirements of Government Code §66000. Briefly, the following steps were undertaken in the calculation of DIFs for the City:

1. Define the level of service desired within the General Plan area for each project or acquisition identified as necessary. In some areas, certain statistical measures are commonly used to measure or define an acceptable level of service for a category of infrastructure. Street intersections, for instance, are commonly rated based on a Level of Service scale of "A" to "F" developed by transportation engineers. Most agencies adopt a LOS of "C."
2. Review the land use map and determine the existing mix of land uses and the amount of undeveloped and developed land. This land use data can thus be considered when planning needed infrastructure, determining the magnitude of

growth and its impacts. This inventory can be found in Table 2-1 in Chapter 2 and Appendix B.

3. Identify all additions to the capital facilities or equipment inventory necessary to maintain the identified levels of services in the City and determine the cost of those additions. An infrastructure *Master Plan* is the highest form of data.
4. Identify a level of responsibility, identifying, as termed in this Report, the relative need (or as referred to in the accompanying schedules as "PERCENT NEED") for the facility or equipment necessary to accommodate "growth" as defined and as opposed to current needs.
5. Distribute the costs identified as a result of development growth based on land use. Costs are distributed between each land use based on their relative use, or *nexus*, of the capital system. For example, future street costs were distributed to each land use based on their trip generation characteristics.

### OTHER ASSUMPTIONS OF THE REPORT

In addition to the land use assumptions contained in the next Chapter of this Report, other important assumptions of this study include the following:

"Normal" Subdivision Improvements Omitted. "Local" public improvements generally associated with and identified as being the sole responsibility of the developer through the subdivision or development review process are not included in either the project lists or consequent calculations. This type of "on-site" and immediately adjacent improvement would include all such capital construction within the boundaries of any development, such as streetlights, curbs, gutters, sidewalks, neighborhood streets, and all local utility pipes. These improvements would continue to be the direct responsibility of the developer, with or without the addition of DIFs.

Land Acquisition Costs. Land acquisition cost estimates have been developed after discussions with City officials over recent acquisitions, current negotiations, or information about parcels similar to what is needed by the City. Arguments for higher or lower costs can be made; however, the herein contained per acre amounts appear to be the most appropriate current figure for the purposes of this study.

Exclusion/Rejection of Any Type of "Credit" for Undeveloped Land. Some have argued that credit for capital-related revenues, such as gas taxes, should be made against the DIFs calculated or imposed by a city. Using the state gas tax as an example, proponents of a DIF credit argue that a city will receive increased annual gas taxes because of the additional population generated by future residential development. It is therefore argued that a developer should receive a credit for any associated gas tax revenues collected as a result of the residents or businesses that occupy the new dwellings against any Circulation DIF imposed by the City based on either of two separate arguments.

The first argument for a gas tax credit supposes that the additional gas taxes created by residential development are needed and dedicated to maintaining existing streets, which is the responsibility of existing development. Since the new streets constructed via DIFs will not require rehabilitation or reconstruction for another 10 to 20 years, the gas tax generated by new development is a windfall to the City and should be credited against the DIF. This argument fails to consider that any new resident or business in the City will begin to contribute immediately to

the use and deterioration of all City streets. A cursory review of City finances will reveal that the amount of the State gas tax received by cities falls far short of meeting the City's needed street improvements and repairs in any given year. The gas taxes *generated* by new development cannot meet the maintenance costs of either the new streets associated with the development or the existing streets used daily.

The second argument proposes that the developer pays his full share of constructing new roads when the developer pays the City's Circulation (streets, signals, bridges, and roadbed protection storm drainage) System Development Impact Fee and that the gas taxes generated by the additional residents in a development are unfairly used to make improvements to the existing street system. It is the experience of most cities that gas taxes are barely adequate to meet street-related operational costs, and if they are sufficient to meet these costs, the remainder is used for capital-related maintenance projects.

For these reasons, this Report does not consider credits of existing operational tax receipts for Circulation System DIFs. A similar discussion can be made for the other fees considered herein, and therefore, no credits against any such fees are included in this calculation of development impact costs. Those annual operational tax receipts need to be dedicated to maintaining the existing system.

Appropriate Expansion. Debt service is a reasonable construction cost for many, but not all, public facilities and infrastructure. The following example illustrates this. DIFs are collected in incremental amounts, but facilities are not expanded in those same incremental amounts. As an example, a community center fee, based upon a standard of 1.2 square feet per detached dwelling residence, may be collected for each residential dwelling in the City, but after collecting the fee for a 100-unit subdivision, it would be impractical to expand the community center by 120 square feet. Fees are collected and placed in a separate fund, generating interest until such a time that a 2,000 to 3,000-square-foot expansion is possible. During that build-up time, the community center will experience temporary overcrowding as the standard drops from 1.2 square feet/dwelling to about 0.9 square feet/dwelling. This "temporary overcapacity" may be an inconvenience, bringing about crowding and increased unavailability for rental or reservation until enough DIFs have been collected for a practical expansion to bring the community center facility back up to the original standard. In short, a development of 120 residences may be occupancy approved and bring about a temporary reduction in community center facility standards without endangering the citizen's health and safety.

However, such a *temporary overcapacity* in stormwater roadbed protection is not possible without the potential for damage to both private and public property. Capacity for the collection/removal of storm water must be available prior to the construction, which increases the impervious surface (and thus storm water run-off) of the parcel. If the local storm collection line is currently at capacity (peak or otherwise), no additional units may be brought online until additional collection capacity can be created. Again, there is a practical size of an addition to construct, and it is not likely practical for developers to wait until there is enough added demand (and fees) to pay for the facility addition. As a result, financing through some type of debt instrument may be the only alternative. Circumstances vary from city to city as to what facility expansions are critical and which can absorb temporary overcapacity for limited periods of time.

Financing Costs. Since financing costs reflect an actual and generally significant outlay of funds for an agency, they would be included in the project costs where debt financing was required due to the immediacy of the need for the facility or infrastructure to show the full costs of such facility or infrastructure and ensure that new development also pays its "fair share" of these costs. These

costs, if any, will be referenced on the *Master Facilities Plan* project detail page. Financing should only be included for facilities where, based on the staff's estimate, the immediacy of the need for the facility requires debt financing. Or, as an alternative, should financing be entered into a facility, the impact fees should be recalculated to reflect those actual costs. In such cases, the debt service payments would be discounted to today's cost to account for the diminishing value of the dollar and would be in keeping with the cost methodology used in this study to show projects in current costs. To consider the face value of bond payments when determining costs, on the other hand, would be inaccurate as it would treat the value of a dollar today the same as the value of a dollar twenty years from now. Such an approach would tend to overvalue the costs of debt service requirements and, therefore, cause an agency to overcharge its DIFs.

### OTHER ISSUES

Some claim that adding DIFs unfairly creates an inflated resale price for existing residences. The argument is that if the public agency adopts a \$35,000 to \$50,000 development impact fee per detached dwelling, the price for an existing dwelling is *artificially* increased by the same amount. We will use the example of a detached dwelling unit that cost the developer \$350,000 to construct and complete until the occupancy permit is approved.

Full Cost of a Residential Dwelling. The \$350,000 represents only the above-ground costs. The true and actual cost of a new dwelling is the cost of acquiring the parcel, necessary government approvals and permits, construction supplies, labor, debt service on the above, onsite<sup>2</sup> public improvements, and the cost of extending public services to that dwelling.

These public service extension costs include (but are not limited to):<sup>3</sup>

- The addition of law enforcement personnel requires the expansion of the police station, response vehicles, and specialty equipment.
- Additional fire stations, response vehicles, and specialty rescue equipment are needed.
- Widening road segments of traffic arterials, collectors, bridges, and additional signals.
- Additions to water delivery capability, including source, storage, and delivery.
- Additions to the wastewater capability, including collection lines.
- Additional library, aquatics center, public meeting, and developed park space for recreational/social purposes.

Thus, while constructing the above-ground portion of a detached dwelling unit may cost \$350,000, the previously identified "downstream" costs may be \$30,000 to \$50,000 per detached dwelling unit or 10% to 15% of the above-ground cost.

---

2. On-site improvements include storm gutters or drainage pipes and all of the other requirements of the City's development code on privately held developments; hence, they are "On-site." These improvements are not of "General Benefit" to the entire community.

3. The City does not necessarily provide all of these services; they are only highlighted to illustrate the types of municipal services typically required to support a residential dwelling or business facility.

If this argument is unclear, picture a 2,800-square-foot detached dwelling, costing \$350,000 to construct the above-ground structure in the middle of an empty square mile, with no roads, utility service, public safety response, flood control, or recreational facilities. What is the market value of this detached dwelling? Probably not even the \$350,000 that it cost to construct the structure. Suddenly, a \$30,000 to \$50,000 impact fee for the infrastructure needed to make that one residential unit more marketable seems like a bargain. In short, new development needs an existing system of municipal infrastructure to hook up to, or it is not viable. Development requires a public agency that provides an infrastructure-based system for private development to be viable.

Thus, the true and complete *cost* of a new detached dwelling unit is the cost of constructing the structure and the cost of extending municipal services to the dwelling, regardless of who pays for the actual costs of extending those services. To some degree, these service-related infrastructure costs have been recognized; the only question remaining is who should pay them, existing or new residents.

Effect on Market Price. Again, let us assume that a cumulative \$30,000 to \$50,000 impact fee imposed upon *new* detached dwelling construction increases the market price of an *existing* detached dwelling unit. Wouldn't this be the recognition that the existing detached dwelling already has those physical links to the municipal services? A slightly different way of looking at this argument is that each family residence has a "share" in a municipal corporation.<sup>4</sup> The share is valued at the cost of connecting to the various municipal utilities, transportation systems, flood protection, and public safety. It is logical to require any newly constructed detached dwelling to purchase a "share" at an equal cost.

## CHAPTER ORGANIZATION

Within each "hard infrastructure" Chapter (Chapters Three and Four), there will be a minimum of three fee/cost comparison tables. They will be:

***Allocation of Project Cost Estimates*** - identifies the projects, their costs, and their relationship to future development in an allocation percentage. These schedules will begin with the number x.1 as in 3.1 and 4.1).

***Minimum Needs-based Impact Fee*** - This schedule will calculate the DIF schedule that would need to be adopted to meet the minimum capital needs identified in the Report (on the second schedule at the end of the Chapter, i.e., 3.2, 4.2, etc.) for that infrastructure but limited to the General City needs. Strictly speaking, this schedule calculates the development impact costs, which are suitable to be adopted as development impact fees by the legislative body, in this case, the Lompoc City Council.

The Quality of Life Infrastructure Impact Fees (Chapters 11 through 14) are limited to a one-page calculation, and they are also at the end of each chapter.

With the adoption of this level of DIFs, one could claim that new development is occurring without any additional cost to the existing residents and businesses. You could not, however, necessarily claim that new development is paying its fair share.

---

4. Not unlike a private corporation.

***Existing Community Financial Commitment Comparison*** This schedule, while not an impact fee calculation, identifies the cost (in current nominal replacement dollar value) of the existing infrastructure, including land, physical improvements, and capital equipment. The distribution of this replacement value equity total over the existing developed community is the average amount invested by the current community of residents and businesses. It is a good indication, or comparison, of what could be imposed upon new development. This financial commitment will be expressed in terms of the cost of constructing or acquiring the assets at current replacement costs. Significant differences between this schedule and the Minimum Needs-based DIF rate schedule would certainly be worth additional analysis. These Schedules would be numbered 3.3, 4.3, 5.3, etc.

If the average equity (for a detached dwelling, for example) on this *Existing Commitment Financial Commitment Comparison* Table is greater than the average cost on the previous *Minimum Needs-based* Table, then that infrastructure system is front-ended with more of the system, say 80% of it has been constructed while only at 50% of General Plan build-out, and it likely has excess capacity at that point in time. The excess capacity is the result of earlier residents and businesses of the community having put more of the system into place than will be necessary by the remaining un-built portions of the community. The existing community has advanced money to build capacity into the infrastructure system to meet the needs of residents and businesses not yet there. This table is intended to be instructive rather than legal.

Distribution of Existing Impact Fee Fund Balance. The existing City-wide DIFs have a combined Fund Balance of a negative \$8.9 million (reserved separately by infrastructure), and each was created to finance various infrastructure needed by new residents and businesses located in newly created residential dwellings and buildings. There are no specific restrictions on the monies beyond the restriction that they can be used on improvements within the Fund title and committed within a five-year time frame. The *Master Facilities Plan*, when adopted, suffices for that commitment.

**END OF CHAPTER TEXT**

## Chapter 2 Demographics and Findings

---

This Chapter represents the beginning and end of the DIF calculation process. It begins with an inventory of fully developed, undeveloped, and underdeveloped units and acreage within the City and concludes with a summary of recommended DIF schedules with detailed infrastructure explanations in the following chapters of this Report.

### LAND USE ASSUMPTIONS

This Report contains an inventory of fully developed, undeveloped, and underdeveloped land within the City limits of Lompoc and is based on the City's most recent General Plan update. The *Undeveloped* and the *Underdeveloped* delta land inventory, identified as *Potential Development*, combine to form the base for the distribution of the estimated costs of the service-expanding capital projects necessary to accommodate that same anticipated development. Without the expansion projects, the City would be unable to accommodate that new development, effectively halting it. The *developed* land inventory forms the base for distributing the replacement cost of the existing infrastructure. This action provides the basis for comparison with the proposed DIF schedules and for the *de facto* identification of the many existing Levels of Service (LOS) currently provided by the City's existing spine infrastructure, which is conservatively valued at between \$1.8 billion.

Table 2-1 is the inventory of all private land uses contained within the current City limits in what is referred to as the General City area. It is based on the General Plan's land use inventory and a planning staff analysis of privately held parcels in the General Plan area (which excludes the City's Sphere of Influence).

Table 2-1 consists of multiple horizontal blocks of information from the top to the bottom; they are:

***Total – Land Use Database – Total of All Areas*** - This block of information identifies the amount of developed and undeveloped land in terms of acres and units for the City's entire City limits and is the sum of the two areas identified following.

***Land Use Database within the City's General City Area - Net*** - This block of information identifies the existing development and development opportunities within the General City area of the City in terms of acres and appropriate units. The information in the *Existing Development* column will be used to identify the current investment and compare the proportionality of the proposed DIFs as previously described in Chapter One. The *Potential Development* column will be used as the denominator to distribute the cost of infrastructure improvements needed to accommodate development in the area to those generating the need for those same improvements. The area is the sum of four General City Sub-areas (Appendix B, Sections C to G).

A greater level of detail is available in Appendix B – Expanded Land Use Database.

[This space is left vacant to place the following table on a single page].

**Table 2-1  
Detailed Land Use Inventory**

A. Total - Land-use Database Total of all Areas (B + C)	Existing Development		Potential Development		Total General Plan Build-out	
	Acres	# of Units	Acres	# of Units	Acres	# of Units
Detached Dwelling Units	1,280.58	7,891	318.30	1,169	1,598.88	9,060
Attached Dwelling Units	247.39	5,681	62.22	1,072	309.61	6,753
Mobile Home Dwelling Units	69.00	980	1.00	14	70.00	994
Commercial Lodging Units	23.70	593	1.00	25	24.70	618
Retail/Service/Office Uses (SF)	290.15	11,279,548	21.90	441,367	312.05	11,720,915
Self Storage Facilities Uses (SF)	20.91	685,989	1.00	32,670	21.91	718,659
Business Park Uses (SF)	62.17	1,877,875	38.79	1,202,493	100.96	3,080,368
Industrial Uses (SF)	94.00	2,047,320	3.00	63,340	97.00	2,110,660
Institutional Use (SF)	4,243.00	120,136,302	1.00	28,314	4,244.00	120,164,616
<b>Total - All City</b>	<b>6,330.90</b>	<b>148,252,280</b>	<b>448.21</b>	<b>52,857,464</b>	<b>6,779.11</b>	<b>201,109,744</b>
Private Residences	1,596.97	14,552	381.52	2,255	1,978.49	16,807
Commercial Lodging Rooms	23.70	593	1.00	25	24.70	618
Business Square Feet	4,710.23	136,027,034	65.69	1,768,184	4,775.92	137,795,218

DIF Land Use Types Definitions. This Report classifies private development into one of three residential *DIF Land Use Types* or one of six business-based *DIF Land Use Types*. For purposes of the Report, the term *DIF Land Use Type* will refer to one of the nine broad types under which the City's specifically defined zoning code *land uses* will fall. These *DIF Land Use Types* are defined following:

**Residential Land Uses:**

- **Detached Dwelling Units** - This DIF Land Use Type is generally defined as a detached unit and corresponds to an allowable use within the City's land use designation of **Rural Density Residential (RDR)**, **Very Low Density Residential (VLDR)** and **Low Density Residential (LDR-2.5, LDR 4-6 and LDR 6.2)**. This category would include the construction of the unusual detached condominium or townhome and a manufactured unit on an individual lot.
- **Attached Dwelling Units** - This larger category consists of apartments, townhomes, condominiums or any other living unit that is attached to any other unit. It generally corresponds to an allowable land use designation of **Medium Density Residential (MDR)** and **High Density Residential (HDR)**.
- **Mobile Home Dwelling Residential Units** - This DIF Land Use Type encompasses portions of **Medium and perhaps High Density Residential** land use designation in the Zoning Code. No applications for this type is anticipated, but given the number of existing mobile home parks, the calculation was included for purposes of the proportional analysis.

It is important to note that removing one existing manufactured unit (or mobile home dwelling) and replacing it with a similar dwelling does not constitute a DIF imposition event; it is merely a replacement of existing demand. The construction

of a mobile unit pad is the DIF imposition event, not the placement of a mobile or modular residential dwelling.

***Business/Commerce Land Uses:***

- **Commercial Lodging (keyed) Units** - This *DIF Land Use Type* generally corresponds to business use designations defined within the **General Commercial (GC)** designation.
- **Retail/Service/Office Uses** - As utilized in this Report, Commercial uses include the general type of retail services and thus includes outlets ranging from restaurants to auto repair shops to shopping centers. This category includes the **Neighborhood Commercial (NC)**, **Office Commercial (OC)** and the **General Commercial (GC)** zones. The Old Town Commercial would also be within this DIF category.
- **Self Storage Facilities Uses** - As utilized in this Report, Self Storage uses would be included with in the general category of **General Commercial (GC)** or in some cases the **Business Park (BP)** zone.
- **Business Park Uses** - This *DIF Land Use Type* is largely limited to the single **Business Park (BP)** land use zone.
- **Industrial/Manufacturing Uses** - This *DIF Land Use Type* contains all businesses engaged in heavy manufacturing or industrial development in the City's single **Industrial (I)** zone.
- **Institutional Uses** - This *DIF Land Use Type*, based upon the specific use, may be approved in just about any of the City's previously mentioned zones. It consists of private schools, private meeting places, places of worship and similar private facilities and could be located within many of the City's land use categories.

Definitions of DIF Application Categories Status. For each of the DIF land use categories detailed in Table 2-1, acreage is categorized as either *Existing Development* or *Potential Development*. Definitions regarding the status of each land use are as follows:

**Existing Development - Acres/Units** - This column title reference identifies land in the City that is developed or land that has received a building permit but may not yet be constructed. Acreage in this category may include non-conforming use areas of the City that contain extensive development prior to annexation or before any changes to the General Plan.

**Potential Development - Acres/Units** - Refers to all non-public vacant acreage located within the City. This category also includes any fully vacant parcel, and those that can be upsized in the future if it contains some remaining development potential on it.

## POPULATION PROJECTIONS

A realistic assessment of the build-out population of the City is a second component in determining the magnitude of the impact of future development and the necessary facilities needed to mitigate that impact. Many of the facilities in this Report are sized according to either the estimated population at theoretical "build-out" or service levels, which are based in part on an

estimation of the population to be served. Library facilities, parks and recreation facilities, and community center facilities and equipment are examples of cost areas that rely heavily on population projections to determine space and facility needs. Park standards are usually stated in terms of the number of acres of parkland per 1,000 people, for instance.

There are at least two generally accepted methods for projecting future population levels in a City: (A) past growth trends projected forward and (B) population holding capacity based on the General Plan land use element. Each of these methods can be useful even though both possess certain limitations.

There are several serious flaws in projecting the build-out population of a community using the past growth trends methodology. While this method is relatively simple and, therefore, easy for the general public to understand, it does not consider when an area is actually built out. Eventually there comes a point in time where the amount of available land to build on is negligible. This technique does not help explain when that point is reached. Also, the approach to past growth trends is not sensitive to policy changes made by the Council or land use issues contained in the City's General Plan. For these reasons, this technique is more useful in projecting short-term population levels and should not be used to forecast the built-out population of an area.

This Report relies on the methodology of **holding capacity** (described in the following section) to project future service levels and facility requirements.

Holding Capacity Analysis. This report uses the current holding capacity approach to forecast the built-out population of Lompoc. This method calculates the sum of existing development and potential development allowable under current land use regulations, using average densities found in the City.

The first step in projecting the City's population using the holding capacity approach is to inventory the remaining undeveloped acres within the City limits, previously accomplished in Tables 2-1 and 2-2 of this Chapter. The next step is to estimate the potential dwelling units allowed per acre and then multiply the potential number of units by the average number of residents per unit.

The number of persons per unit for new residential units is based on the 2000 U.S. Census and ranges from 3.025 to 2.876 for detached and attached dwellings, respectively. Lastly, there are 2.130 persons in each mobile home dwelling unit. The 2000 Census data was selected over the recently released 2020 Census due to a change in reporting the resulting data by eliminating the data.

Based on these 2000 Census dwelling density data, future residential development can be expected to generate somewhere between 6,400 and 6,650 additional residents<sup>5</sup> to the City of Lompoc, joining the 40,738 citizens already living in the City (net after excluding the prison population), resulting in a total estimated population at build-out (based on the existing City limits) of approximately 47,138 residents. The higher number is based on the full occupancy of all new dwelling units, and the lower figure is based on the historical occupancy levels at the time of the census count. The 47,263 population is the average of the two.

Table 2-2 uses the additional housing projection from the Land Use Database and estimates the additional potential population for the City of Lompoc through build-out. The number of potential

---

5. Depending upon the vacancy factor based upon the average of 96.05% for all residences.

new dwelling units was calculated by multiplying the vacant acreage for each land use zone by the average densities (i.e., number of units allowed per acre) indicated in the City's General Plan.

The estimated General Plan build-out population of 47,263 (average between high and low) or more residents using this holding capacity approach is typically lower than the population forecasts based on the mathematical models previously described. This implies that either the City's period of residential build-out will actually take 25 to 30 years or that the City's growth rate will increase from recent historical levels. As the residentially zoned land remaining to be developed continues to be built during the next thirty years, the City is likely to see the number of new dwelling units developed decrease each year.

[This space is left vacant to place the following table on a single page].

**Table 2-2  
City of Lompoc  
Average Dwelling Occupancy by Type  
(2000 United States Census Data)**

Existing Residential	Total Units	Vacant Units	Occupied Units	Total Number of Occupants	Average Occupancy	Percentage Occupied
<b>Detached Dwelling Units</b>						
Detached Dwellings	7,211	171	7,040	21,299	3.025	97.63%
<b>Attached Dwelling Units</b>						
Attached Dwelling Units	1,044	24	1,020	3,007	2.948	97.70%
Duplex to Quadplex Units	1,860	80	1,780	5,167	2.903	95.70%
Five to Forty-nine Units	2,173	165	2,008	5,652	2.815	92.41%
Fifty or More Units	397	7	390	790	2.026	98.24%
<b>Average</b>	<b>5,077</b>	<b>269</b>	<b>4,808</b>	<b>13,826</b>	<b>2.876</b>	<b>94.70%</b>
<b>Mobile Home Dwelling Units</b>						
Mobile Home/Trailer	897	100	797	1,698	2.130	88.85%
<b>Other Dwelling Units</b>						
Other Dwelling Units	43	14	29	32	1.103	67.44%

Existing - State Department of Finance 01/1/2024 Population	<b>43,610</b>
Existing - Federal Bureau of Prisons 01/13/2025 Prison Population	<b>(2,872)</b>
Existing - State Department of Finance 01/01/19 Population, excludes prison population	<b>40,738</b>

<i>G.P. Build-out Population At Historic Occupancy Rates</i>	<i>Anticipated Units</i>	<i>Occupancy Rate</i>	<i>Probable Occupancy</i>	<i>Dwelling Density</i>	<i>Anticipated Population</i>
Potential Detached Dwellings	1,169	97.63%	1,142	3.025	3,455
Potential Attached Dwellings	1,072	94.70%	1,015	2.876	2,919
Potential Mobile Home Dwellings	14	88.85%	12	2.130	26

Population to be Added Via Development at Historic Occupancy Rates	6,400	6,400
Current State of California Department of Finance Population	40,738	
Potential "Build-out" Population at Historic Vacancy Rates.		47,138

<i>G.P. Build-out Population At 100% Occupancy Rate</i>	<i>Anticipated Units</i>	<i>Occupancy Rate</i>	<i>Probable Occupancy</i>	<i>Dwelling Density</i>	<i>Anticipated Population</i>
Potential Detached Dwellings	1,169	100.00%	1,169	3.025	3,537
Potential Attached Dwellings	1,072	100.00%	1,072	2.876	3,083
Potential Mobile Home Dwellings	14	100.00%	14	2.130	30

Population to be Added Via Development at 100% Occupancy	6,650	6,650
Current State of California Department of Finance Population	40,738	
Potential Maximum "Build-out" Population.		47,388

Population at General Plan Build-out @ Low per Dwelling Resident Densities	47,138
Population at General Plan Build-out @ High per Dwelling Resident Densities	47,388
Average Population at General Plan Build-out	47,263

## SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

City staff and RCS have identified over \$544.30 million in needed and Master Planned capital improvement projects required through the City's General Plan build-out, including projects related to existing deficiencies and those needed solely to support future growth. Roughly 16.74% of the total project list can be financed with DIF receipts imposed upon new development. The proposed impact fees will generate just under \$75.64 million, while the application of the existing impact fee schedule upon entitled projects will generate approximately \$15.47 million<sup>6</sup> (and any new ones) upon previously entitled parcels. While most of the infrastructures have a positive but modest fund balance, the water and wastewater utilities currently have a negative fund balance, and in the aggregates, there is a net negative DIF fund balance of \$8.10 million for all funds<sup>7</sup> which adds to the unfunded project total of \$462.10 million. Tables 2-3 indicate the development fee-related capital project costs by area.

**Table 2-3  
Total City-wide General Plan Build-out  
Capital Requirements**

Infrastructure Type	Total – All DIF Projects
Law Enforcement, Vehicles and Equipment	\$4,118,732
Fire Suppression, Vehicles and Equipment	\$14,014,130
Circulation System et al.	\$367,942,630
Electric Source and Distribution System	See Chapter
Water Treatment and Distribution System	\$45,595,210
Wastewater Collection System and Treatment	\$57,782,209
Refuse Collection Vehicles and Barrels	\$1,643,643
General Government, Vehicles, and Equipment	\$2,156,740
Library Collection/Public Use Computers	\$923,686
Public Use Facilities	\$7,569,531
Aquatics Facilities	\$4,557,380
Park Land Acquisition and Improvements et al.	\$37,994,922
Sub-total DIF Related Project Costs	\$544,298,813
Non-Development Generated Projects	\$462,099,813
Total - Identified Projects	\$82,199,330

The difference between the \$82,199,330 in development-related costs and the \$15,468,875 in total potential development impact fee receipts is due to the entitled parcels whose building permit applications would be imposed upon the lower existing impact fee schedule. In short, the cost of the impact remains regardless of any legal fee limitation, such as entitlement to older fee calculations.

6. This figure excludes water and wastewater DIF collection from the entitled properties (outside of detached dwellings) until the meter sizes of the proposed private development applications are determined and calculated.

7. The result of a positive \$6.4 million reduced by negative Water/Wastewater DIF Fund Balance.

DIFs for the General City Plan Area. Based on these costs and the schedules found at the end of each of the remaining chapters of this Report, costs attributable to future development were derived on a per unit basis for residential land uses and on a per square foot of pad basis for business land uses. Schedule 2.1, found at the end of this Chapter, provides a summary of the recommended DIF schedules for each type of infrastructure and land use category. The total recommended maximum DIFs for each of the nine DIF Land Use Types within the General City area are summarized as follows.

**Table 2-4**  
**Summary of Proposed Development Impact Fees**  
**for the City's Existing General Plan Area**

DIF Land Use Type	Recommended Development Impact Fees
Detached Dwelling Unit	\$40,617/Unit
Attached Dwelling Unit	\$36,614/Unit
Mobile Home Dwelling Unit	\$28,323/Unit
Commercial Lodging (Keyed) Unit	\$10,456/Unit
Retail/Service/Office Uses Square Foot	\$12.617/S.F.
Self Storage Uses Square Foot	\$8.215/S.F.
Business Park Uses Square Foot	\$7.881/S.F.
Industrial Uses Square Foot	\$6.326/S.F.
Institutional Use Square Foot	\$8.648/S.F.

Specific DIF schedule rates for each land use and infrastructure can be found at the end of each chapter. Schedule 2.1 at the end of this Chapter also identifies the probable development impact fee revenue of these proposed new development impact fees, the estimated capital cost total, and the difference by individual infrastructure type (e.g., fire).

Specific DIF schedule rates for each land use and infrastructure can be found at the end of each chapter. Schedule 2.2 at the end of this Chapter also identifies the probable impact fee revenue from the application of the existing development impact fee schedule upon previously approved and entitled private development projects.

Schedules 2.1 and 2.2 each require two pages to summarize the many infrastructures, identify the individual Infrastructure DIFs and combined DIFs by DIF Land Use Type, and provide a calculation of the potential collection through build-out at the proposed *Minimum Needs*-based *DIF* schedules and the cost of the total infrastructure needs.

### FORMAT OF THIS REPORT

The following chapters of this Report contain detailed information relative to the calculation of DIFs recommended by RCS for the entire City. Appropriate textual explanations are contained in a specific chapter devoted to each of the twelve sets of differing infrastructure cost schedules for

City boundaries. The infrastructure chapters are listed below, along with four appendices, one of which contains a summary of DIF recommendations.

- CHAPTER 3 - Law Enforcement Facilities, Vehicles, and Equipment
  - CHAPTER 4 - Fire Suppression Facilities, Vehicles, and Equipment
  - CHAPTER 5 - Circulation (Streets, Signals and Bridges) System
  - CHAPTER 6 - Electrical Distribution System Facilities
  - CHAPTER 7 - Water Source, Storage and Distribution
  - CHAPTER 8 - Wastewater Collection System
  - CHAPTER 9 - Refuse Collection Facilities and Equipment
  - CHAPTER 10 - General Facilities, Vehicles and Equipment
  - CHAPTER 11 - Library Facilities and Collection Items
  - CHAPTER 12 - Public Use Facilities
  - CHAPTER 13 - Aquatics Facilities
  - CHAPTER 14 - Park Land and Open Space Acquisition and Park Improvements
- 
- APPENDIX A - Summary of Recommendations.
  - APPENDIX B - Expanded Land Use Database.
  - APPENDIX C - Detailed Park Infrastructure Cost Schedule
  - APPENDIX D – AB-602 Justification

---

***NOTE REGARDING TEXTUAL MATHEMATICS: It is important to note that the use of a computer provides for calculations to a large number extending over a large number of decimal points. Such data, when included in the text and supporting textual tables, has often been rounded to usually no more than two or three decimals for clarity and thus may not be replicated to the necessary degree of accuracy as the spreadsheet schedules at the end of each chapter. If questions arise between the tables and schedules, the schedules at the end of each chapter will prevail as the more accurate. The schedules at the end of the Chapter are instructive to the recommendations. The tables within the chapters are text summaries of the schedules at the end of the chapter and are illustrative.***

---

**END OF CHAPTER TEXT**

Schedule 2.1

City of Lompoc General Plan Maintenance Costs (Non-entitled Parcels)  
 Summary of Development Impact Fees By Type of Fee (continued on next page)  
 (Costs/Fees per Residential Type Dwelling Unit, or Business Type Square Foot)

Land-use Category	Law Enforcement Facilities	Fire Protection Facilities	Streets, Signals and Bridges	Electric Interconnection Facilities	Water Distribution Facilities	Sewer Collection Facilities	Solid Waste Collection (Average)
	Schedule 3.2	Schedule 4.2	Schedule 5.2	See Chapter	Schedule 7.2	Schedule 8.2	Schedule 9.1
<b>Calculated Development Impact Costs</b>							
Detached Dwelling Units	\$1,102	\$1,485	\$4,746	NA	\$4,618	\$5,213	\$734
Attached Dwelling Units	\$1,706	\$1,819	\$3,169	NA	\$3,154	\$4,556	\$576
Mobile Home Dwelling Units	\$1,228	\$529	\$2,470	NA	\$3,155	\$4,559	\$192
Commercial Lodging Units	\$2,449	\$718	\$2,503	NA	\$1,272	\$3,036	\$91
Retail/Service/Office Uses (SF)	\$0.613	\$0.197	\$9.589	NA	\$0.926	\$0.969	\$0.030
Self Storage Facilities Uses (SF)	\$0.559	\$0.102	\$5.481	NA	\$0.926	\$0.797	\$0.029
Business Park Uses (SF)	\$0.393	\$0.013	\$5.702	NA	\$0.571	\$0.841	\$0.025
Industrial Uses (SF)	\$0.661	\$0.016	\$2.939	NA	\$0.602	\$1.644	\$0.053
Institutional Use (SF)	\$0.014	\$0.039	\$6.261	NA	\$0.803	\$1.149	\$0.033
<b>Potential Collection with Recommended Impact Fee Schedule</b>							
Detached Dwelling Units	\$780,661	\$1,051,980	\$3,362,085	NA	\$3,271,410	\$3,692,910	\$519,969
Attached Dwelling Units	\$1,460,208	\$1,556,928	\$2,712,426	NA	\$2,699,587	\$3,899,594	\$493,013
Mobile Home Dwelling Units	\$17,192	\$7,406	\$34,580	NA	\$44,170	\$63,826	\$2,688
Commercial Lodging Units	\$61,225	\$17,950	\$62,575	NA	\$31,800	\$75,900	\$2,275
Retail/Service/Office Uses (SF)	\$253,271	\$81,394	\$3,961,855	NA	\$382,592	\$400,358	\$12,395
Self Storage Facilities Uses (SF)	\$18,263	\$3,332	\$179,064	NA	\$30,252	\$26,038	\$947
Business Park Uses (SF)	\$436,023	\$14,423	\$6,326,216	NA	\$633,509	\$933,067	\$27,737
Industrial Uses (SF)	\$41,868	\$1,013	\$186,156	NA	\$38,131	\$104,131	\$3,357
Institutional Use (SF)	\$396	\$1,104	\$177,274	NA	\$22,736	\$32,533	\$934
Total	\$3,069,107	\$2,735,530	\$17,002,231	NA	\$7,154,187	\$9,228,357	\$1,063,315
Potential DIF Receipts	\$3,069,107	\$2,735,530	\$17,002,231	NA	\$7,154,187	\$9,228,357	\$1,063,315
Fund Balance and Other Revenues	\$118,569	\$97,605	\$5,094,640	NA	(\$7,474,324)	(\$8,942,637)	\$0
Entitled Parcels DIF Receipts (2.2)	\$264,632	\$149,748	\$3,562,756	NA	\$1,542,967	\$0	\$279,718
Required Capital Total	\$4,118,732	\$14,014,130	\$367,942,630	NA	\$45,595,210	\$57,782,209	\$1,643,643
Over or (Under) Collection	-\$666,424	-\$11,031,247	-\$342,283,003	NA	-\$44,372,380	-\$57,496,489	-\$300,610

Schedule 2.1

City of Lompoc General Plan Maintenance Costs (Non-entitled Parcels)  
 Summary of Development Impact Fees By Type of Fee  
 (Costs/Fees per Residential Type Dwelling Unit, or Business Type Square Foot)

Land-use Category	General Government Facilities	Library Expansion Facilities	Public Meeting Facilities	Aquatics Center Facilities	Parkland Facilities Development	Development Impact Fee Total Per Unit or Square Feet
	Schedule 9.2	Schedule 10.1	Schedule 11.1	Schedule 12.1	Schedule 13.1	
<b>Calculated Development Impact Costs</b>						
Detached Dwelling Units	\$651	\$283	\$3,386	\$2,073	\$16,326	\$40,617 per Unit
Attached Dwelling Units	\$651	\$270	\$3,219	\$1,971	\$15,523	\$36,614 per Unit
Mobile Home Dwelling Units	\$651	\$199	\$2,384	\$1,460	\$11,496	\$28,323 per Unit
Commercial Lodging Units	\$154	No Fee	No Fee	No Fee	\$233	\$10,456 per Unit
Retail/Service/Office Uses (SF)	\$0.143	No Fee	No Fee	No Fee	\$0.150	\$12.617 per S.F.
Self Storage Facilities Uses (SF)	\$0.143	No Fee	No Fee	No Fee	\$0.178	\$8.215 per S.F.
Business Park Uses (SF)	\$0.143	No Fee	No Fee	No Fee	\$0.193	\$7.881 per S.F.
Industrial Uses (SF)	\$0.143	No Fee	No Fee	No Fee	\$0.268	\$6.326 per S.F.
Institutional Use (SF)	\$0.143	No Fee	No Fee	No Fee	\$0.206	\$8.648 per S.F.
<b>Potential Collection with Recommended Impact Fee Schedule</b>						
Detached Dwelling Units	\$461,171	\$200,478	\$2,398,656	\$1,468,521	\$11,565,404	\$28,773,245
Attached Dwelling Units	\$557,207	\$231,100	\$2,755,223	\$1,687,028	\$13,286,524	\$31,338,838
Mobile Home Dwelling Units	\$9,114	\$2,786	\$33,376	\$20,440	\$160,944	\$396,522
Commercial Lodging Units	3850	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$5,825	\$261,400
Retail/Service/Office Uses (SF)	\$59,083	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$61,975	\$5,212,923
Self Storage Facilities Uses (SF)	\$4,672	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$5,815	\$268,383
Business Park Uses (SF)	\$158,655	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$214,128	\$8,743,758
Industrial Uses (SF)	\$9,058	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$16,975	\$400,689
Institutional Use (SF)	\$4,049	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$5,833	\$244,859
Total	\$1,266,859	\$434,364	\$5,187,255	\$3,175,989	\$25,323,423	\$75,640,617
Probable DIF Receipts	\$1,266,859	\$434,364	\$5,187,255	\$3,175,989	\$25,323,423	\$75,640,617
Fund Balance/Other Revenues	\$0	\$300,539	\$125,383	\$0	\$1,770,063	-\$8,910,162
Potential Entitled DIF Receipts (2.2)	\$458,062	\$482,056	\$792,844	\$1,381,389	\$6,554,704	\$15,468,875
Required Capital Total	\$2,156,740	\$923,686	\$7,569,531	\$4,557,380	\$37,994,922	\$544,298,813
Over or (Under) Collection	-\$431,819	\$293,272	-\$1,464,049	-\$2	-\$4,346,732	-\$462,099,483

## Chapter 3

### Law Enforcement Facilities, Vehicles, and Equipment

---

The Existing System of Law Enforcement Assets or Infrastructure. The Lompoc Police Department operates out of a 24,892-square-foot facility on roughly three acres at 107 Civic Center Plaza.

The Department also has a significant inventory of:

- Vehicles (official and undercover), some with various added extra equipment;
- Assigned officer equipment such as various leathers, armament, clothing, and safety apparel;
- Communications equipment; and,
- Specialty and computer equipment.

Demand Upon Infrastructure Created by the Development of Underdeveloped or Vacant Parcels. Residents and businesses benefit from law enforcement services in three ways: directly, indirectly, and through standby availability. Direct services are those where a resident or business owner requires a direct response, usually due to being the victim of a crime. Direct service results in the form of a law enforcement officer contacting the victim. Indirect benefits, such as crime prevention programs, free patrol time, and other law enforcement services that serve all businesses, citizens, and visitors, are impossible to calculate for a specific beneficiary. An example of an indirect benefit would be the apprehension of a burglar in your neighbor's residence or business yesterday. Had the burglar not been arrested, he/she may have broken into your dwelling unit or business tomorrow. Most residents and businesses may go for many years before ever requiring a call-for-service. However, these fortunate residents and businesses still benefit from law enforcement services, if in no other way than by the knowledge that a law enforcement officer is available, through adequate planned stand-by, to respond if required. Lastly, residents and businesses also benefit from the stand-by capability, the ability to respond to a police officer should they need service.

The addition of new residential units and new businesses will increase the demand for law enforcement services by creating more direct calls for service, more areas requiring preventive patrol, and, in general, more opportunities for crimes to be committed.

The development of vacant or underutilized parcels into residential or business units will also generate more calls. The residents and business owners occupying those residences and businesses will create an increase in law enforcement calls-for-service. More residences and businesses will mean more responses to burglaries, domestic disputes, noise complaints, shoplifting, and miscellaneous incidents that will occur in the new residences and businesses. Suppose the law enforcement force capabilities (the base) are not expanded. In that case, the increasing number of calls-for-service (the rate) will reduce the amount of "free" hours available for preventative patrol. This inability to expand the capabilities would ultimately drive the Department into a reactionary mode. The additional calls-for-service would limit the amount of time for training, planning, proactive crime prevention, and other non-direct services.

The Purpose of the Fee. Additional law enforcement calls-for-service are expected, and the cost of adding sworn officers necessary to respond to those calls can be determined. Those new costs can be translated to a fee, or an amount, necessary to be collected to offset the added costs of the required additional staffing. These costs include equipping and housing the additional officers.

Providing that the fee is adopted and imposed, new development will finance its proportional capital costs of expansion of the Police Station. The continued costs of the annual salary and benefits for those additional officers will need to come from increases in property and sales tax generated by the new residences and businesses and their occupants.

The Use of the Fee. The revenues raised from a properly calculated and legally supported Law Enforcement Impact Fee would be limited to capital costs related to that growth. The fees would be used to expand the law enforcement station, increase the number of response and investigator vehicles, and properly equip additional officers. Conversely, the Law Enforcement DIF receipts cannot be used to replace existing vehicles or replace normal vacancies. The required projects/capital includes:

**LE-001, Additional Police Station Space/Upgrades** - The existing station will need to be expanded by 2,988 to accommodate the six additional officers (at 498 square feet per officer) needed to handle the additional calls for service generated by new development.

**LE-002, Additional Patrol/Detectives/Specialty/Staff Vehicles** - This project is the acquisition of eight law enforcement vehicles to maintain the existing 1.04 vehicles/officer standard. It should be noted that this project has been completed since the 2020 Nexus Study.

**LE-003, Additional Police Officer Assigned Equipment** - Officers in the field will require personally assigned equipment of persona-assigned radios/electronic devices, leathers, handguns, helmets, and assorted protection, as well as the costly recruitment costs of a background check and other exams. These costs have been included at \$21,923 per additional officer but are only included for successful candidates.

**LE-004, Additional Specialty Equipment** - This project is the acquisition of specialty equipment such as special weapons and tactics equipment, bicycles, and other unique equipment.

**LE-005, Dispatch System** - Due to the expected additional calls-for-service the department will pass the threshold of what the existing dispatch capacity can accommodate and need to acquire additional dispatch technology/equipment capacity for dealing for these anticipated additional calls-for-service.

**LE-006, Advanced Technology Software and Equipment** - This project is the acquisition of specialty equipment such as linked database systems and other cooperative law enforcement sharing systems.

The Relationship Between the Need for *The Fee* and *The Type* of Development Project. Department records were used to demonstrate that differing land uses generate differing numbers of calls. Police staff provided extremely accurate calls-for-service data by overlaying the Department's computerized response records with the City's zoning map, thus allowing 100% of the private sector calls-for-service to be categorized. Table 3-1, following, summarizes an analysis of the calls-for-service received by the Police Department over a recent twelve-month period. The breakdown of calls into the land uses that generated them, divided by the number of developed units (during the same period) generating a *calls-for-service* nexus.

**Table 3-1**  
**Law Enforcement Calls-for-Service Generated by DIF Land-use Type**  
**(2024 Annual Year)**

DIF Land-use Type	Developed Dwellings or Square Feet	Actual Calls For Service Over 12 Months	Total Calls per Dwelling or 1,000 SF (KSF)
Detached Dwelling Units	7,891	8,093	1.026/Unit
Attached Dwelling Units	5,681	9,021	1.588/Unit
Mobile Home Dwelling Units	980	1,138	1.161/Unit
Commercial Lodging Units	593	1,363	2.298/Unit
Retail/Service/Office Uses	11,279,548	6,445	0.571/KSF
Self-storage Facilities Uses	685,989	367	0.535/KSF
Business Park Uses	1,877,875	688	0.366/KSF
Industrial Uses	2,047,320	1,267	0.619/KSF
Institutional Uses	120,136,302	1,527	0.013/KSF

As an example, there were approximately 8,093 calls-for-service that generated a response to one of the 7,891 detached dwelling units in the City. The result indicates that, on average, each dwelling will generate just over 1.026 calls per year. The same analysis was undertaken for most land uses. Since these calls-for-service by land use are an average, they were used to project the number of additional calls that could be expected by multiplying the calls per residential unit or business acre by the number of anticipated new residential dwellings or business acres. To determine the number of additional officers necessary to meet this increase from future developments, the number of increased calls resulting from new development was then divided by the average number of calls that an officer responds to.

These calls-for-service rates are then applied to (multiplied by) the undeveloped land use database anticipated units to determine the number of calls-for-service in the future. In this case, the additional calls-for-service of 3,723 per year were then divided by the number of calls-for-service that a single officer can absorb.

The existing complement of 50 sworn officers currently absorbs the 29,909 annual calls by responding to just over 598 calls-for-service each to privately owned and developed parcels annually. Based upon the addition of 3,723 calls-for-service, the City will need to successfully recruit six additional officers to maintain the same response capabilities that the existing 50 officers currently provide. This is not to imply that the existing level of services or the ratio of officers to calls-for-service is the desired level of service; it merely is the **current** level of service. To adequately mobilize the six new sworn officers, the City will need to add six response vehicles at a total cost of \$416,171 to maintain the existing ratio of 1.04 vehicles per sworn officer (52 vehicles divided by 50 officers) and for the personnel recruitment and officer-assigned equipment at a combined cost of \$131,537 (50 officers X \$21,923 in assigned equipment costs).

The Relationship Between the Use of the Fee and the Type of Development Paying the Fee. Again, the *use of the fee* is a similar argument to the *need for the fee*. As the development occurs, the impact is generated, and the impact fee would be collected as the development occurs. The collected DIF receipts would be put to use to acquire equipment for additional officers, vehicles, and additional building space necessary to respond to those additional calls *without reducing the capability of responding to calls from the existing community*.

The Relationship Between the Amount of the Fee and the Cost of the Portion of the Facility Attributed to the Development Project. The building size at 24,892 square feet, along with the additional 2,988 square feet proposed in LE-001, will meet the needs for operations space (and location) through the General Plan build-out and the land use database depicted in Table 2-1. The build-out complement of 56 sworn officers (50 current and six projected) will allow for the maintenance of an average of about 498 square feet per officer.

Minimum Needs-based Fees. Table 3-2, following, summarizes the resulting DIFs (from Schedule 3.2) for development to contribute \$4,118,732 towards the expansion of the Law Enforcement capabilities of the City in order to allow the City to extend the same level of service to the City's newest citizens and businesses.

**Table 3-2**  
**Minimum Needs-based Law Enforcement Facilities, Vehicles**  
**and Equipment Development Impact Costs**  
**by DIF Land-use Type**

DIF land-use Type	Allocation of Development Costs	Development Impact Cost Per Unit or Square Foot
Detached Dwelling Units	\$1,289,208	\$1,102/Unit
Attached Dwelling Units	\$1,828,526	\$1,706/Unit
Mobil Home Dwelling Units	\$17,189	\$1,228/Unit
Commercial Lodging Units	\$61,237	\$2,449/Unit
Retail/Service/Office Uses	\$270,734	\$0.613/S.F.
Self-storage Uses	\$18,264	\$0.559/S.F.
Business Park Uses	\$472,710	\$0.393/S.F.
Industrial Uses	\$41,899	\$0.661/S.F.
Institutional Uses	\$395	\$0.014/S.F.

Existing Financial Commitment Comparison Costs. The City invested, at current dollars, about \$36.50 million in the existing police station, or stated a slightly different way; it would cost \$36.50 million to replace the existing building. The Department staff uses 52 assorted vehicles with various added extra equipment costing a total of \$3,468,095 for an average cost of about \$66,694 per vehicle. The existing 50 sworn officers each have assigned equipment such as personally assigned radio and communication equipment, various leathers, armament, clothing, and safety apparel, costing some \$21,923 per sworn officer or a combined \$1,096,145. The City's existing dispatch facilities have a replacement value of \$3,421,418. Lastly, \$1,265,792 was invested in specialty equipment, computer capability, and other electronic equipment. Combined, the City has invested, at current replacement costs, some \$36,497,424 into the law enforcement assets, including the \$118,569 existing Law Enforcement Impact Fee Fund balance.

When this combined replacement financial commitment cost figure is distributed over the entire current community (via Table 3-3 following and Schedule 3.3), we find that the existing financial commitment is quite similar to that of the calculated Law Enforcement Minimum Needs-based DIFs (or cost), indicating that the existing community has invested nearly what be required from future development.

**Table 3-3  
Existing Law Enforcement  
Community Financial Commitment Comparison Data**

DIF Land-use Type	Allocation of Development Costs	Development Impact Cost Per Unit or Square Foot
Detached Dwelling Units	\$9,875,745	\$1,252/Unit
Attached Dwelling Units	\$11,008,167	\$1,938/Unit
Mobile Home Dwelling Units	\$1,388,681	\$1,417/Unit
Commercial Lodging Units	\$1,663,245	\$2,805/Unit
Retail/Service/Office Uses	\$7,864,720	\$0.697/S.F.
Self-storage Facilities Uses	\$447,844	\$0.653/S.F.
Business Park Uses	\$839,554	\$0.447/S.F.
Industrial Uses	\$1,546,098	\$0.755/S.F.
Institutional Uses	\$1,863,371	\$0.016/S.F.

### RECOMMENDED DEVELOPMENT IMPACT FEES

Since the *Minimum Needs-based Impact Costs* (necessary for expansion indicating the City's investment in law enforcement capabilities) are nearly the same as the *Existing Community Financial Commitment Comparison*, the *Existing Community Financial Commitment Development Impact Fee* schedule identified in Table 3-2 and Schedule 3.2 would be the most equitable DIF schedule to adopt.

**RECAP OF RECOMMENDED LAW ENFORCEMENT DEVELOPMENT IMPACT FEES**

- **General City** - Adopt Schedule 3.2.
- 

**END OF CHAPTER TEXT**

Schedule 3.1

City of Lompoc  
 2025-26 Development Impact Cost Calculation  
 Allocation of Project Cost Estimates  
 Law Enforcement Facilities, Vehicles and Equipment

Line #	Project Title	Estimated Cost	Construction Needs Supported by Other Resources		Construction Needs Generated by New Development	
			Percent Need	Apportioned Dollar Cost	Percent Need	Apportioned Dollar Cost
LE-001	Additional Police Station Space/Upgrades	\$ 3,301,830.00	0.00%	\$0	100.00%	\$3,301,830
LE-002	Additional Patrol/Detective/Specialty/Staff Vehicles	\$ -	0.00%	\$0	100.00%	\$0
LE-003	Additional Officer Assigned Equipment	\$ 131,537.00	0.00%	\$0	100.00%	\$131,537
LE-004	Additional Specialty Equipment	\$ 151,895.00	0.00%	\$0	100.00%	\$151,895
LE-005	Dispatch Expansion	\$ 410,570.00	0.00%	\$0	100.00%	\$410,570
LE-006	Advanced Technology Software And Equipment	\$ 122,900.00	0.00%	\$0	100.00%	\$122,900
<b>Sub-Total General Plan Total New Project Costs</b>		<b>\$4,118,732</b>	<b>0.00%</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>\$4,118,732</b>
<b>LESS:</b>						
<b>Development Impact Fee Fund Balance</b>		<b>\$118,569</b>	<b>0.00%</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>\$118,569</b>
<b>Total General Plan Total New Project Costs</b>		<b>\$4,000,163</b>	<b>0.00%</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>\$4,000,163</b>

Schedule 3.2

City of Lompoc  
 2025-26 Development Impact Cost Calculation  
 Minimum Capital Needs-based Impact Costs  
 Law Enforcement Facilities, Vehicles and Equipment

DIF Land-use Type	Undeveloped		Call Generation Rate	Expected New Calls for Service	Percentage of Additional Service Calls	Allocation of Expansion Costs	Cost Distribution Per Acre	Average Units or Square Feet/Acre	Development Impact Fee per Unit or Square Foot
	Acres	Units							
Detached Dwelling Units	318.30	1,169	1.026	1,200	32.23%	\$1,289,208	\$4,050	3.67	<b>\$1,102 per Unit</b>
Attached Dwelling Units	62.22	1,072	1.588	1,702	45.71%	\$1,828,526	\$29,388	17.23	<b>\$1,706 per Unit</b>
Mobile Home Dwelling Units	1.00	14	1.161	16	0.43%	\$17,189	\$17,189	14.00	<b>\$1,228 per Unit</b>
Commercial Lodging Units	1.00	25	2.298	57	1.53%	\$61,237	\$61,237	25.00	<b>\$2,449 per Unit</b>
Retail/Service/Office Uses (SF)	21.90	441,367	0.571	252	6.77%	\$270,734	\$12,362	20,154	<b>\$0.613 per S.F.</b>
Self Storage Facilities Uses (SF)	1.00	32,670	0.535	17	0.46%	\$18,264	\$18,264	32,670	<b>\$0.559 per S.F.</b>
Business Park Uses (SF)	38.79	1,202,493	0.366	440	11.82%	\$472,710	\$12,186	31,000	<b>\$0.393 per S.F.</b>
Industrial Uses (SF)	3.00	63,340	0.619	39	1.05%	\$41,899	\$13,966	21,113	<b>\$0.661 per S.F.</b>
Institutional Use (SF)	1.00	28,314	0.013	0	0.01%	\$395	\$395	28,314	<b>\$0.014 per S.F.</b>
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>448.21</b>	<b>--</b>	<b>--</b>	<b>3,723</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>\$4,000,163 in Law Enforcement Development-related GP Projects</b>			

Schedule 3.3

City of Lompoc  
 2025-26 Development Impact Cost Calculation  
 Existing Community Financial Commitment Comparison  
 Law Enforcement Facilities, Vehicles and Equipment

DIF Land-use Type	Developed		Call Generation Rate	Existing Calls for Service	Percentage of Existing Service Calls	Allocation of Infrastructure "Equity"	Distribution of "Equity" per Acre	Average Units or Square Feet/Acre	Current Financial Commitment per Unit or Square Foot
	Acres	Units							
Detached Dwelling Units	1,280.58	7,891	1.026	8,093	27.06%	\$9,875,745	\$7,712	6.16	<b>\$1,252 per Unit</b>
Attached Dwelling Units	247.39	5,681	1.588	9,021	30.16%	\$11,008,167	\$44,497	22.96	<b>\$1,938 per Unit</b>
Mobile Home Dwelling Units	69.00	980	1.161	1,138	3.80%	\$1,388,681	\$20,126	14.20	<b>\$1,417 per Unit</b>
Commercial Lodging Units	23.70	593	2.298	1,363	4.56%	\$1,663,245	\$70,179	25.02	<b>\$2,805 per Unit</b>
Retail/Service/Office Uses (SF)	290.15	11,279,548	0.571	6,445	21.55%	\$7,864,720	\$27,106	38,875	<b>\$0.697 per S.F.</b>
Self Storage Facilities Uses (SF)	20.91	685,989	0.535	367	1.23%	\$447,844	\$21,418	32,807	<b>\$0.653 per S.F.</b>
Business Park Uses (SF)	62.17	1,877,875	0.366	688	2.30%	\$839,554	\$13,504	30,205	<b>\$0.447 per S.F.</b>
Industrial Uses (SF)	94.00	2,047,320	0.619	1,267	4.24%	\$1,546,098	\$16,448	21,780	<b>\$0.755 per S.F.</b>
Institutional Use (SF)	4,243.00	120,136,302	0.013	1,527	5.11%	\$1,863,371	\$439	28,314	<b>\$0.016 per S.F.</b>
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>6,330.90</b>	<b>--</b>	<b>--</b>	<b>29,909</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>\$36,497,424</b>	<b>Total Law Enforcement System Capital Assets</b>		

<b>\$27,127,405</b> in Law Enforcement Facility Assets
<b>\$3,468,095</b> in Law Enforcement Vehicles Assets
<b>\$1,096,145</b> in Law Enforcement Officer Equipment Assets
<b>\$3,421,418</b> in Dispatch Equipment/Improvements
<b>\$1,265,792</b> in Specialty Equipment Assets
<b>\$118,569</b> in Existing Law Enforcement DIF Fund Balance

## Chapter 4

### Fire Suppression Facilities, Vehicles, and Equipment

---

The Existing System. The City has invested in a system of fire facilities, response vehicles, and specialty equipment. The Fire Department responds to calls-for-service from two existing stations. The Department has specific equipment and training for calls-for-service, which consists of fire suppression, emergency medical calls, vehicle extrication, high-angle rescue, trench and collapse rescue, swift water rescue, confined space rescue, and hazardous materials response. The Department is also available to handle other non-anticipated emergency calls-for-service.

The fire station facilities are detailed as follows:

**Fire Station #1/Headquarters** is 9,200 square feet and is located on a 46,000 square foot parcel at 115 South G Street. There is also a 3,750 storage facility on a contiguous 4,500-square-foot lot at this address.

**Fire Station #2** is a 3,000-square-foot residential-style fire station on a 4,500-square-foot parcel at 1100 North D Street.

The land and replacement construction costs of the existing stations and training facilities is approximately \$20,212,420. Not surprisingly, the City also has a sizable fleet of equipped City-owned response and prevention units consisting of:

- Three Type I response engines;
- One aerial ladder vehicle;
- Three Command Vehicles (Chief, Battalion Chief, and one backup);
- Three general-use vehicles;
- Three specific use trailers (HazMat/Mass Casualty, Risk Reduction and USAR);
- One all-terrain utility vehicle;
- Two Wildland Type III brush vehicles; and,
- One utility rescue vehicle.

The total investment in the vehicle complement is about \$8,089,570. State or County vehicles and equipment are not included in the financial commitment figure. The City's firefighter-assigned equipment and successful psychological/background checks, at \$11,265 per firefighter, is approximately \$247,840 total for the existing staff of 22 firefighters. The specialty equipment made up of Urban Search and Rescue, hazardous materials/mass casualty, confined space equipment, major communications equipment, reserve hose, and appurtenances total some \$3,311,900. Specialty tools and decontamination washers/dryers add an additional \$347,200. Lastly, the Fire Suppression Facility, Vehicle, and Equipment Impact Fee fund balance is \$97,605.

The current financial commitment or investment in fire stations, training facilities, response fleet, specialty and communications equipment, and fund balance is a sizable \$32,306,535. This figure represents what it would cost to establish the existing Department response capability at the current vehicle, equipment, land acquisition, and construction costs. The relevance of this figure will be established later in this Chapter.

Demand Upon Infrastructure Created by the Development of Underdeveloped or Vacant Parcels. While it can be said that numerous factors are considered when determining the number and location of fire stations in any city, it can be stated without fear of contradiction that all new private

development in the City will affect the City's current ability to respond to fire, rescue and emergency calls-for-service. The effect, simplified but not trivialized, is twofold. Initially, each new residential and business development will create, on average, more calls-for-service, increasing the likelihood of simultaneous (and thus competing) calls-for-service. Additionally, as development spreads further from any existing station or stations, as large-scale development is often likely to do, the distances (and thus response times) will increase, taking the existing fire companies out of service for greater periods of time.

The capacity of any fire station is finite and will reach practical limits (through call *frequency* and *total time*). When that capacity is exceeded, the level of service afforded to existing development will be greatly reduced. Stated in another way, if development continues without the addition of fire station capacity to respond, the existing stations could be overwhelmed in terms of calls-for-service, making a timely response for emergency service a virtual coin flip. Will the existing fire companies be available to respond to your needs, or will they be out-of-service on a call in a different part of the community?

The Purpose of the Fee. To continue to be able to respond to an ever-increasing number of expected calls, now and in the future, the City staff has determined the need for the additional fire station to maximize coverage. Unfortunately, the station will only be needed when the City's land use database is expanded via annexation or major change in its existing General Plan, as the current future demand generates the need for 25% of an additional station. Until then, the City will have to continue to be creative in dealing with short-term increases in demand. Having the right type, size, and number of fire stations in the right locations will enable policymakers, the Chief, and the City Council to house firefighters, apparatus, and equipment in a rational way for maximum use of capital resources at the lowest annual operations cost.

Conversely, the penalties are high and extremely visible for poor fire station location or a lack of one. Adverse effects are felt by the City staff, the council, and possibly by the existing taxpayers. With poor location or no additional locations, response times via great distance or out-of-service due to a previous call can become excessive, and if a tragedy occurs, the incident would be well publicized.

Response time is often mistakenly referred to for only the first-in unit, which can be a grave error. Instead, response time must consider *all* the forces necessary to place the incident under control. Suppose the first unit arrives within five minutes but cannot provide the necessary water flow or perform the needed functions due to a lack of staffing. In that case, the five-minute response becomes insignificant and irrelevant. Thus, increasing the number and type of response vehicles is also necessary to match and equip the needed additional staff. The following sections identify the manner in which the City plans to meet the demands of additional calls-for-service.

The Use of the Fee. The revenues generated from a properly calculated and legally supported Fire Suppression Facilities, Vehicles, and Equipment Impact Fee would be limited to capital costs related to that growth. The fees would be used to construct new stations or expand existing stations (to increase the response capacity of that station) and increase the number of emergency response vehicles. Conversely, the Fire Suppression Facilities DIF receipts would not be used to repair any existing fire stations or replace any existing emergency response vehicles. Additional facilities are planned to come online, as needed, as development creates additional demands beyond the existing stations' capability (volume or calls and distance). The capital expansions include:

**FS-001**, Construct an 8,465 square foot, two-bay wide by two vehicle deep fire station in a location to be determined in the future. Only about 25% of the station's capacity is required at the

completion of the existing development opportunities within the City's limits. The remaining 75% of the capacity of the station would not be needed until additional development opportunities outside of the existing City's limits become possible. It is recommended that the DIF receipts for this project be placed within a reserve until that time.

**FS-002**, The proposed station would need a basic fully-equipped response engine at \$1,091,480. Again, the station and the engine will only be needed when additional development opportunities outside of the City's limits are possible.

**FS-003, Fire Fighter Assigned Equipment - The additional 10 firefighters** will be needed for the proposed station #3 and will require personally assigned equipment.

**FS-004, Specialty Equipment, And Station-Assigned Tools/Equipment** - The list would include tools, expanded trench shoring devices, electronic and technological advancements, practice ladders, and other similar costly items. Additional practice devices would be included.

**FS-005, Traffic Signal Preemptions** - This project consists of installing 12 traffic signal pre-emption capabilities to existing and future signals to allow the fire response vehicles to control the traffic signal technology (and thus safety) while approaching the traffic signal-controlled intersection.

Schedule 4.1 identifies the proposed projects and costs of \$14,014,130. The total cost of completing the fire infrastructure system is a net \$13,916,525 after subtracting the \$97,605 in the current Fire Suppression Facilities DIF Fund balance from the total capital needs.

The Relationship Between the Need for The Fee and The Type of Development Project. Fire service response standards extended to new development should be consistent with the fire response currently enjoyed by the City's existing citizens and business community by constructing new facilities, or else the result will be in the deterioration of the level of service (LOS) provided both to the existing residents and future citizens and businesses within the City of Lompoc. It follows that it is appropriate to assess future development to contribute additional fire facilities.

To project the impact of future development on fire services, it was first necessary to quantify the current impact on services from each of the City's land uses. Then, the costs of future capital facilities necessary to meet this increased demand were determined. The following section illustrates the relative impact of each land use on fire services and facilities.

While Lompoc citizens made the majority of these requests for service from their residences, a large percentage of requests were generated from new commercial and industrial uses within the City. A survey of each land use and its effect on calls-for-service requests was conducted to project the impact of future development on fire services. The calls-for-service survey was undertaken in a similar manner and concurrently with the process used to determine law enforcement demand (specifically described in Chapter 3, Law Enforcement et al.). Only requests for fire and medic/rescue services to privately held property were counted. Requests for service to public property, such as City parks and public right-of-way or intersections, were excluded, thus distributing these calls pro-rata through the requests for service from privately held property. This is based upon the argument that all public land serves privately held land in some manner.

Table 4-1, following, identifies the number of calls-for-service received by the Fire Department during the past calendar year by the previously identified DIF categories. The number of requests for service received by the Department during the year was then divided by either the developed (1,000) square feet or the existing number of dwelling units to determine the number of requests

generated per business square foot, per dwelling unit, or commercial lodging unit.

**Table 4-1**  
**Fire Suppression Calls-for-Service Generated by Land Use**  
**(Over a 12 Month Period)**

DIF Land-use Type	Developed Dwellings or Square Feet	Actual Calls For Service Over 12 Months	Total Calls per Dwelling or 1,000 SF (KSF)
Detached Dwelling Units	7,891	1,483	0.188/Unit
Attached Dwelling Units	5,681	1,304	0.230/Unit
Mobile Home Dwelling Units	980	66	0.067/Unit
Commercial Lodging Units	593	54	0.091/Unit
Retail/Service/Office Uses	11,279,548	266	0.024/KSF
Self-storage Facilities Uses	685,989	9	0.013/KSF
Business Park Uses	1,877,875	5	0.002/KSF
Industrial Uses	2,047,320	41	0.002/KSF
Institutional Uses	120,136,302	631	0.005/KSF

Of residential land uses, an attached dwelling unit is more likely to require an emergency fire service response at 0.230 annual responses *per unit* than a detached dwelling unit at 0.188 annual responses per unit. Retail use development generates the highest business use demand at 0.024 responses per 1,000 square feet of building space, while industrial development generates the least demand at 0.002 calls per 1,000 square feet. The lower demand by industrial uses should be expected, given the greater density of employees and patrons in an office-use establishment compared to an industrial business of similar square feet. However, it should be noted that while there are fewer calls for industrial properties, significant training is required to be prepared for industrial responses (i.e., trenching response and hazardous materials training).

Based on these calls-for-service and the anticipated development, future demands in General City will increase from the 3,859 annual calls-for-service to private development by 484 to 4,343 calls-for-service per year. Continued development will benefit from the existence of the current two stations and their limited existing capacity.

Resulting General City Area DIF Schedule. Collecting the resulting DIFs through build-out would allow the City to acquire or construct approximately 27.26% of the proposed development-related expansions and required equipment. Table 4-2, following, indicates the development impact fee necessary to finance the cost of the additional stations, response equipment, and fire-fighter equipment.

[This space is required to place the following table on a single page].

**Table 4-2**  
**City of Lompoc's General City Area**  
**Minimum Needs-based Fire Suppression Facilities, Vehicles**  
**and Equipment Development Impact Costs**  
**by DIF Land-use Type**

DIF Land-use Type	Allocation of Development Costs	Development Impact Cost Per Unit or Square Foot
Detached Dwelling Units	\$1,736,973	\$1,485/Unit
Attached Dwelling Units	\$1,950,147	\$1,819/Unit
Mobil Home Dwelling Units	\$7,406	\$529/Unit
Commercial Lodging Units	\$17,962	\$718/Unit
Retail/Service/Office Uses	\$86,849	\$0.197/S.F.
Self Storage Facilities Uses	\$3,353	\$0.102/S.F.
Business Park Uses	\$15,791	\$0.013/S.F.
Industrial Uses	\$1,000	\$0.016/S.F.
Institutional Uses	\$1,118	\$0.039/S.F.

The Relationship Between the Use of the Fee and the Type of Development Paying the Fee. The *use of the fee* is similar to the *need for the fee*. The DIF would be collected as the development occurs (generally at a building permit or some predetermined point in the process). As the development occurs, the impact is generated. The collected DIF receipts would be put to use to acquire additional firefighters assigned and specialty equipment, emergency response vehicles, and an additional fire station necessary to respond to those additional calls-for-service without reducing the capability of responding to calls from the existing community.

The Relationship Between the Amount of the Fee and the Cost of the Portion of the Facility Attributed to the Development Project. Details regarding the full acquisition cost of the existing project are outlined on the *Master Facilities Project* detail page. The relationship for each project is identified on the individual detail project pages in the *MFP*.

The current community has committed to establishing the existing two-station capability, which is paid for via past General Fund receipts. Allowing future residents to benefit by using all of the capital needs without contributing additional assets would be clearly unfair to the existing residents and would reduce their current level of service. Table 4-3, following, summarizes the distribution of the \$32,306,535 in replacement costs of the existing assets to the existing residents and business owners (Schedule 4.3 details this distribution).

The replacement value of the existing fire infrastructure (stations, response fleet, and related safety equipment) of \$32,306,535 represents the current equity investment or community financial commitment toward fire suppression capability by the existing community. When this figure is distributed over the existing community in the same manner as the future costs, by the land use demands, investment or financial "commitment" (or equity, for that matter) per unit can be determined. As an example, each attached dwelling unit has invested about \$1,922 into fire suppression capital, while the proposed DIF is a lesser amount at \$1,819 per attached dwelling.

**Table 4-3  
Existing Fire Suppression Community  
Financial Commitment Comparison Data**

<b>DIF Land-use Type</b>	<b>Allocation of Development Costs</b>	<b>Asset/Equity Investment Per Unit or Square Foot</b>
Detached Dwelling Units	\$12,415,287	\$1,573/Unit
Attached Dwelling Units	\$10,916,746	\$1,922/Unit
Mobile Home Dwelling Units	\$552,535	\$564/Unit
Commercial Lodging Units	\$452,074	\$762/Unit
Retail/Service/Office Uses	\$2,226,882	\$0.197/S.F.
Self Storage Facilities Uses	\$75,346	\$0.110/S.F.
Business Park Uses	\$41,859	\$0.022/S.F.
Industrial Uses	\$343,241	\$0.168/S.F.
Institutional Uses	\$5,282,566	\$0.044/S.F.

### **RECOMMENDED IMPACT FEES**

The Existing Community Financial Commitment Comparison (Schedule 4.3) is just slightly greater than the Minimum Needs-based Impact Costs (Schedule 4.2), which are necessary and sufficient to maintain the established fire suppression system in that area. Schedule 4.2 would be a reasonable fee schedule to adopt for this infrastructure.

### **OTHER RELATED NOTES AND ISSUES**

Newly constructed industrial developments initially charged lower industrial use impact fees, often ended up being retail/service/office uses, and generated greater demands than those of industrial land uses. If this trend is left unrecognized, the Department and other City services will face greater demand from commercial uses. Still, they will be left only to collect the lower industrial impact fee rates. To avoid this under-collection, the City should impose an impact fee representing the difference between the retail/service DIF and the previously paid industrial land-use impact fee when a CUP is approved and tenant improvement plans are submitted indicating a commercial use in an industrial zone.

---

### **RECAP OF RECOMMENDED FIRE SUPPRESSION IMPACT FEES**

- **General City Area-** Adopt Schedule 4.2.
- 

**END OF CHAPTER TEXT**

Schedule 4.1

City of Lompoc  
 2025-26 Development Impact Cost Calculation  
 Allocation of Project Cost Estimates  
 Fire Suppression/Rescue Facilities, Vehicles and Equipment

Line #	Project Title	Estimated Cost	Construction Needs Supported by Other Other Resources/Future		Construction Needs Generated by New Development	
			Percent Need	Apportioned Dollar Cost	Percent Need	Apportioned Dollar Cost
FS-001	Fire Station #3 Land Acquisition And Construction	\$ 11,787,150.00	74.92%	\$8,831,010	25.08%	\$2,956,140
FS-002	Fire Station #3 Response Engine - Fully Equipped	\$ 1,091,480.00	74.92%	\$817,744	25.08%	\$273,736
FS-003	Fire Fighter Assigned Equipment (10)	\$ 112,650.00	74.92%	\$84,398	25.08%	\$28,252
FS-004	Specialty Equipment And Station-Assigned Tools/Equipment	\$ 614,490.00	74.92%	\$460,380	25.08%	\$154,110
FS-005	Traffic Signal Preemptions (12)	\$ 408,360.00	0.00%	\$0	100.00%	\$408,360
<b>Sub-Total General Plan Total New Project Costs</b>		\$14,014,130	72.74%	\$10,193,532	27.26%	\$3,820,598
<b>LESS:</b>						
<b>Development Impact Fee Fund Balance</b>		\$97,605	100.00%	\$97,605	0.00%	\$0
<b>Total General Plan Total New Project Costs</b>		\$13,916,525	72.55%	\$10,095,927	27.45%	\$3,820,598

Schedule 4.2

City of Lompoc  
 2025-26 Development Impact Cost Calculation  
 Minimum Capital Needs-based Impact Costs  
 Fire Suppression/Rescue Facilities, Vehicles and Equipment

Proposed Land Use	Undeveloped		Call Generation Rate	Anticipated New Calls for Service	Percentage of Additional Service Calls	Allocation of Expansion Costs	Cost Distribution Per Acre	Average Units or Square Feet/Acre	Development Impact Fee per Unit or Square Foot
	Acres	Units							
Detached Dwelling Units	318.30	1,169	0.188	220	45.46%	\$1,736,973	\$5,457	3.67	<b>\$1,485 per Unit</b>
Attached Dwelling Units	62.22	1,072	0.230	247	51.04%	\$1,950,147	\$31,343	17.23	<b>\$1,819 per Unit</b>
Mobile Home Dwelling Units	1.00	14	0.067	1	0.19%	\$7,406	\$7,406	14.00	<b>\$529 per Unit</b>
Commercial Lodging Units	1.00	25	0.091	2	0.47%	\$17,962	\$17,962	25.00	<b>\$718 per Unit</b>
Retail/Service/Office Uses (SF)	21.90	441,367	0.024	11	2.27%	\$86,849	\$3,966	20,154	<b>\$0.197 per S.F.</b>
Self Storage Facilities Uses (SF)	1.00	32,670	0.013	0	0.09%	\$3,353	\$3,353	32,670	<b>\$0.102 per S.F.</b>
Business Park Uses (SF)	38.79	1,202,493	0.002	2	0.41%	\$15,791	\$407	31,000	<b>\$0.013 per S.F.</b>
Industrial Uses (SF)	3.00	63,340	0.002	0	0.03%	\$1,000	\$333	21,113	<b>\$0.016 per S.F.</b>
Institutional Use (SF)	1.00	28,314	0.005	0	0.03%	\$1,118	\$1,118	28,314	<b>\$0.039 per S.F.</b>
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>448.21</b>	<b>--</b>	<b>--</b>	<b>484</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>\$3,820,598 in Fire Suppression Development-related GP Projects</b>			

Schedule 4.3

City of Lompoc  
 2025-26 Development Impact Cost Calculation  
 Existing Community Financial Commitment Comparison  
 Fire Suppression/Rescue Facilities, Vehicles and Equipment

Proposed Land Use	Developed		Call Generation Rate	Existing Calls for Service	Percentage of Existing Service Calls	Allocation of Infrastructure "Equity"	Distribution of "Equity" per Acre	Average Units or Square Feet/Acre	Current Financial Commitment per Unit or Square Foot
	Acres	Units							
Detached Dwelling Units	1,280.58	7,891	0.188	1,483	38.43%	\$12,415,287	\$9,695	6.16	<b>\$1,573 per Unit</b>
Attached Dwelling Units	247.39	5,681	0.230	1,304	33.79%	\$10,916,746	\$44,128	22.96	<b>\$1,922 per Unit</b>
Mobile Home Dwelling Units	69.00	980	0.067	66	1.71%	\$552,535	\$8,008	14.20	<b>\$564 per Unit</b>
Commercial Lodging Units	23.70	593	0.091	54	1.40%	\$452,074	\$19,075	25.02	<b>\$762 per Unit</b>
Retail/Service/Office Uses (SF)	290.15	11,279,548	0.024	266	6.89%	\$2,226,882	\$7,675	38,875	<b>\$0.197 per S.F.</b>
Self Storage Facilities Uses (SF)	20.91	685,989	0.013	9	0.23%	\$75,346	\$3,603	32,807	<b>\$0.110 per S.F.</b>
Business Park Uses (SF)	62.17	1,877,875	0.002	5	0.13%	\$41,859	\$673	30,205	<b>\$0.022 per S.F.</b>
Industrial Uses (SF)	94.00	2,047,320	0.002	41	1.06%	\$343,241	\$3,652	21,780	<b>\$0.168 per S.F.</b>
Institutional Use (SF)	4,243.00	120,136,302	0.005	631	16.35%	\$5,282,566	\$1,245	28,314	<b>\$0.044 per S.F.</b>
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>6,330.90</b>	<b>--</b>	<b>--</b>	<b>3,859</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>\$32,306,535</b>	<b>Total Existing Fire Suppression System Assets</b>		
				1,929.50			<b>\$20,212,420 in Fire Suppression Facilities Assets</b>		
							<b>\$8,089,570 in Fire Suppression Vehicles Assets</b>		
							<b>\$247,840 in Fire Fighter Assigned Equipment Assets</b>		
							<b>\$3,311,900 in Specialty Response Equipment Assets</b>		
							<b>\$347,200 in Station-assigned Tools/Equipment</b>		
							<b>\$97,605 in Fire Suppression et. al. DIF Fund Balance</b>		

## Chapter 5 Circulation (Streets, Signals and Bridges) System

---

The following Chapter will discuss the Circulation System capital improvements consisting of major street segments, traffic signals, and bridges required for the City through the build-out of the existing City General Plan as identified in the Land Use Database Table in Chapter 2. Initially, RCS recommends the continuation of the calculation of a comprehensive DIF schedule covering all components of the circulation system within the General Plan area. Those three components consist of major street segments, signals, bridge improvements, and roadbed-protecting drainage improvements. The reasons are practical in that combining this infrastructure will provide greater flexibility in establishing priorities in what is essentially a singular transportation issue with a common nexus, a combination of trip-end<sup>8</sup> generation and average trip distance. It is not uncommon that a single transportation capital project involves both a street improvement and signal improvement.

The Existing System. The City currently has and maintains an extensive system of roadways available for the transportation of goods and services, as well as for educational, recreational, and social purposes. Streets that fall under the jurisdiction of the City of Lompoc are classified as one of six types of roadways for the purposes of this Report.<sup>9</sup> The types of roadways are defined in the Lompoc General Plan Circulation Element.

**Expressways** provide for the highest proportion of regional travel by connecting urbanized areas with major activity and employment centers in the County. Expressways are described in the City's Circulation Element as high-speed/high-capacity roadways that have limited access and at-grade or grade-separated intersections. Expressways are divided roadways with a minimum right-of-way width of 110 feet and at least four auto-lanes. Highway 1 (north of the Wye intersection) passes through the City but is not under the jurisdiction of the City.

**Major Arterials** provide for the highest proportion of travel within the various parts of Lompoc by linking Expressways to Minor Arterials, Collector Streets, and Local Streets. Major Arterials are described as medium speed/high capacity roadways with controlled access. Major Arterials are intended to be divided and undivided roadways with a right-of-way width of at least 100 feet and two or four auto-lanes.

**Minor Arterial** provide for travel between and within the communities of the Lompoc Valley by linking Major Arterials to Collector Streets and Local Streets. Arterials are medium and high speed, medium capacity roadways with controlled roadway access. Minor Arterials are undivided roadways with right-of-way width of at least 80 feet and two auto-lanes.

**Collector Street** provide for relatively-short distance travel between and within neighborhoods by linking Major and Minor Arterials to Local Streets. Collector streets are low-speed/low volume, undivided, two-lane roadways. Driveway access from individual parcels may be discouraged. Collector Streets have a right-of-way width of at least 64 feet

**Local Streets** provide for short distance travel, to discourage through traffic, and to provide direct roadway access to abutting land-uses and driveways. Local streets are low speed/low volume, undivided, two-lane roadways. Driveway access from individual parcels

---

8. A *trip* is defined as a series of one or more trip-ends. A trip-end is a single stop in a trip. As an example, a drive from home to work is a trip. Each individual stop along the way along the way to drop children off at a school, buy gas, get a lunch, drop off laundry and the ultimate arrival at work or home is a trip-end. The term *trip* has no effect on the calculation and only means a *drive*.

9. Alleys are a part of the City's Circulation System but are not included in this list.

is common. Local Streets have a right-of-way width of at least 60 feet. However, the right-of-way width may be reduced to 56 feet for cul-de-sacs less than 350 feet long.

**Rural Roads** provide for both agricultural vehicles and urban vehicular travel, to act as a buffer between agricultural and urban land uses, to discourage through traffic, to provide direct roadway access to abutting residential land uses and driveways, and to join with the City's existing circulation system. They have low speed/low volume, undivided, two-lane roadways. Driveway access from individual parcels should be minimal and may be discouraged.

In general, the construction of local streets is the responsibility of the developer, who then dedicates the completed street to the City. The City will accept these local street improvements and will be responsible for maintaining them if they meet the City's requirements. Because local streets do not exhibit City-wide benefits to all circulation system users, the cost of all "local" streets is not included in the Circulation System financial commitment calculation or the proportionality test.

### GENERAL CITY DEVELOPMENT IMPACT FEES

Demand Upon Infrastructure Created by the Development of Undeveloped Parcels. Undeveloped parcels create few trip-ends beyond an occasional visit to the site for weed abatement purposes, planning purposes, or to consider a sale or development of the vacant parcel. None of these trip-ends are on a routine basis. However, a developed parcel will generate a statistically predictable amount of trip-ends and trip-miles, depending upon the specific land use of the development. Thus, it can be stated that a vacant parcel, when developed for a specific use, i.e., residential or business, will generate more traffic than it did when it was vacant. Similarly, a change in the use of the property may increase or decrease the number of trip-ends, i.e., the demolition of a low trip-generating insurance office into reconstruction as a new high trip-generating fast-food restaurant.

All new developments contribute to cumulative traffic impacts, which are difficult to measure and mitigate on a project-by-project basis but have significant and widespread cumulative impacts on the city's existing road system. Factors that will increase the competition for existing major street segment lane miles in the General City area include the following:

- The construction of just under 1.77 million square feet of private business uses on the net 99 under or undeveloped acres will generate 84,772 additional daily trip miles or about 56.26% of the total new trip miles expected at General Plan build-out. This figure could vary significantly depending upon the type of commercial uses constructed and possible zoning changes or conditional use permits issued.
- An increase in the City's General Plan full-time population through the construction of about 2,255 additional dwelling units, contributing approximately 65,456 new daily trip miles or just 43.44% of the newly expected daily trip miles.
- The addition of about 25 commercial lodging units will generate about 456 daily trip miles or about 0.3 percent of the total new trip miles.

When all (or most) of the available vacant land within the City's limits is developed, the City can expect an additional 150,684 daily trip miles. For perspective, the City currently experiences roughly an estimated 6,852,519 daily trip miles from/to the existing residences and businesses. The roughly 150,684 newly anticipated, development-generated trip miles represent about a 2.15% increase over the current 6,852,519 daily trip miles.

The Purpose of the Fee. In the City, most planned arterials and collectors exist in some form, perhaps not fully widened to allow for the full number of lanes. As stated another way, there are few, if any, opportunities to construct any completely new arterial/collector lane miles. Thus, the collection of Circulation System DIF receipts becomes imperative as a revenue source to finish off any existing but incomplete or not yet maximized roads. The same can be said for bridges, one of which is included on the list (ST-031) to be completed to its maximum planned length and width, again maximizing the carrying capacity of that street segment supported by that bridge. Additionally, the fees would be used to complete the system of signals that ensure the smooth movement of vehicles through intersections. Efficient signalization (i.e., turn pockets and fully actuated left-turn signals) is also important to keep vehicular traffic moving optimally through major intersections.

Included are transportation projects needed to alter existing arterials, connectors, or collectors that are becoming ineffective at moving vehicles due to additional trip-ends.

While the 2.15% increase in demand on the City's circulation system does not appear significant, it is significant that there are very few opportunities to add spine system lane miles, thus ensuring more demand on a static number of lane miles. As a result, the projects that can help absorb the additional traffic needs are generally limited to intersection improvements and the construction of new traffic signals. These projects can assist in limiting congestion and gridlock in the future.

Traffic planners have long known that intersections are the critical constraints in a typical roadway network. While the street capacity may be theoretically adequate to carry traffic volumes at build-out, motorists may experience congestion and even gridlock at the street's intersections. While the City of Lompoc will certainly undertake any remaining major street widening projects, an equally important component of traffic circulation is the installation of traffic signals and lane reconfiguration at critical intersections in the City. However, as previously stated, there are extremely limited opportunities to expand major road lane miles.

The importance of traffic signals is two-fold. First, the City can build only so many major collector/arterial streets, and there are limits as to how many extra lanes they will have. Second, north-south collectors will, by definition, intersect with east-west collectors, assuring that *someone* will have to stop, either at a stop sign or a traffic signal. The traffic carrying capacity of each collector can only be maximized by assuring an orderly traffic flow by signaling those intersecting collectors.

The collection of Circulation System DIFs is not intended to eliminate the time-honored practice of the developer constructing the full-width roadway and being reimbursed for the portion of costs greater than would otherwise be required of the developer in the calculated simple impact fee amount. This impact fee calculation and resulting fee collection would simply improve the City's capability for such reimbursements.

The City's total MFP Circulation (streets, signals and bridges) System infrastructure section identifies thirty-eight circulation-related projects covering both the General City area. They have an estimated cost of \$367,942,630. They consist of:

Twenty traffic signal or intersection improvement projects costing \$15.46 million;

Three bridge projects amounting to \$181.10 million;

Six Projects represent rehabilitation or rebuilding of the City's aging infrastructure, costing some \$163.78 million;

Three projects at \$3.22 million represent the City's extremely limited opportunities to widen a major roadway and create additional lane capacity for an arterial or collector and,

Four storm drainage projects are required to protect major roadways and roadbeds.

Two Master Plan Update projects cost that will cost some \$337,970 to complete.

Roughly 5.62% of this amount, or \$20,674,322, has been identified as the responsibility of development as these projects will increase the capacity of the circulation system. The remaining 94.30%, or \$347,268,306, are not development-generated projects and will require non-DIF revenue sources. The individual projects and costs are identified in Schedule 5.1 at the end of the chapter and detailed in the MFP.

The Use of the Fee. The collection of Circulation System DIF schedule receipts would be used to construct the projects (or portions of projects) identified in Schedule 5.1 at the conclusion of this Chapter's text. The collected fees will be used to create additional lane miles, bridge lanes, and signals with which to accommodate the additional 150,684 daily trip miles expected from further development of General City.

The Relationship Between the Need for the Fee and The Type of Development Project. Schedule 5.1 identifies the additional traffic to be generated by new development, by type of development. The technical volume, *Trip Generation Manual* 11th Edition (Institute of Transportation Engineers, 2021), has been used to identify the *nexus* or relationship between the type of development and the projected number of trips that development will generate.

A 158-unit detached dwelling-specific plan would generate about 5,465 daily trip miles, and a two-acre retail/service development would generate a similar 5,480 daily trip miles. Each would pay its proportionate share of the total 244,945 newly created daily trip miles expected in the City's limits at the General Plan build-out. In the case of the detached dwelling residential development, the daily trip miles generated by the 158 new residences represent about 2.3% of the total 244,945 new trip miles anticipated at build-out. Thus, they would be required to pay or construct projects on the list in an amount equal to 2.3% of the total development-related project costs. The two-acre retail/service/office development, also representing 2.3% of the total new daily trip miles, would also finance 2.3% of the development-related project list.

### **Circulation System Cost Distribution by Average Land Use Trip Frequency/Distance**

New Trip Adjustment for *Pass-by* or *Diverted* Trips. Schedule 5.2 contains a sub-schedule that identifies adjustments to new total **trip-ends**. As an example, an acre of general retail/service/office uses (with a 0.40 FAR) would be expected, on average, to generate about 3,347 trip-ends daily. However, approximately 15% of those trip-ends, or about 562 trip-ends per day, are **pass-by trip-ends**. The **trip-end** is not truly an **end** but is actually one in a series of stops, i.e., at various commercial establishments, with a different location, such as a residence, as the final **trip-end** or destination of the series of **trip-ends**. To be considered a pass-by trip, the location of the stop must be contiguous to the **generator** route,<sup>10</sup> i.e., the route that would have been used even if the temporary stop had not been made. The Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) indicates that:

---

10. An example of a diverted trip-end would be a single trip-end where along the way from work, a motorists evening drive deviates from the normal route taken home at perhaps a preferred grocery store, mail drop, or to pick up a child from a piano lesson before continuing home. Each of these three stops would be considered *diverted* trip-ends.

Thus, when forecasted trips based upon the trip generation rates are distributed to the adjacent streets, some reduction is made to account for those trips already there that will be attracted to the proposed development.<sup>11</sup>

*Pass-by* trip-ends are fully adjusted (reduced at 100%) from the average trip-ends (per day) generated by the nine land uses identified in Schedules 5.2 and 5.3.

A *diverted* trip is similar to a *pass-by* trip-end in that it is an extra stop between, for example, a motorist's work site and their residence. The *diverted* trip differs slightly from the *pass-by* trip, requiring a minor deviation from the normal **generator** route and the temporary stop. In short, a *diverted* trip creates a separate side trip using additional (and different) lane miles from that of the normal route from the motorist's place of employment and his or her residence.<sup>6</sup> Using our example of one acre of general retail/service/office uses, roughly 1,499 of the expected trips would involve a diversion to that basic planned trip. We could expect these trips to increase the traffic volume off of the generator route, but only for brief distances. The ITE states that diverted trips:

are produced from traffic volume on roadways within the vicinity of the generator (route) and require a diversion from that roadway to another roadway with access to the site. These roadways could include streets or freeways adjacent to the generator but without access to the generator.<sup>12</sup>

These *diverted* trips will be adjusted (reduced by 50%) from the full trip count for each of the land uses identified in Chapter 2.

Again, the sub-schedule at the bottom of Schedule 5.2 indicates the total trip-ends and the reduction due to the number of pass-by trips (at 100%) and diverted trips (at 50%). The trip pass-by and diversion percentages were generated and are supported by a study conducted by the San Diego Association of Governments (SANDAG) in conjunction with various U.S. and California government agencies.<sup>13</sup>

Additionally, the same SANDAG data schedule referenced above provides information for a trip distance factor component to the nexus. Based on that data, a trip to an industrial work site has the greatest distance at 9.0 miles. A trip to an office averages 8.8 miles, residential trips average 7.9 miles, a trip from a hotel or motel (once in residence) averages 7.6 miles, and an average trip to a retail/service site is the shortest at 4.3 miles. This indicates that drivers generally appear willing to travel further distances to work and for treatment at medical offices than they are to shop. Both frequency (trip-ends) and distance (average miles per trip) have been combined into the nexus by multiplying the average trip frequency by the average trip distance. Trip-mile rates have been calculated for the nine DIF land-use categories. They are demonstrated at the bottom of schedule 5.2 at the end of the Chapter.

The Relationship Between the Use of the Fee and the Type of Development Paying the Fee. There is very little difference between this and the above category. The fee collected will be

---

11. Trip Generation, Institute of Transportation Engineers, 1099 14<sup>th</sup> Street, Suite 300 West, Washington D.C. 20005-3438. Definition of terms, page 147.

12. Institute of Transportation Engineers, 1099 14<sup>th</sup> Street NW, Suite 300 west, Washington D.C. 2005-3438, Definition of Terms, page 146.

13. *Traffic Generators*, San Diego Association of Governments, 401 B Street, Suite 800, San Diego, CA 92101. Brief Guide to Traffic Generators Rates. Compiled in conjunction with the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development. U.S. Department of Transportation, The California Department of Transportation and the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, July 1995.

based on the projected number of trip-ends the proposed development will generate in relationship to the total 150,684 additional projected trip-miles at build-out. Any amount imposed as a Circulation System DIF will be placed in a separate fund (collecting interest) and used only on the projects identified on Schedule 5.1 as development-related.

From time to time the City may require an applicant for a private project to construct a street or signal improvement (or portion thereof) that is on the list of required improvements at the end of this Chapter. This method is often undertaken to expedite the project at the request of the applicant/developer. The developer should receive a credit for any monies expended on this required improvement against their Circulation System DIF.

The Relationship Between the Amount of the Fee and the Cost of the Portion of the Facility Attributed to the Development Project. The calculation of the Circulation System DIFs is based upon the recognition that differing types of developments generate differing amounts of trip-miles. The fee is based on the projected number of trips generated by the proposed private development project. Circulation DIF receipts will be accumulated until they reach the amount that could construct a meaningful project to alleviate or mitigate the demands of those new developments. Table 5-1 (summarized from Schedule 5.2) on the following page identifies the Minimum Needs-based Circulation System DIF schedule for the City of Lompoc's General Plan area.

**Table 5-1**  
**City of Lompoc's General Plan Area**  
**Minimum Needs-based Circulation System**  
**Development Impact Costs**  
**by DIF Land-use Type**

<b>DIF Land-use Type</b>	<b>Allocation of Development Costs</b>	<b>Development Impact Cost Per Unit or Square Foot</b>
Detached Dwelling Units	\$5,549,594	\$4,746/Unit
Attached Dwelling Units	\$3,396,602	\$3,169/Unit
Mobil Home Dwelling Units	\$34,575	\$2,470/Unit
Commercial Lodging Units	\$62,565	\$2,503/Unit
Retail/Service/Office Uses	\$4,232,169	\$9.589/S.F.
Self-storage Facilities Uses	\$179,050	\$5.481/S.F.
Business Park Uses	\$6,856,317	\$5.702/S.F.
Industrial Uses	\$186,185	\$2.939/S.F.
Institutional Uses	\$177,266	\$6.261/S.F.

This set of proposed fees would generate the Minimum amount of revenue necessary to construct the needed street, signal, and bridge construction projects. These figures then need to be compared to the financial commitment demonstrated by the existing community.

Alternative Cost Methodology. A more precise calculation of costs for specific types of land uses (i.e., banks, hospitals, convalescent residences, etc.) can be determined by multiplying the average cost per trip of \$137.20 by the applicable daily trip-mile rate. An example of this calculation can be found at the bottom of Schedule 5.2 and applied to Table 5-2 on the following page. These tables list trip rates and costs for various residential, resort, industrial, and

commercial developments. A fee system based on a lengthy schedule of trip rates theoretically provides more accuracy and, therefore, financial commitment in determining specific uses' impact on the City's circulation system, but at the same time, may increase the City's costs to administer the fee. A more extensive listing of traffic generators by land use is available in *Trip Generation*, published by the Institute of Transportation Engineers, New York, NY.

[This space is left vacant to place the following table on a single page].

**Table 5-2  
Detail of Circulation System Minimum Needs-based Development (rounded)  
Impact Fees for Specific General City Area Commercial/Service/Office Uses**

<i>Land Use Category</i>	<i>Adjusted Trip- ends</i>	<i>Average Distance</i>	<i>Trip- end to Trip</i>	<i>Additional Trip-miles</i>	<i>Cost per Trip- mile</i>	<i>Cost per 1,000 Square Feet or Dwelling Unit</i>
<b>RESIDENTIAL LAND USES (per Unit):</b>						
<i>Detached Dwelling Unit</i>	8.76	7.9	0.5	34.60	\$137.20	\$4,747.12 /Unit
<i>Apartment</i>	5.85	7.9	0.5	23.1	\$137.20	\$3,169.32 /Unit
<i>Condominium/Townhome</i>	5.36	7.9	0.5	21.2	\$137.20	\$2,908.64 /Unit
<i>High Density Dwelling</i>	3.61	7.9	0.5	14.3	\$137.20	\$1,961.96 /Unit
<i>Mobile Home Dwelling</i>	4.57	7.9	0.5	18.1	\$137.20	\$2,483.32 /Unit
<b>RESORT/TOURIST (per Unit or Entry Door):</b>						
<i>Hotel (multi-story)</i>	6.29	7.6	0.5	23.9	\$137.20	\$3,279.08 /Room
<i>All Suites Hotel</i>	3.77	7.6	0.5	14.3	\$137.20	\$1,961.96 /Room
<i>Motel</i>	4.34	7.6	0.5	16.5	\$137.20	\$2,263.80 /Room
<b>INDUSTRIAL (per 1,000 SF):</b>						
<i>General Light Industrial</i>	6.17	9.0	0.5	27.8	\$137.20	\$3,814.16 /KSF
<i>Heavy Industrial</i>	5.97	9.0	0.5	26.9	\$137.20	\$3,690.68 /KSF
<i>Manufacturing</i>	2.73	9.0	0.5	12.3	\$137.20	\$1,687.56 /KSF
<i>Warehousing</i>	4.39	9.0	0.5	19.8	\$137.20	\$2,716.56 /KSF
<b>MISCELLANEOUS BUSINESS USES (per 1,000 SF):</b>						
<i>Office Park</i>	9.08	8.8	0.5	40.0	\$137.20	\$5,488.00 /KSF
<i>Research Park</i>	7.18	8.8	0.5	31.6	\$137.20	\$4,335.52 /KSF
<i>Business Park (Specific)</i>	11.29	8.8	0.5	49.7	\$137.20	\$6,818.84 /KSF
<b>RETAIL/SERVICE USES (per 1,000 SF):</b>						
<i>Building Material Store</i>	29.35	4.3	0.5	63.1	\$137.20	\$8,657.32 /KSF
<i>Garden Center</i>	23.45	4.3	0.5	50.4	\$137.20	\$6,914.88 /KSF
<i>Movie Theater</i>	2.47	4.3	0.5	5.3	\$137.20	\$727.16 /KSF
<i>Church</i>	5.92	4.3	0.5	12.7	\$137.20	\$1,742.44 /KSF
<i>Medical-Dental Office</i>	22.21	8.8	0.5	97.7	\$137.20	\$13,404.44 /KSF
<i>General Office Building</i>	7.16	8.8	0.5	31.5	\$137.20	\$4,321.80 /KSF
<i>Shopping Center</i>	30.20	4.3	0.5	64.9	\$137.20	\$8,904.28 /KSF
<i>Hospital</i>	11.42	4.3	0.5	24.6	\$137.20	\$3,375.12 /KSF
<i>Discount Center</i>	62.93	4.3	0.5	135.3	\$137.20	\$18,563.16 /KSF
<i>High-Turnover Restaurant</i>	8.90	4.3	0.5	19.1	\$137.20	\$2,620.52 /KSF
<i>Convenience Market</i>	43.57	4.3	0.5	93.7	\$137.20	\$12,855.64 /KSF
<i>Walk-in Bank</i>	13.97	4.3	0.5	30.0	\$137.20	\$4,116.00 /KSF
<b>Other: (not available "per KSF")</b>						
<i>Cemetery (per acre)</i>	3.07	4.3	0.5	6.6	\$137.20	\$905.52 /Acre
<i>Service Station/Market (avg)</i>	107.69	4.3	0.5	231.5	\$137.20	\$31,761.80 /FP/Day
<i>Service Station/Car Wash</i>	99.35	4.3	0.5	213.6	\$137.20	\$29,305.92 /FP/Day

Table 5-3 (and summarized from Schedule 5.3) identifies the assets of the City's existing circulation system (at current replacement costs). The total system costs \$698,625,160, consisting of the existing circulation plan arterial and collector lanes at \$310,627,770, major roadways right-of-way at \$256,451,360, roadbed protection improvements (storm collection lines) at \$31,330,580 and curb, gutter, and sidewalks at \$46,594,170 and signalized intersections valued at \$3,035,890. There are a number of existing bridges over creeks/washes with an estimated replacement value of \$45,490,750. There is also an existing positive fund balance of \$5,094,640. When these existing assets are distributed over the existing community, using the same nexus factor (e.g., trip-miles) used for distribution of future costs, the existing community has contributed the following, on average, by land use:

**Table 5-3  
Existing Circulation System Community  
Financial Commitment  
Comparison Data**

<b>DIF Land-use Category</b>	<b>Allocation of Development Costs</b>	<b>Development Impact Cost Per Unit or Square Foot</b>
Detached Dwelling Units	\$27,826,359	\$3,526/Unit
Attached Dwelling Units	\$13,376,354	\$2,355/Unit
Mobil Home Dwelling Units	\$1,801,892	\$1,839/Unit
Commercial Lodging Units	\$1,102,708	\$1,860/Unit
Retail/Service/Office Uses	\$80,368,481	\$7.125/S.F.
Self Storage Facilities Uses	\$2,793,575	\$4.072/S.F.
Business Park Uses	\$7,956,302	\$4.237/S.F.
Industrial Uses	\$4,470,679	\$2.184/S.F.
Institutional Uses	\$558,928,450	\$4.652/S.F.

It should be noted that the existing community has contributed, on average, slightly more than would be required of future development to meet the minimum needs for build-out and all users. While there is clearly excess capacity in the existing system, it is usually the result of the existing community absorbing the initial street construction costs, including the costly right-of-way acquisition; the latter part of the community often finances only the smaller segment length widening, which maximizes the street segment's capacity.

Recommended Circulation System DIF Schedule. The adoption of Schedule 5.2 at the end of the chapter (and as summarized in Table 5-1), as the Circulation System DIF Schedule, would generate enough capital to construct the facilities needed by the new development. In addition, the City should adopt the application of the *per trip-mile fee* from the bottom of Schedule 5.2 and multiplied by the specific use Table 5-2 or the more extensive listing of traffic generation by land use available in *Trip Generation* as published by the Institute of Transportation Engineers, New York, N.Y.

The Use of The Fee. This fee will be primarily used to construct additional or "extra" lane miles. "Extra" lane miles are defined as the outside two lanes of a four-lane road, the outside four lanes

on a six-lane arterial, or the outside six lanes on an eight-lane arterial. This calculation is intended to create greater equity among privately owned parcels with differing contiguous lane configurations. Consider that some private parcels will be contiguous to six-lane streets and could be exacted to build one-half of the six lanes, while other private parcels may be contiguous to a planned two-lane avenue and would only be exacted to construct one-half of the two lanes or two lanes with a reimbursement for one of the lanes when the parcel on the opposite side is developed. The inequity is obvious; those contiguous to the larger capacity-carrying road types often pay more.

Construction Responsibility vs. DIF Payment. This DIF assumes that each developer, contiguous to a planned Major Street would:

- Dedicate the needed right-of-way and would be responsible for the last lane of asphalt concrete or PCC;
- Construct the parkway landscaping; and,
- Construct the curb, gutter, sidewalk, striping, and street lights.

However, construction of the extra lanes would be financed by the Circulation System DIF, contributed to by all development within the City limits, thereby leveling the playing field between privately held parcels contiguous to a four-lane collector as opposed to those privately held parcels contiguous to a two-lane minor arterial. A given developer may undertake the actual construction of the *extra* lanes at the same time that they construct the *first* lane, but they would receive a reimbursement for the construction of those *extra* lanes. However, it is important to note that if the developer constructs all or a portion of a road, signal, or other circulation system improvement, and that project is not listed on Schedule 5.1, that project is assumed to be a condition of approval and not subject to reimbursement or credit from the City from this DIF Fund. In short, the City cannot give credit for a project that is not partially financed through this calculation.

The DIF Adoption Ordinance should contain the necessary language for identifying the process for calculating the reimbursement amount for the construction of *extra* lanes.

---

## RECAP OF RECOMMENDED CIRCULATION SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT IMPACT FEES

- **General City Area** - Adopt Schedule 5.2 for most land-uses and the \$78.50 per trip-end rate on Schedule 5.2 to be used in conjunction with the most current edition of ITE manual (and the trip frequency/length figures (via SANDAG) at the bottom of Schedule 5.2) as well as Table 5-2 for unusual land-uses.

---

**END OF CHAPTER TEXT**

Schedule 5.1

City of Lompoc  
 2025-26 Development Impact Cost Calculation  
 Allocation of Project Cost Estimates  
 Circulation (Streets, Signals and Bridges) System

Line #	Project Title	Estimated Cost	Construction Needs Supported by Other Resources		Construction Needs Generated by New Development	
			Percent Need	Apportioned Dollar Cost	Percent Need	Apportioned Dollar Cost
ST-001	Class II Bikeways, In-fill	\$602,420	90.00%	\$542,178	10.00%	\$60,242
ST-002	Bridge Evaluations	\$135,190	100.00%	\$135,190	0.00%	\$0
ST-003	Bridge Rehabilitation/Improvement	\$238,110	100.00%	\$238,110	0.00%	\$0
ST-004	Sidewalk and Pedestrian Ramp In-fill	\$3,012,080	90.00%	\$2,710,872	10.00%	\$301,208
ST-005	Curb, Gutter and Sidewalk Repairs	\$4,969,930	100.00%	\$4,969,930	0.00%	\$0
ST-006	Sidewalk/Pedestrian Ramp Construction	\$3,388,590	90.00%	\$3,049,731	10.00%	\$338,859
ST-007	Street Maintenance Paving (25 Years)	\$150,604,020	100.00%	\$150,604,020	0.00%	\$0
ST-008	Airport Avenue (D Street/D/E Alley)	\$777,330	50.00%	\$388,665	50.00%	\$388,665
ST-009	O Street (Laurel/Oak) Widening	\$1,850,050	50.00%	\$925,025	50.00%	\$925,025
ST-010	V Street, W/S Frontage Improvements	\$594,590	0.00%	\$0	100.00%	\$594,590
ST-011	Paving of Unimproved Alleys	\$1,204,830	100.00%	\$1,204,830	0.00%	\$0
ST-012	Central Avenue and H Street Intersection Improvements	\$2,503,040	0.00%	\$0	100.00%	\$2,503,040
ST-013	Traffic Signal Video Detection	\$520,810	50.00%	\$260,404	50.00%	\$260,405
ST-014	Relocate Traffic Signal Pole (L Street at Central)	\$188,260	50.00%	\$94,129	50.00%	\$94,130
ST-015	Signalize Intersection - V/Ocean	\$564,770	0.00%	\$0	100.00%	\$564,770
ST-016	Signalize Intersection - V/Laurel	\$640,070	0.00%	\$0	100.00%	\$640,070
ST-017	Signalize Intersection And Restripe - V/North	\$602,420	0.00%	\$0	100.00%	\$602,420
ST-018	Signalize Intersection - V/College	\$564,770	0.00%	\$0	100.00%	\$564,770
ST-019	Signalize Intersection - D/North	\$564,770	0.00%	\$0	100.00%	\$564,770
ST-020	Signalize Intersection - O/North	\$564,770	0.00%	\$0	100.00%	\$564,770
ST-021	Signalize Intersection - O/Pine	\$564,770	0.00%	\$0	100.00%	\$564,770
ST-022	Signalize Intersection - O/College	\$564,770	0.00%	\$0	100.00%	\$564,770
ST-023	Signalize Intersection - O/Laurel	\$564,770	0.00%	\$0	100.00%	\$564,770
ST-024	Signalize Intersection - A/Barton	\$564,770	0.00%	\$0	100.00%	\$564,770
ST-025	Signalize Intersection - A/Laurel	\$564,770	0.00%	\$0	100.00%	\$564,770
ST-026	Signalize Intersection - A/Pine	\$564,770	0.00%	\$0	100.00%	\$564,770
ST-027	Signalize Intersection - A/College	\$564,770	0.00%	\$0	100.00%	\$564,770
ST-028	Signalize Intersection - A/Central	\$564,770	0.00%	\$0	100.00%	\$564,770
ST-029	Signalize/Improve Intersection - A/North Avenue	\$564,770	0.00%	\$0	100.00%	\$564,770
ST-030	Intersection Improvement 12th Street/Ocean Avenue	\$1,807,250	0.00%	\$0	100.00%	\$1,807,250
ST-031	Central Avenue Extension Bridge And Extension Road	\$180,724,830	97.85%	\$176,836,275	2.15%	\$3,888,555
ST-032	Traffic Signal System Control and Operations Center	\$4,362,900	90.00%	\$3,926,610	10.00%	\$436,290
ST-033	Full Trash Capture Coanda Screens	\$74,620	90.00%	\$67,158	10.00%	\$7,462
ST-034	Full Trash Capture Connector Pipe Screens	\$235,490	90.00%	\$211,941	10.00%	\$23,549
ST-035	Storm Drainage Improvements to Protect Major Roadbeds	\$1,204,830	90.00%	\$1,084,347	10.00%	\$120,483
ST-036	Automatic Retractable Screens	\$20,990	90.00%	\$18,891	10.00%	\$2,099
ST-037	Circulation Master Plan	\$153,620	0.00%	\$0	100.00%	\$153,620
ST-038	Storm Drainage Master Plan	\$184,350	0.00%	\$0	100.00%	\$184,350
<b>Sub-Total General Plan Total New Projects</b>		<b>\$367,942,630</b>	<b>94.38%</b>	<b>\$347,268,306</b>	<b>5.62%</b>	<b>\$20,674,322</b>
<b>LESS:</b>						
Streets Development Impact Fee Fund Balance		\$3,042,716	100.00%	\$3,042,716	0.00%	\$0
Traffic Signals Development Impact Fee Fund Balance		\$1,872,021	100.00%	\$1,872,021	0.00%	\$0
Bikeways Development Impact Fee Fund Balance		\$179,903	100.00%	\$179,903	0.00%	\$0
<b>Development Impact Fee Fund Balance Total</b>		<b>\$5,094,640</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>\$5,094,640</b>	<b>0.00%</b>	<b>\$0</b>
<b>Total Net General Plan Project Costs</b>		<b>\$362,847,990</b>	<b>94.30%</b>	<b>\$342,173,666</b>	<b>5.70%</b>	<b>\$20,674,322</b>

Schedule 5.2

City of Lompoc  
 2025-26 Development Impact Cost Calculation  
 Minimum Capital Needs-based Impact Costs  
 Circulation (Streets, Signals and Bridges) System

Proposed Land Use	Undeveloped		Trip-end and Length Factor	Total GC Additional Trip-miles	Percentage of Additional Trip-miles	Allocation of Expansion Costs	Cost Distribution Per Acre	Average Units or Square Feet/Acre	Development Impact Fee per Unit or Square Foot
	Acres	Units							
Detached Dwelling Units	318.30	1,169	34.588	40,448	26.84%	\$5,549,594	\$17,435	3.67	\$4,746 per Unit
Attached Dwelling Units	62.22	1,072	23.095	24,756	16.43%	\$3,396,602	\$54,590	17.23	\$3,169 per Unit
Mobile Home Dwelling Units	1.00	14	18.035	252	0.17%	\$34,575	\$34,575	14.00	\$2,470 per Unit
Commercial Lodging Units	1.00	25	18.239	456	0.30%	\$62,565	\$62,565	25.00	\$2,503 per Unit
Retail/Service/Office Uses (SF)	21.90	441,367	69.888	30,846	20.47%	\$4,232,169	\$193,250	20,154	\$9,589 per S.F.
Self Storage Facilities Uses (SF)	1.00	32,670	39.944	1,305	0.87%	\$179,050	\$179,050	32.670	\$5,481 per S.F.
Business Park Uses (SF)	38.79	1,202,493	41.557	49,972	33.16%	\$6,856,317	\$176,755	31,000	\$5,702 per S.F.
Industrial Uses (SF)	3.00	63,340	21.419	1,357	0.90%	\$186,185	\$62,062	21,113	\$2,939 per S.F.
Institutional Use (SF)	1.00	28,314	45.634	1,292	0.86%	\$177,266	\$177,266	28,314	\$6,261 per S.F.
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>448.21</b>	<b>--</b>	<b>--</b>	<b>150,684</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>\$20,674,322</b>	<b>in Development-related Circulation General Plan Projects</b>		
<b>ALTERNATIVE FEE METHODOLOGY</b>				<b>150,684</b>		<b>\$20,674,322</b>	<b>\$137.20 per Daily Trip-mile</b>		

Trip-ends Adjustment Calculation	Daily Total Trip-ends	Percent of Diverted Trips	Diverted Trip-end % Adjustment	Diverted Trip-end Percent	Percent of Pass-by Trips	Combined Diverted and Pass-by	Remaining Trip % as Adjustment %	Adjusted Trip Rate, Adjustment % X Total trips	Average Trip Length	Trip-ends X Length X 50%
Land Use Title										
Detached Dwelling Units	9.57	11	0.50	5.5	3.0	8.5	91.5%	8.76	7.9	34.588
Attached Dwelling Units	6.39	11	0.50	5.5	3.0	8.5	91.5%	5.85	7.9	23.095
Mobile Home Dwelling Units	4.99	11	0.50	5.5	3.0	8.5	91.5%	4.57	7.9	18.035
Commercial Lodging Units	6.23	38	0.50	19.0	4.0	23.0	77.0%	4.80	7.6	18.239
Retail/Service/Office Uses (SF)	50.01	40	0.50	20.0	15.0	35.0	65.0%	32.51	4.3	69.888
Self Storage Facilities Uses (SF)	10.50	19	0.50	9.5	4.0	13.5	86.5%	9.08	8.8	39.944
Business Park Uses (SF)	10.44	19	0.50	9.5	2.0	11.5	88.5%	9.23	9.0	41.557
Industrial Uses (SF)	5.38	19	0.50	9.5	2.0	11.5	88.5%	4.76	9.0	21.419
Institutional Use (SF)	11.99	19	0.50	9.5	4.0	13.5	86.5%	10.37	8.8	45.634

Schedule 5.3

City of Lompoc  
 2025-26 Development Impact Cost Calculation  
 Existing Community Financial Commitment Comparison  
 Circulation (Streets, Signals and Bridges) System

Proposed Land Use	Undeveloped		Trip-end and Length Factor	Existing GC Trip-miles	Percentage of Additional Trip-miles	Allocation of Expansion Costs	Cost Distribution Per Acre	Average Units or Square Feet/Acre	Development Impact Fee per Unit or Square Foot
	Acres	Units							
Detached Dwelling Units	1,280.58	7,891	34.588	272,937	3.98%	\$27,826,359	\$21,729	6.16	\$3,526 per Unit
Attached Dwelling Units	247.39	5,681	23.095	131,203	1.91%	\$13,376,354	\$54,070	22.96	\$2,355 per Unit
Mobile Home Dwelling Units	69.00	980	18.035	17,674	0.26%	\$1,801,892	\$26,114	14.20	\$1,839 per Unit
Commercial Lodging Units	23.70	593	18.239	10,816	0.16%	\$1,102,708	\$46,528	25.02	\$1,860 per Unit
Retail/Service/Office Uses (SF)	290.15	11,279,548	69.888	788,304	11.50%	\$80,368,841	\$276,991	38,875	\$7.125 per S.F.
Self Storage Facilities Uses (SF)	20.91	685,989	39.944	27,401	0.40%	\$2,793,575	\$133,600	32,807	\$4.072 per S.F.
Business Park Uses (SF)	62.17	1,877,875	41.557	78,040	1.14%	\$7,956,302	\$127,977	30,205	\$4.237 per S.F.
Industrial Uses (SF)	94.00	2,047,320	21.419	43,851	0.64%	\$4,470,679	\$47,560	21,780	\$2.184 per S.F.
Institutional Use (SF)	4,243.00	120,136,302	45.634	5,482,293	80.00%	\$558,928,450	\$131,730	28,314	\$4.652 per S.F.
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>6,330.90</b>	<b>--</b>	<b>--</b>	<b>6,852,519</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>\$698,625,160 Total Circulation System Capital Assets</b>			
						<b>\$310,627,770 in General Plan Major Streets/Bike Paths Assets</b>			
						<b>\$256,451,360 in General Plan Streets Rights of Way Assets</b>			
						<b>\$31,330,580 in Road Protection (Storm) Assets</b>			
						<b>\$46,594,170 in Curb, Gutter and Sidewalk Assets</b>			
						<b>\$3,035,890 in General Plan Traffic Signalized Intersections</b>			
						<b>\$45,490,750 in General Plan Bridges Assets</b>			
						<b>\$5,094,640 in Circulation System Related DIF Fund Balance</b>			

## **Chapter 6 Electric System Facilities**

---

Due to the difficulties in determining average electrical demand for private development proposals, this infrastructure has not been included in this step. Instead, any development applicant will need to contact the electric utility management staff to determine the required additions necessary to the City's system in order to accommodate the electrical needs of the proposed development.

---

### **RECAP OF RECOMMENDED ELECTRICAL SYSTEM IMPROVEMENTS DIFS**

- **General City** – Contact the City's electrical system management staff.
- 

**END OF CHAPTER TEXT**

## Chapter 7

# Water Source, Storage, and Distribution Facilities System

---

Assuming an adequate water supply is available, treatment facilities, water storage, and distribution systems are the next critical components needed to accommodate development. The City's water source, as presently constituted, can be fully expected to support the City's existing and future population completely. However, to meet all future water demands, the City will need to collect sufficient money to increase the new storage reservoir's well and capacity.

Existing System. In addition to the City's distribution system with a replacement value of \$122,074,240, the City has well capacities with a replacement value of \$41,669,100 and reservoirs at \$29,495,650. The system also has altitude valve assets (\$1,554,670), booster stations (\$2,332,000), and treatment facilities (\$103,910,710). The Water Impact Fee Fund has a negative fund balance of \$6,270,000 resulting from debt service that created capacity for future development-based users. In addition, there is also a negative DIF fund balance of \$7,474,324. The total net investment is \$287,292,046. The net replacement value of the City's water system is \$287,292,046.

The Purpose of the Fee. As additional businesses and residential structures are constructed, each one will generate a greater demand for the existing water system infrastructure. The existing system of distribution pipes, reservoirs, pumping stations, and the water source will prove inadequate to meet all of the anticipated water demands. The impact fee is based upon the additional capital additions necessary to accommodate the water demands of individual units of development outlined in Table 7-1.

Impact fees are necessary for constructing the remainder of the water system for one significant reason. Initially, the storage and delivery of water has, for many years, been recognized by most public agencies as a utility. Utilities differ from general tax-supported services in that they are similar to private-sector utility businesses. Water rates are elastic, within reason, and can be set to meet water delivery costs, whereas taxes cannot. Therefore, general taxes must be protected and reserved for services that do not have any such elastic revenue source. These services include public safety, park maintenance, and storm drainage.

The use of water (consumer benefit) can be measured. Unlike many of the City's services, water rates can and should be set to meet the Council's priorities and policies regarding water use. As a result of the above, the use of general taxes, where no relationship between the rate of taxation and benefit exists, in support of any utility service would be inappropriate.

The Use of the Fee. The revenues collected from the potentially adopted impact fees outlined and supported in this Chapter will be used to construct or acquire the list of projects identified on Schedule 7.1. A stronger statement would be that they are limited to the projects identified on that Schedule.

The Relationship Between the Need for the Fee and the Type of Development Project. Daily water demands will vary by category/type of development. However, use within a category/type tends to meet averages, thus making projection fairly accurate. The nine land uses identified for separate impact fees and averages for each type of land use are used. The service to be provided to the new users will mirror the existing level of service. Water use for residential users was calculated (and planned for) on either a gallon per dwelling unit per day (GPD) basis for residential

uses or gallons acre per day (GPAD) basis for business uses in the City's most recent Water Master Plan. Table 7-1 indicates the DIF Land Use Type averages used as the nexus in the DIF distribution model. Since the City does not have a regional recycled water program in the area to water common areas, the capital-needs costs will be distributed over new development based on potable water demands at the meter and will not include any distributed recycled water demands. The following water demands are from the Master Plan of a similar-sized public agency.

**Table 7-1  
General City Water Demand by DIF Land Use Type  
Demand in GPD or GPAD**

DIF Land-use Type	Gallons (per Unit) per Day	Gallons per Acre per Day
Detached Dwelling Units	544	
Attached Dwelling Units	372	
Mobile Residences Dwelling Units	372	
Commercial Lodging Units	150	
Retail/Service/Office Uses		2,200
Self Storage Facilities Uses		2,200
Business Park Uses		2,200
Industrial Uses		2,000
Institutional Uses		2,200

The Relationship Between the Use of the Fee and the Type of Development Paying the Fee. The *use of the fee* is similar to the *need for the fee*. The impact fee would be collected as the development occurs. As the development occurs, the impact is generated. The collected fee would be used to acquire additional water generation, storage and distribution facilities, and additional equipment necessary to respond to those additional water demands without reducing the capability of providing water to the existing community.

Based upon Table 7-2 and the land-use database, the City currently (on average) delivers about 17.20 million gallons/day to private water users. This excludes water demands from public institutions, other non-private uses, and system loss. Obviously, this is an annual average, and seasonal factors could be expected to affect use. Table 7-2, on the following page, indicates the demand for water (on average) for existing development within the City water delivery area.

[This space is required to place the following table on a single page].

**Table 7-2  
Existing Community Water Demand  
in Gallons per Day (GPD rounded)**

DIF Land-use Type	Potential Residential Units	Potential Business Acres	Water Demand in GPD or GPAD	Projected GPD Water Demand
Detached Dwellings	7,891		544/Unit	4,292,704
Attached Dwellings	5,681		372/Unit	2,113,332
Mobile Home Dwellings	980		372/Unit	364,560
Commercial Lodging Units	593		150/Unit	88,950
Retail/Service/Office Uses		290.15	2,200/Acre	638,330
Self Storage Facilities Uses		20.91	3,400/Acre	46,002
Business Park Uses		62.17	2,200/Acre	136,774
Industrial Uses		94.00	2,000/Acre	188,000
Institutional Uses		4,243.00	2,200/Acre	9,334,600
<b>Total Gallons per Day</b>	- - -	- - -	- - -	<b>17,203,252</b>

Again, using the GPD demand data from Table 7-1 and the land-use database, the City will be asked to deliver an additional net 1.19 million gallons per day (average) to new users. Tables 7-3 below indicate the demand for water (on average) for future development within the City's water delivery boundaries. The 1.19 million gallons daily figure results in a slightly lower actual daily total water demand due to the use of Master Plan land-use demand averages applied to the narrower nine DIF Land-use Types as opposed to the wide variety of business uses. This will hold true for Tables 7-2, 7-3 and 7-4. Each of these tables' **Total Gallons per Day** will be slightly understated when compared to the Water Master Plan (if any) totals.

[This space is required to place the following table on a single page].

**Table 7-3  
Development-generated Additional Water Demand  
in Gallons per Day (rounded)**

DIF land-use Type	Potential Residential Units	Potential Business Acres	Water Demand in GPD of GPAD	Projected GPD Water Demand
Detached Dwellings	1,169		544/Unit	636,156
Attached Dwellings	1,072		372/Unit	398,756
Mobile Home Dwellings	14		372/Unit	5,208
Commercial Lodging Units	25		150/Unit	3,750
Retail/Service/Office Uses		21.9	2,200/Acre	48,180
Self Storage Facilities Uses		1.0	32,200/Acre	2,200
Business Park Uses		38.8	2,200/Acre	85,338
Industrial Uses		3.0	2,000/Acre	6,000
Institutional Uses		1.0	2,200/Acre	2,200
<b>Total Gallons per Day</b>	---	---	---	<b>1,187,788</b>

The total average daily need (existing and future) water demand is as follows:

**Table 7-4  
Total Average Day Water Demand at  
General Plan Build-out (rounded)  
in Gallons per Day (GPD rounded)**

DIF Land-use Type	Potential Residential Units	Potential Business Acres	Water Demand in GPD or GPAD	Projected GPD Water Demand
Detached Dwellings	9,060		544/Unit	4,928,860
Attached Dwellings	6,753		372/Unit	2,512,088
Mobile Home Dwellings	994		372/Unit	369,768
Commercial Lodging Units	618		150/Unit	92,700
Retail/Service/Office Uses		312.1	2,200/Acre	686,510
Self Storage Facilities Uses		21.9	2,200/Acre	48,202
Business Park Uses		101.0	2,200/Acre	222,112
Industrial Uses		97.0	2,000/Acre	194,000
Institutional Uses		4,244.0	2,200/Acre	9,336,800
<b>Total Gallons per Day</b>	---	---	---	<b>18,391,040</b>

The total projected average daily demand from all Lompoc privately held acreage at General Plan build-out is about 18.39 million gallons daily. Although encouraged, widespread conservation efforts are not currently mandated in the City. The City, through past oversizing of water treatment, wells, and water storage infrastructure (via bonds), has the capacity to serve all new developments. The expected increase in average daily demand may require the City to add a few amenities to its water system infrastructure. The bonds that created the excess capacity to serve will be retired in 2033-34

### PROJECTS NEEDED FOR PROPER WATER DISTRIBUTION

Utility infrastructure such as water is unique among all City infrastructures. Water demand expansion cannot be ignored for long periods of time, as can police, fire, streets, and park levels of service (LOS). Residents could be asked to allow the number of officers to remain static, wait a little longer for firefighters, or even put up with the more congested traffic or more crowded parks. However, a delivered water supply must be in evidence to even *consider* additional growth. Even though Tables 7-4 apply average daily use rates and create a total demand that is difficult to imagine, it is apparent that additional water pumping and storage capability is necessary to allow for additional growth. Without adequate water distribution capabilities, development will grind to a stop. It is a prerequisite system.

Since a water distribution system is a prerequisite to development (i.e., there is no development without water), it tends to be a somewhat "front-ended" system; that is, the system develops earlier, and the existing community tends to have built more of the system at any point in time than does the remainder of development. That is precisely the case with Lompoc's water utility; the water system appears to have been front-ended by the existing community.

The Relationship Between the Amount of the Fee and the Cost of the Portion of the Facility Attributed to the Development Project. Schedule 7.1 identifies the water distribution system improvements needed to ensure the continued adequate flow of water as needed for proposed development projects. There are 14 capital projects necessary to extend service to new developments or maintain service to existing water users, with a net total (after fund balance and reimbursement adjustments) of just over \$53.07 million. Nine of the projects (or portions thereof) totaling some \$35.52 million have been identified for funding by the existing water users as either replacements or benefitting only existing users. This figure is not included in any portion of the impact fee calculation.

Approximately \$10.07 million in projects have been identified as benefitting new development within the City. This figure was used to calculate the DIF schedule.

### CALCULATION OF IMPACT COSTS

This Report identifies two methods of calculating potable water system delivery DIFs and imposing said fees. They are:

- *Standard (Average) DIF Land-use Type DIFs, similar to the other fees in this Report.*
- *An impact fee based upon the meter size needed to serve a development, if needed.*

Standard Use Category DIFs. Table 7-5 lists the nine major land uses based on average water usage statistics (see Schedule 7.2). As stated earlier, some \$53,069,534 in new or replacement water capital expansion is required in the City to accommodate the additional demand by new

development properly. Approximately \$10,072,228 of this cost has been identified for DIF funding. The negative fund balance has not been included in this figure. The \$10.07 million is distributed pro-rata over the remaining under-built and totally vacant acreage in the City's General City area, as demonstrated in Table 7-5.

**Table 7-5  
Minimum Needs-based Water Distribution System  
Development Impact Costs  
by DIF Land-use Type**

DIF Land-use Type	Allocation of Development Costs	Development Impact Cost Per Unit or Square Foot
Detached Dwelling	\$5,394,488	\$4,618/Unit
Attached Dwelling Units	\$3,381,379	\$3,154/Unit
Mobile Home Dwelling Units	\$44,163	\$3,155/Unit
Commercial Lodging Units	\$31,799	\$1,272/Unit
Retail/Service/Office Uses	\$408,558	\$0.926/S.F.
Self Storage Facilities Uses	\$18,656	\$0.571/S.F.
Business Park Uses	\$723,651	\$0.602/S.F.
Industrial Uses	\$50,879	\$0.803/S.F.
Institutional Uses	\$18,656	\$0.659/S.F.

Cost and Financing of the Existing System. Typically, a water system is the oldest service provided by any City. The City's engineering staff has identified the cost of the existing "spine" system, consisting of distribution pipe, wells, valves, and reservoirs, to be \$287,292,046. This figure does not include local (tract) lines and connections, which are estimated conservatively to be in the area of an additional \$238,109,130. It also does not include the value of any shares of water rights. The system has been constructed from four sources: water user rates (more commonly known as monthly water bills), exactions, DIFs, and development approval requirements. A portion of that nearly \$287.29 million figure is the existing negative fund balance in the Water System DIF Fund of \$7,474,324. The debt is largely due to the cost of projects that created excess capacity (via debt service) necessary to ensure water service upon demand to any new user. In addition, there is a debt service obligation of \$6,270,000.

When this net \$287.29 million in infrastructure contributions is distributed to the existing community based upon the same nexus used to distribute future costs by land use (see Schedule 7.3), the results indicate that a detached dwelling has contributed, on average, an astounding \$9,088 towards the water system. This distributed equity is clearly greater than the distributed - *Minimum Capital Needs-based Impact Costs* exemplified in Table 7-5 (and Schedule 7.2), indicating no proportionality issues. Table 7-6 following demonstrates the distribution of existing assets.

[This space is required to place the following table on a single page].

**Table 7-6  
General Plan Build-out Proportional Water Distribution System  
Development Impact Costs by DIF Land-use Type**

DIF Land-use Type	Allocation of Development Costs	Development Impact Cost Per Unit or Square Foot
Detached Dwelling Units	\$71,687,592	\$9,088/Unit
Attached Dwelling Units	\$35,292,366	\$6,213/Unit
Mobil Home Dwelling Units	\$6,088,104	\$6,214/Unit
Commercial Lodging Units	\$1,485,453	\$2,505/Unit
Retail/Service/Office Uses	\$10,660,027	\$0.945/S.F.
Self Storage Facilities Uses	\$768,227	\$1.120/S.F.
Business Park Uses	\$2,284,108	\$1.216/S.F.
Industrial Uses	\$3,139,575	\$1.534/S.F.
Institutional Uses	\$155,886,592	\$1.298/S.F.

Necessity of DIF Financing. For one significant reason, DIFs are necessary for constructing the remainder of the water system. Initially, the storage and delivery of water has, for many years, been recognized by most public agencies as a utility. Utilities differ from general tax-supported services in that they are similar to private-sector utility businesses. Potable water rates are elastic, within reason, and can be set to meet water delivery costs, whereas taxes cannot. Therefore, general taxes must be protected and reserved for services that do not have any such elastic revenue source, such as public safety, park maintenance, storm drainage, and others.

The use of water (consumer benefit) can be measured, unlike many of the City's other municipal services. Water rates can, and should be, set to meet the Council's priorities and policies in terms of water use. As a result of the above, the use of general taxes, where no relationship between the rate of taxation and benefit exists, in support of any utility service would be inappropriate.

Recommended DIF Schedule. The adoption of Table 7-5, based upon Schedule 7.2 at the end of the chapter, as the water distribution DIFs would generate enough capital to construct the facilities needed by the new development. The DIFs contained in Schedule 7.2 also contain amounts less than the Existing Community Financial Commitment Comparison identified in Schedule 7.3 and, thus, do not violate any proportionate requirements.

### **CREDITS AGAINST DEVELOPMENT IMPACT FEES**

The City does not charge *stand-by* water rates. Vacant parcels are not charged water rates, and therefore, they have not contributed to the capital development of the water system. As a result, there can be no credit for previous contributions to capital from vacant parcels simply because none were made. Additionally, there have been no General Fund expenditures on water projects.

Credit for Developer Constructed Improvements. Similar to roadway and storm drainage construction, it will likely be advantageous to have the developer construct certain public improvements contiguous to the private development. The adoption of the DIF schedules encourages such agreements. It is recommended that the City continue the process of agreeing

to allow developers to construct water system capital improvements, identified within the DIF calculation, and then calculate a credit for that project contribution amount. The net DIF would be the amount per the adopted schedules, less the credit for the capital constructed by the developer. Credits can only be given for private construction of any project that is listed on Schedule 7.1. Thus, any improvements that are project-specific in nature and benefit will likely be imposed as conditions of approval.

### ALTERNATIVE DEVELOPMENT IMPACT FEE METHODOLOGIES

There are two alternatives to the nine Minimum Needs-based area DIF categories. They are primarily applicable to the more specific demands of the multitude of differing business uses.

Equivalent EDU Based on Meter Size. The standard detached dwelling residence has a 3/4" meter at 15 gallons per minute normal (minimum-maximum) flow<sup>14</sup> which is defined as the **Equivalent Dwelling Unit**, or EDU. Schedule 7.2 indicates that the smallest meter size at 3/4" would cost \$4,618 per connection at the Minimum needs-based DIF schedule rate. The following Table 7-7 indicates the cost for larger meters based upon the normal flow demands, with the detached dwelling (detached) residence as the standard. A one-inch meter is rated at 25 gallons per minute, which is 1.67 times larger than the 15 gallons per minute that is afforded by a 3/4" meter. Thus, the one-inch meter fee would be 1.67 times higher (\$7,698) than \$4,618 for the 3/4" meter. Other meter sizes are as follows:

**Table 7-7**  
**Equivalent Water Meter Size Calculation**  
**Based upon Minimum Needs-based Impact Fees**

Water Meter Size	Normal Water Flow (GPM)	Water Demand Factor	Cost per E.D.U (3/4" Meter)	DIF Cost per Meter Size
3/4" Meter	15	1.000	\$4,618	\$4,618
1" Meter	25	1.667	\$4,618	\$7,698
1 & 1/2" Meter	50	3.333	\$4,618	\$15,392
2" Meter	80	5.333	\$4,618	\$24,628
3" Meter	240	16.000	\$4,618	\$73,888
4" Meter	420	28.000	\$4,618	\$129,304
6" Meter	920	61.333	\$4,618	\$283,236
8" Meter	1,600	106.667	\$4,618	\$492,588
10" Meter	2,500	166.667	\$4,618	\$769,668
12" Meter	3,300	220.000	\$4,618	\$1,015,960

14. *Meter Flow Ranges*, based upon *Minimum Maximum Continuous Flow Rates*, American Water Works Association.

**RECAP OF RECOMMENDED WATER SYSTEM IMPROVEMENTS IMPACT FEES**

- Adopt:
    - A. Schedule 7.2 for the nine basic DIF categories,
    - B. Table 7-7, Equivalent Water Meter Size Calculation Based upon *Minimum Needs-based Development Impact Fees*.
- 

**END OF CHAPTER TEXT**

Schedule 7.1

City of Lompoc  
 2025-26 Development Impact Cost Calculation  
 Allocation of Project Cost Estimates  
 Water Treatment, Storage and Distribution System

Line #	Project Title	Estimated Cost	Construction Needs Supported by Other Resources		Construction Needs Generated by New Development	
			Percent Need	Apportioned Dollar Cost	Percent Need	Apportioned Dollar Cost
WT-001	Water Distribution Mains (Replacement Schedule)	\$15,632,690	100.00%	\$15,632,690	0.00%	\$0
WT-002	Well #10	\$2,023,930	0.00%	\$0	100.00%	\$2,023,930
WT-003	Meter Replacements	\$565,330	100.00%	\$565,330	0.00%	\$0
WT-004	SCADA HMI Server Replacement	\$52,230	93.54%	\$48,857	6.46%	\$3,373
WT-005	Basin Engineering Study	\$61,450	0.00%	\$0	100.00%	\$61,450
WT-006	Well #12	\$2,142,980	0.00%	\$0	100.00%	\$2,142,980
WT-007	Treatment Basin Upgrades	\$1,190,550	93.54%	\$1,113,658	6.46%	\$76,892
WT-008	Filter Body Feed System Upgrade	\$55,300	93.54%	\$51,728	6.46%	\$3,572
WT-009	Fricke Springs Vehicle Bridge	\$380,970	100.00%	\$380,970	0.00%	\$0
WT-010	Reservoir Tank re-coating	\$201,440	100.00%	\$201,440	0.00%	\$0
WT-011	Water Master Plan	\$92,170	0.00%	\$0	100.00%	\$92,170
WT-012	Remaining Water System Debt Service	\$6,270,000	68.84%	\$4,316,268	31.16%	\$1,953,732
WT-013	Reservoir Capacity Expansion (5.5 MG)	\$16,618,920	79.50%	\$13,212,041	20.50%	\$3,406,879
WT-014	Water System Maintenance Vehicles	\$307,250	0.00%	\$0	100.00%	\$307,250
<b>Sub-Total General Plan Total New Projects</b>		<b>\$45,595,210</b>	<b>77.91%</b>	<b>\$35,522,982</b>	<b>22.09%</b>	<b>\$10,072,228</b>
<b>LESS:</b>						
<b>Development Impact Fee Fund Balance</b>		<b>(\$7,474,324.00)</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>(\$7,474,324.00)</b>	<b>0.00%</b>	<b>\$0</b>
<b>Other Off-setting Revenues</b>		<b>\$0.00</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>0.00%</b>	<b>\$0</b>
<b>Development Impact Fee Fund Balance Total</b>		<b>(\$7,474,324.00)</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>(\$7,474,324.00)</b>	<b>0.00%</b>	<b>\$0</b>
<b>Total Net General Plan Project Costs</b>		<b>53,069,534.00</b>	<b>81.02%</b>	<b>\$42,997,306</b>	<b>18.98%</b>	<b>\$10,072,228</b>

Schedule 7.2

City of Lompoc  
 2025-26 Development Impact Cost Calculation  
 Minimum Capital Needs-based Impact Costs  
 Water Treatment, Storage and Distribution System

Proposed Land Use	Undeveloped		Water Allocation Rate GPD (1)	Cumulative New Water Allocation	Percentage of Added Water Allocation	Allocation of Expansion Costs	Cost Distribution Per Acre	Average Units or Square Feet/Acre	Development Impact Fee per Unit or Square Foot
	Acres	Units							
Detached Dwelling Units	318.30	1,169	544	636,156	53.56%	\$5,394,488	\$16,948	3.67	\$4,618 per Unit
Attached Dwelling Units	62.22	1,072	372	398,756	33.57%	\$3,381,379	\$54,346	17.23	\$3,154 per Unit
Mobile Home Dwelling Units	1.00	14	372	5,208	0.44%	\$44,163	\$44,163	14.00	\$3,155 per Unit
Commercial Lodging Units	1.00	25	150	3,750	0.32%	\$31,799	\$31,799	25.00	\$1,272 per Unit
Retail/Service/Office Uses (SF)	21.90	441,367	2,200	48,180	4.06%	\$408,558	\$18,656	20,154	\$0.926 per S.F.
Self Storage Facilities Uses (SF)	1.00	32,670	2,200	2,200	0.19%	\$18,656	\$18,656	32,670	\$0.571 per S.F.
Business Park Uses (SF)	38.79	1,202,493	2,200	85,338	7.18%	\$723,651	\$18,656	31,000	\$0.602 per S.F.
Industrial Uses (SF)	3.00	63,340	2,000	6,000	0.51%	\$50,879	\$16,960	21,113	\$0.803 per S.F.
Institutional Use (SF)	1.00	28,314	2,200	2,200	0.19%	\$18,656	\$18,656	28,314	\$0.659 per S.F.
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>448.21</b>	<b>--</b>	<b>--</b>	<b>1,187,788</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>\$10,072,228 in Total Water System Development-related Projects</b>			
<b>ALTERNATE FEE METHODOLOGY</b>				<b>1,187,788</b>		<b>\$10,072,228</b>	<b>\$8.480 Per Gallon Demand</b>		

Schedule 7.3

City of Lompoc  
 2025-26 Development Impact Cost Calculation  
 Existing Community Financial Commitment Comparison  
 Water Treatment, Storage and Distribution System

Proposed Land Use	Undeveloped		GC Water Allocation Rate GPD (1)	Cumulative Existing Water Allocation	Percentage of Existing Water Allocation	Allocation of Existing System Costs	Cost Distribution Per Acre	Average Units or Square Feet/Acre	Development Impact Fee per Unit or Square Foot
	Acres	Units							
Detached Dwelling Units	1,280.58	7,891	544	4,292,704	24.95%	\$71,687,592	\$55,981	6.16	<b>\$9,088 per Unit</b>
Attached Dwelling Units	247.39	5,681	372	2,113,332	12.28%	\$35,292,366	\$142,659	22.96	<b>\$6,213 per Unit</b>
Mobile Home Dwelling Units	69.00	980	372	364,560	2.12%	\$6,088,104	\$88,233	14.20	<b>\$6,214 per Unit</b>
Commercial Lodging Units	23.70	593	150	88,950	0.52%	\$1,485,453	\$62,677	25.02	<b>\$2,505 per Unit</b>
Retail/Service/Office Uses (SF)	290.15	11,279,548	2,200	638,330	3.71%	\$10,660,027	\$36,740	38,875	<b>\$0.945 per S.F.</b>
Self Storage Facilities Uses (SF)	20.91	685,989	2,200	46,002	0.27%	\$768,227	\$36,740	32,807	<b>\$1.120 per S.F.</b>
Business Park Uses (SF)	62.17	1,877,875	2,200	136,774	0.80%	\$2,284,108	\$36,740	30,205	<b>\$1.216 per S.F.</b>
Industrial Uses (SF)	94.00	2,047,320	2,000	188,000	1.09%	\$3,139,575	\$33,400	21,780	<b>\$1.534 per S.F.</b>
Institutional Use (SF)	4,243.00	120,136,302	2,200	9,334,600	54.26%	\$155,886,592	\$36,740	28,314	<b>\$1.298 per S.F.</b>
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>6,330.90</b>	<b>--</b>	<b>--</b>	<b>17,203,252</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>\$287,292,046</b>	<b>Total Existing Water System Inventory</b>		
							<b>\$122,074,240 in Water Distribution System Assets</b>		
							<b>\$41,669,100 In Water Well/Pumping Assets</b>		
							<b>\$29,495,650 in Water Storage Reservoir Assets</b>		
							<b>\$1,554,670 in Altitude Valves Assets</b>		
							<b>\$2,332,000 In Booster Station Assets</b>		
							<b>\$103,910,710 in Treatment Facilities Assets</b>		
							<b>(\$6,270,000) in Remaining Water Debt Service</b>		
							<b>(\$7,474,324) in Water System DIF Fund Balance</b>		

## Chapter 8

# Wastewater Collection and Treatment Facilities System

---

As was mentioned in the prior chapter and will be reiterated here, a city or public agency experiencing dramatic growth may put off the construction of needed parks, roads, storm drainage projects, and the like and still function, perhaps minimally. However, nothing stops development in its tracks faster than the lack of water distribution and sewage collection systems. These two systems were some of the earliest calculated DIFs, although they were generally called *hook-up* fees.<sup>15</sup> In short, a residence or business cannot exist without these important connections.

The Purpose of the Fee. The City has adequate and sufficient wastewater treatment capacity, albeit as the result of an existing debt service. Additionally, the spine (or major) collection system has been largely completed. However, some of the existing sewer pipes throughout the collection system will need to be upsized to accommodate the additional wastewater demands from new development. It is a commonly accepted principle in both water and wastewater expansion that DIF receipts can finance the expansions as needed and required. If a development wanted to connect and there were no close-by lines, the developer would finance the expansion with perhaps a reimbursement agreement if appropriate.

The principle remains the same with these DIFs. This Chapter will calculate a fee schedule that represents the proportional expense per unit of growth by DIF Land-use Type, i.e., a detached dwelling unit, a commercial lodging unit, or 1,000 square feet of business space.

The Use of the Fee. The revenues generated from a properly calculated and legally-supported Wastewater Collection Facilities System Development Impact Fee would be limited to capital costs related to the additional residential and business-related growth anticipated in the City's General Plan as depicted in Schedule 6.1. The impact fees would be used to construct additional spine wastewater collection lines or upsize existing ones to provide collection capacity for the additional demands from development that exceed the capacity of the existing system. Conversely, the Wastewater Collection and Treatment Facilities system DIF receipts would not be used to repair or replace any existing line (unless up-sizing is required).

Similar to the circulation/storm drainage and water DIFs, wastewater system infrastructure will require a separate DIF schedule to ensure that existing users are not placed in the position of subsidizing private development.

### EXISTING WASTEWATER COLLECTION SYSTEM

The City's major line wastewater collection system currently consists of an identified 329,725 linear feet of various-sized (8" to 42") reinforced concrete pipe with over 330 junctions and various backfill, road base, and asphalt. The current cost of duplicating the entire system of locals and collectors would be approximately \$189,160,020. There are also a number of pump stations with a replacement value of \$921,740. The wastewater treatment facility has a replacement value of about \$337,970,980 million. On the negative side, there is an outstanding debt of \$38,508,139

---

15. Not to be confused with a "connection" fee which is a reimbursement for the actual costs of having a city-worker either set the water meter or connect the privately owned sewer pipe from the home to the City's later sewer pipe.

that results from an expansion of the system to create existing available capacity. Lastly, there is a negative existing DIF fund balance of \$8,942,637. These individual assets create a net system investment of \$480,601,964.

### GENERAL CITY WASTEWATER COLLECTION SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT IMPACT FEES

The Relationship Between the Need for the Facility (improvement) and the Type of Development Project. Schedule 8.1 identifies thirteen capital projects costing \$57,782,209. Seven of these projects are necessary to accommodate the City's remaining growth and maintain the existing system. Development will be responsible for some portion (or all) of these seven development-related projects. The thirteen projects cost \$57,782,209 to design, construct, inspect, or acquire. The addition of the negative fund balance of \$8,942,637 acts to increase that \$57,782,209 figure to a greater net of \$66,724,846. However, none of the existing negative fund balance has been attributed to new development.

The Relationship Between the Use of the Fees and the Type of Development Paying the Fee. The project costs related to growth needs were then distributed to the development categories within the system design flows, gallons per day/acre flow rates (GPAD) for business development, or gallons per day (GPD) for residential construction. The wastewater design flow rates are based upon general engineering standard flow rates from a similar public agency and are as follows in Table 8-1:

**Table 8-1  
General City Wastewater Flow Rate  
Demand by Land Use  
Demand in GPD or GPAD**

DIF Land-use Type	Gallons (per Unit) per Day	Gallons per Acre per Day
Detached Dwelling Units	240	
Attached Dwelling Units	210	
Mobile Residences Dwelling Units	210	
Commercial Lodging Units	140	
Retail/Service/Office Uses		900
Self Storage Facilities Uses		1,200
Business Park Uses		1,200
Industrial Uses		1,600
Institutional Uses		1,500

### DISTRIBUTION OF CAPITAL COSTS

The Relationship Between the Amount of the Fee and the Cost of the Portion of the Facility Attributed to the Development Project. Table 8-2 is extracted from Schedule 8.2 and demonstrates the results of distributing the \$12,713,079 in wastewater system development-related expansion costs over the remaining private sector development opportunities.

**Table 8-2**  
**Minimum Needs-based Wastewater Collection System**  
**Development Impact Costs**  
**by DIF Land-use Type**

DIF Land-use Type	Allocation of Development Costs	Development Impact Cost Per Unit or Square Foot
Detached Dwelling Units	\$6,089,184	\$5,213/Unit
Attached Dwelling Units	\$4,883,856	\$4,556/Unit
Mobil Home Dwelling Units	\$63,820	\$4,559/Unit
Commercial Lodging Units	\$75,897	\$3,036/Unit
Retail/Service/Office Uses	\$427,668	\$0.969/S.F.
Self Storage Facilities Uses	\$26,062	\$0.797/S.F.
Business Park Uses	\$1,009,927	\$0.841/S.F.
Industrial Uses	\$104,120	\$1.644/S.F.
Institutional Uses	\$32,545	\$1.149/S.F.

The results indicate that the varying types of residential dwellings will need to contribute anywhere from a low of \$4,556 for an attached dwelling unit to a high of \$5,213 for a detached dwelling unit in either DIF payments or in contributed capital in the form of off-site wastewater lines (to the same amount).

Existing Contribution. Table 8-3, on the following page, distributes the current replacement value of the existing system over those who have contributed to the existing wastewater system, the current users, and the ratepayers. This has been done in the same manner as the future costs were distributed against the future users, using the same average demand statistics used for modeling master plans. The results indicate that the average high-density dwelling unit has contributed \$9,849 per unit, and a detached dwelling unit has contributed about \$11,255.

[This space is left vacant to place the following table on a single page].

**Table 8-3  
Existing Wastewater Collection System Community  
Financial Commitment Comparison Data**

<b>DIF Land-use Type</b>	<b>Allocation of Development Costs</b>	<b>Development Impact Cost Per Unit or Square Foot</b>
Detached Dwelling Units	\$88,786,407	\$11,255/Unit
Attached Dwelling Units	\$55,932,457	\$9,849/Unit
Mobil Home Dwelling Units	\$9,650,487	\$9,847/Unit
Commercial Lodging Units	\$3,892,876	\$6,565/Unit
Retail/Service/Office Uses	\$12,240,932	\$1.085/S.F.
Self Storage Facilities Uses	\$1,177,475	\$1.716/S.F.
Business Park Uses	\$3,498,782	\$1.864/S.F.
Industrial Uses	\$7,050,431	\$3.444/S.F.
Institutional Uses	\$298,376,923	\$2.484/S.F.

### PROPORTIONATE SHARE ANALYSIS

Necessity for DIFs. DIFs are necessary and appropriate for constructing the remainder of the wastewater collection system for one significant reason. Like water distribution, most public agencies have long since recognized sewage collection and treatment as a utility. Utilities differ from general tax-supported services in that they are similar to private-sector utility businesses and are financed by utility rates. Wastewater collection rates are relatively elastic, within reason, and can be set to meet sewage collection costs, whereas taxes for general municipal services cannot. As a result, general taxes must be protected and reserved for services that do not have any such elastic revenue source, such as public safety, park maintenance, storm drainage, and others. Additionally, as long as the existing wastewater users have an adequate system for their needs, they would have little interest in having wastewater rates rise for any reason other than operating costs as opposed to meeting the cost of adding new users. Clearly, the cost of adding to the system infrastructure to accommodate additional private development demands should be imposed upon that same private development.

Unlike many of the City's services, the contribution to the wastewater collection system (benefit) can be measured. Wastewater rates can and should be set to meet the Council's priorities and policies in terms of wastewater system use. The use of general taxes, where no relationship between the rate of taxation and benefit exists, in support of any utility service would be inappropriate.

Recommended DIF Schedule. The adoption of Schedule 8.2 at the end of the Chapter text (as summarized in table 8-2), as the Wastewater Collection and Treatment Facilities system DIF schedule, is both reasonable and would generate enough capital to construct or pay for the infrastructure facilities needed by the new development as well as a proportional amount of the debt service that created the excess capacity. The DIFs in Schedule 8.2 also contain amounts lesser than the significant financial commitment costs identified in Schedule 8.3; thus, Schedule 8.2 does not violate any proportionate requirements.

### **CREDITS AGAINST DEVELOPMENT IMPACT FEES**

Like the water utility, there are no *stand-by* wastewater collection rates. Vacant parcels are not charged wastewater rates, and therefore, they have not contributed to the capital development of the wastewater system. As a result, there can be no credit for previous contributions to capital from vacant parcels simply because there were none. Additionally, there have been no General Fund expenditures on wastewater projects.

Credit for Developer Constructed Improvements Contained Within the City's MFP and Impact Fee Calculation. Similar to other infrastructure construction, having the developer construct certain public improvements contiguous to the private development may be advantageous. The adoption of DIFs should not preclude such agreements. Thus, it is recommended that the City continue agreeing to allow developers to make wastewater system capital improvements identified within the City's MFP that are part of the impact fee calculation and receive a credit for that constructed amount. The net DIF would be the amount per the adopted schedules, less the credit for the capital constructed by the developer.

---

### **RECAP OF RECOMMENDED WASTEWATER SYSTEM IMPROVEMENTS IMPACT FEES**

- **General City** - Adopt Schedule 8.2 for the nine basic land uses.
- 

**END OF CHAPTER TEXT**

Schedule 8.1

City of Lompoc  
 2025-26 Development Impact Cost Calculation  
 Allocation of Project Cost Estimates  
 Wastewater Collection and Treatment System

		<b>Construction Needs Supported by Other Resources</b>		<b>Construction Needs Generated by New Development</b>		
<b>Line #</b>	<b>Project Title</b>	<b>Estimated Cost</b>	<b>Percent Need</b>	<b>Apportioned Dollar Cost</b>	<b>Percent Need</b>	<b>Apportioned Dollar Cost</b>
WW-001	Sewer Line Replacement/Upsizing	\$15,000,870	50.00%	\$7,500,435	50.00%	\$7,500,435
WW-002	Influent Gate Replacement	\$83,340	100.00%	\$83,340	0.00%	\$0
WW-003	Effluent Line Rebuild	\$357,160	100.00%	\$357,160	0.00%	\$0
WW-004	Upgrade Flow Meters, In-fill and Seep Technology	\$258,090	50.00%	\$129,045	50.00%	\$129,045
WW-005	Influent Screens Replacement	\$467,010	100.00%	\$467,010	0.00%	\$0
WW-006	Caltrol Motorized Slide Gates	\$53,460	100.00%	\$53,460	0.00%	\$0
WW-007	Drying Bed Paving	\$339,310	94.59%	\$320,964	5.41%	\$18,346
WW-008	Replace Perimeter Fence Sections	\$122,900	100.00%	\$122,900	0.00%	\$0
WW-009	Rehabilitate Secondary Clarifiers	\$921,740	100.00%	\$921,740	0.00%	\$0
WW-010	Laboratory Upgrades	\$307,250	75.00%	\$230,438	25.00%	\$76,813
WW-011	Remaining Wastewater System Debt Service	\$38,508,139	89.80%	\$34,580,309	10.20%	\$3,927,830
WW-012	Wastewater System Maintenance Vehicles	\$1,209,320	25.00%	\$302,330	75.00%	\$906,990
WW-013	Wastewater Collection System Master Plan	\$153,620	0.00%	\$0	100.00%	\$153,620
<b>Sub-Total General Plan Total New Projects</b>		<b>\$57,782,209</b>	<b>78.00%</b>	<b>\$45,069,131</b>	<b>22.00%</b>	<b>\$12,713,079</b>
<b>LESS:</b>						
<b>Development Impact Fee Fund Balance</b>		<b>(\$8,942,637)</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>(\$8,942,637)</b>	<b>0.00%</b>	<b>\$0</b>
<b>Other Off-setting Revenues</b>		<b>\$0</b>	<b>0.00%</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>\$0</b>
<b>Development Impact Fee Fund Balance Total</b>		<b>(\$8,942,637)</b>	<b>0.00%</b>	<b>(\$8,942,637)</b>	<b>0.00%</b>	<b>\$0</b>
<b>Total Net General Plan Project Costs</b>		<b>\$66,724,846</b>	<b>80.95%</b>	<b>\$54,011,768</b>	<b>19.05%</b>	<b>\$12,713,079</b>

Schedule 8.2

City of Lompoc  
 2025-26 Development Impact Cost Calculation  
 Minimum Capital Needs-based Impact Costs  
 Wastewater Collection and Treatment System

Proposed Land Use	Undeveloped		Gallons per Day Sewer Demand Rate	Cumulative New Sewer Demand	Percentage of Additional Sewer Demand	Allocation of Expansion Costs	Cost Distribution Per Acre	Average Units or Square Feet/Acre	Development Impact Fee per Unit or Square Foot
	Acres	Units							
Detached Dwelling Units	318.3	1,169	240	280,657	47.90%	\$6,089,184	\$19,130	3.67	\$5,213 per Unit
Attached Dwelling Units	62.2	1,072	210	225,104	38.42%	\$4,883,856	\$78,493	17.23	\$4,556 per Unit
Mobile Home Dwelling Units	1.0	14	210	2,940	0.50%	\$63,820	\$63,820	14.00	\$4,559 per Unit
Commercial Lodging Units	1.0	25	140	3,500	0.60%	\$75,897	\$75,897	25.00	\$3,036 per Unit
Retail/Service/Office Uses (SF)	21.9	441,367	900	19,710	3.36%	\$427,668	\$19,528	20,154	\$0.969 per S.F.
Self Storage Facilities Uses (SF)	1.0	32,670	1,200	1,200	0.21%	\$26,062	\$26,062	32,670	\$0.797 per S.F.
Business Park Uses (SF)	38.8	1,202,493	1,200	46,548	7.94%	\$1,009,927	\$26,036	31,000	\$0.841 per S.F.
Industrial Uses (SF)	3.0	63,340	1,600	4,800	0.82%	\$104,120	\$34,707	21,113	\$1.644 per S.F.
Institutional Use (SF)	1.0	28,314	1,500	1,500	0.26%	\$32,545	\$32,545	28,314	\$1.149 per S.F.
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>448.21</b>	<b>--</b>	<b>--</b>	<b>585,959</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>\$12,713,079 in Total Wastewater Development-related GP Projects</b>			

The demand characteristics have been taken from Table 3 from the June, 2011 Technical Memorandum from AKM Consulting Engineers.

Schedule 8.3

City of Lompoc  
 2025-26 Development Impact Cost Calculation  
 Existing Community Financial Commitment Comparison  
 Wastewater Collection and Treatment System

Proposed Land Use	Undeveloped		Gallons per Day Sewer Demand Rate	Cumulative Existing Sewer Demand	Percentage of Existing Sewer Demand	Allocation of Expansion Costs	Cost Distribution Per Acre	Average Units or Square Feet/Acre	Development Impact Fee per Unit or Square Foot
	Acres	Units							
Detached Dwelling Units	1,280.58	7,891	240	1,893,840	18.47%	\$88,786,407	\$69,333	6.16	<b>\$11,255 per Unit</b>
Attached Dwelling Units	247.39	5,681	210	1,193,010	11.64%	\$55,932,457	\$226,090	22.96	<b>\$9,849 per Unit</b>
Mobile Home Dwelling Units	69.00	980	210	205,800	2.01%	\$9,650,487	\$139,862	14.20	<b>\$9,847 per Unit</b>
Commercial Lodging Units	23.70	593	140	83,020	0.81%	\$3,892,876	\$164,256	25.02	<b>\$6,565 per Unit</b>
Retail/Service/Office Uses (SF)	290.15	11,279,548	900	261,135	2.55%	\$12,240,932	\$42,188	38,875	<b>\$1,085 per S.F.</b>
Self Storage Facilities Uses (SF)	20.91	685,989	1,200	25,092	0.25%	\$1,177,475	\$56,312	32,807	<b>\$1,716 per S.F.</b>
Business Park Uses (SF)	62.17	1,877,875	1,200	74,604	0.73%	\$3,498,782	\$56,278	30,205	<b>\$1,864 per S.F.</b>
Industrial Uses (SF)	94.00	2,047,320	1,600	150,400	1.47%	\$7,050,431	\$75,005	21,780	<b>\$3,444 per S.F.</b>
Institutional Use (SF)	4,243.00	120,136,302	1,500	6,364,500	62.08%	\$298,376,923	\$70,322	28,314	<b>\$2,484 per S.F.</b>
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>6,330.90</b>	<b>--</b>	<b>--</b>	<b>10,251,401</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>\$480,601,964 Total Wastewater Capital Needs to Finish System</b>			

<b>\$189,160,020 in Wastewater Collection System Assets</b>
<b>\$921,740 in Wastewater Collection Pump Station Assets</b>
<b>\$337,970,980 In Wastewater Treatment Capacity</b>
<b>-\$38,508,139 In Remaining Wastewater Debt Service</b>
<b>-\$8,942,637 in Wastewater System DIF Fund Balance</b>

## Chapter 9 Refuse Collection Vehicles/Barrels

---

This chapter contains a calculation of the cost of capital items necessary to meet the added refuse collection demands from development upon the City's inventory of refuse collection equipment and barrel inventory. Staff has indicated that facility storage and maintenance facilities are more than adequate with which to meet future demands. Collection vehicles and refuse containers are a different story. The existing refuse capacity is the result of existing customer rates and fee payments. New refuse customers will impact the refuse collection capability by requiring the City to obtain new refuse vehicles and various types of collection containers. It should be noted that the City currently charges new users for new barrels but does not charge for additional collection vehicles. This action would eliminate the need for the existing refuse collection customers from having to pay for the acquisition of new collection vehicles.

Many cities simply include the cost of capital acquisition within their operating budget. Cities that choose to finance the expansion of their refuse fleet through monthly user charges rather than DIFs are, in fact, forcing the existing refuse customers to subsidize the costs of these new businesses and residences. However, these costs can legitimately be recovered through a DIF schedule in virtually the same manner as a circulation or wastewater DIF.

Table 9-1 identifies the cost calculation for the direct capital acquisition costs of the collection vehicles and the collection bins required by each DIF use category.

**Table 9-1  
Refuse Collection Vehicle Cost  
per Daily Barrel Stop**

	<b>Total Cost</b>
Collection Vehicle Barrel Stop Capacity per Day	500
Days of Collection	5
Weekly Barrel Collection Capacity	2,500
Cost per Collection Vehicle	\$411,715
Weekly Barrel Collection Capacity	2,500
Total Cost per Collection Barrel Stop	\$165

Table 9-2, following, identifies the cost per barrel that should be a cost to the new residential and business customers.

**Table 9-2  
Refuse Collection Barrels  
Development Impact Fee**

	<b>Total Cost</b>
65/95 Gallon Collection Barrels	\$80
300/450 Gallon Collection Barrels	\$500

---

**RECAP OF RECOMMENDED REFUSE COLLECTION VEHICLES AND COLLECTION BARRELS DEVELOPMENT IMPACT FEES**

- **General City** - Adopt Schedule 9.1 for all service collection types. However, the final required number of Refuse Collection Vehicle Stops and Barrels demand DIF to be imposed on any given private development will be based upon the submitted design drawings and proposed use. As an example, some attached dwelling units will have limited space for refuse collection barrels and may require common bin service. Still, individual barrel collection services may better serve other attached dwelling units. The Solid Waste Management staff would determine this during the development review process or upon service application. The latter would probably be more accurate.
- 

**END OF CHAPTER TEXT**

**Schedule 9.1**

**City of Lompoc  
2025-26 Development Impact Cost Calculation  
Refuse Collection Vehicles/Barrels  
Minimum Capital Needs-based Impact Costs**

Collection Vehicle Cost Calculation	
Daily Stops per Single Route	500 Barrel Stops per Day
Number of Days of Collection	5 Ten-hour Days per Week
Pick-up Capability of One Truck	2,500 Barrels per Week
Cost per Collection Vehicle	\$411,715 per Collection Vehicle
Number of Days of Collection	2,500 Barrels per Week
Cost per Barrel per Pick-up Stop	\$165 per Barrel per Stop
Collection Barrell Cost Calculation	
65/95 Gallon Collection Barrel	\$80 per Collection Barrel
300/450 Gallon Collection Barrel	\$500 per Collection Barrel

## Chapter 10 General Facilities, Vehicles, and Equipment

---

The Existing System. General Facilities are generally limited to general office or work buildings and equipment used by City staff to undertake their daily duties. The replacement costs totaling \$35,539,860 are as follows:

City Hall Facilities .....	\$33,972,910
Computer and Miscellaneous Electronic Equipment .....	\$1,474,780
General Fund Pool Cars .....	\$92,170
General Facilities Impact Fee Fund Balance (None).....	\$0

Demand Upon Infrastructure Created by the Development of Underdeveloped or Undeveloped Parcels. As the City increases in population and additional business ventures, the City Hall will typically become overcrowded with a growing staff, even if major efforts are made to keep the number of municipal workers to a minimum. However, The Lompoc City Hall's existing 28,646 square feet will be able to absorb any additional needs from the existing General Plan build-out demands, given a reconfiguration of the existing floor plan to make better use of all of the existing space. Staff has indicated that no additions are needed for the City Maintenance Service Center.

City pool vehicles are generally made available to general employees assigned to general code enforcement, intra-city mail delivery, planning and engineering field inspection projects, and other issues. These tasks often require on-site inspection or review. Another demand for pool cars is travel by employees who do not have assigned City vehicles. These vehicles will be checked out increasingly, requiring a minor fleet addition.

Lastly, the greater amounts of data necessary to manage a larger city will also impact the City's centralized and personal desktop computer processing capability and storage space.

The Purpose of the Fee. The costs of extending the same level of service to the newly developing community as is provided to the existing community that has largely paid for the existing facilities can be calculated, a fee imposed and collected, and the fee used to expand the facilities necessary to extend that same level of services.

The Use of the Fee. The revenues raised from a properly calculated and supported General Facilities, Vehicles, and Equipment Impact Fee would be limited to capital costs related to that growth. The fees would be used to construct additional general facilities. Conversely, the General Facilities, Vehicles, and Equipment DIF receipts would not be used to repair any existing general building, except for reconfiguring City Hall to increase capability and capacity, which would be far less expensive than constructing a building addition. The improvements necessary to contend with increased demand resulting from additional residents and businesses would include the following:

- City Hall floor plan reconfiguration.
- Expansion of the administrative pool car fleet.
- Up-sizing of the existing centralized computer system capacity.

The Relationship Between the Need for The Fee and The Type of Development Project. The need is based upon the recognition that additional developed parcels in the City will create the need for more building space and specialty equipment, largely within the arena of overhead space, i.e., administrative management, personnel, record keeping, financial accounting, etc. The costs are distributed on an equal acreage basis as the most direct index of demand relating to central management services.

The Relationship Between the Use of the Fee and the Type of Development Paying the Fee. General management of the City and General Plan issues transcend the type of land use, the use of the fee, and the need for the fee. The distribution of new demand will be based on an equal benefit in terms of the City's general management.

Relationship Between the Amount of the Fee and the Cost of the Portion of the Facility Attributed to the Development Project. The fee would be based on the size of the development. A fee has been determined for individual units, either residential dwelling units or business square feet. Developing twelve residential units would have to pay a fee twelve times larger than a single unit. No developer will be required to construct any portion of any general facility as a condition of development.

Resulting DIF Schedule. Table 10-1 summarizes the Minimum Needs-based General Facilities DIFs. The following fees represent the fees necessary to construct or acquire the facilities identified in Schedule 10.1.

**Table 10-1**  
**City of Lompoc's Entire City Area**  
**Minimum Needs-based General Facilities, Vehicles and Equipment**  
**Development Impact Costs**  
**by DIF Land-use Type**

DIF Land-use Type	Allocation of Development Costs	Development Impact Cost Per Unit or Square Foot
Private Residential Units	\$1,468,668	\$651/Unit
Commercial Lodging Units	\$3,850	\$154/Unit
Business Uses	\$252,875	\$0.143/S.F.

It must be restated that the existing community has established the City Hall, general pool fleet, and computer/electronic equipment inventory. In short, the current community has created more than adequate staff facilities from which future development can attain immediate benefits. Table 10-2, following, identifies the average investment by residential dwelling units, commercial lodging units, and business square feet.

**Table 10-2  
Existing General Facilities, Vehicles, and Equipment  
Community Financial Commitment Comparison**

<b>DIF Land-use Type</b>	<b>Allocation of Development Costs</b>	<b>Development Impact Cost Per Unit or Square Foot</b>
Residential Dwelling Units	\$8,964,932	\$616/Unit
Commercial Lodging Units	\$133,045	\$224/Unit
Business Uses	\$26,441,883	\$0.194/S.F.

### RECOMMENDED IMPACT FEES

The *Minimum Needs-based Impact Costs* should be adopted for the two broad land uses, per Schedule 10.2 and summarized in Table 10-3. The Existing Community Financial Commitment indicates that the existing community has generated a great deal more infrastructure than will be required for future development.

---

### RECAP OF RECOMMENDED GENERAL FACILITIES ET. AL. IMPACT FEES

- **General Plan Area** - Adopt Schedule 10.3 for the three basic land uses.
- 

END OF CHAPTER TEXT

Schedule 10.1

City of Lompoc  
 2025-26 Development Impact Cost Calculation  
 Allocation of Project Cost Estimates  
 General Facilities, Vehicles and Equipment

Line #	Project Title	Estimated Cost	Construction Needs Supported by Other Resources		Construction Needs Generated by New Development	
			Percent Need	Apportioned Dollar Cost	Percent Need	Apportioned Dollar Cost
GF-001	City Hall Reconfiguration/Expansion	\$ 1,824,920.00	20.00%	\$364,984	80.00%	\$1,459,936
GF-002	Expansion Of Administrative Pool Car Fleet	\$ 55,300.00	20.00%	\$11,060	80.00%	\$44,240
GF-003	Electronic Specialty Equipment/Computer Hardware/Software	\$ 276,520.00	20.00%	\$55,304	80.00%	\$221,216
<b>Sub-Total General Plan Total New Project Costs</b>		<b>\$2,156,740</b>	<b>20.00%</b>	<b>\$431,348</b>	<b>80.00%</b>	<b>\$1,725,392</b>
<b>LESS:</b>						
<b>Development Impact Fee Fund Balance</b>		<b>\$0</b>	<b>0.00%</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>\$0</b>
<b>Total General Plan Total New Project Costs</b>		<b>\$2,156,740</b>	<b>20.00%</b>	<b>\$431,348</b>	<b>80.00%</b>	<b>\$1,725,392</b>

Schedule 10.2

City of Lompoc  
 2025-26 Development Impact Cost Calculation  
 Minimum Needs-based Impact Costs  
 General Facilities, Vehicles and Equipment

Proposed Land Use	Undeveloped		Acre Distribution Factor	Acre Demand Factor	Percentage of Additional Demand	Allocation of Expansion Costs	Cost Distribution Per Acre	Average Units or Square Feet/Acre	Development Impact Fee per Unit or Square Foot
	Acres	Units							
Private Residences	381.52	2,255	1.000	381.52	85.12%	\$1,468,668	\$3,850	5.91	<b>\$651 per Unit</b>
Commercial Lodging Rooms	1.00	25	1.000	1.00	0.22%	\$3,850	\$3,850	25.00	<b>\$154 per Unit</b>
Business Square Feet	65.69	1,768,184	1.000	65.69	14.66%	\$252,875	\$3,850	26,917	<b>\$0.143 per S.F.</b>
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>448.21</b>	<b>--</b>	<b>--</b>	<b>448.21</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>\$1,725,392</b>	<b>in Total General Facilities Development-related GP Projects</b>		

Schedule 10.3

City of Lompoc  
 2025-26 Development Impact Cost Calculation  
 Existing Community Financial Commitment Comparison  
 General Facilities, Vehicles and Equipment

Proposed Land Use	Developed		Acre Distribution Factor	Acre Demand Service	Percentage of Existing Service Calls	Allocation of Infrastructure "Equity"	Distribution of "Equity" per Acre	Average Units or Square Feet/Acre	Current Financial Commitment per Unit or Square Foot
	Acres	Units							
Private Residences	1,596.97	14,552	1.000	1,596.97	25.23%	\$8,964,932	\$5,614	9.11	<b>\$616 per Unit</b>
Commercial Lodging Rooms	23.70	593	1.000	23.70	0.37%	\$133,045	\$5,614	25.02	<b>\$224 per Unit</b>
Business Square Feet	4,710.23	136,027,034	1.000	4,710.23	74.40%	\$26,441,883	\$5,614	28,879	<b>\$0.194 per S.F.</b>
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>6,330.90</b>	<b>--</b>	<b>--</b>	<b>6,330.90</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>\$35,539,860</b>	<b>in Total Existing General Facilities Capital Assets</b>		
							<b>\$33,972,910 in City Hall Land/Facilities</b>		
							<b>\$1,474,780 in Equity in Existing Computer/Electronic Equipment</b>		
							<b>\$92,170 in General Fund Pool Vehicles</b>		
							<b>\$0 in Existing General Facilities Impact Fee Fund Balance.</b>		

## Chapter 11

### Library Collection Items and Dedicated Public Use Computer Stations

The Existing System. The City-owned Lompoc Library serves the City's residents. The facility provides access to a broad inventory of books, tapes, electronic books, subscriptions called a *collection* of volumes, and a number of dedicated public-use computer stations available to the public. The City also has approximately \$300,539 in existing Library DIF fund balance, representing about 7,864 additional collection items and four dedicated public-use computer stations. Table 11-1, following, identifies the current inventory of library offerings enjoyed by the City's residents.

**Table 11-1**  
**Identification of Current Library Inventories and Calculation of  
Collection Items and Computer Stations per Resident Standards**

	Collection Items	Computer Stations
Existing Collection Items	92,359	44
Collection Items Available Within Fund Balance	7,864	4
Total Collection Items/Public Computers	100,223	48
Current City Population	40,738	40,738
Current Standard per Resident	2.460	0.0012

When the total 100,223 collection items are divided by the current net population of 40,738, a library collection standard of 2.460 collection items/resident is established. When the 48 dedicated public-use computer stations are divided by the current population of 41,109, a dedicated public-use computer station standard of 0.0012 dedicated public-use computer stations/residents is established.

Why is a library collection of items and dedicated public-use computer station DIF schedule important? Simply stated, the 100,223 collection items will only be able to accommodate a finite number of patrons. Additional development will increase the demand for the existing collection items. The same will hold true for the 44 dedicated public-use computer stations. Without additional computer stations, the 44 existing stations will become harder to access with the additional 6,650 new residents from the 2,255 new private residences.

**The Purpose of the Fee.** The purpose of the fee is to enable the City to add collection items and additional computer stations to ensure that the City's citizens have access to the collection items and computer stations. Table 11-2, following, indicates that the remaining residential development and typical number of persons per type of residential dwelling will generate a need for an additional 16,359 collection items in order to maintain the existing local library collection facility standard of 2.460 collection items per person and eight dedicated public use computer stations to maintain the existing standard of 0.0012 stations per resident.

**Table 11-2  
Collection Items Required to Maintain Existing  
Library Collection Items Standard**

<b>Residential DIF Land Use Type</b>	<b>Number of Units Anticipated</b>	<b>Persons per Dwelling</b>	<b>Population Generated</b>
Detached Dwelling Units	1,169	3.025	3,537
Attached Dwelling Units	1,072	2.876	3,083
Mobil Home Dwelling Units	14	2.130	30
Additional City Residents from Added Dwelling Units			6,650
Collection Items per Person Existing Standard			2.460
<b>Collection Items Required to Maintain Standard</b>			<b>16,359</b>

The County currently has 44 existing computer stations and four additional stations represented in the Library DIF Fund balance. Again, divided by the existing population of 41,109, the resulting standard is 0.0012 dedicated public use computer stations per person. Table 11-3, following, indicates the additional number of residents (6,650) to be served by the existing 44 computer stations and the number of computer stations required (eight) to maintain the existing standard of 0.0012 computer stations per person in light of the additional 6,650 additional residents at build-out.

**Table 11-3  
Collection Items Required to Maintain Existing  
Library Dedicated Public-Use Computer Stations Standard**

<b>Residential DIF Land Use Type</b>	<b>Number of Units Anticipated</b>	<b>Persons per Dwelling</b>	<b>Population Generated</b>
Detached Dwelling Units	1,169	3.025	3,537
Attached Dwelling Units	1,072	2.876	3,083
Mobil Home Dwelling Units	14	2.130	30
Additional City Residents from Added Dwelling Units			6,650
Existing Computer Stations per Person Standard			0.0012
<b>Computer Stations Required to Maintain Standard</b>			<b>8</b>

**The Use of the Fee.** If adopted, the fee imposed and collected would be limited to acquiring additional library collection items and dedicated public-use computer stations but not to replace either. The preservation of the existing Library standards must be maintained.

**The Relationship Between the Need for The Fee and The Type of Development Project.** Developing any acreage zoned for residential uses increases the demand for the finite amount of library collection items and dedicated public-use computer stations. Thus, those residential land uses that generate higher amounts of residents (i.e., detached dwelling units) will be charged a

proportionally higher amount. No information is available demonstrating a significant link or nexus between library use by local businesses.

**The Relationship Between the Use of the Fee and the Type of Development Paying the Fee.** Additional collection items and dedicated public-use computer stations will be acquired with the impact fee receipts collected from residential development.

**The Relationship Between the Amount of the Fee and the Cost of the Portion of the Facility Attributed to the Development Project.** The cost of acquiring additional volumes, called the accession process<sup>16</sup> is \$36.69 per item per Schedule 11.1. The accession process cost has decreased steadily over recent years due to the contracting out of this time-intensive process. When the 100,223 collection items inventory is divided by the 40,738 existing citizens, a standard of 2.460 collection items per resident is established. When the standard of 2.460 collection items is multiplied by \$36.69 per item, a charge of \$90.26 per additional City resident is determined.

**Table 11-4  
Establishment of the Library Collection Standard  
and Cost per Person to Maintain the Standard**

Library Collection Items	100,223
Current Population	40,738
Collection Items per Resident	2.460
Acquisition Cost of Collection Item	\$36.69
<b>Cost per Additional Resident</b>	<b>\$90.26</b>

The cost of acquiring a single computer station (per Schedule 11.1) is estimated at \$2,812.90 per computer, monitor, software license, workstation, and installation. The 44 existing computer stations used by Lompoc residents, when divided by the 40,738 net existing residents, create a standard of 0.0012 dedicated public use computer stations per City resident. The standard of 0.0012 collection items multiplied by the \$2,812.90 per public computer station results in a cost of \$3.38 per additional City resident in order to maintain the existing standard. Table 11-5 identifies this:

**Table 11-5  
Establishment of the Library Dedicated Public Use  
Computer Station Standard  
and Cost per Person to Maintain the Standard**

Dedicated Public Use Computer Stations	44
Current Population (State D.O.F.)	40,738
Collection Items per Resident	0.0012
Accessions Cost per Collection Item	\$2,813
<b>Cost per Additional Resident</b>	<b>\$3.38</b>

16. The accession process includes: need research, ordering, receipt, preparation, entering it into the computer and actual placement on the shelves.

Library Collection Items and Computer Station DIF Schedule. The combined cost per new resident is \$93.64 (\$90.26 for 2.460 collection items and \$3.38 for 0.0012 additional computer stations). Table 11-6, following, indicates the amount required for pro-rata expansion of the library space per Schedule 9.1. If adopted and imposed on the remaining development, it would collect enough to acquire an additional 16,359 library collection volumes and eight dedicated public-use computer stations.

**Table 11-6  
Summary of Collection Items and Computer  
Stations Impact Costs**

<b>DIF Land Use Type</b>	<b>Residents Per Dwelling</b>	<b>Cost per Resident</b>	<b>Impact Cost per Dwelling</b>
Detached Dwelling Units	3.025	\$93.64	\$283
Attached Dwelling Units	2.876	\$93.64	\$270
Mobile Home Dwelling Units	2.130	\$93.64	\$199

---

**RECAP OF RECOMMENDED LIBRARY AND COLLECTION VOLUMES IMPACT FEES**

- Adopt Schedule 11.1 for the three basic residential dwelling DIF types.
- 

**END OF CHAPTER TEXT**

**Schedule 11.1**

**City of Lompoc  
2025-26 Development Impact Cost Calculation  
Library Collection Items/Dedicated Public Use Computers**

	<b>Collection Items</b>	<b>Computer Stations</b>	<b>Total Resources</b>
<b>Existing Number of Collection Items</b>	92,359		
<b>Existing Number of Dedicated Public Computer Stations</b>		44.00	
Library Assets Stations Represented by Existing Fund Balance	7,864	4.00	
<b>Total Library Components Status</b>	<b>100,223</b>	<b>48.00</b>	
Current Net City Population	40,738	40,738	
Collection Items per Resident	2.460		
Computer Stations per Resident		0.0012	
Accessions Cost per Collection Item	\$36.69		
Cost per Computer Station with Licenses, Installed		\$2,812.90	
Collection Item Cost per Resident	\$90.26		
Collection Item Cost per Resident		\$3.38	

  

<b>Cost per Land Use Residential Dwelling Unit</b>	<b>Density per Dwelling Unit</b>	<b>Collection Items</b>	<b>Computer Stations</b>	<b>Total Resources</b>
Detached Dwelling Unit	3.025	\$273	\$10	\$283
Attached Dwelling Unit	2.876	\$260	\$10	\$270
Mobile Home Dwelling Unit	2.130	\$192	\$7	\$199

## Chapter 12 Public Use Facilities

---

This important component of the City’s offerings to its citizens is distinct from the Park Land and Park Improvements DIF as a separate DIF infrastructure category. The City of Lompoc was one of the earlier cities to undertake this process, and it was undertaken for three probable reasons.

First, few parks contain a community public use center. Secondly, it is difficult to ensure that the cost for such a facility is properly included in the average park development cost per acre. Lastly and perhaps most importantly, it has been the experience of RCS staff that when the cost for community centers is included as a cost of park development, these facilities do not get built. This is because the park impact fee revenues get used on the costly demand for turfed park acres with sports or passive-use park improvements.

Lastly and perhaps most importantly, RCS staff have experienced that when the cost for public use facilities (community centers et al.) is included as a cost of park development, these facilities do not get built, as the park impact fee revenues are used to pay for the costly demand for turfed park acres with sports or passive-use park improvements. The premise remains valid.

The Existing System. The City has a number of facilities currently dedicated to public use. Such facilities are available to community groups for meetings, classes, sports activities, and other civic functions. This category of buildings differs from General Facilities, which are those used by the City staff to undertake their municipal service duties (City Hall and the City Corporation Yards are good examples).

The City owns some facilities dedicated to a specific use, such as the Senior Center, and others available for broader use, such as the Anderson Recreation Center. Table 12-1 shows the City’s existing public meeting facilities.

**Table 12-1  
Inventory of Existing (Owned) Public Meeting Facilities**

Public Use Meeting Facility	Square Feet
Anderson Recreation Center	15,439
Art Gallery	1,200
Civic Center Auditorium	8,205
Museum	4,437
Lompoc Library Building	19,710
Senior Center Facility	15,500
Future Facilities in DIF Fund Balance	178
<b>Total Public Use Square Feet</b>	<b>64,669</b>

Based upon a net population of 40,738, the 64,669 square feet create an impressive standard of 1.587 square feet per resident. This standard indicates that the City is committed to providing a community center or recreation space for public groups and individuals. Table 12-2, following, demonstrates the calculation establishing the square foot standard:

**Table 12-2  
Calculation of Public Use Facilities  
Square Foot Standard**

Existing Public Meeting Space Square Feet	64,669
Current City Population	40,738
Square Foot per Resident Standard	1.587

Demand Upon Infrastructure Created by the Development of Underdeveloped or Undeveloped Parcels. Additional residential dwelling units will increase the population, placing greater demands on the use of the existing community centers. The construction of a detached dwelling unit will create, on average, 3.025 potential new community center users. The addition of a new attached dwelling unit will create, on average, 2.876 potential new users.

The Purpose of the Fee. The purpose of the fee is to determine the cost of expanding the community center and public-use type facilities by some 10,554 square feet to meet the added demands created by the construction of additional residential dwelling units. It should be noted that 10,554 square feet of public use facilities may not fully meet the needs of the build-out community and that the community may desire additional square feet. The reference to the 10,554 square feet indicates the amount of additional public use facilities in square feet that DIFs could finance. Table 12-3, following, demonstrates the calculation of the number of additional square feet required to maintain the existing Public Use facilities standard:

**Table 12-3  
Square Feet of Community Center Space  
Required to Maintain Existing Standard**

Residential DIF land-use Type	Number of Units Anticipated	Persons per Dwelling	Population Generated
Detached Dwelling Units	1,169	3.025	3,537
Attached Dwelling Units	1,072	2.876	3,083
Mobil Home Dwelling Units	14	2.130	30
Additional City Residents from Added Dwelling Units			6,650
Square Foot per Person Existing Standard			1.587
<b>Public Use Facilities (SF) Required to Maintain Standard</b>			<b>10,554</b>

The Use of the Fee. If adopted, the fee would be imposed, collected, and spent on the construction of additional community center space that benefits the City of Lompoc residents, not on the rehabilitation of any existing public use facility.

The Relationship Between the Need for The Fee and The Type of Development Project. Different residential dwellings generally have differing amounts of people dwelling in them. Census data indicates the following occupancy statistics for the City:

Detached Dwelling Units .....	3.025 Persons/Unit
Attached Dwelling Units .....	2.876 Persons/Unit
Mobile Home Family Dwelling Units .....	2.130 Persons/Unit

The Relationship Between the Use of the Fee and the Type of Development Paying the Fee. The fee will be used to expand the amount of community center square feet in proportions consistent with the average number of persons per dwelling. Community centers would be expanded in the following amounts following, by type of residential dwelling:

Detached Dwelling Unit ...3.025 Persons per Unit X 1.587 Square Feet = 4.801 Square Feet  
 Attached Dwelling Unit ....2.876 Persons per Unit X 1.587 Square Feet = 4.564 Square Feet  
 Mobile Home Unit.....2.130 Persons per Unit X 1.587 Square Feet = 3.380 Square Feet

The Relationship Between the Amount of the Fee and the Cost of the Portion of the Facility Attributed to the Development Project. The cost of adding 1.587 square feet of building space per person is roughly \$1,119.37 based upon a \$661.09 per square foot for construction, \$13.50 for parcel hardscape improvements based upon a \$4.50 per square foot cost, and a Floor Area Ratio of 0.333) and land acquisition and parcel site grading improvements of \$30.75 (\$10.25 per square foot, again with a 0.333 Floor Area Ratio). A detached dwelling unit with 3.025 persons would require 4.801 square feet of public meeting space at a cost of \$3,386 (4.801 square feet X \$705.34 per square foot, rounded). An attached dwelling unit requires 4.564 square feet of public meeting space at a cost of about \$3,219 (4.564 square feet X \$705.34 per square foot).

Resulting DIFs. Table 12-4 indicates the proposed Public Meeting Facilities DIF.

**Table 12-4  
Summary of Public Use Facilities Impact Fee**

DIF Land-use Type	Impact Fee Per Unit
Detached Dwelling Unit	\$3,386
Attached Dwelling Unit	\$3,219
Mobile Home Dwelling Unit	\$2,384

---

**RECAP OF RECOMMENDED PUBLIC USE FACILITIES IMPACT FEES**

- **General City** - Adopt Schedule 12.1 for the three basic residential dwelling categories.
- 

**END OF CHAPTER TEXT**

Schedule 12.1

City of Lompoc  
 2025-26 Development Impact Cost Calculation  
 Public Use Facilities

	Land and Building
Anderson Recreation Center	15,439
Art Gallery	1,200
Civic Center Auditorium	8,205
Museum	4,437
Lompoc Library Building	19,710
Senior Center	15,500
Facilities Represented in Existing DIF Fund Balance	178
Existing City-owned Public Use Facilities Square Feet	64,669
Current Population	40,738
Square Foot per Resident Standard	1.587
Average Public Use Facility Construction Cost per Square Foot	\$661.09
Parcel Hardscape Improvements, \$4.50 S.F. and 0.333 Floor Area Ratio	\$13.50
Land Acquisition/Grading Cost @ \$10.25 per square foot X 0.333 FAR	\$30.75
<b>Total Cost for a Single Square Foot of Public Use Space</b>	<b>\$705.34</b>
<b>Total Cost for one Square Foot of Public Use Space</b>	<b>\$705.34</b>
Square Foot per Resident Standard	1.587
<b>Cost per New Resident</b>	<b>\$1,119.37</b>

Cost per Land Use Residential Dwelling Unit	Density per Dwelling Unit	Total Resources
Detached Dwelling Unit	3.025	\$3,386
Attached Dwelling Unit	2.876	\$3,219
Mobile Home Dwelling Unit	2.130	\$2,384

## Chapter 13 Aquatics Facilities

---

This component of City infrastructure is also separated from the Park Land Acquisition and DIF for the same reasons described in the previous Chapter regarding Public Use (community center) Facilities.

The Existing System. The City owns and operates an impressive aquatics facility consisting of a total of 15,515 square feet of swimming pool surface and 42,392 square feet of combination locker/utilities/office buildings. The City's prior natatorium listed in the previous Report, has been dismantled and is no longer included in the calculation of the standard. The existing facilities are available to individuals and organized groups represented by the existing 41,109 residents for leisure, competition, and general fitness uses. Table 13-1, following, details the four aquatics complexes and the existing fund balance.

**Table 13-1  
Existing City Pools/Utility Buildings**

Pool Facility	Pool Surface Capacity	Pool Support Facilities
Competition Pool	6,382	
Play Area	7,448	
Therapy/Training Pool	1,685	
Aquatics Center Building		42,392
Fund Balance Square Feet	0	0
<b>Total Square Feet</b>	<b>15,515</b>	<b>42,392</b>

Demand Upon Infrastructure Created by the Development of Underdeveloped or Undeveloped Parcels. Additional residential dwelling units will increase the population, placing greater demands on the City's existing aquatics centers. The construction of detached dwellings and attached dwellings will create, on average, 3.025 and 2.876 potential new potential pool users, respectively. The addition of mobile residences in the unlikely event that any mobile parks be applied for and approved) will create 2.130 potential new pool users each. The current *de-facto* standards are 1.0406 square feet of locker/office building per person and 0.3808 square feet of pool surface per person in the City.

The Purpose of the Fee. The purpose of the fee is to generate DIF revenue with which to expand the aquatics center's capacity to meet the added demands created by the construction of additional residential dwelling units.

The Use of the Fee. If adopted, the fee would be imposed, collected, and spent on constructing additional aquatic centers that would benefit the City of Lompoc residents. Still, it would not be spent on rehabilitating the existing aquatic center.

The Relationship Between the Need for The Fee and The Type of Development Project. Different types of residential dwellings generally have differing numbers of people dwelling in them. United States Census 2000 data (see Table 2-2, page 23) was used to determine the occupancy density statistics for the City. They are summarized following:

Detached Dwelling Units .....	3.025 Persons/Unit
Attached Dwelling Units .....	2.876 Persons/Unit
Mobile Home Dwelling Units .....	2.130 Persons/Unit

The Relationship Between the Use of the Fee and the Type of Development Paying the Fee. The fee will be used to expand the pool surface space and support the building in proportions consistent with the average number of persons per dwelling. The aquatic center pools and locker/utility buildings will be expanded in the amounts on the following page by type of residential dwelling:

Detached Dwelling Units .....	3.148 S.F. of locker space and 1.152 S.F. of pool surface
Attached Dwelling Units .....	2.876 S.F. of locker space and 1.095 S.F. of pool surface
Mobile Home Dwelling Units .....	2.130 S.F. of locker space and 0.811 S.F. of pool surface

The Relationship Between the Amount of the Fee and the Cost of the Portion of the Facility Attributed to the Development Project. Schedule 13.1 indicates the pool and locker building cost calculations. The pool construction costs are also based on past pool construction costs received from previous agencies.

The two separate square foot costs above total about \$685.33 per person for the pool expansion (\$335/S.F. X 0.3808 S.F per resident = \$127.57 per person), approximately \$557.76 per person for the locker building expansion (\$536/S.F. X 1.3808 S.F. per resident = \$557.76 per person) or \$685.33 per person for both construction components. Thus, a detached dwelling or detached unit would incur impact costs of \$2,073/dwelling (3.025 persons X \$685.33, rounded). An attached dwelling unit would generate impact costs of about \$1,971/dwelling (2.876 persons X \$685.33, rounded).

Resulting DIF Schedule. Schedule 13.1, as summarized in Table 13-2, indicates the proposed Aquatics Facilities DIF schedule.

**Table 13-2**  
**Summary of Aquatics Facilities Impact Fee**

DIF Land-use Type	Impact Fee Per Unit
Detached Dwelling Unit	\$2,073
Attached Dwelling Unit	\$1,971
Mobile Home Dwelling Unit	\$1,460

---

**RECAP OF RECOMMENDED AQUATICS FACILITIES IMPACT FEES**

- **General City** - Adopt Schedule 13.1 for the three basic residential land uses.
- 

**END OF CHAPTER TEXT**

Schedule 13.1

City of Lompoc  
 2025-26 Development Impact Cost Calculation  
 Aquatics Facilities

	Pool Capacity in Surface Square Feet	Support Facilities in Square Feet
Competition Pool	6,382	
Play Area	7,448	
Therapy/Training Pool	1,685	
Aquatics Center Building		42,392
Facilities Represented in Existing DIF Fund Balance	0	0
Current Pool Size (Surface Square Feet):	15,515	
Current Aquatics Building (Square Feet):		42,392
Current Population (1)	40,738	40,738
<b>Existing Standards:</b>		
Square Feet of Surface /Resident	0.3808	
Square Foot of Locker Building/Person		1.0406
<b>Construction Costs</b>		
Pool Cost per Surface Square Foot	\$335.00	
Facilities Construction/Square Foot		\$536.00
Existing Standards per Resident	0.3808	1.0406
Adjusted Pool Cost per Resident	\$127.57	
Adjusted Facilities Cost per Resident		\$557.76

Cost per Land Use Residential Dwelling Unit	Density per Dwelling Unit	Pool Surface	Support Facilities	Total Cost
<b>Total Cost per Added Resident</b>		\$127.57	\$557.76	\$685.33
Detached Dwelling Unit	3.025	\$386	\$1,687	<b>\$2,073</b>
Attached Dwelling Unit	2.876	\$367	\$1,604	<b>\$1,971</b>
Mobile Home Dwelling Unit	2.130	\$272	\$1,188	<b>\$1,460</b>

## Chapter 14

# Park Land Acquisition and Park Infrastructure Development

---

This Chapter summarizes the City's existing inventory of parks and identifies the ratio of parkland per resident allowable under the Quimby Act (§66477 of the Government Code)<sup>17</sup> for residential developments involving the subdivision of land and the Mitigation Fee Act (§66000 of the Government Code) for the construction of residential developments not involving the subdivision of land. The existing per capita standard is then utilized to calculate the park dedication requirement for future residential development.

### EXISTING PARKS AND RECREATION SYSTEM

Intensive parks and park recreational facilities constitute one of the City of Lompoc's greatest challenges concerning facilities for current and future residents. Providing a well-planned park system, with a variation in the size and nature of facilities offered, is an important amenity to residents of any city, including the City of Lompoc. A mixture of passive and active uses and facilities and programs that appeal to a broad spectrum of potential park users is considered optimal in most urban cities. A city's park system and inventory of open space are often a major factor in selecting a place to live. The current acres dedicated to park use will serve well to meet the City's current needs. However, suppose the number of improved active/passive park acres remains static at 148.26 acres. In that case, they will not continue to meet recreational demands in light of a potential near doubling of the City's population.

By increasing the City's population, future residential development will impact the City's park system by requiring additional baseball fields and adequate space for various athletic activities. Given the magnitude of growth projected in this and other reports, the challenge facing the City will be to provide new facilities and parkland to serve the recreational needs of these new residents. Without additional parkland acquisition and continued development of currently owned but underutilized parkland during the next twenty to thirty years, the City's parks will become overcrowded and overused, ultimately becoming a negative experience for park users.

Existing Parks. The City currently owns approximately 148.26 acres of park land, most of it developed. Beattie, Ken Adam, River (partial) and Riverbend (partial), and Ryon Memorial parks are the City's largest developed parks, representing over 80% of the park system acreage (when only traditional improved parks are considered) and providing the greatest variety of sports and passive uses.

Table 14-1, on the following page, is an inventory of the existing park acreage.

[This space is left vacant in order to place the following table on a single page].

---

17. Adoption of a Quimby Act Fee requires a park "plan".

**Table 14-1  
Inventory of Owned and Developed Park Land**

<b>Park or Space Name</b>	<b>Owned Park Acres</b>	<b>Developed Park Acres</b>	<b>Open Space Acres</b>
Barkin Park	0.68	0.68	4.72
Beattie Park	15.00	15.00	18.00
Briar Creek Park	3.49	3.49	3.30
Centennial Park	0.32	0.32	0.00
Johns-Manville Park	6.90	6.90	0.00
Ken Adam Park	10.00	10.00	83.96
Old Mission Park	0.62	0.62	0.00
Pioneer Park	4.71	4.71	0.00
Pocket Park	0.15	0.15	0.00
River Park/RV Park	36.47	36.47	168.66
Riverbend Park	40.80	40.80	138.42
Ryon Memorial Park	20.33	20.33	0.00
Skate Park	1.13	1.13	0.00
Thompson Park	4.34	4.34	0.00
Westvale Park	1.96	1.96	0.00
Park Equivalent in Fund Balance	1.60	1.60	0.00
<b>Total Park Acres</b>	<b>148.26</b>	<b>148.26</b>	<b>417.06</b>

City De Facto Park Standard. Table 14-2 compares the acreage of parks to the City of Lompoc's current population and indicates that the City presently possesses a total standard of 3.639 acres of owned parkland per 1,000 residents (148.26 acres [40,738 residents ÷ 1,000], rounded). This is slightly above the benchmark of 3.0 acres per 1,000 persons contained in Section 66477 of the California Government Code relating to the dedication of parks.

**Table 14-2  
Calculation of Actual City-owned Improved Park Acres Standard**

	<b>Owned Acres</b>	<b>Developed Acres</b>
Total Park Acres	148.26	148.26
Current City Population	40,738	40,738
Population Divided by 1,000	40.74	40.74
Park Acres per 1,000 Population	3.639	3.639

However, the Quimby Act, to be discussed later, allows a minimum standard of 3.0 acres per thousand residents even if the City does not reach that standard. The Quimby minimum of 3.0 acres per 1,000 residents has been exceeded by the 3.639 acres per 1,000 residents, and thus,

the Quimby allowable minimum of 3.0 acres per 1,000 will not be used in the remainder of the Chapter for park *construction*. The 3.639 acres per 1,000 residents will be the standard used to calculate the parkland acquisition and park improvements development impact fee. Though not relevant to the City of Lompoc, the Quimby Act has a cap of 5.0 acres per thousand residents (Government Code §66447 (a) (2)).

Planned Park Improvements. In addition to the ongoing improvement of the existing 148.26 acres,<sup>18</sup> the City will need to acquire 24.20 park acres, per Table 14-3, and develop these new parks to serve the additional 6,650 residents anticipated to live in both the General City and

**Table 14-3**  
**Calculation of Required**  
**Park Acres per Allowable Standard**

General Plan Anticipated Population Increase	6,650
Additional Population Divided by 1,000	6.650
Allowable Standard in Acres/1,000	3.639
Park Acres required to Maintain Standard	24.20

These general improvements are outlined in the MFP. The 24.20 acres could be constructed in any of the following configurations:

**Mini or “Pocket” Parks** - These are the smallest of the park designations and, though generally not planned due to higher maintenance costs, usually are the result of acquiring an unusual parcel of land, sometimes with historical significance. The City’s Barkin, Centennial, Old Mission Parks, and the fittingly named Pocket Park best demonstrate this category.

**Local or Neighborhood Parks** - These parks are generally five to ten acres and serve local (1/4 mile walk-in distance) users. Not surprisingly, the City has a number of these parks. Thompson Park, Pioneer Park, and Johns-Manville Park are good examples of this category.

**Community or Sports Parks** - These parks are most functional when they are twenty acres or larger and are designed to meet the entire community's needs. Often, ten to twenty-acre parks are forced to act as community or sports parks. These needs include youth and adult sports organizations, clubs or associations, and large-scale community events such as 4<sup>th</sup> of July celebrations or festivals. Although on the small side, Johns-Manville, Pioneer, and Parks are examples of parks that support sports needs. Ryon Memorial Park best depicts a broad-based use community park.

The park and recreation improvements that could be contained within the almost 24.22 needed acres and the existing standard (Table 14-1) are both consistent with the City's Park and Recreation Element of the General Plan. The City’s 3.639 acres per 1,000 population standard speaks well for the City as a three-acre per 1,000 population standard is a common minimum but frequently the unmet target of municipalities and recreation/park special districts throughout Southern California.

---

18. The Quimby Act does allow for the use of receipts raised by the adoption of a Quimby Act park Impact Fee to be used for rehabilitation of existing park configurations.

## CALCULATION OF PARK DEDICATION STANDARD

Unlike the other facilities discussed in this Report, the California Government Code contains enabling legislation for the acquisition and development of community and neighborhood parks by a City. This legislation, codified as Section 66477 of the Government Code and known commonly as the "Quimby Act," establishes criteria for charging new development for park facilities based on specific park standards. This Report will recommend the adoption of Quimby-style park fees over an AB 1600-style DIF for developments requiring the subdivision of land and an AB 1600 fee for non-subdivided land.

Allowable Park Standard As stated earlier, under §66477 of the Government Code, the City may charge new residential development based on a standard of 3.0 acres per 1,000 residents even if the City does not presently possess a ratio of 3.0 acres per 1,000 for the existing population. The Government Code also enables a city to charge development based on a standard higher than 3.0 acres (to a maximum of 5.0 acres) if the City currently exceeds the minimum benchmark ratio of 3.0 acres per 1,000 residents.

The law states that "if the amount of existing neighborhood and community park area ... exceeds the [3 acres of park area per 1,000 people] limit ... the legislative body may adopt the calculated amount as a higher standard not to exceed 5 acres per 1,000 persons".<sup>19</sup> The City may require park fees provided that the City meets certain conditions, including:

- The amount and location of land to be dedicated or the fees to be paid shall bear a reasonable relationship to the use of the park by the future inhabitants of the subdivision.
- The legislative body has adopted a general plan containing a recreational element, and the park and recreational facilities are in accordance with definite principles and standards contained therein.
- The city ... shall develop a schedule specifying how, when, and where it will use the land or fees, or both, to develop park or recreational facilities ... Any fees collected under the ordinance shall be committed within five years after the payment of such fees.

Determination of a Park Standard. As previously identified, the City currently has 3.639 acres of owned and developed park acres/1,000 residents. The Quimby Act allows the City to adopt a standard of 3.0 acres per thousand as the low-end threshold. However, the 3.0 acres per 1,000 resident standard is the highest standard that can be adopted under the Quimby Act without maintaining a standard higher than 3.0 acres/1,000.

## CALCULATION OF IMPACT COSTS

Once a per capita standard for parks is determined, the impact of residential development on the city's park system can be computed as follows:

Park Land Acquisition Costs. Land costs will vary significantly from one park to another. The parkland to be acquired must be suitable for park construction and is conservatively estimated at approximately \$690,900 per acre (\$653,400/acre for the land purchase and \$37,500/acre for rough grading and contiguous area public improvements), which is used in the park DIF calculation. However, the use of this figure could be criticized if a developer can show that the

---

<sup>19</sup> California Government Code, Title 7, Division 2, Section 66447 (b).

cost of the residential land they are developing is currently valued at less than the \$653,400/acre acquisition figure. The fee recommendation at the end of the Chapter will recognize this challenge.

**Park Improvements Construction Costs.** Park improvement construction costs are based upon a schedule (Appendix C) of common park improvements by the size of the park and costs from various construction bids received by other clients, as the City does not have any more recent full park construction history. Again, public-use facilities and aquatic centers were not included in the cost calculation (see Chapters 12 and 13).

**Average Park Acquisition, Development, and Maintenance Vehicles and Facilities Cost per Capita.** The combined cost of parkland acquisition, park improvements development, and support facilities is \$1,299,351 per acre (\$690,900/acre for land acquisition, \$608,451 per acre for park improvements). If the City were to charge development for the maximum allowable amount of park acreage as allowed in the Quimby Act and as recommended here, then the City would need to acquire 3.00 acres of new parkland for every potential 1,000 new residents in the City. The 3.639 acres of land acquisition and development per 1,000 persons would be \$4,728,340 or about \$4,728 per new resident. Schedule 14.1 calculates the cost to develop 3.639 acres, again representing the required parkland cost for 1,000 persons.

**Average Cost per Dwelling Unit.** Schedule 14.1 further calculates the cost per dwelling unit based on the per-person parkland acquisition and improvement costs of \$4,728 (Schedule 14.1) and the average number of persons per unit for each category of housing. Detached residential housing has the highest number of persons per dwelling unit (@ 3.025 per unit) and consequently carries the highest impact fee, \$14,303 per unit (\$4,728 X 3.025 persons per unit, rounded). Attached dwelling units have an average of 2.876 persons per unit and would need to be assessed at \$13,599 (\$4,728 X 2.876, rounded). Table 14-4 summarizes the calculated and recommended fees for each of these three residential categories. Schedule 14.1 provides greater park calculation detail and a complete schedule of Park Land Acquisition and Park Improvements DIFs for each of the three dwelling unit types.

**Table 14-4**  
**Summary of Park Development Fees for Residential Dwelling Construction**

DIF Land-use Type	Development Impact Cost
Detached Dwelling Unit	\$14,303/Unit
Attached Dwelling Unit	\$13,599/Unit
Mobile Home Dwelling Unit	\$10,071/Unit

The DIFs for detached dwelling residential development involving the subdivision of land, as identified in Table 14-6, should be adopted under the auspices of the Quimby Act. The DIFs for Residential dwelling units not requiring the sub-division of a privately owned parcel will need to be adopted as a Government Code § 66000 supported DIF.<sup>20</sup>

20. This is required because the Quimby Act is referenced in the State Subdivision Code

**Park Acquisition and DIF Calculation Example.** Developers have been allowed to donate sites in the past, and it is in the City's best interest to continue this practice. The size of the park needed to serve the proposed residential development is calculated by multiplying the number of single and detached residences to be developed by the average number of people living in the units. The example, demonstrated in Table 14-5, calculates the developed park size required for a 200-detached dwelling unit development:

**Table 14-5**  
**Example of Park Construction in-lieu of Fee**  
**(rounded)**

<b>Park Development Requirement</b>	<b>Park Land</b>	<b>Park Improvements</b>	<b>Total Cost</b>
Number of Detached Dwelling Units Approved	250	250	
Average Number of resident per Unit	3.025	3.025	
Total Number of New Residents	756	756	
Basis of Standard	1,000	1,000	
Added Population Divided by 1,000	0.756	0.756	
Acres Required per 1,000 Population	3.639	3.639	
Required Park Acquisition/Improvement Acres	2.751	2.751	
Cost of Park Development per Acre	\$690,900	\$608,451	\$1,299,351
<b>Total Park DIF Contribution</b>	<b>\$1,900,666</b>	<b>\$1,673,850</b>	<b>\$3,574,516</b>

Per the example above, the City and a developer could reach an agreement on the park obligation in a number of ways. The following are a few examples. Note that each example requires the total \$3,574,516 park obligation (in land/improvements or in-lieu payment) required of the 1,000 detached dwelling unit developments in any combination of land, improvements, or fee payment.

**Option 1.** The developer could make a \$3,574,516 Park Land Acquisition and DIF payment, and the City could use it (in combination with other park fees) to construct the park elsewhere in the City. However, most large-scale developers would probably prefer that the park be very near, if not within, the proposed subdivision.

**Option 2.** The developer could construct and donate a developed park smaller in size, say 1.5 acres, and make a payment for the remaining 2.751 acres required of the developer. This option is generally only used when the proposed residential development is in excess of 1,000 residences.

**Option 3.** The developer could construct a 2.751-acre park and dedicate it to the City. A developed park of this size would represent a \$3,574,516 total acquisition and DIF. This would not likely be an option for smaller developments resulting in parks less than 2.0 acres in size. A small park of this size generates significant annual maintenance costs, so it is not generally desired.

**Option 4.** The City could combine other DIFs with the developer's 2.751-acre contribution or actual park contribution to create a larger park, assuming the developer agrees to make the larger park parcel available.

**Option 5.** The developer could donate 5.174 acres of undeveloped land (\$3,574,516 total park fee requirement ÷ \$690,900/acre cost), and then the City could use other DIFs to develop it.

The key to understanding the flexibility of the options above is that each one represents the same amount in terms of a total contribution of DIF payment and/or dedicated park improvement to the City's park system with the result that the same amount has been contributed for each dwelling.

Land Acquisition Cost Adjustment Challenge. As mentioned previously, the use of \$690,900 as the parkland cost is based upon the assumption that park acreage would likely be close in proximity and thus similar in cost to the residential land value of the project the park is intended to serve. However, if the developer or contractor of a dwelling can provide evidence (acceptable to the City) in the form of a recent appraisal of the property they will be developing that the current land value is worth less than the pre-graded \$653,400/acre or \$15/square foot cost, the DIF could be adjusted downward accordingly by placing the actual cost of land acquisition into the calculation identified in Schedule 14.1. Again, if the City wishes to adopt such an adjustment, the terms under which the challenge may be made and proved should be included in the Impact Fee Ordinance.

### OPEN SPACE IMPACT FEE COMPONENT

Open Space Acquisition Standards and Costs. The City currently owns 417.06 acres of protected open space within the City's boundaries. Again, based upon the current population of 40,738, the standard is 10.237 acres per 1,000 population ( $417.06 \text{ acres} \div [40,738 \div 1,000] = 10.237 \text{ acres per 1,000 residents}$ ). Table 14-6 is summarized from Schedule 14.1.

**Table 14-6**  
**Inventory of Existing (Owned) Open Space**

Open Space Area	Acres
Barkin Park	4.72
Beattie Park	18.00
Briar Creek Park	3.30
Ken Adam Park	83.96
River Park	168.66
Riverbend Park	138.42
<b>Total Open Space Acres</b>	<b>417.06</b>
City Population Divided by 1,000	<b>40.74</b>
<b>Acres of Open Space per 1,000 Residents</b>	<b>10.237</b>

Open Space Misconception. There is a significant amount of open space within the City's limits; some of it is publicly owned and will never be developed. However, a great deal of the "open space" is privately owned and has not yet been considered for development by the owners. Some City residents and businesses do not fully understand that owners of private land have development rights. These same residents and businesses expect that some or all of the currently

privately owned open space will continue to exist as open space in perpetuity. This will not necessarily be the case unless the City maintains the active role that it has to date in acquiring some of the more critical open space parcels. The calculation recognizes that open space, often at a steep grade or slope presupposing development, will be available at far less cost per acre than parkland. The City certainly understands this concept and commitment better than most other cities, given the City's open space inventory of 417.06 acres.

This Report uses a very nominal \$1.50 per square foot for open space acquisition, which will be defined as the proper compensation for odd lots with little value other than as open space that is dedicated to the City. This assumes the City makes a determination that the parcel in question enhances the City's inventory of open space and is not merely an unusable lot that would be little more than a maintenance cost and liability on the owner of the private land. At \$65,340 per acre and the 10.237 acres of open space per 1,000 residents standard, the cost of maintaining the currently met open space standard is \$668.89 per new resident ( $10.237 \text{ acres} \times \$65,340/\text{acre} = \$668,886 \div 1,000 = \$668.89$ ). Table 14-7, following, indicates the fee per type of residential dwelling.

**Table 14-7**  
**Summary of Open Space Development Impact Fees for Residential Dwelling Construction**

<b>Residential Land Use</b>	<b>Residents per Dwelling</b>	<b>Cost per Resident</b>	<b>Open Space Cost per Residential Dwelling</b>
Detached Dwelling Units	3.025	\$668.89	\$2,023
Attached Dwelling Units	2.876	\$668.89	\$1,924
Mobile Home Dwelling Units	2.130	\$668.89	\$1,425

Table 14-8 indicates the total cost of residential dwellings necessary to maintain the City's actual park and open space standards.

[This space is left vacant in order to place the following table on a single page].

**Table 14-8**  
**Summary of Open Space Development Impact Fees for Residential Dwelling Construction**

<b>Residential Land Use</b>	<b>Residential Park Impact Fee</b>	<b>Residential Open Space Fee</b>	<b>Total Residential Park and Open Space Impact Fee</b>
Detached Dwelling Units	\$14,303	\$2,023	\$16,326
Attached Dwelling Units	\$13,599	\$1,924	\$15,523
Mobile Home Dwelling Units	\$10,071	\$1,425	\$11,496

Business Use Open Space Impact Fees. Developing privately held parcels for business uses does not generate demand for developed park facilities. Residents need park facilities, not businesses. However, the development of any currently vacant property or parcel reduces the amount of open space in the community, protected or otherwise. Thus, the development of any parcel for business use (retail/office or industrial) should have an open space impact fee imposed. Table 14-9, following, indicates the standard for open space per developed acre in the City.

**Table 14-9**  
**Establishment of Business Use Open Space Standard**

Park Acres Owned (per Schedule 14.1)	148.26
Open Space (per Schedule 14.1)	417.06
Total Park and Open Space Acres	565.32
Total Privately-held Developed Acres (per Schedule 2.0)	6,330.90
Acres of Protected Space per Privately-held Developed Acre	0.0893
Cost of Open Space Land Acquisition per Acre	\$65,340
Cost of Open Space Land Acquisition per Acre to be Developed	\$5,835

Any parcel developed as a business use should contribute approximately \$5,835 per gross private acre of private development towards the acquisition and, thus, protection of open space. The Open Space DIF receipts would be used to acquire open space in the City in order to maintain that standard. Table 14-10, following, indicates the fee per type of business land-use.

[This space left vacant in order to place the following table on a single page].

**Table 14-9  
Open Space per Business use**

<b>Business Land Use</b>	<b>Impact Cost per Business Acre</b>	<b>Average Units/Acre</b>	<b>Impact Cost per Unit</b>
Commercial Lodging Units per Acre	\$5,835	25.02	\$233/Unit
S.F. Pad per Retail/Service/Office Acre	\$5,835	38,875	\$0.150/SF
S.F. Pad per Self Storage Facility Acre	\$5,835	32,807	\$0.178/SF
S.F. Pad per Business Park Acre	\$5,835	30,205	\$0.193/SF
S.F. Pad per Industrial Acre	\$5,835	21,780	\$0.268/SF
S.F. Pad per Institutional Acre	\$5,835	28,314	\$0.206/SF

---

**RECAP OF RECOMMENDED PARK LAND ACQUISITION AND PARK INFRASTRUCTURE DEVELOPMENT IMPACT FEES**

- **Residential Housing** - Adopt Schedule 11.1 for Park Land and Park Improvements for the three basic residential land uses.
- **Residential Housing** – Adopt Schedule 11.1 for Open Space Acquisition for the three basic residential land uses.
- **Business Uses** – Adopt Schedule 11.2 for Open Space Acquisition for the six basic business land uses.

Consider creating a DIF Fund titled “Quality of Life Infrastructure” and deposit all revenues from the Library, Public Use Facilities, Aquatics, Park Land Acquisition, and Park Improvements and Open Space Land Acquisition impact fees into this Development Impact Fee Fund.

---

**END OF CHAPTER TEXT**

Schedule 14.1

City of Lompoc

2025-26 Development Impact Cost Calculation

Park Land and Open Space Acquisition and Park Improvements  
(both Quimby and Mitigation Fee Act Calculations)

Park Name	Existing Park Acres	Improved/Constructed Park Acres	Open Space Acres
Barkin Park	0.68	0.68	4.72
Beattie Park	15.00	15.00	18.00
Briar Creek Park	3.49	3.49	3.30
Centennial Park	0.32	0.32	0.00
Johns-Manville Park	6.90	6.90	0.00
Ken Adam Park	10.00	10.00	83.96
Old Mission Park	0.62	0.62	0.00
Pioneer Park	4.71	4.71	0.00
Pocket Park	0.15	0.15	0.00
River Park/RV Park	36.47	36.47	168.66
Riverbend Park	40.80	40.80	138.42
Ryon Memorial Park	20.33	20.33	0.00
Skate Park	1.13	1.13	0.00
Thompson Park	4.34	4.34	0.00
Westvale Park	1.96	1.96	0.00
Park Equivalent in Fund Balance	1.36	1.36	0.00
<b>Total Acres (Owned/Developed)</b>	<b>148.26</b>	<b>148.26</b>	<b>417.06</b>
Current Population	40,738	40,738	40,738
Population/1,000	40.74	40.74	40.74
Current Standard	3.639	3.639	10.237
Minimum Acres/1,000 Population Standard	3.639	3.639	10.237
Construction Cost per Acre		\$608,451	\$65,340
Land Acquisition Cost per Acre	\$653,400		
Grading/Contiguous Infrastructure	\$37,500		
City Yard Improvements per Acre (1)			
Additional Maintenance Fleet per Acre (2)			
<b>Total Cost per Acre</b>	<b>\$690,900</b>	<b>\$608,451</b>	<b>\$65,340</b>
Cost X 3.64 Acre/1,000 Residents Standard	\$2,514,185	\$2,214,155	\$668,886
Population Served by Standard	1,000.00	1,000.00	1,000.00
Acquisition/Construction Cost per Resident	\$2,514.19	\$2,214.15	\$668.89

	Occupants/Dwelling	Land Acquisition	Park Construction	Open Space Acquisition	Total Park Costs
Cost per Additional Resident		\$2,514.19	\$2,214.15	\$668.89	\$5,397.23
<b>Detached Dwelling Unit</b>	3.025	\$7,605	\$6,698	\$2,023	\$16,326
<b>Attached Dwelling Unit</b>	2.876	\$7,231	\$6,368	\$1,924	\$15,523
<b>Mobile Home Dwelling Unit</b>	2.13	\$5,355	\$4,716	\$1,425	\$11,496

Schedule 14.2

City of Lompoc  
 2025-26 Development Impact Cost Calculation  
 Park Land and Open Space Acquisition and Park Improvements

Open Space Area	Limited to Open Space Acres
Barkin Park	4.72
Beattie Park	18.00
Briar Creek Park	3.30
Ken Adam Park	83.96
River Park/RV Park	168.66
Riverbend Park	138.42
<b>Total Open Space Acres</b>	<b>417.06</b>

<b>Business Use Open Space</b>		
Total Acres of Open Space (See above)		417.06
Total Acres of Park Land (per Schedule 14.1)		148.26
<b>Total City-wide Preserved Open Space/Park Acres</b>		<b>565.32</b>
Total Privately-held Developed Acres (Schedule 2.0)		6,330.90
Acres of Open Space per Privately-held Developed Acre		0.0893
Cost of an Acre of Open Space at \$1.00 per Square Foot		\$65,340
<b>Cost of Open Space per Developed Acre</b>		<b>\$5,835</b>
Commercial Lodging Units	25.02	\$233
Retail/Service/Office Uses (SF)	38,875	\$0.150
Self Storage Facilities Uses (SF)	32,807	\$0.178
Business Park Uses (SF)	30,205	\$0.193
Industrial Uses (SF)	21,780	\$0.268
Institutional Use (SF)	28,314	\$0.206

**Appendix A**  
**Summary of Recommendations**

## SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS

### **Chapter 3 - Law Enforcement Facilities and Equipment**

- Adopt Schedule 3.2, *Minimum Capital Needs-based Impact Costs*

### **Chapter 4 - Fire Suppression/Rescue Facilities, Vehicles and Equipment**

- Adopt Schedule 4.2, *Minimum Capital Needs-based Impact Costs*.

### **Chapter 5 - Circulation (Streets, Signals and Bridges) System**

- Adopt Schedule 5.2, - *Minimum Capital Needs-based Impact Costs*
- Adopt the *ALTERNATIVE COST METHODOLOGY*, per single trip-end cost from Schedule 5.2 to apply to Table 5-2 and the more specific /TE Trip Calculation, 7th Edition for Business Uses.

### **Chapter 6 - Electric Distribution System - See Chapter**

### **Chapter 7 - Water Treatment, Storage and Distribution Facilities**

- Adopt Schedule 7.2, *Minimum Capital Needs-based Impact Costs*
- Adopt Table 7-7, *Equivalent Water Meter Size Calculation based Upon Minimum Needs-based Impact Fees*.

### **Chapter 8 - Wastewater Collection Facilities**

- Adopt Schedule 8.2, - *Minimum Capital Needs-based Impact Costs*.

### **Chapter 9 - Refuse Collection Vehicles and Barrels**

- Adopt Schedule 9.1, - *Minimum Capital Needs-based Impact Costs*.

### **Chapter 10 - General Facilities, Vehicles and Equipment**

- Adopt Schedule 10.2, Entire City - *Minimum Capital Needs-based Impact Costs*

**QUALITY OF LIFE INFRASTRUCTURE IMPACT FEE FUND** - Consideration should be given to the creation of a DIF Fund titled "Quality of Life Infrastructure" and deposit all revenues from the Library, Public Use Facilities, Aquatics, Park Land Acquisition and Park Improvements and Open Space Land Acquisition impact fees into this Development Impact Fee Fund.

### **Chapter 11 - Library Collection Items/Dedicated Public Use Computer Stations**

- Adopt Schedule 11.1.

### **Chapter 12 - Public Meeting (i.e., community centers et al.) Facilities**

- Adopt Schedule 12.1.

### **Chapter 13 - Aquatics Facilities**

- Adopt Schedule 13.1.

### **Chapter 14 - Park Land and Open Space Acquisition and Park Improvements**

- Create a separate Quimby Act Park Land and Open Space Acquisition and Improvement DIF Fund, Note (1). And;
- Adopt Schedule 14.1, for residential uses requiring the sub-division of land for Quimby Act application.
- Create a separate Mitigation Fee Act Park Land and Open Space Acquisition and Improvement DIF Fund, Note (1).
- Adopt Schedule 14.1, for residential uses not requiring the sub-division of land via the application of the Mitigation Fee Act (AB1600).

- Adopt Schedule 14.2, for business uses contribution towards the acquisition of Open Space.

**NOTES:**

(1). Separate Park Land Acquisition and Development Funds are necessary because the Quimby Act allows the use of receipts for the rehabilitation of existing facilities, whereas the Mitigation Fee Act requirements prevent such expenditures.

**Appendix B**  
**Detailed Land Use Database**

Appendix B  
City of Lompoc  
Expanded Land-use Database  
2025-26 Development Impact Cost Calculation

A. Total - Land-use Database Total of all Areas (B + C)	Existing Development		Potential Development		Total General Plan Build-out	
	Acres	# of Units	Acres	# of Units	Acres	# of Units
Detached Dwelling Units	1,280.58	7,891	318.30	1,169	1,598.88	9,060
Attached Dwelling Units	247.39	5,681	62.22	1,072	309.61	6,753
Mobile Home Dwelling Units	69.00	980	1.00	14	70.00	994
Commercial Lodging Units	23.70	593	1.00	25	24.70	618
Retail/Service/Office Uses (SF)	290.15	11,279,548	21.90	441,367	312.05	11,720,915
Self Storage Facilities Uses (SF)	20.91	685,989	1.00	32,670	21.91	718,659
Business Park Uses (SF)	62.17	1,877,875	38.79	1,202,493	100.96	3,080,368
Industrial Uses (SF)	94.00	2,047,320	3.00	63,340	97.00	2,110,660
Institutional Use (SF)	4,243.00	120,136,302	1.00	28,314	4,244.00	120,164,616
<b>Total - All City</b>	<b>6,330.90</b>		<b>448.21</b>		<b>6,779.11</b>	
Private Residences	1,596.97	14,552	381.52	2,255	1,978.49	16,807
Commercial Lodging Rooms	23.70	593	1.00	25	24.70	618
Business Square Feet	4,710.23	136,027,034	65.69	1,768,184	4,775.92	137,795,218

  

B. Land-use Database within the Non-entitled Parcels within City (D+E)	Existing Development		Potential Development		Total General Plan Build-out	
	Acres	# of Units	Acres	# of Units	Acres	# of Units
Detached Dwelling Units	1,280.58	7,891	152.42	708	1,433.00	8,599
Attached Dwelling Units	247.39	5,681	46.90	856	294.29	6,537
Mobile Home Dwelling Units	69.00	980	1.00	14	70.00	994
Commercial Lodging Units	23.70	593	1.00	25	24.70	618
Retail/Service/Office Uses (SF)	290.15	11,279,548	18.97	413,167	309.12	11,692,715
Self Storage Facilities Uses (SF)	20.91	685,989	1.00	32,670	21.91	718,659
Business Park Uses (SF)	62.17	1,877,875	33.96	1,109,473	96.13	2,987,348
Industrial Uses (SF)	94.00	2,047,320	3.00	63,340	97.00	2,110,660
Institutional Use (SF)	4,243.00	120,136,302	1.00	28,314	4,244.00	120,164,616
<b>Sub-total - Non-entitled Parcels</b>	<b>6,330.90</b>		<b>259.25</b>		<b>6,590.15</b>	

  

C. Land-use Database Representing Entitled Development Projects	Existing Development		Potential Development		Total General Plan Build-out	
	Acres	# of Units	Acres	# of Units	Acres	# of Units
Detached Dwelling Units			165.88	461	165.88	461
Attached Dwelling Units			15.32	216	15.32	216
Mobile Home Dwelling Units			0.00	0	0.00	0
Commercial Lodging Units			0.00	0	0.00	0
Retail/Service/Office Uses (SF)			2.93	28,200	2.93	28,200
Self Storage Facilities Uses (SF)			0.00	0	0.00	0
Business Park Uses (SF)			4.83	93,020	4.83	93,020
Industrial Uses (SF)			0.00	0	0.00	0
Institutional Use (SF)			0.00	0	0.00	0
<b>Sub-total - Entitled Parcels</b>	<b>0.00</b>		<b>188.96</b>		<b>188.96</b>	

  

D. Land-use Database Representing the General City Area	Existing Development		Potential Development		Total General Plan Build-out	
	Acres	# of Units	Acres	# of Units	Acres	# of Units
Detached Dwelling Units	1,280.58	7,891	4.42	27	1,285.00	7,918
Attached Dwelling Units	247.39	5,681	46.90	856	294.29	6,537
Mobile Home Dwelling Units	69.00	980	1.00	14	70.00	994
Commercial Lodging Units	23.70	593	1.00	25	24.70	618
Retail/Service/Office Uses (SF)	290.15	11,279,548	18.97	413,167	309.12	11,692,715
Self Storage Facilities Uses (SF)	20.91	685,989	1.00	32,670	21.91	718,659
Business Park Uses (SF)	62.17	1,877,875	33.96	1,109,473	96.13	2,987,348
Industrial Uses (SF)	94.00	2,047,320	3.00	63,340	97.00	2,110,660
Institutional Use (SF)	4,243.00	120,136,302	1.00	28,314	4,244.00	120,164,616

Appendix B  
City of Lompoc  
Expanded Land-use Database  
2025-26 Development Impact Cost Calculation

<b>Sub-total - General City</b>		<b>6,330.90</b>	<b>111.25</b>	<b>6,442.15</b>
---------------------------------	--	-----------------	---------------	-----------------

  

E. Land-use Database Representing <b>Baily Avenue Annexation Area</b>	Existing Development		Potential Development		Total General Plan Build-out	
	Acres	# of Units	Acres	# of Units	Acres	# of Units
Detached Dwelling Units			148.00	681	148.00	681
Attached Dwelling Units			0.00	0	0.00	0
Mobile Home Dwelling Units			0.00	0	0.00	0
Commercial Lodging Units			0.00	0	0.00	0
Retail/Service/Office Uses (SF)			0.00	0	0.00	0
Self Storage Facilities Uses (SF)			0.00	0	0.00	0
Business Park Uses (SF)			0.00	0	0.00	0
Industrial Uses (SF)			0.00	0	0.00	0
Institutional Use (SF)			0.00	0	0.00	0
<b>Sub-total - Baily Avenue Annexation</b>	<b>6,330.90</b>		<b>148.00</b>		<b>148.00</b>	

  

F. Land-use Database Representing <b>Entitled Development Projects</b>	Existing Development		Potential Development		Total General Plan Build-out	
	Acres	# of Units	Acres	# of Units	Acres	# of Units
Detached Dwelling Units			29.97	124	29.97	124
Attached Dwelling Units			21.32	293	21.32	293
Mobile Home Dwelling Units			0.00	0	0.00	0
Commercial Lodging Units			0.00	0	0.00	0
Retail/Service/Office Uses (SF)			7.24	283,837	7.24	283,837
Self Storage Facilities Uses (SF)			0.00	0	0.00	0
Business Park Uses (SF)			15.02	457,990	15.02	457,990
Industrial Uses (SF)			0.00	0	0.00	0
Institutional Use (SF)			0.00	0	0.00	0
<b>Sub-total -</b>	<b>0.00</b>		<b>73.55</b>		<b>73.55</b>	

  

G. Land-use Database within <b>Burton Ranch Area (Entitled)</b>	Existing Development		Potential Development		Total General Plan Build-out	
	Acres	# of Units	Acres	# of Units	Acres	# of Units
Detached Dwelling Units			148.41	323	148.41	323
Attached Dwelling Units			1.00	26	1.00	26
Mobile Home Dwelling Units			0.00	0	0.00	0
Commercial Lodging Units			0.00	0	0.00	0
Retail/Service/Office Uses (SF)			0.00	0	0.00	0
Self Storage Facilities Uses (SF)			0.00	0	0.00	0
Business Park Uses (SF)			0.00	0	0.00	0
Industrial Uses (SF)			0.00	0	0.00	0
Institutional Use (SF)			0.00	0	0.00	0
<b>Sub-total -</b>	<b>0.00</b>		<b>149.41</b>		<b>149.41</b>	

**Appendix C**  
**AB-602 Considerations**

## **Findings in Support of Continuation of City Policy to Impose Residential Development Impact Fees on a per Unit Basis.**

AB-602 (Gov't Code. sections 66016.5(a)(5)(A) and (B)) states that if the City adopts a calculation and nexus study after July 1, 2022, it must *either* "calculate a fee imposed on a housing development project proportionately to the square footage of proposed units of the development" *or* make the following findings:

- (i) An explanation as to why square footage is not an appropriate metric to calculate fees imposed on housing development projects.
- (ii) An explanation that an alternative basis of calculating the fee bears a reasonable relationship between the fee charged and the burden posed by the development.
- (iii) That other policies in the fee structure support smaller developments or otherwise ensure that smaller developments are not charged disproportionate fees.

However, the City is not required to have a financial element in the City's General Plan document. Thus, a properly calculated *Development Impact Fee Calculation and Nexus Report* functions as the de-facto financial plan in support of the City's General Zoning Plan. It identifies the anticipated service demands by infrastructure based upon the empirically-based per residential unit-based averages and lays out a fair and reasonable method with which to finance the required capital projects and acquisitions necessary to accommodate those anticipated new service demands.

The City of Lompoc has expressed that it will continue to impose residential development impact fees based on the same manner in which additional development service demands are calculated – that is, by the type of average residential unit. The City will not impose development impact fees based on residential development projects proportionate to the square footage of proposed units for completing the City's General Plan. The current set of fees fosters greater accuracy in planning and provides the City with the required level of certainty in needed impact fee collection to assure that the infrastructure needs, also determined by average residential unit demands, will be adequate and sufficient to finance the infrastructure required by that same development.

The California Mitigation Fee Act (Government Code §66000, et.seq.), which was first established in 1987, specifies that every public agency that adopts development impact fees must provide the essential calculation and nexus report with fees calculated upon data that is as empirical accurate as possible. AB-602's *Proportionate to Square Footage* is based upon a *presumption*<sup>1</sup> that a smaller detached dwelling creates less local government service demands than a larger detached dwelling. AB-602 does not offer any peer-reviewed, third-party empirical data that substantiates that a small square foot detached dwelling unit creates less municipal service impacts than a larger square foot detached dwelling. As such, the City has determined the best practices for both managing development and obtaining adequate impact fee financing for the development-generated infrastructure is as identified in the many infrastructure chapters in this Report.

The City's zoning code allows for the identification of the use of privately held land and, in

---

<sup>1</sup> (Noun: **presumption**; plural noun: **presumptions** – an idea that is taken to be true and often used as the basis for other ideas, although it is not known for certain.

some cases, primarily business uses. It provides for a maximum Floor Area Ratio (FAR) that limits the amount of square feet that can be constructed on an acre of business space. No such limitation is placed upon the construction square foot of a detached dwelling unit (AKA "single-family residence"). The detached dwellings can be a size that the developer determines to be a marketable product.

This Report indicates that the City (using recent GIS data) has 1,280 acres zoned for detached dwellings. At approximately 6.16 detached dwelling units per acre, this equates to an additional 1,169 detached dwellings to be constructed by General Plan build-out of the City. However, The City does not have any information on how many square feet any of these 1,169 detached dwelling units will be, that is, within applicable zoning, determined by the developers of the various parcels.

This Report employs the most defensible empirical sources appropriate to the demands of that particular infrastructure to determine the *average* demands of an *average* detached dwelling. These sources determine the demand for an average detached dwelling but do not produce this demand data for various-sized detached dwellings. Such data is not available.

The amount of and complexity of any City's infrastructure defines (in all or part) the Level of Service (LOS) of that infrastructure, not just currently but in perpetuity. This makes the one-time DIF financing of any City's infrastructure much more critical. It takes balance to accommodate development with the police responses within the desired standard. It will take a combination of additional law enforcement station space, response and support vehicles, and specialty equipment to support the required officers (non-impact supported). The importance of having a properly calculated and documented DIF schedule to accommodate development-related demands cannot be overstated. The same concept holds true for the two labor-intensive public safety services and the infrastructure-intensive services such as circulation, storm drainage collection, potable and recycled water distribution, and sewer collection.

The collection of an impact fee to raise capital revenue for development-based demands is one-time but represents the municipal service needs of that dwelling unit as long as that structure exists. Thus, the argument that any new detached dwelling will generate less municipal service demand based on its smaller square footage is divorced from the reality that any particular residential dwelling may have different occupants over 50 years (e.g., a home for a family of four to a single resident).

Government Code §66000 charges local governments to determine the fairest method of distributing the costs of infrastructure required to support services to new development. The following paragraphs identify the logic behind using a per unit impact fee schedule over per square foot impact fee schedule by infrastructure. To summarize, each uses best practices information from empirical data, all of which is based upon per unit demand data. To divert to a per-square-foot fee schedule, any agency would have to divide the more accurate per-unit fee schedule by an average square-foot figure for detached dwellings, attached dwellings, and mobile home dwellings. Since there is no known source for average residential dwelling size particular to the City of Lompoc, the resulting figure would be no more than a guess and not even an educated one; thus, the resulting per square foot schedule would become arbitrary and capricious, clearly not the intent of Government Code §66000. As a result, the per-square-foot impact fee schedule would not be defended as an accurate result.

If the City employed a per residential square foot impact fee schedule, one of three results could occur. Initially, the City could collect the exact impact fee revenue required over the course of permitting over 2,255 residential units, an improbable result. What is more likely is that the City will either under-collect or over-collect the impact fees. If the City were to overstate the average size of a detached dwelling at, say, 3,250 square feet per detached

dwelling and the actual average of the permitted detached homes is 2,500 square feet, the City would seriously under-collect the impact fees and would not be able to finance the required infrastructure. In short, the City would only be able to finance 77% of the required infrastructure (2,500 SF ÷ 3,250). In the alternative, if the City were to understate the average size of a detached dwelling at, say, 2,500 square feet per detached dwelling and the actual average of the permitted detached homes is 3,250 square feet, the City would be in a position of over-collecting the impact fees and would be forced to return any excess to the current owners of those parcels that over-paid. The City cannot afford to under-collect, nor does it desire to over-collect either. The responsible method is to employ the per unit impact fee schedule to avoid either of those results.

**Police and Fire Calls-for-Service (CFS)** - For the calculation of Police and Fire demand data, RCS used Lompoc-sourced GIS-based calls-for-service matched up with the City's Land-Use GIS database. As an example, in 2024 there were law enforcement calls-for-service logged into the dispatch data to the 8,093 existing detached dwellings for an average of 1.026 calls-for-service to a single detached dwelling. Again, the City does not know what size of any of the City's detached dwellings are so the City could not possibly determine the total square feet of 8,093 detached dwellings or the individual square footage of each of those 8,093 dwellings. There is no accurate or demonstrated link between the square foot sizes of a detached dwelling and that dwelling's service demand rate. The City's GIS data does not include the size of each residential dwelling in the City; such information is not available. Converting the accurate per-unit impact fee schedule into a per-square-foot impact fee schedule would render it an arbitrary and capricious result.

**Circulation Needs** - According to the volume of empirical data collected by the highly respected *Institute of Traffic Engineering* (ITE), an average detached dwelling generates approximately 9.5 trip-ends per day; however the ITE does not offer any distinction between small and large homes, because such data does not exist in their database. There is no demonstrated link or nexus between the square foot sizes of a detached dwelling with its traffic-generation demand rate. GIS data does not include the size of each residential dwelling in the City. To convert the accurate per unit impact fee schedule into a per square foot impact fee schedule would render it an arbitrary and capricious result. There is no evidence that a "small" home generates any less traffic demand than a "large" detached dwelling.

**Public Utilities** - The City's Water and Sewer Master Plans are the documents that engineering consultants and City staff use to ensure that the proposed spine water distribution and sewer collection systems are sufficient to meet all needs and demands within the City's limits. These Master Plan total demand calculations are typically based upon averages for each of the City's utilities. Utility Master Plans are based on the proposed number of dwelling units or business square feet in order to identify and quantify the new water and sewer demands resulting from that new infrastructure. Financing via a per-unit impact fee schedule should be on the same basis. There is no demonstrated link or nexus between the square foot sizes of a detached dwelling with its utility demand rates. GIS data does not include the size of each residential dwelling in the City. To convert the accurate per unit impact fee schedule into a per square foot impact fee schedule would render it an arbitrary and capricious result. There is no evidence that a "small" home generates any significantly less water and sewer demand than a "large" detached dwelling. The City does not have limits to how many people may live in a residential unit.

**Quality of Life Infrastructure (parks, aquatic facilities, libraries, and community centers)** - Quality of Life standards are based on current population numbers. As an example, there are 64,669 square feet of public use facilities (i.e., community centers). Given an existing population of 40,738 residents, that creates an existing standard of 1.587 square feet of public

use facilities per resident. A fee for a new square foot of public use facility is determined and then multiplied by the empirically-based average number of people per type of residential dwelling. These impact fees are generally based on census data that identifies an average number of people per type of dwelling unit. In Lompoc, those figures are 3.025 people per detached dwelling, 2.876 per attached dwelling unit, and 2.130 per mobile home (see Table 2-4). The Census data does not determine these figures by dwelling unit size but represents the most empirically driven dwelling density data. Anecdotally, there are likely 1,300 square foot dwellings housing anywhere from one, two, or six residents, just as there can be in a 3,600 square foot home. Therefore, an average based on the type of dwelling is far more empirical than dividing the average cost by some unsubstantiated (arbitrary) average dwelling size. By doing so, larger residential dwellings could be treated unfairly if they end up being assessed a greater amount in order to balance or subsidize the smaller detached dwelling units based upon the presumption (non-empirical data) that these smaller detached dwelling units somehow create lesser dwelling densities than would a larger unit. Such a subsidy is an affront to the Mitigation Fee Act (Government Code §66000 et. seq.).

**Importance of a Static or Average per Unit-based Development Impact Fee Schedule.**

The City must be able to depend on the collection of sufficient impact fee revenues with which to finance development-generated projects necessary to accommodate new development with adequate and sufficient service levels without decreasing the existing levels of service. This assurance will greatly diminish should the City choose an arbitrarily determined per residential square foot impact fee schedule. For example, the City has identified that a 6,200 square-foot basic 2X2 fire station is required to service an area with about 3,000 average detached dwellings. However, if a greater proportion of the 3,000 homes are far smaller than the City had anticipated, the City will not have adequate DIF revenue to construct that station. With a per unit determined fee representing an average demand per unit, the City can have significantly greater confidence in receiving the DIF revenue necessary to construct that station and thus respond to those 3,000 detached dwellings, regardless of the size of the detached dwellings.

The City's development practices neither favor nor penalize any one land use over another. Nor are the City's policies unfair regarding any land use based on available empirical data. For residential units based upon best practices empirically based averages, all are assessed the same fee; no developer is charged disproportionately, as could be the case with an arbitrarily based "average" detached dwelling size estimate. The type of dwelling unit drives the fee, not the square footage. For detached, attached, and mobile home residential units, all are assessed the same fee (within those three residential types); none are charged disproportionately. A five-unit detached dwelling development would have one-tenth the impact fees imposed, as would a fifty-unit detached dwelling unit proposal.

Since the City does not impose per square-foot-based impact fees, it also does not apply such fees on any room addition to a residential dwelling.

DIFs for non-residential uses (e.g., the variety of businesses) have always been calculated and imposed on a per-square-foot basis as empirical data is available for those uses. Additionally,, each of those business uses (see Table 2-1) has differing maximum allowable floor area ratio (FAR).

The City is mindful that the state is encouraging construction of smaller detached dwellings and is assuming that these types of residential dwellings create lesser demand merely because they are smaller. However, given the lack of any empirical data supporting such a presumption, the City feels obligated to adopt residential impact fees that are fair to all developers of residential

dwellings, regardless of size. In the end, the City has determined to err on the side of fair treatment of all residential development.

In conclusion, given the empirically-based and significant effort spent on identifying the number and capacity of increasing infrastructure projects needed to accommodate the planned-for and anticipated new development and the fairness strived for and demonstrated in the calculation of the impact fee schedule and the Nexus Report, the City has determined that the empirically-driven per Unit residential fee is the most appropriate metric with which to calculate and fairly impose the City's impact fee schedule.

**Appendix D**  
**Application of Development**  
**Impact Fees on Accessory**  
**Dwelling Units**

## Application of Development Impact Fees Upon Accessory Dwelling Units

Application of Development Impact Fee on Accessory Dwelling Units. The approach recommended for calculating DIFs for application to the construction of ADUs is to make them a function of the demand for one detached dwelling unit, which is consistent with current State statutes. One can assume that the State identified them as functions of a detached dwelling DIF as they more closely resemble detached dwellings, albeit smaller in size, as they are largely located within detached dwelling neighborhoods and will likely function as such.

The application of an ADU DIF as a function of a Detached Dwelling is consistent with the recently Chaptered Government Code, Title 7, Division 1, Chapter 4, Article 2 (attached as Attachments A to E).

Section 65852.2, (f) (1).

(3) (A) A local agency, special district, or water corporation shall not impose any impact fee upon the development of an accessory dwelling unit less than 750 square feet. *Any impact fees charged for an accessory dwelling unit of 750 square feet or more shall be charged proportionately in relation to the square footage of the primary dwelling unit.*

The following Table is an example of a proposed 750-square-foot accessory dwelling unit to be constructed behind a 3,000-square-foot primary dwelling unit. The 750 square feet ADU represents 25.0% of the 3,000 square foot primary unit (750 SF/3,000 SF= 25.0%). The City will also receive a spreadsheet application enabling staff to make other such calculations depending on the facts presented within the ADU application.

Existing Mitigation Fee Act Findings. The five required Government Code §66000 findings within each chapter would apply to the imposition/collection of ADU DIFs. The fees collected would be used to finance the same projects limited for use in that DIF-defined area in each corresponding infrastructure chapter in the *2025-26 Development Impact Fee Calculation and Nexus Report*.

Square Feet of Attached Dwelling Unit (ADU)	750
Square Feet of Primary Dwelling Unit	3,000
Ratio of ADU to Primary Unit	25.0%
Detached Dwelling Unit Impact Fee	\$40,617
ADU Impact Fee	\$10,154

**Appendix E**  
**Gov Code 66016.5(a)(4)**  
**Requirement**

## **Gov Code 66016.5(a)(4) Requirement: Fee Increase Review & Nexus Analysis Based on the 2003 Maximus Impact Fee Study**

### **Context and Legal Framework**

The 2003 Maximus Impact Fee Study, prepared for the **City of Lompoc**, was developed to ensure that **new development pays its fair share** of the cost of public facilities required to maintain service standards. The study was grounded in the requirements of the **California Mitigation Fee Act**, which mandates that:

- Impact fees must be reasonably related to the **need for public facilities** generated by new development.
- There must be a **nexus** between the fee charged and the **benefit received or impact caused**.
- If a **fee increase** is proposed, the jurisdiction must **review the original study's assumptions and evaluate the fees collected** under the original program.

### **Review of Assumptions Supporting the Original Fee**

As described in the original report, the Maximus study relied on:

- Demographic forecasts and **land use designations** from the General Plan.
- Standardized metrics like **vehicle trips, population per household, acreage, and gallons per day** for utility services.
- Capital cost estimates for each facility category.
- The premise that new development **should not degrade** existing levels of service for the broader community.

These assumptions are still critical reference points when considering whether a fee increase is justified.

### **Evaluation of Fees Collected Under the Original Fee**

The study projected revenues per facility based on expected development:

- **Parks & Recreation:** \$12.9 million
- **Community Centers:** \$1.6 million
- **Libraries:** \$959,000
- **Water System:** \$3.4 million (nominal dollars, 20-year horizon)

- **Wastewater System:** \$1.78 million
- **Police & Fire:** \$2.7 million combined
- **Street, Traffic, Bikeways:** Several million projected (based on trip generation)

The most recent Annual Compliance Report for Development Impact Fees per Government Code Subdivision 66006(b)(1) and Five-Year Compliance Report per Government Code Subsection 66001(d)(1) was received at the December 17, 2024 City Council meeting and is available as Item No. 2 on the City's website using the following link:

<https://www.cityoflompoc.com/Home/Components/Calendar/Event/6938/67?npage=2>.

### **Nexus Descriptions by Facility Type**

Below are detailed descriptions of the **nexus** between development and the corresponding impact fees for each facility type. Each section explains **how new development creates a quantifiable need** and how the fee structure was designed to fund facilities to meet that need equitably.

#### **Parks (Chapter 3)**

- **Nexus:** New residential development increases population, which raises demand for parks and recreation areas. The fee is based on **maintaining the City's existing ratio** of park acreage per 1,000 residents.
- **Demand Variable:** Population per dwelling unit
- **Impact Basis:** Developed Park acreage per capita (6.96 acres/1,000 residents)
- **Fee Use:** Improvement of parks and acquisition of additional land (Quimby Act basis)
- **Fee Type:** Standard-based (applies only to residential)

#### **Community & Recreation Centers (Chapter 4)**

- **Nexus:** More residents require increased use of and access to recreation centers, community gathering spaces, and indoor recreational amenities.
- **Demand Variable:** Population per dwelling unit
- **Impact Basis:** Current per capita investment in facilities (\$248.79/person)
- **Fee Use:** Maintain the same facility investment level as the existing community
- **Fee Type:** Standard-based, residential only

### **Libraries (Chapter 5)**

- **Nexus:** New residential units lead to a higher population, increasing the demand for library building space and materials.
- **Demand Variable:** Population per unit
- **Impact Basis:** Current ratio of library square feet (0.35 SF per person) and materials (1.57 volumes per person)
- **Fee Use:** Expansion of collection and facility size to maintain existing access and usage levels
- **Fee Type:** Standard-based, residential only

### **Water System (Chapter 6)**

- **Nexus:** New development consumes additional water, necessitating production, treatment, storage, and distribution capacity.
- **Demand Variable:** Average gallons per day per user
- **Impact Basis:** Share of capital improvement costs attributable to increased demand (e.g., wells, treatment plants)
- **Fee Use:** Recovery of bond-financed system improvements with capacity reserved for new development
- **Fee Type:** Capacity-based (adjusted annually, meter-size based)

### **Wastewater System (Chapter 7)**

- **Nexus:** New development contributes to sewage flows and pollutant loads, requiring expanded or upgraded treatment capacity.
- **Demand Variable:** Average gallons of wastewater discharged per day
- **Impact Basis:** Share of treatment plant upgrade costs based on projected future use
- **Fee Use:** Repayment of bonds and loans used to finance system improvements (e.g., Lompoc Regional Wastewater Reclamation Plant)
- **Fee Type:** Capacity-based (adjusted annually, meter-size based)

### **Police Facilities & Equipment (Chapter 8)**

- **Nexus:** As development increases population and land use intensity, the demand for police calls, patrols, and emergency response increases.

- **Demand Variable:** Number of police “activities” (calls + officer-initiated events)
- **Impact Basis:** Proportional allocation of existing and planned facility and equipment costs based on projected activity volume
- **Fee Use:** Facility expansion and equipment procurement
- **Fee Type:** “Buy-in” methodology—new development pays for its share of total system assets

### **Fire Protection Facilities (Chapter 9)**

- **Nexus:** Increased building square footage and development area demand additional fire response capacity, personnel, and apparatus.
- **Demand Variable:** Developed acreage (as a proxy for fire protection needs)
- **Impact Basis:** Total cost of stations, equipment, and facility relocation apportioned to growth
- **Fee Use:** Fund facility upgrades, apparatus replacement, and fire station relocation
- **Fee Type:** Buy-in methodology

### **Street Improvements (Chapter 10) & Traffic Signals (Chapter 11)**

- **Nexus:** Commercial and residential developments generate vehicle trips, impacting peak-hour congestion and triggering the need for road expansions and new signalization.
- **Demand Variable:** Peak-hour trips generated by land use type
- **Impact Basis:** Cost of specific improvement projects divided by projected trip generation
- **Fee Use:** Pay for new roads, signal installations, and capacity enhancements
- **Fee Type:** Plan-based

### **Bikeways (Chapter 12)**

- **Nexus:** Residential development increases the demand for safe, accessible, non-vehicular travel routes, especially for recreation and short commutes.
- **Demand Variable:** Population per residential unit
- **Impact Basis:** Cost of existing bikeways divided by current population to determine per capita share

- **Fee Use:** Expansion and maintenance of the bikeway system
- **Fee Type:** Buy-in / standard-based

### **Refuse Containers (Chapter 13)**

- **Nexus:** New residential units require the initial provision of refuse containers, which represent a fixed, upfront cost.
- **Demand Variable:** Dwelling unit count
- **Impact Basis:** Cost per container multiplied by number of units
- **Fee Use:** Purchase and delivery of refuse containers
- **Fee Type:** Per-unit equipment charge

### **Justification for Using the 2025 Nexus Report Over the 2003 Maximus Study**

While the **2003 Maximus Impact Fee Study** provided a strong foundational framework for calculating development impact fees (DIFs) in the City of Lompoc, a shift to the **2025 Development Impact Fee Calculation and Nexus Report** (prepared by Revenue and Cost Specialists, LLC) is both warranted and necessary. This transition is justified based on the following key factors:

### **Updated Growth Projections and Land Use Data**

The 2025 Nexus Report integrates:

- **Revised General Plan data** and a fully updated **land use inventory** for developed, underdeveloped, and vacant parcels.
- A more precise estimation of **General Plan buildout**, with a new population projection of **47,263** residents (up from the estimates in 2003), using refined occupancy rates and housing type breakdowns.
- A complete analysis of **potential development** across **residential, commercial, industrial, and institutional** land uses, providing a more accurate denominator for distributing capital costs.

This represents a significant improvement over the more generalized projections in the 2003 study.

## Detailed Project Listings and Master Facilities Plan Integration

The 2025 Report:

- Enumerates **92 capital projects** tied to future development, each with detailed cost estimates, timing assumptions, and funding sources.
- Offers full integration with the **Master Facilities Plan (MFP)**, enhancing transparency, traceability, and accountability for how fees will be used.
- Allows for continuous compliance with Government Code §66000, particularly regarding the **five-year fund use requirement** and audit trail needs.

By contrast, the 2003 study only provided **aggregate-level costs** without specific project detail or facility-level tracking.

## Compliance with Legal Standards and Recent Case Law

The 2025 report explicitly aligns with:

- The **Mitigation Fee Act** (Gov. Code §§66000–66009)
- The **Nollan/Dolan** standards for “essential nexus” and “rough proportionality”
- The 2024 **Sheetz v. County of El Dorado** U.S. Supreme Court decision, affirming the constitutional limits on impact fees

It includes proportional analysis that compares **existing infrastructure investment per unit** with the **proposed impact fee per unit**, ensuring that new development pays only for its **share of growth-related costs** and not for correcting existing deficiencies.

This legal compliance was only implicitly addressed in the 2003 study and lacked the comprehensive proportional analysis now required under evolving jurisprudence.

## Adjusted Cost Estimates and Fee Equity

Due to inflation and increased construction costs, especially post-COVID, the infrastructure cost assumptions in the 2003 study are no longer valid. The 2025 report recalculates:

- Unit costs for land acquisition, materials, and labor
- Facility capacity standards (e.g., square feet per officer for police or gallons/day for utilities)
- Replacement costs of existing infrastructure, now valued at **\$1.87 billion**, with **\$1.5 billion** in depreciable capital assets

It concludes that **\$544 million** in total infrastructure is needed, of which **\$75.64 million** can be attributed directly to future developmental level of financial detail and precision not found in the 2003 analysis.

## 6.6 Improved Administrative and Tracking Mechanisms

The 2025 Nexus Report:

- Offers clear guidance on how to **adjust fees based on land use changes or special cases** (e.g., parking structures, accessory dwelling units)
- Provides a **mechanism to calculate fees on a square-foot or per-unit basis**, ensuring proportionality even in partial redevelopments
- Includes a structure for updating fees based on financing costs, inflation, and legislative changes

This makes the 2025 report more adaptable, defensible, and user-friendly for both City staff and the development community.

## Conclusion

The **2025 Nexus Report** is not only more current but also reflects best practices, statutory compliance, and greater technical accuracy. While the 2003 Maximus Study served its purpose for over two decades, the needs of a growing Lompoc and the requirements of modern development law demand a transition to the updated framework.

## Proposed and Existing Development Impact Fees

Land Use	Proposed Development Impact Fee	Existing Development Impact Fee
Detached Dwelling Unit	\$40,617	\$29,359
Attached Dwelling Unit	\$36,614	\$17,111
Mobile Home Dwelling Unit	\$28,323	\$13,108
Commercial Lodging	\$10,456	\$8,048
Retail/Service/Office Uses (SF)	\$12.617	-
Commercial – General (1K SF)	-	\$35,333
Commercial – Service (1K SF)	-	\$21,263
Self Storage Facilities Uses (SF)	\$8.215	-
Business Park Uses (SF)	\$7.881	-
Industrial Uses (SF)	\$6.326	-
Industrial – Light (1KSF)	-	\$10,018
Industrial – Heavy (1K SF)	-	\$5,089
Institutional Uses (SF)	\$8.648	-

END OF REPORT