



PARADISE RECREATION AND PARK DISTRICT

PARK IMPACT FEE NEXUS STUDY

OCTOBER 2014
REVISED FEBRUARY 2015

PREPARED FOR:

**BOARD OF DIRECTORS
PARADISE RECREATION AND PARK DISTRICT**

PREPARED BY:

SCI Consulting Group
4745 MANGELS BOULEVARD
FAIRFIELD, CA 94534
PHONE 707.430.4300
FAX 707.430.4319

(THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK)

PARADISE RECREATION AND PARK DISTRICT

BOARD OF DIRECTORS

Gloria Rodgers, Chair
Al McGreehan, Vice Chair
Julie Van Roekel, Secretary
Morgan Miller, Director
Steve Rodowick, Director

DISTRICT MANAGER

Mike Trinca

DISTRICT CONSULTANT

Blair Aas, Director of Planning Services
Jerry Bradshaw, Senior Engineer

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This Park Impact Fee Nexus Study was prepared by SCI Consulting Group under contract with the Paradise Recreation and Park District.

The work was accomplished under the general direction of Mike Trinca, Manager of the District.

We would like to acknowledge the contributions made by individuals and organizations to this project:

Deborah DeBrunner, Butte County Department of Development Services

Shari McCracken, Butte County Office of County Administrator

Brian Lasagna, Butte County Association of Governments

Craig Baker, Town of Paradise Community Development Department

TABLE OF CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	1
INTRODUCTION	1
ABOUT THE PARADISE RECREATION AND PARK DISTRICT	1
METHODOLOGY / APPROACH.....	1
NEXUS REQUIREMENTS.....	2
SUMMARY OF KEY FINDINGS.....	2
SUMMARY OF GENERAL RECOMMENDATIONS.....	4
EXISTING PARK FACILITIES AND LEVEL OF SERVICE STANDARDS	5
DEVELOPED PARKS	5
OPEN SPACE	5
COMMUNITY USE FACILITIES.....	6
AQUATICS CENTER.....	6
NEXUS STUDY LEVEL OF SERVICE STANDARDS.....	6
PER CAPITA COST COMPONENTS.....	7
PARKLAND ACQUISITION COST PER CAPITA	7
PARK DEVELOPMENT COST PER CAPITA.....	8
COMMUNITY USE FACILITY COST PER CAPITA.....	8
DETERMINATION OF THE PARK IMPACT FEES.....	9
PARK IMPACT FEE COST COMPONENTS.....	9
PARK IMPACT FEE DETERMINATION.....	10
NEXUS FINDINGS.....	11
APPENDICES.....	13
APPENDIX A – POPULATION PROJECTION THROUGH 2035.....	14
APPENDIX B – RECENT VACANT LAND SALES.....	15
APPENDIX C – PARK DEVELOPMENT COSTS	16
APPENDIX D – CONSTRUCTION COSTS FOR COMMUNITY USE FACILITIES	17
APPENDIX E – AVERAGE HOUSEHOLD SIZE BY HOUSING TYPE	18
APPENDIX F – INVENTORY OF DISTRICT FACILITIES.....	19

LIST OF FIGURES

FIGURE 1 – CURRENT PARK IMPACT FEES 3

FIGURE 2 – PROPOSED PARK IMPACT FEES 4

FIGURE 3 – EXISTING PARK FACILITIES AND COMPARISON OF LEVEL OF SERVICE 6

FIGURE 4 – PARKLAND ACQUISITION COST PER CAPITA 7

FIGURE 5 – PARK DEVELOPMENT COSTS PER CAPITA 8

FIGURE 6 – COMMUNITY USE FACILITY COST PER CAPITA 8

FIGURE 7 – PARK IMPACT FEE COST COMPONENTS 9

FIGURE 8 – TOTAL COST PER UNIT 10

FIGURE 9 – PROPOSED PARK IMPACT FEE 10

FIGURE 10 – DISTRICT POPULATION PROJECTIONS 14

FIGURE 11 – RECENT VACANT LAND SALES 15

FIGURE 12 – COMMUNITY PARK CONSTRUCTION COSTS 16

FIGURE 13 – PER-SQUARE-FOOT COSTS FOR TYPICAL COMMUNITY USE FACILITY 17

FIGURE 14 – AVERAGE HOUSEHOLD SIZE BY HOUSING TYPE 18

FIGURE 15 – SUMMARY OF DISTRICT FACILITIES 19

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

INTRODUCTION

This Park Impact Fees Nexus Study ("Nexus Study") was prepared pursuant to the "Mitigation Fee Act" as found in Government Code § 66000 et. seq., Chapter 16, Article 5 of the Butte County Code; and Ordinance 427 of the Town of Paradise. The purpose of this Nexus Study is to establish the legal and policy basis for the imposition of new park impact fees ("park facility fees" or "fees") on new residential development within the Paradise Recreation and Park District ("District").

This study was originally completed in October 2014, but is being revised in February 2015 to accommodate the District's wish to exclude the Forest Ranch Planning Area (Doe Mill Ridge area) from the impact fee program. This is due to their determination that the area is currently not served by District facilities and programs, and, due to its remote proximity and limited access, there are no plans to construct park and recreational facilities in the area in the foreseeable future. The effect of this exclusion area is minimal: the study population decreases by 200, and levels of service and resultant impact fee recommendations are unchanged from the earlier study.

ABOUT THE PARADISE RECREATION AND PARK DISTRICT

The District is one of five recreation and park districts in Butte County. Established in 1948, the District is comprised of approximately 165 square miles consisting of the Town of Paradise ("Town") and unincorporated areas of Butte County ("County") including the Butte Creek Canyon area and the unincorporated communities of Magalia/Paradise Pines and Concow/Yankee Hill. It is bordered by the Chico Area Recreation and Parks District to the southwest, Feather River Recreation and Park District to the east and southeast and the Durham Recreation and Park District to the south. The District serves approximately 46,200 residents (excluding the Forest Ranch Planning Area).

METHODOLOGY / APPROACH

As the need for park and recreational services is inherently population-driven, this Nexus Study utilizes a per capita standard-based methodology to calculate the District's park impact fees. Under this method, the cost components are defined on a per capita basis based on the District's existing level of service ("LOS"). The total per capita costs are then applied to two residential land use categories according to their respective average household population and average square footage to establish a cost / fee per square foot of new living area.

NEXUS REQUIREMENTS

In order to impose such fees, this Nexus Study will demonstrate that a reasonable relationship or “nexus” exists between new development that occurs within the District and the need for additional developed parkland and recreational facilities as a result of new development. More specifically, this Nexus Study will present findings in order to meet the procedural requirements of the Mitigation Fee Act, also known as AB 1600, which are as follows:

- Identify the purpose of the fee;
- Identify the use to which the fee is to be put;
- Determine how there is a reasonable relationship between the fee's use and the type of development project on which the fee is imposed;
- Determine how there is a reasonable relationship between the need for the public facility and the type of development project on which the fee is imposed;
- Determine how there is a reasonable relationship between the amount of the fee and the cost of the public facility or portion of the public facility attributable to the development on which the fee is imposed.

SUMMARY OF KEY FINDINGS

Based on a review of the 2010 District Master Plan (“Master Plan”); the County General Plan; Town General Plan; applicable County and Town code sections; District’s demographics and specific cost estimates, the following key findings are presented:

1. The District’s current park impact fee program and park impact fee were established in 2004, and the fees were increased by approximately 14% in 2006. The fees were adopted separately by the Town of Paradise and Butte County (for unincorporated areas). These are summarized below.

FIGURE 1 – CURRENT PARK IMPACT FEES

Residential Land Use Category	2004 Impact Fee	2006 Impact Fee	Proposed 2014 Impact Fee
	<i>Per Sq. Ft.</i>	<i>Per Sq. Ft.</i>	<i>Per Sq. Ft.</i>
<u>Town of Paradise</u>			
Single Family Housing and Residential Additions	\$0.44	\$0.50	\$0.82
Other Residential ^A	\$0.76	\$0.86	\$1.49
<u>Unincorporated County</u>			
Single Family Housing and Residential Additions	\$0.44	\$0.51	\$0.82
Other Residential ^A	\$0.76	\$0.87	\$1.49

Notes:

^A The Other Residential category includes townhomes, duplex, triplex, fourplex, apartments and mobile home units.

2. The original park impact fees were based on an assumed land acquisition cost of \$15,000 per acre and an average park improvement cost of \$130,000 per acre. Today, land acquisitions costs in the Paradise area are estimated to be \$63,000 per acre, and Park development costs are estimated to be \$299,800 per acre.
3. The District's Master Plan level of service goal is to provide five (5) acres of accessible developed park land for every 1,000 residents. Developed park land includes both active and passive use areas.
4. Based on the District's current population and existing park facilities, the District's existing levels of service for every 1,000 residents are 1.6 acres of developed park land, 8.5 acres of open space, and 177.5 square feet of community use facility space.
5. A reasonable relationship or "nexus" exists between new residential development in the District and the need for additional developed parkland and recreational facilities as a result of new development.
6. This park impact fee program and proposed park impact fees for the District are consistent with the policies of the County and Town General Plans.

SUMMARY OF GENERAL RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on the findings presented in the Nexus Study, the following general recommendations are presented:

1. The District should establish new park impact fees to fairly allocate the costs of park development to new residential development. The following park impact fees for the District are proposed:

FIGURE 2 – PROPOSED PARK IMPACT FEES

Residential Land Use Category	Proposed Park Impact Fee
	<i>Per Sq. Ft. of living space</i>
Single Family Housing and Residential Additions	\$0.82
Other Residential ^A	\$1.49

Notes:

^A The Other Residential category includes townhomes, duplex, triplex, fourplex, apartments and mobile home units.

2. The District should periodically conduct a review of facility costs, land costs and building trends in the District. If costs change significantly in either direction, this Nexus Study should be updated and the park impact fees adjusted accordingly. Alternatively, the District may periodically adjust the park impact fees using the method required by local codes.
3. The District's new park impact fees should be adopted and implemented in accordance with the applicable provisions of the Mitigation Fee Act (California Govt. Code § 66000).
4. The land acquisition portion of the impact fees should be waived when any Quimby Fees are applied upon development.
5. As a condition of tentative map approval, the County and Town, in cooperation with the District, should consider requiring developers of large residential subdivisions to approve a Mello-Roos Community Facilities District or Landscaping and Lighting Benefit Assessment to ensure full funding for on-going operational, maintenance, repair and replacement costs of the park and recreational facilities associated with the development.

EXISTING PARK FACILITIES AND LEVEL OF SERVICE STANDARDS

As previously mentioned, this Nexus Study utilizes a per capita-standard based methodology to determine the park impact fees because the need for / demand for park and recreational services is inherently driven by population. Using this approach, new park and recreational facility costs are reduced to a cost per capita based on level of service standards for such facilities.

This section generally describes the District's existing park facilities and Master Plan goals for each. Figure 3 below presents the level of service standards used in this Nexus Study for determining the proposed park impact fees.

DEVELOPED PARKS

Mini-parks, about 0.5 to 2 acres in size, are designed to serve a concentrated or a special population such as children or senior citizens. Neighborhood parks, 3 to 5 acres in size, are typically a combination playground and park designed primarily for non-supervised, non-organized recreation activities. Community parks, typically about 15 to 25 acres in size, are designed for organized groups or team sports, while also providing facilities for individual and family activities. The District's Master Plan makes no distinction between these categories as the parks vary in size, function and amenities on a case-by-case basis. The District has seven developed parks plus a joint use agreement with the Paradise Unified School District for partial use of the High School facilities totaling 74.7 acres or 1.6 acres for every 1,000 residents. The District's Master Plan standard for developed parks is five (5) acres per 1,000.

OPEN SPACE

Open space areas typically provide areas for passive uses and trailways, picnic sites and jogging circuits. They also provide access to waterways or serve as transportation corridors for trailways. The District currently has 394.5 acres of open space or undeveloped park land, or 8.5 acres for every 1,000 residents. The District's Master Plan does not state a specific standard for open space acreage, but it does outline the need for acquisition of additional acreage to meet future needs for each of its six service areas including the underserved Forest Ranch and Butte Creek Canyon areas.

COMMUNITY USE FACILITIES

Community use facilities are recreational facilities such as community centers, gymnasiums and multi-use facilities. The District currently has one community center without a gymnasium plus access to gymnasiums at Pine Ridge and Paradise Intermediate Schools through a joint use agreement with the Paradise Unified School District. These facilities have a total area of 8,236 square feet, or 177.5 square feet for every 1,000 residents. The District's Master Plan does not state a specific level of service standard for community use facilities, but it does identify a need to accommodate future growth by providing one additional community center and one gymnasium or multi-use facility including facilities for indoor basketball and volleyball.

AQUATICS CENTER

The District has one aquatics center plus an agreement to utilize the Golden Feather Union School District swim pool during the summer months for recreational programming. The District's Master Plan identifies a long-range need to accommodate future growth by providing one aquatics center. However, the District recognizes that this long-range, high cost need may not fit the requirements of Government Code § 66000 et seq. at this time. Therefore, aquatics facilities are excluded from the proposed fee program.

NEXUS STUDY LEVEL OF SERVICE STANDARDS

Figure 3 below presents the levels of service for developed parks, open space and community use facilities. The level of service standards used in this Nexus Study for determining the park impact fee are shown in the last column of the table.

FIGURE 3 – EXISTING PARK FACILITIES AND COMPARISON OF LEVEL OF SERVICE
(per 1,000 residents)

Type of Park	Existing Facilities	Master Plan Standard ^A	Existing Standard ^B	Nexus Study Standard ^C
Developed Park	74.7 acres	5 acres	1.6 acres	1.6 acres
Open Space	394.5 acres	na	8.5 acres	8.5 acres
Community Use Facility	8,236 sq. ft.	na	177.5 sq. ft.	177.5 sq. ft.

Notes:

^A From the District Master Plan, 2010

^B Based on a 2014 District population of 46,200 as presented in Appendix A.

^C The LOS standard used in the Nexus Study for the determination of the proposed park impact fee.

PER CAPITA COST COMPONENTS

This section presents the per capita cost for parkland acquisition and development, and construction costs for community use facilities based on the Nexus Study level of service standards from the previous section and their associated costs in current dollars.

PARKLAND ACQUISITION COST PER CAPITA

Figure 4 below presents the per capita cost for parkland acquisition based on an assumed land value of \$63,000 per acre for developed parks and \$8,000 per acre for open space. Arguments for higher land costs can be made; however, the presented amount appears to be an appropriate and conservative figure for the purposes of this Nexus Study.¹ As shown, the District Nexus Study level of service standards for park land and open space are multiplied by the estimated per-acre land cost to arrive at a cost per capita.

FIGURE 4 – PARKLAND ACQUISITION COST PER CAPITA

Type of Park	Acres per 1,000 Population ^A	Acres per Capita	Land Cost Per Acre ^B	Cost per Capita
Park Land	1.6	0.0016	\$63,000	\$100.80
Open Space	8.5	0.0085	\$8,000	\$68.00
Total Acquisition Cost				\$168.80

Notes:

^A Based on the District's existing level of service for developed parks.

^B Based on recent vacant land sales within the District. (Appendix B.)

¹ Appendix B presents recent vacant land sales in the District which were used as the based to determine land acquisition costs per acre.

PARK DEVELOPMENT COST PER CAPITA

The calculation of the per capita cost for developing new parks in the District are shown in the following table. As presented, the District's Nexus Study level of service standard for parks is multiplied by the estimated development cost per acre to arrive at a total per capita cost. The average development costs shown represents average construction cost (in 2014 dollars) based on recent cost estimates developed by the District in connection with their master planning efforts for Lakeridge Park and Crain Park.²

FIGURE 5 – PARK DEVELOPMENT COSTS PER CAPITA

Type of Park	Acres per 1,000 Population ^A	Acres per Capita	Average Development Cost per Acre ^B	Cost per Capita
Developed Parks	1.6	0.0016	\$299,800	\$479.68

Source: Paradise Recreation and Park District

Notes:

^A Based on the District's existing level of service for developed parks.

^B Estimates are in 2014 \$. See Appendix C for cost estimate details.

COMMUNITY USE FACILITY COST PER CAPITA

The calculation of the per capita costs for constructing new community use facilities is shown in the following table. As presented, the District's Nexus Study level of service standard for community use facilities are multiplied by the estimated construction costs to arrive at total per capita costs. The average construction costs shown represent average construction costs (in 2014 dollars) based on industry-standard costs of typical community use facilities.³

FIGURE 6 – COMMUNITY USE FACILITY COST PER CAPITA

Cost Component	S.F. per 1,000 Population ^A	S.F per Capita	Est. Cost per S.F. ^B	Cost Per Capita
Community Use Facilities	177.5	0.1775	\$610	\$108.28

Notes:

^A Based on the District's existing level of service.

^B Estimated site development and construction costs for a typical Community Use Facility. See Appendix D for details.

² Appendix C presents the District's typical park construction costs.

³ Appendix D presents community use facilities construction costs.

DETERMINATION OF THE PARK IMPACT FEES

This section presents the calculation of the park impact fees based on the per capita cost for parkland acquisition, park development and community use facility construction costs for two residential land uses categories.

PARK IMPACT FEE COST COMPONENTS

As previously discussed, the park impact fee cost components for the proposed park impact fee are acquisition of open space and park land, development of park land, and the construction cost of new community use facilities based on per capita levels of service. In addition, the cost of administration of the impact fee program, which includes periodic nexus study updates, collection, accounting, annual reporting and other associated costs, is an allowable cost component and is conservatively estimated to be three percent (3%). As shown below, the total per capita cost is \$779.46.

FIGURE 7 – PARK IMPACT FEE COST COMPONENTS

Cost Components	Per Capita Costs
Parkland Acquisition	\$168.80
Park Development	\$479.68
Community Use Facilities	\$108.28
Impact Fee Administration (3%)	\$22.70
Total Cost per Capita	\$779.46

PARK IMPACT FEE DETERMINATION

The next two tables present the calculation of the park impact fees. The average household size for the two residential land use categories are multiplied by the per capita costs for each to arrive at cost per dwelling unit.⁴ In figure 8, the cost per dwelling unit is then divided by the average square footage to arrive at a cost per square foot for each. For residential additions, the park impact fee per square foot for single-family housing is used.

FIGURE 8 – TOTAL COST PER UNIT

Residential Land Use Category^A	Average Household Size^B	Total Cost Per Capita	Total Cost per Unit^C
Single-Family Residential	2.37	\$779.46	\$1,847.32
Other Residential ^A	2.02	\$779.46	\$1,574.51

Notes:

^A The Other Residential category includes townhomes, duplex, triplex, fourplex, apartments and mobile home units.

^B See Appendix E for details about Average Household Size.

^C Rounded to the nearest cent.

FIGURE 9 – PROPOSED PARK IMPACT FEE

Residential Land Use Category^A	Total Cost per Unit	Average Square Footage^B	Proposed Park Impact Fee^C
Single-Family Residential	\$1,847.32	2,255	\$0.82
Other Residential ^A	\$1,574.51	1,058	\$1.49

Notes:

^A The Other Residential category includes townhomes, duplex, triplex, fourplex, apartments and mobile home units.

^B Based on data from the March 2014 Butte County Assessor Roll. For Single-Family category, only homes built since 2008 were used.

^C Rounded to the nearest cent.

⁴ See Appendix E for details about average household size.

NEXUS FINDINGS

This section frames the results of Nexus Study in terms of the legislated requirements to demonstrate the legal justification of the park impact fees. The justification of the park impact fees on new development must provide information as set forth in Government Code § 66000. These requirements are discussed below.

IDENTIFY THE PURPOSE OF THE FEES

The purpose of the park impact fees are to acquire and develop open space and parkland and provide community use facilities to meet the needs of the new residential population within the District.

IDENTIFY THE USE OF THE FEES

As outlined in the Nexus Study, the general purpose of the fees is to fund the acquisition and development of park and recreation facilities. Revenue from fees collected on new development may be used to pay for any of the following:

- Acquisition or leasing of land for park and recreational facilities;
- Construction of park and recreational facilities;
- Park impact fee program costs including District administrative costs, nexus study and associated costs;
- Other park and recreational facility costs resulting from population growth caused by new residential development.

Revenue from the fees collected may not be used to fund the following:

- District operational costs;
- Park maintenance costs.⁵

DETERMINE HOW THERE IS A REASONABLE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE FEES' USE AND THE TYPE OF DEVELOPMENT PROJECT ON WHICH THE FEES ARE IMPOSED

Since the need for park and recreational services is inherently population-driven, new residential development in the District will generate additional need for new parks and recreational services and the corresponding need for various facilities. The fees will be used to develop and expand the District's parks and community use facilities required to serve new residential development. The fees' use (developing new park and recreational facilities) is therefore reasonably related to the type of project (new residential development) upon which it's imposed.

⁵ The District should consider establishing assessment districts or community facilities districts to fund on-going operation, maintenance and improvements costs attributable to new development.

DETERMINE HOW THERE IS A REASONABLE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE NEED FOR THE PUBLIC FACILITIES AND THE TYPE OF DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS ON WHICH THE FEES ARE IMPOSED

Each new residential development project will generate additional need for park and recreational services and the associated need for developed parkland and community use facilities. The need is defined by the District's Nexus Study level of service standards for such facilities.

DETERMINE HOW THERE IS A REASONABLE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE AMOUNT OF THE FEES AND THE COST OF THE PUBLIC FACILITIES OR PORTION OF THE PUBLIC FACILITIES ATTRIBUTABLE TO THE DEVELOPMENT ON WHICH THE FEES ARE IMPOSED

The amount of park and recreational facilities needed to serve a unit of development is based on the District's level of service standard for providing such facilities. The cost for land acquisition, park development and community use facilities defined on a cost per capita basis. These per capita costs are applied to two residential land uses categories according to their respective average household population and average square footage.

APPENDICES

Appendix A - Population Projection through 2035

Appendix B - Recent Vacant Land Sales

Appendix C - Park Development Costs

Appendix D - Construction Costs for Community Use Facilities

Appendix E - Average Household Size by Housing Type

Appendix F - Inventory of District Facilities

APPENDIX A – POPULATION PROJECTION THROUGH 2035

Figure 10 presents a projection of the District's population (excluding the Forest Ranch Planning Area) through 2035. The 2014 population estimate is based on the 2010 US Census for population densities, on the 2014 California Department of Finance E-5 Report for vacancy rates, and on the 2014 Butte County secured tax lien rolls for housing units. Future annual growth rate is projected by the Butte County Association of Governments ("BCAG") at 0.7% for the Town of Paradise and 1.1% for unincorporated areas of the County. BCAG staff recommend using the lower Town growth rate for unincorporated areas within the District.

FIGURE 10 – DISTRICT POPULATION PROJECTIONS

Estimated Future Population	2014	2015	2020	2025	2030	2035
Paradise RPD	46,200	46,500	48,200	49,900	51,700	53,500

Notes:

- The US Census did not provide a designation that matched the boundaries of the District. The Paradise Census County Division (CCD) included a large area to the north and northwest that fell outside the District, but excluded the Concow area and much of the Feather River area. A closer look at specific Census tracts also showed a misfit to the District boundaries. The closest fit included tracts 17.01, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22 and 23, although these excluded the Concow, Feather River and Forest Ranch areas. Populations and population densities were tallied for both Census areas. For each housing classification, the densities for the two Census areas were almost identical and were considered representative of the District. They were arithmetically averaged to determine densities used for this study.
- Population was calculated using parcel and housing unit data provided by the County tax authorities. For each housing classification:
 - Housing units for each parcel were tallied;
 - Vacancy rates taken from the California Department of Finance E-5 Report were applied to compute occupied units; and
 - Population densities were applied to occupied units to determine the population within each housing classification, which were then summed to arrive at the population for the District.

This process was used for the Town of Paradise and unincorporated County areas separately using different vacancy rates as reported in the E-5 Report.

APPENDIX B – RECENT VACANT LAND SALES

FIGURE 11 – RECENT VACANT LAND SALES

Sale	APN or Address	Location	Sales Date	Value	Size (Acres)	Price per Acre	Price per Sq. Ft.
1	4926 Malibu Dr	Paradise RPD	Jul-14	\$84,500	1.23	\$68,699	\$1.58
2	1823 Cloe Ct	Paradise RPD	Jun-14	\$50,000	0.61	\$81,967	\$1.88
3	14804 Northwood Dr	Paradise RPD	Jun-14	\$20,000	0.23	\$86,955	\$2.00
4	1753 Eden Roc Dr	Paradise RPD	Apr-14	\$3,500	0.09	\$38,889	\$0.89
5	6477 Vine Rd	Paradise RPD	Mar-14	\$12,000	0.46	\$26,087	\$0.60
6	377 Apple Ln	Paradise RPD	Feb-14	\$45,000	0.58	\$77,586	\$1.78
7	6595 Boulder Dr	Paradise RPD	Nov-13	\$16,500	0.50	\$33,000	\$0.76
8	263 Redbud Dr	Paradise RPD	Sep-13	\$22,000	0.32	\$68,750	\$1.58
9	5830 Acorn Ridge Dr	Paradise RPD	Aug-13	\$55,000	0.57	\$96,491	\$2.22
10	116 Valley View Dr	Paradise RPD	Jun-13	\$37,000	0.70	\$52,857	\$1.21
11	24 Mallard Ct	Paradise RPD	Jun-13	\$20,000	0.46	\$43,478	\$1.00

Open Space Land Valuation

Sale	APN or Address	Location	Sales Date	Value	Size (Acres)	Price per Acre	Price per Sq. Ft.
1	13109 Jordan Hill Rd	Paradise RPD	Apr-14	\$60,000	15.70	\$3,822	\$0.09
2	14011 Centerville Rd	Paradise RPD	Mar-14	\$325,000	28.50	\$11,404	\$0.26
3	15145 Shadowwood Dr	Paradise RPD	Jul-13	\$80,000	14.90	\$5,369	\$0.12
4	13414 Cirby Creek Rd	Paradise RPD	Jun-13	\$57,000	5.72	\$9,965	\$0.23

APPENDIX C – PARK DEVELOPMENT COSTS

FIGURE 12 – COMMUNITY PARK CONSTRUCTION COSTS

Item	2014 Cost
<u>Lakeridge Park Master Plan</u>	
Group Meeting Area (Pavillion)	\$ 336,270
Playground Complex	\$ 498,801
Trails	\$ 94,156
Botanical Gardens / Public Art	\$ 100,881
Landscape	\$ 342,996
Restrooms / Maintenance Building	\$ 168,135
Roadway / Parking	\$ 510,010
Site Development	\$ 459,569
Subtotal	<u>\$ 2,510,818</u>
Design, Engineering, Fees, Admin.	\$ 184,388
Lakeridge Park Project Cost (8 acres)	<u>\$ 2,695,206</u>
<u>Crain Park Master Plan</u>	
Group Meeting Facility	\$ 64,564
Playground	\$ 100,881
Playfield	\$ 67,254
Trails	\$ 20,176
Landscape	\$ 63,219
Restroom / Mtc Bldg / Well	\$ 375,502
Roadway / Parking	\$ 73,979
Subtotal	<u>\$ 765,575</u>
Design, Engineering, Fees, Admin.	\$ 137,000
Crain Park Project Cost (4 acres)	<u>\$ 902,575</u>
Average Cost Per Acre (Rounded)	\$ 299,800

Sources: PRPD Master Plans for Lakeridge Park and Crain Park

using the Engineering News Record Construction Cost Index for the San Francisco Bay Area.

APPENDIX D – CONSTRUCTION COSTS FOR COMMUNITY USE FACILITIES

FIGURE 13 – PER-SQUARE-FOOT COSTS FOR TYPICAL COMMUNITY USE FACILITY

Item	Surcharge	Cost per S.F.
Base Unit Cost for Community Use Facility ^A		\$ 318
Add for Site Grading, Utilities Parking and Landscaping ^B	20%	\$ 64
Subtotal Construction Costs		<u>\$ 382</u>
Design, Engineering, Fees, Admin. ^B	30%	\$ 114
Base Unit Cost (unadjusted)		<u><u>\$ 496</u></u>
Adjustments for Location and Year		
Escalate from 2013 to 2014 ^C	4.90%	\$ 24
Adjust for Chico / Yuba City ^D	18.00%	\$ 89
Total Base Unit Cost (rounded to nearest dollar)		<u><u>\$ 610</u></u>

Notes:

^A From 2013 ENR Square Foot Cost Book, average of Community Center, Learning Center, and Child Learning Center.

^B Estimated surcharges consistent with industry standards

^C From ENR Construction Cost Index for San Francisco Area

^D From 2013 ENR Square Foot Cost Book

APPENDIX E – AVERAGE HOUSEHOLD SIZE BY HOUSING TYPE

FIGURE 14 – AVERAGE HOUSEHOLD SIZE BY HOUSING TYPE

Residential Land Use Categories	Total Housing Units ^A	Vacant Housing Units ^B	Occupied Housing Units	Total Number of Occupants	Average Household Size ^C
Single-Family Residential	12,666	1,172	11,494	27,255	2.37
Other Residential	10,498	1,003	9,495	19,154	2.02

Notes:

^A From Butte County 2014 secured tax lien rolls

^B From California Department of Finance 2014 E-5 Report

^C From 2010 US Census

Note: The US Census did not provide a geographical designation that matched the boundaries of the District. The Paradise Census County Division (CCD) included a large area to the north and northwest that fell outside the District, but excluded the Concow area and much of the Feather River area. A closer look at specific Census tracts also showed a misfit to the District boundaries. The closest fit included tracts 17.01, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22 and 23, although these excluded the Concow, Feather River and Forest Ranch areas. Populations and population densities were tallied for both Census areas. For each housing classification, the densities for the two Census areas were almost identical and were considered representative of the District. They were arithmetically averaged to determine densities used for this study. Townhome (condominium), duplex, tri-plex, four-plex, multi-family (< 4 units) and mobile homes categories had relatively similar densities and housing sizes, so they were combined into the Other Residential category for the purpose of this study.

APPENDIX F – INVENTORY OF DISTRICT FACILITIES

FIGURE 15 – SUMMARY OF DISTRICT FACILITIES

Park Facilities	Total Acres	Improved Acres	Unimproved Acres / Open Space	General Features
Terry Ashe Recreation Center & Business Office	3.5	3.5		Community Center, picnic area, gazebo, playground, restrooms
Aquatic Park	6.0	6.0		Swim pool, picnic areas, playground, recreation building, kids fishing pond, group barbeque, sand volleyball, horseshoe pits, restrooms
Bille Park & Expansion	55.0	15.0	40.0	Playground, council Area, picnic pavillion & BBQ areas, nature trail, gazebo, kitchen, covered structure, restrooms, water feature
Moore Road Dog Park - Lezlie Morrow Memorial Dog Park	19.0	19.0		2 lighted ballfields, playground, horse arena, dog park, ropes course, restrooms
Coutolenc Park	320.0	20.0	300.0	Archery range, hiking, picnic area, chemical toilets
Crain Memorial Park	8.0	8.0		Picnic area, meadow, chemical toilets
Oak Creek Natural Area	17.0		17.0	Walking trail
Drendel Circle	0.5		0.5	Open Space - unimproved
Paradise Memorial Park	2.0	2.0		Gold Nugget Museum
Lakeridge Park	25.0		25.0	Unimproved - development pending
Noble Orchard Property	12.0		12.0	Open Space - unimproved
Paradise High School ^A	1.2	1.2		8 tennis courts (4 lighted), 1 lighted ballpark, all-weather track, chemical toilets
Total	469.2	74.7	394.5	

Community Use Facilities	Total SF	General Features
Terry Ashe Recreation Center	6,100	Multi-purpose Community Center
Paradise Intermediate School ^A	1,068	Multi-purpose facility
Pine Ridge School ^A	1,068	Multi-purpose facility
Total	8,236	

Source: Paradise Recreation and Park District, 2010 Master Plan public.

PARK IMPACT FEES

I. APPLICABILITY

The fees set forth herein shall apply as to building permit applications and mobile home installation or utility connection permit applications, submitted on or after _____, 2014

II. FACTORS USED TO ESTABLISH FEES/CREDITS

1. General Factors

	<u>Single-Family Residential</u>	<u>Other Residential</u>
a. Average Household Size	2.37 persons per unit	2.02 persons per unit
b. Average Square Footage	2,255 sq. ft.	1,058 sq. ft.

2. Factors for Park Impact Fees

a. Required facilities per 1,000 new residents

Developed Park	1.6 acres	(Existing level of service)
Open Space	8.5 acres	(Existing level of service)
Community Use Facility	177.5 square feet	(Existing level of service)

b. Average land cost, unimproved

Park land	\$63,000 per acre
Open Space	\$8,000 per acre

c. Average development cost

Park development	\$299,800 per acre
Community Use Facilities	\$610 per square foot

III. PARKLAND AND DEVELOPMENT FACILITY FEES

	<u>Single-Family Residential</u>	<u>Other Residential</u>
a. Fee per Sq. Ft.	\$0.82 per sq. ft.	\$1.49 per sq. ft.

BASIS FOR PARK IMPACT FEES

Assumptions:

1.6 acres of improved parkland for each new 1,000 residents
8.5 acres of open space (unimproved) for each new 1,000 residents
177.5 square feet of community use facilities for each new 1,000 residents

Single Family Dwelling 2.37 persons per unit, 2,255 average square feet
Multifamily Dwelling 2.02 persons per unit, 1,058 average square feet

Per Capita Costs Calculation:

Unimproved Acreage Per Capita Costs

Developed Parks

\$63,000 / acre times 1.6 acres is \$100,800 / 1,000 residents

\$100,800 divided by 1,000 residents = \$100.80 per capita

Open Space

\$8,000 / acre times 8.5 acres is \$68,000 / 1,000 residents

\$68,000 divided by 1,000 residents = \$68.00 per capita

Improved Acreage Per Capita Costs

Developed Parks

\$299,800 / acre times 1.6 acres is \$479,680 / 1,000 residents

\$479,680 divided by 1,000 residents = \$479.68 per capita

Community Use Facilities Per Capita Cost

\$610 / SF times 177.5 SF is \$108,280 / 1,000 residents

\$108,280 divided by 1,000 residents = \$108.28 per capita

Impact Fee Program Administration Per Capita Cost

3% times (\$100.80 plus \$68.00 plus \$479.68 plus \$108.28) = \$22.70
per capita

TOTAL Per Capita Cost

\$100.80 plus \$68.00 plus \$479.68 plus \$108.28 plus \$22.70 = \$779.46
per capita

Park Impact Fee Calculation:

Single Family Residential and Residential Additions

\$779.46 total per capita cost times 2.37 persons per unit = \$1,847.32
per unit

\$1,847.32 per unit divided by 2,255 average square feet = **\$0.82 per
square foot**

Other Residential Units

\$779.46 total per capita cost times 2.02 persons per unit = \$1,574.51
per unit

\$1,574.51 per unit divided by 1,058 average square feet = **\$1.49 per
square foot**