Development Impact Fee Calculation and Nexus Report for the Carpinteria–Summerland Fire Protection District

Update – October 2008

Revenue & Cost Specialists, L.L.C.
2545 East Chapman Avenue, Suite 103
Fullerton, CA 92831
(714) 524-6436

Revenue & Cost Specialists, LLC

Serving Local Governments Since 1975

October 27, 2008

Honorable District Board
Via Mr. Micheal Mingee, Fire Chief
Carpinteria-Summerland Fire Protection District
911 Walnut Avenue
Carpinteria, CA 93013

RE: ***2008-09 Development Impact Fee (DIF) Calculation and Master Facilities Plan (MFP) Update***

Honorable Chairperson, District Board and Chief Mingee:

The original Development Impact Fee (DIFs) report was completed for the District in October of 2003 based upon an ultimate three-station configuration. The resulting development impact fees were adopted by both the City of Carpinteria City Council and the Santa Barbara County Board of Supervisors and have been routinely updated to maintain financial relevance.

The identification of the projects proposed in the original 2003 Report would have a profound effect on the annual operation costs of the District and thus have become a major consideration in the capital planning process. Thus, in the summer of 2008 *Revenue and Cost Specialists, L.L.C.*, was asked to assist the District in undertaking a significant change in the identification of the capital projects and capital acquisitions necessary to maximize the existing ***Levels of Service (LOS)*** currently enjoyed by (after having have been paid for by) the existing community. The major change was a shift from a three-station configuration using the two existing stations to a two-station configuration with relocation of the northerly station to a larger (but nearby) parcel.

The District continues to experience private development of vacant parcels and the inherent demands for service created by that development and will continue to do so for some time. As a result, the list of required capacity-increasing station facilities and response fleet/equipment must remain relevant to avoid the eventual diminution of the existing ***Levels of Service*** due to the absorption of new residential and business development within the Carpinteria-Summerland Fire Protection District service boundaries.

The following cost alterations have been incorporated into this update (over the 2006-07 effort). The cost of fire station construction has been increased from $375.00/square foot (construction only) to $400.00/square foot. The $400.00/square foot is consistent with similar recent constructions. Design, project administration/inspection, front footage public improvements,

landscape and hardscape costs along with station furnishing costs were then added as a percentage resulting in a turn-key cost, (land acquisition, design, construction and equipping) of about $510 to $575/square foot depending upon the type of building and its use (i.e. station vs. offices).

This 2008-09 Report update has been limited to the proposed project changes and estimated cost changes only. No changes were made to the land-use database.

The District staff and Board, responsible for providing services to a continually expanding residential and business community, must recognize that the magnitude of the development impact fees is **a direct function** of the $10,072,436 net cost of the capital projects identified in the *Master Facilities Plan* as capacity increasing, The $10,072,436 is based upon the $12,267,247 in total project costs less $2,194,811 to be financed by other revenue sources including the possible sale of the existing station #2 parcel and the current impact fee fund balance. It is incumbent upon this Report to continue to convince the District Board of the justification of the updated proposed development impact fees.

The Report calculates updated development impact fees for the Carpinteria-Summerland Fire Protection District based on the aforementioned changes and the District's changing requirements for fire suppression facilities. The adoption of the updated DIFs will enable this District board, as well as succeeding Boards, to continue to ensure that the District will be able to meet the ***basic*** fire suppression infrastructure needs of new growth, without unduly burdening the existing population and business community for these development-generated capital costs.

Adoption of the maximum impact fees contained herein and imposition upon the remaining development opportunities in the Carpinteria-Summerland Community, could generate approximately $4.8 million in a combination of public improvement dedications and revenues for use on the many capital expansion projects deemed as development generated depending upon what level of impact fees are adopted. The identification of the net $10,072,436 in net capital needs generated by new development is not taken lightly, but must be examined in relation to the cost of the District's existing fire suppression facilities, vehicles, and equipment that a new development project will share in and benefit from, upon approval, construction and finally, occupancy.

The District will need to find other revenues sources to bridge the gap of $5.3 million in revenue shortfall between the net $10.1 million in capital needs and the projected $4.8 million in development impact fee revenue.

To offer such a perspective, a major element in this Report is a *proportional analysis*, or comparison of what is being asked of future residents, in the form of dedicated public improvements or an in-lieu (impact fee) payment, with the cost of the District's existing infrastructure, 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 $11,251,134 (at current replacement costs) in the form of facilities, vehicles, and equipment improvements to the Carpinteria-Summerland area. Newly developing properties *directly* benefit from this capital investment by existing homeowners and businesses over the many years.

It is not intended for the recommended development impact fees to address all of the District's capital needs, especially replacement of aging facilities, vehicles and equipment. As per California Government Code 66000 et. seq. and common fairness, development impact fees cannot address existing capital deficiencies. The proposed fees will recognize and meet the needs of the District's growing population and business community. However, with the adoption of impact fees, other District discretionary revenue resources that may have been used to meet growth-generated needs for expanded services and facilities will now be available for those accumulating replacement and rehabilitation projects.

The revised and updated *Development Impact Fee Calculation and Nexus Report* is now submitted for your review and consideration. RCS staff is prepared to assist in increasing the Board's and community's understanding of this very significant part of the District's revenue structure.

Sincerely,

Scott Thorpe,
Senior Vice President

CARPINTERIA-SUMMERLAND FIRE PROTECTION DISTRICT DEVELOPMENT IMPACT FEE CALCULATION/NEXUS UPDATE REPORT

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter One

Background and Introduction

The Carpinteria-Summerland Fire Protection District has retained Revenue & Cost Specialists[1] (henceforth referred to as RCS) to recalculate the District's 2003-04 Development Impact Fee Schedule (henceforth referred to as DIFs) based upon an updated *Master Facilities Plan*. The development impact fees contained herein, if adopted, would replace the existing development impact fees. A periodic review and adjustment of the Board's DIFs is appropriate and warranted in order to continue to insure that the District collects sufficient monies to construct the additional infrastructure needed to serve new residential, commercial lodging and business development. The DIFs contained in this Report will serve the District well for a number of years, with periodic economic indicator increases.

This DIF Calculation Report includes a significant amount of detail such as a complete list of all projects to be financed by impact fees, by infrastructure.[2] The *Development Impact Fee Calculation and Nexus Report* and the *Master Facilities Plan* (Appendix A) offers substantial information to support Board policy decisions, greater understanding by the development community, and an easier tracking (and updating) system for the staff.

This Report provides the documentation of the Board's costs which serve as the basis for calculating Development Impact Fees (DIFs). The proposed Development Impact Fees and related information can be found in Chapter 3 and Appendices A and B of this Report.

Based upon District staff input, RCS prepared the nexus calculation of Development Impact Fees. The resulting fees will need to be adopted by the two land-use agencies covering the District's boundaries (e.g. Santa Barbara County Board of Supervisors and the City of Carpinteria City Council).

Inclusion of the Proportional Analysis. As stated earlier, this Report includes a *proportional analysis*. This analysis is intended to recognize and reconcile the difference between the Board's desired level of service required of 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. This addition will assist the Board in making the difficult policy decisions regarding the required additions of new development.

Development Impact Fee Schedule Structure. The General Plan provides a range of potential densities for residential development, the DIFs for residential uses need to be calculated on a per (type of) dwelling unit basis to reflect more accurately and greater fairness, the impacts from a

specific development. For example, a property zoned for development of detached dwellings may contain from three to six units per acre. If fees are calculated on an acreage basis, the developer proposing three units per acre will pay the same amount as a developer constructing six units per acre. Similarly, fees for commercial and industrial properties are calculated on a square footage basis to reflect the impacts of different building intensities for this type of development. The addition of the proportional analysis will assist the District Board in adopting a fee structure that recognizes inter-generational equity and increase the lay-person's understanding of what is *fair*.

A second reason for the proposed DIF fee structure recommended in this Report involves the issue of building expansion or intensification of commercial and industrial areas. For example, if a property owner of commercial or industrial property proposes an expansion to his building, the question exists about how to charge this proposed expansion for its impact on the agency's streets, storm drainage system, and other infrastructures. A fee calculated on the building structure square footage basis will simplify this calculation.

CALCULATION OF DEVELOPMENT IMPACT FEES

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

AB1600 requires documentation of projects to be financed by Development Impact Fees prior to their levy and collection, and that the monies collected actually 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, AB1600 requires the following:

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 3 & 4 will be reversed throughout the chapters in this Report in a recognition 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 AB1600. Briefly, the following steps were undertaken in the calculation of impact fees for the District and are listed below:

1. Define the level of service needed 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. This Report will use a calculated calls-for-service demand factor specific to the Carpinteria-Summerland Fire Protection District.

2. Review the Land use map and determine the existing mix of land uses and amount of undeveloped and developed land. The magnitude of growth and its impacts can thus be determined by considering this land use data when planning needed infrastructure. This inventory can be found in Table 2-1 in Chapter 2.

3. Identify all additions to the capital facilities or equipment inventory necessary to maintain the identified levels of service in the area and also accommodate additional calls-for-service generated by new development, then, determine the cost of those additions.

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 on a basis of land use. Costs are distributed between each land use based on their relative *(or proportional)* use of the capital system. For example, future street costs would be distributed to each land use based on their trip-mile generation characteristics. For this Report, the capital costs are based upon the various land-use fire response demands from previous years.

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:

Land Costs. Land acquisition cost estimates were developed after discussions with District officials over recent acquisitions or current negotiations, and where necessary, a land appraiser for all land purchase needs. 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.

Appropriate Expansion. Debt service is a reasonable cost of construction of many, but not necessarily all, public facilities and infrastructure. The following example illustrates. DIFs are collected in incremental amounts, but facilities are not expanded in those same incremental amounts. As an example, a fire station fee, based upon a standard of one basic station per 5,000 Detached Dwelling Unit, may be collected for each residential dwelling in the District, but after collecting the fee for a 250-unit subdivision (5% of the total amount needed to construct a station), it would be impractical to build just 5% of a station. Fees will be collected, placed in a separate fund, generating interest until such a time that a parcel may be purchased or acquisition of architectural/engineering plans may be obtained. During that build-up time, any existing station will experience some temporary over-demand as the standard drops from one station per 5,000 dwellings to about one station per 5,250 dwellings. This "temporary over-demand" will clearly bring about some over-demand and an increased unavailability until enough DIFs have been collected for full construction or a practical expansion to bring the actual existing fire station standard back up to the original standard. In short, a development of 250 homes may be brought "on-line" (occupancy approved) and bring about a temporary reduction in fire station facility standards probably without endangering the citizen's health and safety.

However, a "temporary overcapacity" in fire suppression is not infinite. At some point, capacity to respond to calls-for service needs to be made available prior to the private construction that, in effect, is the straw that breaks the camels back. If the nearest fire station is currently at ***maximum*** operational capacity (a point beyond nominal or planned capacity), ***no*** additional residential or business units can be brought on line until additional response capacity can be created and the existing stations drop back to planned capacity. Again, there is a practical size of fire station 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 at some point. Circumstances will vary from agency to agency as to what facility expansions are critical and which can absorb temporary overcapacity for limited periods of time.

Financing costs would only be included in the impact fee calculation for facilities where, based upon staff's estimate, the immediacy of need for the facility requires debt financing. 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 on its development impact fees. However, no project requiring debt service was identified in the Master Facilities Plan.

PROPORTIONAL ANALYSIS

A proportional analysis is important, if for no other reason, than for community inter-generational equity, i.e., fairness in the infrastructure investment made by existing residents and businesses with those of new residents and businesses that wish to use the existing District infrastructure. In short, previous generations of businesses and residents have contributed to the development of the District infrastructure and this fact should be recognized by future residents and businesses by contributing a like or fair amount towards completing the various infrastructure systems.

It is one thing to identify the many public improvement projects needed through build-out. It is an entirely different thing to assume that all of the identified improvements are required to meet the demands of the new development. Clearly, some projects could be *replacements* of the existing infrastructure while others will be *capacity increasing* projects. Within the category of the latter, they may also be further classified into two categories;

1. Projects dealing with existing deficiencies, i.e., project required regardless of whether there is additional development or not. An example would be the replacement of a station roof or an failing emergency generator.

2. Projects that are required as a result of development. An example of this would be an aerial truck necessary because of future three and four floor construction.

All impact fee calculations claim to be fair. Most DIF calculations will identify the desired or required capital projects, most ostensibly generated *as a result of development*. However, little evidence is ever offered in support for such a claim. Therefore, what is fair and equitable? Is it fair to require future residents and businesses in a District to construct, via payment of impact fees, a new Fire Station when the current stations are merely rented or leased space? On the other hand, if a community already has all of the fire stations they will need at build-out, are they

precluded from imposing an impact fee to recoup some of that expenses incurred in constructing the those existing facilities? These are difficult questions that may be made easier by the following examples.

Comparison of Needed Infrastructure with Existing Infrastructure. The answer to these difficult questions may best be answered by comparing various fixed location infrastructure scenarios. This can be accomplished by looking closely at our friends in the planned community of Happy Valley[3] for a few scenarios to explain the three possible conditions that can occur regarding the agency's current infrastructure and the demand upon them. We will use the provision of fire protection, a service that most of us as nonprofessional fighters can somewhat comprehend. These three "conditions" include, the fire suppression system of infrastructure construction:

1. is ***On-target;***

2. has been ***Deficient***; and;

3. has created ***Excess Service Capacity.***

Adoption of a Standard - According to the National Fire Protection Association (NFPA), a standard two-bay fire station (estimated for purposes of this example to cost about $2,000,000) can meet the needs of 5,000 homes or 10,000,000 square feet of business pad. If these standards were adopted as Happy Valley's public safety element of the District's General Plan, they would be known as the *de jure* or stated (or desired) standard (i.e., the standard the community would like to meet). The inductive impact fees (or cost per proportional unit served) for this *de jure* standard would then be:

Table 1-1
Calculation of N.F.P.A. Impact Cost

Land Use	Station Cost	Units Served	Impact Fee
Residential Units	$2,000,000	5,000	$400.00 per home
Business S.F.	$2,000,000	10,000,000	$0.20 per S.F.

Service Base - Happy Valley's General Plan indicates that there will be 10,000 residential units and about 20,000,000 square feet of commercial/industrial space creating a need for four stations at build-out. The station calculation is as follows:

Table 1-2
Determination of the Required Number of Stations

	Number of Units	Units served by One Station	Stations Required
Residential Units	10,000	5,000	2 Stations
Business S.F.	20,000,000	10,000,000	2 Stations
Required Stations at General Plan Build-out			4 Stations

Infrastructure is "On-target" - The need for four stations appears quite clear and the Happy Valley Council need only impose the impact fees calculated in Table 1-1. Currently, Happy Valley has 6,250 residential units and 7,500,000 square feet of commercial/industrial building pad and is half "built-out" (in terms of fire calls-for-service). The existing development in Happy Valley is generating half of its ultimate (General Plan build-out) fire calls-for-service. This is demonstrated in Table 1-3 below:

Table 1-3
Development of Current Infrastructure is "On-Target"

	Number of Units	Units served by One Station	Stations Required
Residential Units	6,250	5,000	1.25 Stations
Business S.F.	7,500,000	10,000,000	0.75 Stations
Total Number of Stations Required Currently			2.00 Stations

Conversely, Happy Valley has the remaining half of its fire demand (in terms of calls-for-service) yet to come. Left to build are 3,750 detached dwelling units and 12,500,000 square feet of business floor space, and when constructed would generate the following capital needs identified on Table 1-4 on the following page:

Table 1-4
Remaining Development and Station Requirement

	Number of Units	Units served by One Station	Stations Required
Residential Units	3,750	5,000	0.75 Stations
Business S.F.	12,500,000	10,000,000	1.25 Stations
# of New Stations Required from Land to be Developed			2.00 Stations

If the earlier calculated impact fees ($400 per residence and $0.20 per square foot of business pad) were adopted and imposed, Happy Valley would collect (by General Plan build-out) enough capital revenues to construct the remaining two stations. Table 1-5 following, demonstrates this:

Table 1-5
Remaining DIF Collection

	Number of Units	Impact Fee	Amount Collected
Residential Units	3,750	$400.00	$1,500,000
Business S.F.	12,500,000	$0.20	$2,500,000
Amount Collected in Impact Fees			$4,000,000
Cost of a One New Station			$2,000,000
Stations to be Built with Impact Fees			2.00

Infrastructure is in Deficient Condition - And everyone is pleased in Happy Valley, (in particular the Fire Chief who now has four stations). However, consider the implications if the current Happy Valley residents and businesses had only shown the earlier commitment to construct a single station when, based upon their adopted standards, they should have constructed two stations? Clearly three more stations would be needed on the path to General Plan "build-out". We can easily dismiss as completely inequitable the possibility of requiring the remaining future home and business owners to finance all three remaining stations. But would it be fair and equitable to charge new residents

the $400 per home and new businesses the $0.20 per business square foot in order to build the remaining two stations required to meet the N.F.P.A. standards?

The simple and direct answer is no. The Happy Valley community has not (with only one station constructed at half build-out) demonstrated their full and complete commitment to meeting the N.F.P.A. standards, and as a result would not have a strong case to assert that others who build after them need to contribute towards the construction of multiple (two) fire stations at a higher level of service (LOL) by including the "missing" second station.[4]

The service provided by the single existing station is the community's *de facto* (or "in fact") standard service level. With one station, the contributed equity to build the single station would be half of the impact fee proposed in Table 1-1, or $200/residential unit and $0.10/square foot of business space, respectively (see Table 1-6, following).

Table 1-6
Impact Fee at Deficient Condition

	Number of Units	Existing Contribution	Amount Collected
Residential Units	3,750	$200.00	$750,000
Business S.F.	12,500,000	$0.10	$1,250,000
Amount Contributed by Existing Community			$2,000,000
Cost of One New Station			$2,000,000
Station(s) built with Community's Contribution			1.00

If Happy Valley has only built one station when the General Plan is at half build-out, we would be forced to conclude that the District is currently *deficient* by one station. If the future residents were asked to pay at a rate that would build two stations (the $400/$0.20 rates) the District would have three stations at build-out, one financed and built by the first half of the community, and *two* financed and built by the second half of the community. The first half of the community would, in effect "inherit" one half of a station at no cost to themselves. In short, Happy Valley would fail the proportionality test required of the Dolan decision. The inequity would then be exacerbated when the community decides to build the final "missing" second station from a District-wide assessment or from annual General Fund receipts, paid for by the entire community, including those who just paid for the two new stations.

The only truly equitable option is for the District to adopt impact fees at the $200/residence and $0.10/business square foot rates. Adoption of this fee would be referred to as the ***Community Financial Commitment or Equity-based Impact Fees.*** Admittedly, the District will go further into a deficit position in terms of the number of required stations, from being deficient by one station at half build-out to a deficiency of two stations at final build-out, *but the ratio of deficiency (or overall proportionality) would remain a constant 50% of the stations needed at either time.* The community, if they are truly serious about meeting the NFPA recommended standard, would then need to assess the entire community in some fashion to raise the needed money in some fashion for the remaining two stations either in the form of an assessment or dedication of general receipts of the District.

Infrastructure - Excess Capacity - One final but important scenario remains and must be considered. In this scenario the existing residents of Happy Valley were the industrious sort and (at half build-out) had constructed three stations when they were at the point when they only needed two stations. Clearly there is demonstrable excess capacity in each of the three existing stations. In this case the Happy Valley's current *de facto* standard would be well above the *de jure* or target standard. Statistically, each of the three stations would have approximately 1/3 excess capacity (for providing services) and should be busy only about two-thirds of the time. Should the impact fee be limited only to the marginal $200 per residence and $0.10 per business square foot required to construct the one remaining required station? If so, the future residents receive a gift of the extra (third) station. There will be tough decisions ahead to be made by the Happy Valley District Council.

Marginal or Recoupment Fee? Hopefully, we would all agree that the Happy Valley District Council should adopt, *at a minimum*, the $200/residence and $0.10/square foot business space rates to insure that the fourth station would be built. This would be referred to as the ***marginal needs-based*** fee. This clearly would be a benevolent gesture, giving the new residents and businesses, in effect, a free ride on the cost of the (already built and paid for) third station.

Or in the alternative, the Council can recognize that the $2,000,000 used to build the third station was little more than a loan from the existing community's General Fund, and needs to be repaid by the future community receiving an instantaneous level of fire protection the day they receive their occupancy permit[5], through the imposition and collection of impact fees.[6] In this case, the $400/residence and $0.20/square foot of business space impact fees should be adopted, imposed and collected. The impact fee would accumulate $4,000,000 through build-out, $2,000,000 required to repay the General Fund in delayed revenue (for Station #3) and the $2,000,000 necessary to build the fourth station. This would be referred to as the ***Fair Share at General Plan Build-out-based*** fee. And more importantly, at General Plan built-out, long term equity would be achieved as each home and business would have contributed the same $400 per residence and $0.20 per square foot.

However, it is not possible to accept and support the idea that the proportionality test, when it limits the amount of the impact fee due to existing deficiencies, is a reasonable argument, but reject it when

it indicates that there is excess capacity in the existing system. The issues in developing impact fees are often complex, but are best reached when equity between existing and future users is the target. Such equity is the target of this Report.

CHAPTER ORGANIZATION

Within Chapter 3 there could be three cost/fee tables that summarize three cost schedules at the end of the Chapter. The schedules at the end of the Chapter are:

The first schedule, 3.1, the ***Allocation of Project Cost Estimates*** identifies the project, its costs and the relationship, in a percentage, to development.

Marginal Needs-based Impact Fee - This schedule, 3.2, will identify the impact fees that would need to be adopted to meet the basic capital needs identified in the Report for that infrastructure.

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

Community Financial Commitment or Equity-based Impact Fees - Schedule, 3.3 would identify the cost (in current nominal dollar value) of the existing infrastructure, including land, physical improvements and capital equipment. This is the average amount that has been"invested"by the current community of residents and businesses. This equity will be expressed in terms of the cost to construct or acquire the assets at current costs.

If the average "equity" (for detached dwelling for example) on this Table is greater then the average cost on the previous "Marginal Needs" Table, then the infrastructure system is "front-ended" or has excess capacity. Earlier residents and businesses of the community have put more of the system into place than will the remaining unbuilt portions of the community, (as they build). The existing community has advanced money to build capacity into the infrastructure system to meet the needs of residents and businesses not yet there! The scenario where Happy Valley had already built three fire stations while it only had the current demands for two stations is an good example of a *front-ended* system.

Adoption of this level of impact fee would allow the District to claim that *new development is not being required to pay to eliminate existing deficiencies.*

However, if the average *equity* (again using a detached dwelling as an example) is less than the average cost on the previous *marginal-needs* table (for the same detached dwelling), it is an indication that system construction has been lagging or is currently *deficient*. When the marginal needs are greater than the *equity*, the fees are limited to the *equity* figures, based upon the argument that it would inequitable to require future residents and businesses to contribute greater amounts than have the existing residents and businesses. Where marginal needs are greater than current equity, there is no need for the third table (Fair Share at General Plan Build-out) in these cases. In short, if the existing community has not been inclined to construct an infrastructure system proportionally as the community developed, what basis does the community have to require the future residents to invest more, thus by eliminating, to some degree, the deficiencies created by the existing community? The answer is, there can be no such rational argument.

Distribution of Existing Impact Fee Fund Balance. The current District Development Impact Fee Fund has a positive balance of $194,811 and was created to finance various infrastructure needed as new residents and businesses locate in newly created homes and buildings. There are no specific restrictions on the monies, beyond the restriction to be used on improvements within the Fund title and used within Government Code §66000 specifications within a reasonable time frame.

Chapter Endnotes

1. The firm had been previously known as *Management Services Institute*, but the same partners reorganized as *Revenue & Cost Specialists, L.L.C.*.

2. For greater detail of each project, refer to the District's *Master Facilities Plan* in Appendix A.

3. "Happy Valley" has been used as an imaginary community for purposes of DIF example for about nine years. Clearly no insult is intended to any real or imagined community of Happy Valley. It is also a Happy Valley because there is no inflation and the value of a dollar remains nominal.

4. Barring the specific definitions of number and location of fire stations in a large specific plan.

5. Actually, the permitted structure receives fire protection services as it is being constructed.

6. This example assumes that each of the existing three stations is debt-free and owned out-right.

Chapter Two

Demographics and Findings

This Chapter provides an inventory of developed and land available for development within the District's boundaries and presents a summary of recommended Development Impact Fees detailed in the following chapters of this Report. There remain a number of development opportunities for residential, lodging, commercial and industrial expansions. This Report is limited to those parcels *currently* within the Board's service area and no annexations are included.

LAND USE ASSUMPTIONS

The following is a discussion of the inventory of developed and land available for development within the boundaries of the Carpinteria-Summerland Fire Protection District service area. The inventory of available land within the entire District limits forms the base for distribution of the estimated costs of impacts from new development. The developed land inventory forms the base for distributing the cost of the existing infrastructure for comparison and for the *de facto* identification of the existing levels of service (LOS) provided by those existing infrastructure.

Table 2-1, below, provides the inventory of all private land uses contained within the current District boundaries[1]. The acreage amounts indicated on Table 2-2, and page 17, are based on a land use inventory and staff analysis by City of Carpinteria and Santa Barbara County of privately held parcels.[2] The detailed land-use database can be found in Appendix B at the end of the Report.

Table 2-1
Detailed Land Use Inventory

Total – Land Use Database	Developed		Available		Total	
	Acres	# of Units	Acres	# of Units	Acres	# of Units
Estate Dwellings	850.0	88	2,168.0	1,084	3,018.0	1,172
Detached Dwellings	2,177.0	3,029	565.3	841	2,742.3	3,870
Attached Dwellings	133.0	1,909	1.0	3	134.0	1,912
Mobile Home Dwellings	101.0	850	1.0	8	102.0	858
Commercial Lodging	16.0	579	1.0	36	17.0	615
Commercial/Office Uses	92.0	1,001,880	36.0	394,600	128.0	1,396,480
Industrial Uses	127.0	1,659,636	26.0	332,400	153.0	1,992,036
Total – District Boundaries	3,496.0	- - -	2,798.3	- - -	6,294.3	- - -
Private Residences	3,261.0	5,876	2,735.3	1,936	5,996.3	7,812
Commercial Lodging Rooms	133.0	1,909	1.0	3	134.0	1,912
Business Square Feet	219.0	2,661,516	62.0	727,000	281.0	3,388,516

Land Use Definitions. This Report classifies properties as either one of three residential land uses or two different categories of business development. These Development Impact Fee schedule land use categories are described[3] following:

Residential Land Uses:

- **Estate Detached Dwellings** - Corresponds to an allowable use within various County and City land use designations but generally indicates a detached residential dwelling in excess of 2,700 square feet (see Chapter Three text).

- **Detached Dwellings** - Refers to a detached residential dwelling generally 2,700 square feet or less. This category would include a mobile or modular home erected on an individual parcel as opposed to in a mobile home park. It includes detached condominiums, i.e. land with common ownership but the residential dwellings that look and function as detached dwellings.

- **Attached Dwellings** - Refers to all residential dwellings constructed attached or contiguous to other like residential dwellings. Residential dwellings commonly referred to as condominiums, townhouses and apartments would be included in this category.

- **Mobile Home Residential** - This category would be limited to the construction of mobile home pads for mobile homes in a mobile home park setting.

Business/Commerce Land Uses:

- **Commercial Lodging** - This category refers to the construction of hotel, motel or other commercial units constructed for temporary residency.

- **Commercial Uses** - As utilized in this Report, commercial uses include the general category of retail services and thus includes outlets ranging from restaurants to auto repair shops to shopping centers. This category also includes the service commercial, general commercial, general office, medical and dental office. Convalescent or congregate care facilities are included within this fee category.

- **Industrial Uses** - As utilized in this Report, business uses include the general category of manufacturing or industrial services and thus includes outlets ranging from auto repair shops to light manufacturing.

Definitions of Land Use Status. For each of the major land use categories detailed above and on Table 2-2, land is categorized as either *Developed* or *Available*. Definitions regarding the status of each land use are as follows:

Developed Acreage - Includes land in the District which is fully developed and is in conformance with the zoning designation for that area, or land which has received a building permit but which is not yet constructed. Acreage in this category may also include non-conforming use areas of the District which contain extensive development prior to annexation or before changes to the General Plan were made.

RCS has made no request for projections regarding properties which are currently classified as "Developed" but which may undergo redevelopment in the future. The District may wish to establish a policy now about how to charge impact fees for these redeveloping properties, especially in the situation where an older property (i.e., a building constructed in the 1960's) may never have paid an impact fee to the District.

Available Acreage - Refers to all non-public available acreage located within the agency (and limited to only the portions of parcel that can be developed). This category also includes any properties that are currently developed but anticipated to be redeveloped in the future resulting in greater density[4].

Table 2-2
Summary of Developed and Available Acres

	Developed Acres	% of Total	Available Acres	% of Total	Total Acres
Estate Detached Dwellings	850.0	13.5%	2,168.0	34.5%	3,108.0
Detached Dwellings	2,177.0	34.6%	565.3	9.0%	2,742.3
Attached Dwellings	133.0	2.1%	1.0	0.0%	134.0
Mobile Home Dwellings	101.0	1.6%	1.0	0.0%	102.0
Commercial Lodging	16.0	0.2%	1.0	0.0%	17.0
Commercial/Office	92.0	1.5%	36.0	0.6%	128.0
Industrial	127.0	2.0%	26.0	0.4%	153.0
Total	3,496.0	55.5%	2,798.3	44.5%	6,294.3

Table 2-2, previous page, provides a summary of the detailed land use inventory, limited to privately held property and only the portion of publicly held land that can be developed, (e.g the construction of a detached dwelling unit on a larger but substantially unusable property), provided on Table 2-1. County and City staff's land use inventory reveals that there are presently 3,496.0 acres of privately-held developed land within the current District boundaries. Conversely, there remain 2,798.3 acres of available or substantially undeveloped (or available) land in the agency. Available land represent approximately 44.5% of the total 6,294.3 privately held acres within the Carpinteria-Summerland Fire Protection District boundaries. Not surprisingly, detached dwellings (includes estate-sized dwellings) designated land constitutes the greatest amount (91.6%) of available acreage of all the land uses.

Business Development. In order to assess the costs of impact from commercial or industrial building intensification or building expansions, this Report includes a calculation of impact fees both on an acreage basis and per gross square foot basis for commercial and industrial development. In order to accomplish this, County and City planning staff have, where necessary, estimated the average square feet of building coverage developed per net acre of land (often referred to as the average FAR, or Floor Area Ratio), shown following:

Commercial Development - 10,890 Gross Square Feet per Acre (about 25% F.A.R.)
Industrial Development - 13,068 Gross Square Feet per Acre (about 30% F.A.R.)

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

District staff have identified $12,267,247 in needed and desired capital improvement projects. These are additional capital needs and not replacements of existing or aging facilities and are thus are in some part attributable to new development. The projects that expand service delivery capacity and are generally required through increased development that will result from General Plan build-out of both the City of Carpinteria and Santa Barbara County (District area). The $12,247,247 figure is mitigated by the existing $194,811 in of-setting Development Fund balance and an additional $2,000,000 anticipated from the sale of existing assets for a net projected cost of $10,052,436 ($12,247,247 in capital needs less $2,194,811 in other sources). The adoption of the recommended the *Community Financial Commitment or Equity-based* impact fees, as supported by the calculations in this Report (Schedule 3.3), would not finance all of the needed capital facilities but would raise approximately $4.8 million towards the expansion of facilities, vehicles[5]. The District will then need to determine a revenue source for the $5,243,270 shortfall in meeting all of the District's long term capital needs, either development or replacement generated. It is important to note that this Report does not address vehicle replacement needs.

Based on these costs and the schedules found at the end of Chapter Three 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 commercial and industrial land uses. Schedule 2.1, found at the end of this Chapter, provides a summary of the recommended Development Impact Fees for each type of infrastructure and land use category.

The total recommended maximum DIFs for each land use are also summarized below.

Table 2-4
Summary of Proposed 2007-08 Development Impact Fee Schedule
(at Maximum Fee Amounts)

Land Use	Recommended Development Impact Fees
Estate Detached Dwelling Units (1)	$1,467/Dwelling Unit
Detached Dwelling Units	$1,467/Dwelling Unit
Attached) Dwelling Units	$1,237/Dwelling Unit
Mobile Home Dwelling Units	$1,631/Dwelling Unit
Commercial Lodging (hotel/motel) Units	$886/Lodging Unit
Commercial/Office Uses	$2.12/Square Foot
Industrial Uses	$0.18/Square Foot

(1) Plus $0.362 per square foot beyond the basic 2,700 square feet detached dwelling model.

[This space left vacant to place the Chapter Endnotes on a single page].

Chapter Endnotes

1 No annexations have been included in the land-use database.

2. The figures are consistent with the most recent County Land Use Element as well as the City of Carpinteria General Plan.

3. Santa Barbara County General Plan, Land Use Element, Table 2: Build-out by Planning Area and Land Use Designations, Community Planning Area : Carpinteria, page II-165.

4. Reconstruction of any razed buildings not resulting in any greater square footage (or more dwelling units) would not have any impact fee imposed. As ana example, if a 20,000 square foot commercial building is razed and a new 20,000 square foot building is constructed in it place, not additional demand is created..

4. The impact fee collection figure may be higher or lower depending upon the ultimate size of the roughly 1,000 estate detached dwellings to be built and the number of square feet of business space constructed. Up-sizing of demand by razing existing aged structures and constructing at a greater density is also difficult to estimate.

Chapter Three

Fire Suppression Facilities, Vehicles, and Equipment

The Existing System. The Fire District currently responds to calls-for-service from two existing stations to calls-for-service within District boundaries. The two stations are:

- Fire Station #1, located at 911 Walnut Avenue in Carpinteria, is a complex of a number of buildings on an approximately 36,450 square foot parcel. The structures include:

  A 6,730 square foot square foot station with living quarters.
  A 1,450 square foot annex building (additional living quarters).
  A 760 square foot utility room.
  A 441 square foot garage.
  A 363 square foot (pad) three-story drying tower.

- Fire Station #2 is 2,350 square feet and is located at 2375 Lillie Avenue in Summerland.

The land acquisition and structure replacement costs of the two existing stations is approximately $8,827,139. The administrative staff is currently working out of rented facilities. This rented facility is not considered an on-going asset.

Given the service area and current calls-for-service demand, the District also has acquired a sizable fleet of District-owned and equipped response and prevention units consisting of:

- A KME Type I engine,
- A Pierce-Lance Type I engine,
- A Van Pelt Type I engine,
- A Pierce Type III engine,
- A Rescue Squad vehicle,
- Three Chevrolet utility trucks,
- Two Chevrolet Tahoe command vehicles, and;
- One Ford staff SUV.

The total investment in the vehicle compliment and equipment is $2,055,000. State or County vehicles and equipment sometime stored at local stations, have not been included in the above figures. The District's has invested $177,250 in computers, electronic gear and communications equipment, $88,530 in living quarters furniture and appliances, $83,360 in fire specialty equipment and tools and finally $149,340 in miscellaneous supplies. Additionally, there is

$194,811 in the existing Fire Suppression Facility, Vehicle and Equipment Development Impact Fee Fund. The total investment in fire suppression infrastructure is $11,575,430. However, this document and the Master Facilities Plan proposes the sale (and minor relocation) of existing Station #2 and thus the replacement cost of that asset ($2,324,296) has been removed and an estimated sale of the facility/parcel (@ $2,000,000) has been added thus reducing the replacement value of the existing facilities, vehicles and equipment infrastructure by a net of $324,296 to $11,251,134.

The current replacement value of the continuing station, parcels, response fleet and specialty equipment is approximately $11,251,134. This figure represents the cost to replace the existing District response capability at current land acquisition , vehicle, equipment and structure construction costs. The relevance of this figure will be established later in this Chapter.

Demand Upon Infrastructure Created by the Development of Underdeveloped or Available Parcels. While it can be said that numerous factors are considered when determining the number and location of fire stations in any agency, it can be stated without any logical argument that all new private development in the District will have an affect on the District's current ability to respond to fire, rescue, and emergency calls-for-service. The affect, 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 the existing station, as large-scale development is often likely to do, the distances (and thus response times) will increase, taking the existing pumper, rescue and truck 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. Or stated in another way, if development continues without the addition of fire stations, the existing station could be overwhelmed, making a timely response for emergency service a virtual coin flip. That is, will the existing engine companies be available to respond to your needs or will they most likely be out-of-service on a call in a different part of the community?

The Purpose of the Fee. In order to continue to be able to respond to an ever-increasing number of expected calls, the District staff has determined the need for the addition of one station and an expansion of the existing fleet to accommodate known and expected development. Having the right type and number of fire stations in the right locations will enable policy makers, the Chief and District Board, to house firefighters, apparatus, and equipment in a rational way for maximum use of resources.

Conversely, the penalties are high and extremely visible, for poor fire station location or no facility location. Adverse effects are felt by the District staff, the Board, and indeed by the existing taxpayers. With poor locations or an inadequate number of locations, response times, (via distance or out-of-service due to a previous call), can become excessive, and if a tragedy occurs, the incident will be well publicized.

Often, response time for the first-in unit (only) is mistakenly considered the only factor. This, however, can be a grave error. Instead, response time must consider *all* the suppression/rescue forces necessary to place the incident under control. If 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, the five minute response becomes insignificant and irrelevant. Thus an increase in 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 District plans to meet the demands of additional calls-for-service.

The Use of the Fee. The revenues raised 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 a new station or expand the response capacity of the existing station. Conversely, the Fire Suppression Facilities, Vehicles, and Equipment Development Impact Fee receipts would not be used to ***repair*** the existing fire station or ***fully replace*** any existing emergency response vehicles. However, DIF revenues could be used to change the use of a structure to add additional capacity, such as the recent relocation of the administrative staff to rented facilities and the reconstruction of that vacated space as expanded living quarters thus allowing an expansion of Station #1 response staff. In effect the District traded one asset, that being administrative office space, for another asset, additional living quarters allowing the station many more years of service.

Infrastructure Plan. Additional facilities are planned to come on-line, as needed, as development creates additional demands beyond the capability (volume or calls and distance) of the existing stations. The original 2003-04 *Master Facilities Plan* identified/planned for the need to reconstruct or expand both existing Stations #1 and #2 and construct a third (additional) station. It also identified the need for response vehicles for the expanded facilities. However, plans change with time and the District staff has reconsidered the need for (and staffing of) three stations and now recommends a different arrangement of response facilities. The limited parcel size of the existing Station #2 and the potential for acquisition of that parcel by CALTRANS for the widening of SR-101 offers a new opportunity.

The proposed fire suppression capital project/acquisitions (see *Master Facilities Plan)* included as Appendix A) will be required at General Plan build-out of both the City of Carpinteria and County of Santa Barbara, likely a 30-40 year time span. The proposed fire suppression capital

projects are not placed in order of priority. Priority of construction or acquisition will be based upon the pace and location of actual development as approved by the two previously mentioned land-use authorities. The revised capital expansion plans include:

■ **FD-01, Relocate Northerly Station #2** to a nearby 29,430 square foot parcel and construct a 5,886 square foot two-bays wide by two vehicles deep station. One of the four- bay parking spots would have a large hydraulic lift for on-site vehicle maintenance. When not in use it would house a large response vehicle. Approximately 75% of the cost of this project is reconstruction of the existing station and would not be financed by development impact fees and the remaining 25% of the station cost is expansion and appropriate for development impact fee financing. Hopefully the District can acquire a 2.66 acre parcel so that Station #2, the administrative headquarters offices, an EOC facility and a training facility can be located on a single parcel.

■ **FD-02, Expand Southerly Station #1** by 2,784 square feet. The addition would be a 1,392 square foot, single door wide by two vehicles deep bay with an additional 1,392 square feet of living space above the bay. The facility may need to be a non-contiguous structure. The existing Station #1 can serve the existing calls-for-service in the southerly area adequately and sufficiently and this expansion is required to meet additional demand for service thus the expansion is 100% attributed to new development. No additional land is required.

■ **FD-03, Relocate the Administrative Offices** (from the current rented facilities) by acquiring a half acre and constructing 4,000 square feet of office space for management, fire prevention inspection, development processing (construction plan check and inspection) and the incident and personnel records storage functions. Again the opportunity exists to find a 2.66 acre parcel with adequate space to accommodate projects FD-01, FD-03, FD-04 and FD-05. New administrative office will support the roughly 75% of the general Plan build-out demand that currently exists. The remaining amount has been allocated to new development creating the remaining general plan build-out demand.

■ **FD-04, Construct an Emergency Operations Center (EOC)** that is approximately thirty foot by forty foot open room to be equipped with emergency back-up communications equipment and prepared emergency plans, maps and documents. This facility would need an approximately ½ acre parcel and, to maximize management capabilities, would need to be constructed contiguous to the administrative facility. The EOC facility could be used for District Board meetings, staff meetings, training (see FD-05) and could be made available to residents in the area for small public meetings such as youth sports organizations, clubs and such. Roughly 75% of the general plan build-out calls-f0r-service demand currently exists, so 75% has been allocated to existing development (requiring a separate revenue source such as a tax measure) with the remaining 25% allocated to new development.

■ **FD-05, Construct Training Tower/Drafting Pit** on a one acre parcel. The training facility would consist of a four-story live fire tower for hands-on manipulated training, a drafting pit, pipe trench, possibly an airplane fuselage and other various training apparatus. The addition of a training facility would allow for more coordinated training in a single facility and safer water draft testing. This important component facility is also planned to be located contiguous to the proposed relocated Station #2 - administrative headquarters location along with the EOC facility creating a centralized management/Emergency Operations Center/training complex. The EOC facility would act as the training facility classroom. As an alternative to the District incurring the full construction and maintenance costs at this site, the District will investigate the potential for establishment of a cooperative training facility with a nearby fire district under a joint use agreement. The District has not to date had a dedicated training facility and it will support the roughly 75% of the ultimate General Plan build-out calls-for-service demand that currently exist, the remaining 25% has been allocated to new development.

■ **FD-06, Acquire a Additional Type I Engine with Aerial Attack Capability (Telesquirt).** Based upon the anticipated additional 33% increase in calls-for-service, a fourth Type I engine/pumper will ultimately be necessary to ensure adequate response capability to the probable simultaneous calls-for-service. This acquisition would allow for two Type I engines to be assigned to each of the northerly and southerly stations. However, given that the remaining development is likely to include both over-height (on small parcels) and over-width buildings, the District will also need to acquire hydraulic lift and aerial fluid stream capability. This Type I engine would be assigned to the station with the most over-height and over wide pad in its first-in response area.

■ **FD-07, Acquire a Type III Fire Engine.** There will be an increased need for rapid response brush rigs that are better suited for quick response to wildland interface areas contiguous that continue to be developed. Upon acquisition, each of the two stations would have one Type III rapid response brush engine.

■ **FD-08, Acquire a Multi-use Support Vehicle** - This vehicle primarily serves as a coordinated communication center on large scale incidents that require communications with other public agencies such as law enforcement, local public works agencies and other fire agencies. The vehicle or trailer would have high intensity lights that can be aimed for improving the visibility of an involved structure and high speed air bottling capability. This vehicle would also serve as an on-site supply warehouse and hot kitchen/storage canteen for long-term responses.

■ **FD-09, Improve the Wildland Patrol/Brush Inspection Vehicle.** This existing vehicle, essentially a flat-bed truck, is used for inspection and is often assigned to inspect brush areas. The improvement would consist of installing a 100 gallon tank and small pump to allow the firefighter/inspector to respond to any brush fire that may occur while out inspecting brush areas.

The proposed projects and costs are identified on Schedule 3.1 and are detailed in the Master Facilities Plan. The net cost of completing the fire suppression system is a net cost to the District of $10,072,436, (total of $12,267,247 less $2,194,811 in existing Development Impact Fee fund balance and other sources).

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 District's existing residents and business community by constructing new facilities, or the result will be a deterioration in the level of service provided both to the existing residents and future citizens and businesses within the Carpinteria-Summerland Fire Protection District boundaries. 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 Board's land uses. Then, a determination of the costs of future capital facilities necessary to meet this increased demand was made. The following section illustrates the relative impact from each land use on fire services and facilities.

While the majority of these requests for service were made by the Carpinteria-Summerland Fire Protection District citizens from their residences, there were also some requests generated from business uses within the District. A survey of each land use and its existing effect on requests for calls-for-service was conducted to project the impact of future development on fire services. Table 3-1, following, summarizes an analysis of the average number of calls-for-service per year received by the District (over a two year period). The breakdown of calls into the land uses that generated them, divided by the number of developed units (during the same period) generated a "calls-for-service" factor.

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

Table 3-1
Calls Generated by Land Use (average over a two year period)

Land Use	Developed Dwellings or Acres	Calls for Service	Total Calls per Dwelling or Acre
Detached Dwelling Units	3,117	419	0.134/Unit
Attached Dwelling Units	1,909	216	0.113/Unit
Mobile Home Units	850	127	0.149/Unit
Commercial Lodging Units	579	47	0.081/Unit
Commercial Use Acres	92	194	2.109/Acre
Industrial Use Acres	127	27	0.213/Acre

As an example, there were approximately 419 calls-for-service per year that generated a response to one of the 3,117 detached dwelling units in the District. The result indicates that, on average, each detached dwelling will generate 0.134 calls per year. The same analysis was undertaken for the business land uses. Since these calls-for-service by land use are an average, they can be used to project the number of additional calls that could be expected in the future by multiplying the average calls per residential unit or business acre by the number of anticipated number of new residential dwellings or business square feet.

Only requests for fire and rescue services to ***privately held*** property were counted. Requests for service to public property, such as parks and public ROW or intersections, were excluded which 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.

Of residential land uses, an attached dwelling unit is slightly less likely to require an emergency fire service response at 0.113 annual responses *per unit*, than a detached dwelling unit at 0.134 annual responses *per unit*. Commercial and industrial acre development is shown to generate 2.109 and 0.213 responses *per acre* of developed land respectively. However, it should be noted that while there appear to be fewer calls to industrial properties, significant training is required to be prepared for business responses, (i.e., mass casualty and hazardous and flammable materials training).

Table 3-2, following, indicates, that on a comparative basis (and at average densities at build-out), an acre of commercial lodging development creates the highest demand for fire services, thus the impact fee for that use is the highest on an acreage basis. Attached dwelling units create the highest demand of the typical dwelling land uses at 1.582 calls per acre. Detached dwellings on estate land uses are typically larger than 2,700 square feet.

Table 3-2
Fire Suppression/Medic Calls Generated by Land Use

Land Use	Average Calls for Service	Units per Acre	Total Calls per Acre
Detached Dwelling Units	0.134	2	0.268/Acre
Attached Dwelling Units	0.113	14	1.582/Acre
Mobile Home Dwelling Units	0.149	8	1.192/Acre
Commercial Lodging Units	0.081	36	2.196/Acre
Commercial Use Acres	2.109		2.109/Acre
Industrial Use Acres	0.213		0.213/Acre

Based on the existing rate of responses by land use, the increased number of fire service responses generated by future residential and business development was extrapolated. This was accomplished by multiplying the average responses per unit or acre, established in Table 3-1, by the number of probable units, rooms or acres. This data is summarized in Table 3-3, following.

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

Table 3-3
Additional Annual Fire Responses Generated
by Future Development (Rounded)

Land Use	Fire Responses Per Unit	Available Units or Acres	Additional Fire Responses
Estate Detached Dwelling Units	0.134/unit	1,084 units	145.26 calls
Detached Dwelling Units	0.134/unit	841 units	112.69 calls
Attached Dwelling Units	0.113/unit	3 units	0.34 calls
Mobile Home Dwelling Units	0.149/unit	8 units	1.19 calls
Commercial Lodging Units	0.081/unit	36 units	2.92 calls
Commercial Uses	2.109/acre	36 acres	75.92 calls
Industrial Uses	0.213acre	26 acres	5.54 calls
Total (rounded)	—	—	343.86 calls

Resulting Marginal Needs-based Impact Fees. The adoption of the resulting Marginal Needs-based impact fee, through build-out would pay for all of the proposed expansions and equipment, but may not necessarily be fair or equitable. Table 3-4, following, indicates the impact fee necessary to impose and collect the $4,494,071 necessary for Fire Suppression Facilities Vehicles and Equipment expansion (expansion of stations #1 and #2, construction of station #3 and acquisition of the three fully equipped new response vehicles).

[This space left vacant to place the following table on one page].

Table 3-4
Marginal Needs-based Fire Suppression Facilities, Vehicles and Equipment Development Impact Fees

Land Use	Allocation of Costs	Total Equity Per Unit or SF
Estate Detached Dwelling Units	$1,898,426	$1,751/Unit
Detached Dwelling Units	$1,472,856	$1,751/Unit
Attached Dwelling Units	$4,431	$1,477/Unit
Mobile Home Dwelling Units	$15,579	$1,947/Unit
Commercial Lodging Units	$38,111	$1,079/Unit
Commercial/Office	$992,290	$2.51/S.F.
Industrial Uses	$72,379	$0.22/S.F.

The Relationship Between the Use of the Fee and the Type of Development Paying the Fee. The *use of the fee* is a equivalent to the *need for the fee*. The impact fee would be collected as the development occurs (generally at building permit). As the development occurs, the impact is generated. The DIF would be put to use to expand station #1, relocate station #2 and acquire additional emergency response vehicles necessary to respond to those additional calls-for-service, *without reducing the capability of responding to calls-for-service 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. A replacement value of the existing fire infrastructure (stations, response fleet and related safety equipment) of $11,251,134 was referenced. This represents the current investment or *financial commitment* towards fire suppression capability by the existing District's community. When this figure is distributed over the existing community in the same manner as the future costs, by the land use demands, an investment, or financial *commitment* (or *equity* for that matter) per unit can be determined. As an example, each detached dwelling unit has "invested" a significant $1,467 into fire suppression capital. A large figure like this is not uncommon in a small or non-urban district, given that there is a minimum or base capital infrastructure necessary to be a functioning station, regardless of how few residents and businesses that may need the service. There is no rational argument for requiring any greater or lessor financial commitment from future businesses or citizens.

The current community's commitment has been to establish a two-station capability paid for via past DIFs and General Fund receipts. To allow future residents to benefit by use of all of the capital needs without contributing additional assets, would be clearly unfair to the existing residents. Table 3-5, below, summarizes the distribution of the $11,251,134 in replacement cost to the existing community, (Schedule 3.3 shows it in greater detail).

Table 3-5
District Financial Commitment or Equity -based (Dolan Test) Impact Fees

Land Use	Allocation of Equity	Total Equity Per Unit or SF
Estate Detached Dwellings (1)	$129,057	$1,467/Unit
Detached Dwelling Units	$4,442,194	$1,467/Unit
Attached Dwelling Units	$2,360,901	$1,237/Unit
Mobile Home Dwelling Units	$1,386,113	$1,631/Unit
Commercial Lodging Units	$513,283	$886/Unit
Commercial/Office Uses	$2,123,527	$2.12/S.F.
Industrial Uses	$296,058	$0.18/S.F.

(1) Plus an additional 0.362 per square foot over 2,700 square feet, see following text)

Estate Properties Adjustment. The Carpinteria-Summerland Fire Protection District is experiencing the added demands of particularly large detached dwelling units requiring a response consisting of four or more engines. A typical detached dwelling unit will require a minimum fire response of three engines. The six firefighters from two of the engines (three firefighters from two engines) would be available for the interior attack while the (at least) three firefighters from the third engine would remain outside of the structure to ensure the safety of the six firefighters in the interior of the structure maintaining engine pumping management and fire attack planning. Thus it has become necessary to identify a *basic* or maximum size detached dwelling that can be fought properly by a team of six interior attacking firefighters.

According to the text of Fire Command 1A - Command Principles for Company officers Student Manual, *every firefighter on scene should be able to supply 80 to 100 gpm*[1]. The calculation in Table 3-6 will use 90 gpm as an average. Additionally the cubic feet of a structure (width x depth

x height) should be divided by 100, a constant to determine the number of 100 cubic feet increments[2]. Thus, three firefighters would be capable of 270 gallons per minute which covers 27,000 cubic feet divided by 20' in average height equals 1,350 square feet of floor space. As a result, the minimum response to a detached dwelling unit, three engines (again, two for interior and one outside), can adequately attack the interior of a 2,700 square foot residence (or less). A 2,700 square foot residential structure, the maximum that can be served by a three engine response team, is thus defined as size of a ***basic detached dwelling unit***.

Table 3-6
Calculation of Fire-fighting Capacity of a Single Engine and Identification of a *Basic* Detached Dwelling Unit

Capacity per Firefighter Capability (in gallons pumped per minute)	90
Number of Firefighters per Responding Engine	3
Gallons per Minute Capability for Three Firefighters	270
Constant of Cubic Feet Coverage per Gallon Pumped Capability	100
Total Cubic Feet Capability of Three Firefighters	27,000
Divided by Building Height (average twenty feet)	20
Building Square Feet Capability per Responding Engine	1,350
Engines Attacking Interior of ***Basic Detached Dwelling Unit***	2
Square Foot Size of ***Basic Detached Dwelling Unit***	2,700

Table 3-7 indicates the number of engines required to respond to the various sized *Detached Dwelling* units. Larger dwelling units require a greater (company) fire suppression response.

Table 3-7
Required Response by Size of Detached Dwelling Unit

Detached Dwelling Residence Sizes	Engine Response	Home in Square Feet
Basic Detached Dwelling Unit, 2,700 S.F. or Smaller	3	2,700
Basic Detached Dwelling Unit, 2,701 S.F. to 4,050 S.F.	4	4,050
Basic Detached Dwelling Unit, 4,051 S.F. to 5,400 S.F.	5	5,400
Basic Detached Dwelling Unit, 5,401 S.F. to 6,750 S.F.	6	6,750

The development impact fee that supports a three engine response team is $1,467 and thus a single additional engine response would be an additional $489, divided by 1,350 square feet results in an additional amount of $0.362 per square foot. *This amount of $0.362 per square foot should also be applied to home expansions over 2,700 square feet.*

Table 3-8, following identifies some of the key system attributes of the Fire suppression infrastructure inventory. The attributes identify that approximately 74.9% (or 1,028.02) of the total 1,371.88 annual calls-for-service at "build-out" are represented by the existing community who, unfortunately, have contributed a smaller proportion (71.5%) of the total financing of the entire system than that of the proportion of calls generated by that same group. The fire suppression response system yet to be built (by new development) represents about 28.6% of the fire suppression facilities, vehicles and required when the District is fully developed[3]. All of the above generally indicates that the District is slightly deficient in terms of the construction of (and replacement) fire suppression infrastructure. Or another way to state it is that the future District members will generate only 25.1% of the ultimate "build-out" calls-for-service, but would be asked to finance 28.6% of the total required infrastructure. It would clearly be unreasonable, (and certainly disproportional) to assume that the remaining 25.1% of the new calls-for-service generators would have to contribute the remaining 28.6% cost of the infrastructure.

Table 3-8
Comparison of Fire Suppression System Attributes

Infrastructure Factor	Existing Development	Future Development	Total at Build-out
Annual Calls-for-service	1,028.02	343.86	1,371.88
Percentage of Total	74.9%	25.1%	100.0%
Cost of Total Infrastructure	$11,251,134	$4,494,071	$15,745,205
Percentage of Total	71.5%	28.6%	100.0%

Of importance is the fact that the equity-based costs on Table 3-5 are lower, by nearly 16% of the marginal-needs based fees as demonstrated in Table 3-4. This indicates that the District has not been financially able to *increase* the existing infrastructure (stations and response equipment) capacity due to annual financial appropriations necessary to maintain an adequate schedule of maintenance or replacement of existing structures, vehicles and specialty equipment. Additionally, Table 3-6 shows the slight dis-proportionality of the current investment as opposed to the demands to be placed on future development.

RECOMMENDED IMPACT FEES

1. Since the equity position of the existing community is, unfortunately lesser than the marginal need-based fees, the existing Financial Commitment or Equity-based impact fees, as identified in Table 3-5 as detailed in Schedule 3.3, would be the most equitable fee schedule to adopt.

2. The District should also adopt the $0.362/square foot development impact fee to be imposed on any new Estate Detached Dwelling construction (over 2,700 square feet) or on the expansion of any existing detached dwelling over the basic detached dwelling of 2,700 square feet of floor space, per Schedules 3.3 and 3.4.

CHAPTER ENDNOTES

1. California Fire service Training and Education System, Second Edition, April 1995, Accredited by the Office of the State Fire Marshall, page SM23.2. Published by State Fire Training, Sacramento, California 95823-2034.

2. Ibid, page SM23.1.

3. There is an additional $5,243,270 in capital revenues (apart from DIF revenue) necessary to finance the replacement portions of the Master Facilities Plan that are not accommodating new development but are mere replacements of existing infrastructure accommodating existing demand (portion of Station #2), or are facilities here-to-for not owned by the District (i.e. training facility or EOC).

Schedule 3.1

Carpinteria–Summerland Fire Protection District
Development Impact Fee Calculation and Nexus Report 2008–09 Update
Allocation of Project Cost Estimates
Fire Suppression Facilities, Vehicles and Equipment

Line #	Description	Estimated Cost	Construction Needs Supported by Other Resources: Percent Need	Construction Needs Supported by Other Resources: Apportioned Dollar Cost	Construction Needs From New Development in the Entire District: Percent Need	Construction Needs From New Development in the Entire District: Apportioned Dollar Cost
FD-01	Relocate Northerly Station #2	$4,210,993	75.00%	$3,158,245	25.00%	$1,052,748
FD-02	Expand Southerly Station #1	$1,607,760	0.00%	$0	100.00%	$1,607,760
FD-03	Relocate the Administration Offices	$2,785,668	75.00%	$2,089,251	25.00%	$696,417
FD-04	Construct an Emergency Operations Center (EOC)	$954,416	75.00%	$715,812	25.00%	$238,604
FD-05	Construct Training Tower/Drafting Pit	$1,473,410	75.00%	$1,105,058	25.00%	$368,353
FD-06	Acquire a Type I Engine with Aerial Attack Capability (Telesquirt)	$675,000	25.00%	$168,750	75.00%	$506,250
FD-07	Acquire a Type III Fire Engine	$315,000	50.00%	$157,500	50.00%	$157,500
FD-08	Acquire a Multi-use Incident Support Vehicle	$225,000	75.00%	$168,750	25.00%	$56,250
FD-09	Improve the Wildland Patrol/Brush Inspection Vehicle	$20,000	75.00%	$15,000	25.00%	$5,000
	SUB-TOTAL ESTIMATED NEW PROJECT COSTS	$12,267,247	61.78%	$7,578,366	38.22%	$4,688,882
	LESS: Mitigating Revenues					
	Fire Suppression Facility Impact Fee Fund Balance	($194,811)	0.00%	$0	100.00%	($194,811)
	Sale of Property	($2,000,000)	100.00%	($2,000,000)	0.00%	$0
	SUB-TOTAL MITIGATING REVENUES	($2,194,811)	0.00%	($2,000,000)	0.00%	($194,811)
	Total - Fire Suppression Capital Project Needs	$10,072,436	55.38%	$5,578,366	44.62%	$4,494,071
						Forward to Schedule 3.2

NOTES:
1. Costs distribution based upon a the Fire Districts "Calls-for-Service" statistics.

Schedule 3.2

Carpinteria–Summerland Fire Protection District
Development Impact Fee Calculation and Nexus Report 2008–09 Update
Marginal Needs–based Impact Fees
Fire Suppression Facilities, Vehicles and Equipment

Proposed Land Use	Undeveloped Acres	Undeveloped Units	Call Generation Rate	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
Estate Detached (1)	2,168	1,084	0.134	145.26	42.24%	$1,898,426	$876	0.50	*$1,751 per Unit*
Detached Dwellings	565	841	0.134	112.69	32.77%	$1,472,856	$2,605	1.49	*$1,751 per Unit*
Attached Dwellings	1	3	0.113	0.34	0.10%	$4,431	$4,431	3.00	*$1,477 per Unit*
Mobile Home Dwellings	1	8	0.149	1.19	0.35%	$15,579	$15,579	8.00	*$1,947 per Unit*
Commercial Lodging	1	36	0.081	2.92	0.85%	$38,111	$38,111	36.00	*$1,059 per Unit*
Commercial/Office Uses	36	394,600	2.109	75.92	22.08%	$992,290	$27,564	10,961	*$2.51 per S.F.*
Industrial Uses	26	332,400	0.213	5.54	1.61%	$72,379	$2,784	12,785	*$0.22 per S.F.*
TOTAL	2,734			343.86	100.00%	$4,494,071	In Total Fire Suppression Capital Needs to Finish System		

NOTES:
(1). The impact fee is $1,467/Unit for the first 2,700 square feet and $0.362/square foot thereafter.

Schedule 3.3

Carpinteria–Summerland Fire Protection District
Development Impact Fee Calculation and Nexus Report 2008–09 Update
Community Financial Commitment or Equity–based Impact Fees
Fire Suppression Facilities, Vehicles and Equipment

Proposed Land Use	Developed Acres	Developed Units	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
Estate Detached (1)	850	88	0.134	11.79	1.15%	$129,057	$152	0.10	$1,467 per Unit
Detached Dwellings	2,177	3,029	0.134	405.89	39.48%	$4,442,194	$2,041	1.39	$1,467 per Unit
Attached Dwellings	133	1,909	0.113	215.72	20.98%	$2,360,901	$17,751	14.35	$1,237 per Unit
Mobile Home Dwellings	101	850	0.149	126.65	12.32%	$1,386,113	$13,724	8.42	$1,631 per Unit
Commercial Lodging	16	579	0.081	46.90	4.56%	$513,283	$32,080	36.19	$886 per Unit
Commercial/Office Uses	92	1,001,880	2.109	194.03	18.87%	$2,123,527	$23,082	10,890	$2.12 per S.F.
Industrial Uses	127	1,659,636	0.213	27.05	2.63%	$296,058	$2,331	13,068	$0.18 per S.F.
TOTAL	3,496	– – –	– – –	1,028.02	100.00%	$11,251,134	In Total Equity in Current Fire Suppression Assets		
						$6,502,843	In Equity in Existing Fire Facilities.		
						$177,250	In Equity in Existing Computer/Electronic/Radio Equipment.		
						$88,530	In Equity in Existing Station Furniture.		
						$149,340	In Equity in Existing Miscellaneous Supplies.		
						$83,360	In Equity in Existing Fire Specialty Equipment and Tools.		
						$2,055,000	In Equity in Current Response Vehicles and Equipment.		
						$2,194,811	In Equity in Mitigating Revenues		

NOTES:
(1). The impact fee is $1,467/dwelling unit for the first 2,700 square feet and $0.362/square foot thereafte

Appendix A

Master Facilities Plan

Carpinteria–Summerland Fire Protection District Master Facilities Plan Fire Suppression Facilities, Vehicles and Equipment		2008–09	2009–10	2010–11	2011–12	2012–13 Through Build–out	Project Build–out Total
FD–01	Relocate Northerly Station #2	$0	$0	$0	$0	$4,210,993	$4,210,993
FD–02	Expand Southerly Station #1	$0	$0	$0	$0	$1,607,760	$1,607,760
FD–03	Relocate the Administration Offices	$0	$0	$0	$0	$2,785,668	$2,785,668
FD–04	Construct an Emergency Operations Center (EOC)	$0	$0	$0	$0	$954,416	$954,416
FD–05	Construct Training Tower/Drafting Pit	$0	$0	$0	$0	$1,473,410	$1,473,410
FD–06	Acquire a Type I Engine with Aerial Attack Capability (Telesquirt)	$0	$0	$0	$0	$675,000	$675,000
FD–07	Acquire a Type III Fire Engine	$0	$0	$0	$0	$315,000	$315,000
FD–08	Acquire a Multi–use Incident Support Vehicle	$0	$0	$0	$0	$225,000	$225,000
FD–09	Improve the Wildland Patrol/Brush Inspection Vehicle	$0	$0	$0	$0	$20,000	$20,000
	Totals	$0	$0	$0	$0	$12,267,247	$12,267,247

October 2008

Notes:

1. Project timing is not a component of this project. As a result, all projects default to the "2012–13 to Build–out" column.

Carpinteria–Summerland F.P.D.
Master Facilities Plan Project Detail

Project Title:	*Program:*
Relocate Northerly Station #2	Fire Suppression Facilities, Vehicles and Equipment
Submitting Department(s):	*Project No.:*
District Administrative/Command Staff	FD–01

Project Description:
Relocate the existing station #2 to a larger two bays–wide by two vehicles–deep facility on a larger parcel. The bays would require 2,764 square feet leaving 992 square feet for mechanical/storage needs and 2,110 square feet for living space. The parcel would need to be approximately two–thirds of an acre but hopefully can be combined with the two acres required for the combined administrative headquarters, Emergency Operations Center (EOC) and training facility. One of the four structure's parking spaces (or one–half of a bay) would have a hydraulic lift to allow for fleet maintenance. NOTE: The order in which the proposed improvements are listed on this schedule does not necessarily reflect the order in which the facilities will be constructed or equipment will be acquired.

Justification/Requirement for Project:
Initially, the existing facility has a limited time as CALTRANS will require the parcel to widen SR–101. Rehabilitation of the aged structure is not an option as the building would remain earthquake non–compliant and the ceiling too low to be able to house the more modern fire response vehicles. This facility provides fire protection and emergency point of contact for the township of Summerland and the more westerly portions of the District. Future projections indicate a need to house additional fire response equipment and increased staffing levels. Hopefully, other District facility needs can be accomodated at the same site (see FD–03, FD–04 and FD–05).

Consequences of Not Completing Project:
The useful capacity of the structure has been reached if not exceeded. The increased requests for for service (demands) anticipated in the future will result in a shortage of space for equipment and personnel.

Reference Document:	*Project Timing:*
District management staff capital facilities planning.	The timing or scheduling of the capital construction or capital outlay acquisition described herein, was not included in the scope of this engagement, thus all project cost default to the "Build–out" column.

PROPOSED EXPENDITURES	*2008–09*	*2009–10*	*2010–11*	*2011–12*	*2012–13 to Build–out*	*Total all Years*
Design/Engineering/Admin.	$0	$0	$0	$0	$651,032	$651,032
Land Acquisition/Right of Way	$0	$0	$0	$0	$772,538	$772,538
Construction	$0	$0	$0	$0	$2,390,118	$2,390,118
Contingency	$0	$0	$0	$0	$161,865	$161,865
Equipment/Other	$0	$0	$0	$0	$235,440	$235,440
TOTAL COST	$0	$0	$0	$0	$4,210,993	$4,210,993

2008–09 DIF/MFP Update Action:
The facilities required at City/County General Plan build–out have been altered from a 3 station to a 2 station configuration with the administrative/EOC/training facilities being planned to be contiguous to the second (relocated) station.

Carpinteria–Summerland F.P.D.
Master Facilities Plan Project Detail

Project Title:	*Program:*
Expand Southerly Station #1	Fire Suppression Facilities, Vehicles and Equipment
Submitting Department(s):	*Project No.:*
District Administrative/Command Staff	FD–02

Project Description:
Expand the existing 9,744 square foot facility with an additional 2,784 square feet of bay/living quarters. The expansion would consist of a 1,392 square foot one bay–wide by two vehicle–deep configuration and thus be able to house two additional major–sized response vehicles. There would be also 1,392 square feet of living quarters constructed over the added bay that would create greater individual privacy. There are no current plans to relocate this station. NOTE: The order in which the proposed improvements are listed on this schedule does not necessarily reflect the order in which the facilities will be constructed or equipment will be acquired.

Justification/Requirement for Project:
This station will continue to be the main facility in the southerly area of the District. Current projections reflect the need to house additional emergency equipment due to increased alarm activity.

Consequences of Not Completing Project:
The building is the primary facility for housing emergency equipment and personel for the southerly area. The lack of adequate space for equipment and personel will compromise the District's emergency operations in the near future.

Reference Document:	*Project Timing:*
District management staff capital facilities planning.	The timing or scheduling of the capital construction or capital outlay acquisition described herein, was not included in the scope of this engagement, thus all project cost default to the "Build–out" column.

PROPOSED EXPENDITURES	*2008–09*	*2009–10*	*2010–11*	*2011–12*	*2012–13 to Build–out*	*Total all Years*
Design/Engineering/Admin.	$0	$0	$0	$0	$306,240	$306,240
Land Acquisition/Right of Way	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0
Construction	$0	$0	$0	$0	$1,113,600	$1,113,600
Contingency	$0	$0	$0	$0	$76,560	$76,560
Equipment/Other	$0	$0	$0	$0	$111,360	$111,360
TOTAL COST	$0	$0	$0	$0	$1,607,760	$1,607,760

2008–09 DIF/MFP Update Action:
The facilities required at City/County General Plan build–out have been altered from a 3 station to a 2 station configuration with the administrative/EOC/training facilities being planned to be contiguous to the second (relocated) station.

(c)

Carpinteria–Summerland F.P.D.
Master Facilities Plan Project Detail

Project Title:	*Program:*
Relocate the Administration Offices	Fire Suppression Facilities, Vehicles and Equipment
Submitting Department(s):	*Project No.:*
District Administrative/Command Staff	FD–03

Project Description:
Aquire land for, design and construct approximately 4,000 square feet of administrative office space for management, staff and incident records keeping, the fire marshall and plan check and inspection staff. Hopefully the EOC identified in FD–04 will also come to fruition as it includes an approximated 1,200 square foot EOC center that could be used for staff training if constructed contiguous to the administrative building. If it is not, then this facility would need to be increased by approximately 400 square feet. NOTE: The order in which the proposed improvements are listed on this schedule does not necessarily reflect the order in which the facilities will be constructed or equipment will be acquired.

Justification/Requirement for Project:
The District administrative and technical staff is currently working out of leased facilities having moved out of the limited Station #1 offices making that facility strictly a fire suppression/paramedic response structure. This action created additional living capacity for the existing fire–fighters. The relocation of the second station would allow for master planning of the remaining required support District facilities (FD–03, FD–04 and FD–05) at a single location thus allowing for maximum management capability.

Consequences of Not Completing Project:
The District would need to continue to lease space not contiguous to other fire facilities reducing maximum management capability.

Reference Document:	*Project Timing:*
District management staff capital facilities planning.	The timing or scheduling of the capital construction or capital outlay acquisition described herein, was not included in the scope of this engagement, thus all project cost default to the "Build–out" column.

PROPOSED EXPENDITURES	*2008–09*	*2009–10*	*2010–11*	*2011–12*	*2012–13 to Build–out*	*Total all Years*
Design/Engineering/Admin.	$0	$0	$0	$0	$414,801	$414,801
Land Acquisition/Right of Way	$0	$0	$0	$0	$571,725	$571,725
Construction	$0	$0	$0	$0	$1,546,017	$1,546,017
Contingency	$0	$0	$0	$0	$103,125	$103,125
Equipment/Other	$0	$0	$0	$0	$150,000	$150,000
TOTAL COST	$0	$0	$0	$0	$2,785,668	$2,785,668

2008–09 DIF/MFP Update Action:
The facilities required at City/County General Plan build–out have been altered from a 3 station to a 2 station configuration with the administrative/EOC/training facilities being planned to be contiguous to the second (relocated) station.

Carpinteria-Summerland F.P.D.
Master Facilities Plan Project Detail

Project Title:	*Program:*
Construct an Emergency Operations Center (EOC)	Fire Suppression Facilities, Vehicles and Equipment
Submitting Department(s):	*Project No.:*
District Administrative/Command Staff	FD-04

Project Description:
Aquire a half an acre for, design and construct approximately 1,200 square feet of Emergency Operations Center (EOC) space. The facility would consist largely of a 30' by 40' room to be outfitted with emergency communications equipment, maps and incident emergency plans. There would also be a small general storage room of approximately 300 square feet. The space, when not used for District purposes, including Board meetings, could be made available to the nearby public for small group meetings. NOTE: The order in which the proposed improvements are listed on this schedule does not necessarily reflect the order in which the facilities will be constructed or equipment will be acquired.

Justification/Requirement for Project:
The District does not currently have a fully designed and dedicated Emergency Operations Center. As the District continues towards City/County General Plan Build-out, such a facility increases in importance. Given the high potential for localized seismic activity (including landslides), routine wildland fires and required coverage of the District's segment of SR-101 (large chain vehicle accidents, fuel/toxic spills), such a facility is imperitive.

Consequences of Not Completing Project:
The District would need to continue to use the leased space (or some other ad hoc facility such as a school) as the EOC.

Reference Document:	*Project Timing:*
District management staff capital facilities planning.	The timing or scheduling of the capital construction or capital outlay acquisition described herein, was not included in the scope of this engagement, thus all project cost default to the "Build-out" column.

PROPOSED EXPENDITURES	*2008-09*	*2009-10*	*2010-11*	*2011-12*	*2012-13 to Build-out*	*Total all Years*
Design/Engineering/Admin.	$0	$0	$0	$0	$109,551	$109,551
Land Acquisition/Right of Way	$0	$0	$0	$0	$343,035	$343,035
Construction	$0	$0	$0	$0	$436,017	$436,017
Contingency	$0	$0	$0	$0	$26,813	$26,813
Equipment/Other	$0	$0	$0	$0	$39,000	$39,000
TOTAL COST	$0	$0	$0	$0	$954,416	$954,416

2008-09 DIF/MFP Update Action:
The facilities required at City/County General Plan build-out have been altered from a 3 station to a 2 station configuration with the administrative/EOC/training facilities being planned to be contiguous to the second (relocated) station.

Carpinteria-Summerland F.P.D.
Master Facilities Plan Project Detail

Project Title:	*Program:*
Construct Training Tower/Drafting Pit	Fire Suppression Facilities, Vehicles and Equipment
Submitting Department(s):	*Project No.:*
District Administrative/Command Staff	FD-05

Project Description:
Acquire an acre for and construct a training facility over a period of time. No specific or optimum location has been determined at this time, but it is hoped that a site contiguous to the proposed relocation of Station #2 would be available. The main feature of the training facility would be a multi-story training tower for hands-on manipulated training. Ultimate improvements would include a drafting pit, pipe trench and other numerous situation devices or props including potential aircraft response (if aircraft is donated). As an alternative, the District could use this same amount towards a training facility co-owned (via a joint use facility agreement) with a contiguous or nearby fire district/department. NOTE: The order in which the proposed improvements are listed on this schedule does not necessarily reflect the order in which the facilities will be constructed or equipment will be acquired.

Justification/Requirement for Project:
The proposed facility would enable the Fire District to meet mandated and recommended training requirements without taking units out-of-service at larger distances. Training while on-site and on-duty is cost-effective. Locally, squads undergoing training would be available as 2nd alarm response crews. Lastly, the pumping capabilities of each Type I engine/pumper could be tested more frequently without risk to the pumps.

Consequences of Not Completing Project:
The District would be required to continue to send staff and much needed equipment significant distances for fire tower training. Additionally, without a properly constructed and maintained drafting pit, engine pumps would be a risk while being tested.

Reference Document:	*Project Timing:*
District management staff capital facilities planning.	The timing or scheduling of the capital construction or capital outlay acquisition described herein, was not included in the scope of this engagement, thus all project cost default to the "Build-out" column.

PROPOSED EXPENDITURES	*2008-09*	*2009-10*	*2010-11*	*2011-12*	*2012-13 to Build-out*	*Total all Years*
Design/Engineering/Admin.	$0	$0	$0	$0	$138,040	$138,040
Land Acquisition/Right of Way	$0	$0	$0	$0	$686,070	$686,070
Construction	$0	$0	$0	$0	$567,034	$567,034
Contingency	$0	$0	$0	$0	$33,516	$33,516
Equipment/Other	$0	$0	$0	$0	$48,750	$48,750
TOTAL COST	$0	$0	$0	$0	$1,473,410	$1,473,410

2008-09 DIF/MFP Update Action:
The facilities required at City/County General Plan build-out have been altered from a 3 station to a 2 station configuration with the administrative/EOC/training facilities being planned to be contiguous to the second (relocated) station.

(c)

Carpinteria–Summerland F.P.D.
Master Facilities Plan Project Detail

Project Title:	*Program:*
Acquire a Type I Engine with Aerial Attack Capability (Telesquirt)	Fire Suppression Facilities, Vehicles and Equipment
Submitting Department(s):	*Project No.:*
District Administrative/Command Staff	FD–06

Project Description:
In addition to basic Type I engine capabilities, this response engine with hydraulic lift and aerial stream (telesquirt) capability. NOTE: The order in which the proposed improvements are listed on this schedule does not necessarily reflect the order in which the facilities will be constructed or equipment will be acquired.

Justification/Requirement for Project:
Additional development within the area will creating additional calls requiring a vehicle with aerial capacity. The addition of numerous tall buildings or wide building footprints will require the addition of a hydraulic lift/pumper response vehicle. Emergency response vehicle inventory at both the northerly and southerly stations would include either a front–line Type I engine or the Type I with telesquirt, a back–up Type I engine and a Type III engine.

Consequences of Not Completing Project:
Not obtaining additional response vehicles will necessitate the use of the reserve engine as first–out engines. Constant use of and dependency upon older reserve engines would result in greater maintenance costs and would ultimately complete failure of those vehicles. Additionally, any down time for repairs would result in a lack of back–up engines in place, resulting in a dramatic decreased level of service for that portion of the community.

Reference Document:	*Project Timing:*
District management staff capital facilities planning.	The timing or scheduling of the capital construction or capital outlay acquisition described herein, was not included in the scope of this engagement, thus all project cost default to the "Build–out" column.

PROPOSED EXPENDITURES	*2008–09*	*2009–10*	*2010–11*	*2011–12*	*2012–13 to Build–out*	*Total all Years*
Design/Engineering/Admin.	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0
Land Acquisition/Right of Way	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0
Construction	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0
Contingency	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0
Equipment/Other	$0	$0	$0	$0	$675,000	$675,000
TOTAL COST	$0	$0	$0	$0	$675,000	$675,000

2008–09 DIF/MFP Update Action:
The additional response vehicles required to accommodate the additional demands generated by new development have been altered to match the change in proposed facilities.

Carpinteria–Summerland F.P.D.
Master Facilities Plan Project Detail

Project Title:	*Program:*
Acquire a Type III Fire Engine	Fire Suppression Facilities, Vehicles and Equipment
Submitting Department(s):	*Project No.:*
District Administrative/Command Staff	FD–07

Project Description:
The vehicle would be assigned to the proposed relocated/expanded Station #2. These type of response vehicles are smaller, lighter and can more easily access unimproved roads and attack small fires in wildland interface areas more quickly. Emergency response vehicle inventory at both the northerly and southerly stations would include a front–line Type I engine or the Type I with telesquirt, a back–up Type I engine and a Type III engine. NOTE: The order in which the proposed improvements are listed on this schedule does not necessarily reflect the order in which the facilities will be constructed or equipment will be acquired.

Justification/Requirement for Project:
Residential homes will continue to be built closer to wildland interface areas in the future. The District will need to be able respond to wildland fires quickly to extinguish fires before they enter developed areas.

Consequences of Not Completing Project:
Not obtaining additional response vehicles will necessitate the use of the reserve engine as first–out engines. Constant use of and dependency upon older reserve engines would result in greater maintenance costs and would ultimately complete failure of those vehicles. Additionally, any down time for repairs would result in a lack of back–up engines in place, resulting in a dramatic decreased level of service for that portion of the community.

Reference Document:	*Project Timing:*
District management staff capital facilities planning.	The timing or scheduling of the capital construction or capital outlay acquisition described herein, was not included in the scope of this engagement, thus all project cost default to the "Build–out" column.

PROPOSED EXPENDITURES	*2008–09*	*2009–10*	*2010–11*	*2011–12*	*2012–13 to Build–out*	*Total all Years*
Design/Engineering/Admin.	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0
Land Acquisition/Right of Way	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0
Construction	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0
Contingency	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0
Equipment/Other	$0	$0	$0	$0	$315,000	$315,000
TOTAL COST	$0	$0	$0	$0	$315,000	$315,000

2008–09 DIF/MFP Update Action:
The additional response vehicles required to accommodate the additional demands generated by new development have been altered to match the change in proposed facilities.

Carpinteria-Summerland F.P.D.
Master Facilities Plan Project Detail

Project Title:	*Program:*
Acquire a Multi-use Incident Support Vehicle	Fire Suppression Facilities, Vehicles and Equipment
Submitting Department(s):	*Project No.:*
District Administrative/Command Staff	FD-08

Project Description:
Acquire an incident operations support vehicle. The vehicle's primary purpose would be as a communications center with capacity to combine the communications needs of several cooperating public safety agencies. Collateral uses would include rapid S.C.B.A. air-bottle filling capability along with aimable, high intensity lighting. Additional uses would include a rolling warehouse and canteen for long-term incidents. NOTE: The order in which the proposed improvements are listed on this schedule does not necessarily reflect the order in which the facilities will be constructed or equipment will be acquired.

Justification/Requirement for Project:
The vehicles are necessary for long-term incidents.

Consequences of Not Completing Project:
Communications/lighting will be less than optimum and air bottle and other supplies and when necessary, nourishment, would need to be brought over by other vehicles.

Reference Document:	*Project Timing:*
District management staff capital facilities planning.	The timing or scheduling of the capital construction or capital outlay acquisition described herein, was not included in the scope of this engagement, thus all project cost default to the "Build-out" column.

PROPOSED EXPENDITURES	*2008-09*	*2009-10*	*2010-11*	*2011-12*	*2012-13 to Build-out*	*Total all Years*
Design/Engineering/Admin.	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0
Land Acquisition/Right of Way	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0
Construction	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0
Contingency	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0
Equipment/Other	$0	$0	$0	$0	$225,000	$225,000
TOTAL COST	$0	$0	$0	$0	$225,000	$225,000

2008-09 DIF/MFP Update Action:
The additional response vehicles required to accommodate the additional demands generated by new development have been altered to match the change in proposed facilities.

Carpinteria-Summerland F.P.D.
Master Facilities Plan Project Detail

Project Title:	*Program:*
Improve the Wildland Patrol/Brush Inspection Vehicle	Fire Suppression Facilities, Vehicles and Equipment
Submitting Department(s):	*Project No.:*
District Administrative/Command Staff	FD-09

Project Description:
The improvement consists of adding a 100 gallon tank and pump system to an existing stakebed utility truck used by the wildland patrol/brush inspector. NOTE: The order in which the proposed improvements are listed on this schedule does not necessarily reflect the order in which the facilities will be constructed or equipment will be acquired.

Justification/Requirement for Project:
The existing vehicle is used for inspecting wildland areas for enforcement of brush removal requirements. The officer in charge of this responsibility travels through wildland interface areas and would afford a more immediate fire response capability when this officer is in the field.

Consequences of Not Completing Project:
The existing vehicle would be limited to transportation purposes only, not attack or response. result in complete failure of those vehicles. Additionally, any down time for repairs would result in a lack of back-up engines in place, resulting in a dramatic decreased level of service for that portion of the community.

Reference Document:	*Project Timing:*
District management staff capital facilities planning.	The timing or scheduling of the capital construction or capital outlay acquisition described herein, was not included in the scope of this engagement, thus all project cost default to the "Build-out" column.

PROPOSED EXPENDITURES	*2008-09*	*2009-10*	*2010-11*	*2011-12*	*2012-13 to Build-out*	*Total all Years*
Design/Engineering/Admin.	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0
Land Acquisition/Right of Way	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0
Construction	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0
Contingency	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0
Equipment/Other	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0
TOTAL COST	$0	$0	$0	$0	$20,000	$20,000
	$0	$0	$0	$0	$20,000	$20,000

2008-09 DIF/MFP Update Action:
The additional response vehicles required to accommodate the additional demands generated by new development have been altered to match the change in proposed facilities.

Appendix B

Expanded Land-use Database

Total – Land Use Database	Developed		Available		Total	
	Acres	# of Units	Acres	# of Units	Acres	# of Units
ate Dwellings	850.0	88	2,168.0	1,084	3,018.0	1,172
Detached Dwellings	2,177.0	3,029	565.3	841	2,742.3	3,870
Attached Dwellings	133.0	1,909	1.0	3	134.0	1,912
Mobile Home Dwellings	101.0	850	1.0	8	102.0	858
Commercial Lodging	16.0	579	1.0	36	17.0	615
Commercial/Office Uses	92.0	1,001,880	36.0	394,600	128.0	1,396,480
Industrial Uses	127.0	1,659,636	26.0	332,400	153.0	1,992,036
Total – District Boundaries	3,496.0	- - -	2,798.3	- - -	6,294.3	- - -
Private Residences	3,261.0	5,876	2,735.3	1,936	5,996.3	7,812
Commercial Lodging Rooms	133.0	1,909	1.0	3	134.0	1,912
Business Square Feet	219.0	2,661,516	62.0	727,000	281.0	3,388,516

Land-use Database Within Carpinteria City Limits	Developed		Available		Total	
	Acres	# of Units	Acres	# of Units	Acres	# of Units
Estate Dwellings	850.0	88	0.0	0	850.0	88
Detached Dwellings	2,177.0	3,029	223.3	670	2,400.3	3,699
Attached Dwellings	133.0	1,909	1.0	3	134.0	1,912
Mobile Home Dwellings	101.0	850	1.0	8	102.0	858
Commercial Lodging	16.0	579	1.0	36	17.0	615
Commercial/Office Uses	92.0	1,001,880	33.0	357,600	125.0	1,359,480
Industrial Uses	127.0	1,659,636	7.0	89,400	134.0	1,749,036
Sub-total – Carpinteria City	3,496.0	- - -	266.3	- - -	3,762.3	- - -

Land-use Database within Summerland Plan Area	Developed		Available		Total	
	Acres	# of Units	Acres	# of Units	Acres	# of Units
Estate Dwellings	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0
Detached Dwellings	0.0	0	342.0	171	342.0	171
Attached Dwellings	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0
Mobile Home Dwellings	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0
Commercial Lodging	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0
Commercial/Office Uses	0.0	0	1.0	10,000	1.0	10,000
Industrial Uses	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0
Sub-total – Summerland Area	0.0	- - -	343.0	- - -	343.0	10,171

Land-use Database within Toro Canyon Plan Area	Developed		Available		Total	
	Acres	# of Units	Acres	# of Units	Acres	# of Units
Estate Dwellings	0.0	0	610.0	305	610.0	305
Detached Dwellings	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0
Attached Dwellings	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0
Mobile Home Dwellings	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0
Commercial Lodging	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0
Commercial/Office Uses	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0
Industrial Uses	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0
Sub-total – Toro Canyon	0.0	0	610.0	305	610.0	305

Land-use Database within Carpintreia Foothills	Developed		Available		Total	
	Acres	# of Units	Acres	# of Units	Acres	# of Units
Estate Dwellings	0.0	0	1,558.0	779	1,558.0	779
Detached Dwellings	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0
Attached Dwellings	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0
Mobile Home Dwellings	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0
Commercial Lodging	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0
Commercial/Office Uses	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0
Industrial Uses	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0
Sub-total – Carpinteria Foothils	0.0	0	1,558.0	779	1,558.0	779

Land-use Database within Greenhouse Build-out	Developed		Available		Total	
	Acres	# of Units	Acres	# of Units	Acres	# of Units
Estate Dwellings	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0
Detached Dwellings	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0
Attached Dwellings	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0
Mobile Home Dwellings	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0
Commercial Lodging	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0
Commercial/Office Uses	0.0	0	2.0	27,000	2.0	27,000
Industrial Uses	0.0	0	19.0	243,000	19.0	243,000
Sub-total – Greenhouse Area	0.0	0	21.0	270,000	21.0	270,000

NOTES:

(1) Assumes a pad yield of 25% per gross acre for commercial projects (10,890 Square Feet).
(2) Assumes a pad yield of 30% per gross acre for industrial projects (13,068) Square Feet).

Appendix C

Clarification of the Application of Impact Fees on Greenhouse Construction

Clarification of Application of Impact Fees on Greenhouse Construction. A question has been raised regarding the application of the *Fire Suppression Facilities, vehicles and Equipment Development Impact Fees* on the construction of greenhouse-related uses. The published calculation and nexus study included greenhouses as an industrial use. The back-up states (sic.) that the "Greenhouse Study approval of 2.7 million sq. ft. times the accessory building factor 10 percent equals 270,000 sq. ft. Mitigation fee is applied to accessory buildings."[1].

Based upon the Greenhouse Study, Carpinteria-Summerland Fire District Staff indicated that approximately 10% of the total greenhouse space requirements would likely be accessory buildings similar in construction and call-for-service demand as typical industrial buildings. Accessory buildings generally are buildings where packing and shipping occurs and may include some physical plant infrastructure such as pumps, ventilation equipment and the like. This assumption has been included for future greenhouse construction also..

However, in order to foster fairness, the fee will be imposed upon 10% of the total proposed accessory building square feet and the greenhouse square feet. If this were not the case, there would be circumstances where someone plans on constructing only greenhouse and would not have an impact fee imposed and someone who plans on constructing only an accessory building and would pay a full impact fee on the proposed square footage. The intent of the calculation was never to apply the impact fee only to the construction of accessory buildings and not actual greenhouse construction. The proper application of the impact fees upon greenhouse is clarified as follows:

> Impact Fee Upon the Construction of Greenhouse Construction. ***Full application of the $0.18 per square foot fee for industrial land uses but only 10% of the total square footage of the sum of actual greenhouse square foot and accessory building square foot construction. Construction of any commercial building intended for the sales of the products of a greenhouse operation would be imposed at the $2.12 per square foot Commercial land-use rate.***

The table on the following page is an example of the construction of a greenhouse expansion. The example consists of the construction of 900,0000 square feet of greenhouse, 100,000 square feet of accessory building and a 1,500 square foot retail sales building. The calculation indicates:

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

Table C-1
Example of Greenhouse Construction Project

	Industrial	Commercial	Total
Retail Sales Building Square Feet.	0	1,500	1,500
Accessory Building Square Feet	100,000	0	100,000
Greenhouse Structures Square Feet	900,000	0	900,000
Total Square Feet	1,000,000	1,500	1,001,500
Development Impact Fee/Square Foot	$0.18	$2.12	
Percent to be Imposed	10%	100%	
Calculated Development Impact Fee	$18,000	$3,180	$21,180

Appendix C Endnotes

1. Page2, Development Impact Fee Nexus Calculation Report for the Carpinteria-Summerland Fire Protection District Back-up Detail, October, 2003.

End of Report