Recommendation

That City Council:

1. By motion approve Negative Declaration No. 92-20; and

2. Adopt a resolution setting planned traffic circulation facilities fees (Traffic Impact Fees); and

3. Adopt a resolution establishing requirements for Traffic and Transportation studies and mitigation procedures; and

4. Approve, reading by title only for first reading and subsequent adoption, an ordinance amending development fee procedures.

Discussion

The review of the FY 91-92 development fees with the development community began with a meeting on May 23, 1991 and progressed through many meetings between staff and representatives of the development community and several City Council study sessions. (Attachment #1 describes the process). The processing fees were adopted by City Council on August 6, 1991. The infrastructure fees for growth requirement capital, water, wastewater, and drainage were adopted by City Council on October 8, 1991. Since then staff has continued meetings with the Building Industry Association (BIA) and the Chamber of Commerce regarding the traffic impact fee. Much of the effort has been dedicated to review of the technical data, analysis, and assumptions that support the proposed increase in traffic impact fees. This effort has been informative but has not resulted in an alternative which could be supported by both the development community and the Public Works Department.

Discussions from January through March centered around an approach under which the City would phase in the increase in traffic impact fees over a three-year period. The current fee per trip is $253.76, resulting in a cost per single-family residential unit of $2,791. The proposed fee per trip is $518.01, resulting in a cost per single-family residential unit of $5,698. The phasing would increase the cost per single-family residential unit about $1,000 per year plus an adjustment for inflation based on the Construction Cost Index (CCI). The following table shows the phases:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fiscal Year</th>
<th>Fee Per Trip</th>
<th>Fee Per Single-Family Residence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>90-91 &amp; 91-92</td>
<td>$253.76</td>
<td>$2,791.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92-93</td>
<td>336.36 + 3.4% = $347.79</td>
<td>$3,700 + 3.4% = $3,825.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93-94</td>
<td>$427.27 + CCI</td>
<td>$4,700.00 + CCI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94-95</td>
<td>$518.01 + CCI</td>
<td>$5,698.11 + CCI</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The commercial and industrial fees would go up accordingly (Attachment 2). The advantage to the phasing plan is that the City would gain acceptance of the traffic impact fee increases over the next three years.

However, the BIA and the Chamber of Commerce after meeting with their members indicated they were not ready to support the phased approach and requested further discussions of traffic impact fee issues. On May 12, 1992, City Council appointed Councilmembers Manuel Lopez and Gerry Furr to serve on the committee to work with representatives of the development community to consider changes in the traffic impact fee. Attachment #3 provides an update on meetings of the traffic impact fee committee.

The committee is reviewing issues that impact the way in which the traffic impact fee is calculated, the procedures for mitigation of traffic impacts and collection of the traffic impact fee. The issues that impact the way in which the traffic impact fee is calculated will require several months for the collection of data and calculation of the fee rate. However, issues that impact the procedures and collection of the fee can be resolved at this time. It is proposed that several of these changes be adopted now with the first phase of the traffic impact fee phased increased. The Traffic Impact Fee Committee will continue to work on resolving the remaining issues. The changes which are proposed for adoption now are: 1) Mitigation of a project's specific impacts only rather than mitigation back to Level of Service (LOS) C; 2) Limitation of the cost of mitigation to twice the traffic impact fee; and 3) Deferral of 50% of the traffic impact fee.

Mitigation of the Project's Specific Impact Rather than Mitigation to LOS C

Currently projects which generate a significant increase in traffic are conditioned to improve impacted intersections to LOS C regardless of deficiencies due to existing projects, approved projects and pending projects. The cost of the mitigation of such deficiencies is reimbursed to the developer of the project through the City's reimbursement policy. It is proposed that projects be required to mitigate their specific impacts on intersections within the LOS C to F range, so that no intersection would be further degraded by the project. For example, even though a project may not cause an intersection to fall below LOS C it would be responsible for mitigating its own impact at an intersection which is within the LOS C range. In a similar way, projects impacting intersections within the LOS D to F range would also be responsible for mitigating the specific impacts of the project.

Projects in process when this policy change becomes effective, will have the option at the project's expense, to redo its traffic study or to continue the process under the old policy.
Limit the Cost of Mitigation to twice the Traffic Impact Fee

The improvements necessary to mitigate an intersection for the specific impacts of a project in practice generally provide excess capacity. Because the cost of making these improvements can in some cases be very high relative to the ability of the project to obtain financing, a policy is proposed that will limit the cost of making conditioned improvements. Under the proposed policy the project will be conditioned to make improvements up to a value equal to twice the traffic impact fee for that project.

The City will identify conditioned improvements required to mitigate the impacts of the project. If the list of conditioned improvements exceeds twice the traffic impact fee, the City will select projects to be built in an amount less than or equal to twice the traffic impact fee and the project will build these improvements and pay the difference between the cost of the improvements and twice the traffic fee. If the conditioned improvements are greater than twice the traffic impact fee and the City determines that building a portion of the improvements at a cost less than twice the traffic impact fee is not feasible, the City will require payment of twice the traffic impact fee in lieu of the conditioned improvements. If the conditioned improvements are less than twice the traffic impact fee, the project will build all of the conditioned improvements.

Only off-site improvements will be subject to the mitigation limit. Frontage improvements will be required separate from the limit. Also, any conditioned participation in assessment districts will be separate from the limit.

For purposes of reimbursement, those projects that pay twice the traffic impact fee in lieu of building conditioned improvements will be reimbursed as if the projects had built conditioned improvements equal to that amount. The amount in excess of one time the traffic impact fee will be reimbursed according to the policy of the City at 10% per year or $20,000 per year whichever is greater.

Deferral of 50% of the Traffic Impact Fee

Because the amount of the traffic impact fee is often large relative to the project's ability to obtain financing, it is proposed a policy be adopted to defer a portion of the fee payment for non-residential development (Attachment No. 6). The deferral would be applied only to cash payments and not to the provision of conditioned improvements. The remaining fee to be paid in cash after credits for conditioned improvements under the proposed policy will be 50% at the time of building permit issuance with the balance to be paid on sale or transfer of all or any part of the project or issuance of a temporary or permanent certificate of occupancy for all or any part of the project, whichever occurs first. This policy will not apply to residential projects, neighborhood commercial projects or fast food restaurants. Residential projects are excluded because of the risk of premature occupancy and the difficulties that would result if a fee payment were a condition of occupancy. Neighborhood commercial projects and fast food restaurants are excluded because there is often a short term turnover of ownership with this type of business.
Right-of-Way Cost

The fee methodology in the June 11, 1991 agenda report included for the first time the cost of right-of-way for street improvements. Up until now the right-of-way for streets adjacent to the project was dedicated by the developer. The right-of-way for off-site improvements was purchased by the developer with no eligibility for credits nor reimbursements. Improvements built by the City relied on other resources (often unavailable) to purchase right-of-way. The June 11, 1991 report included the cost of all right-of-way in the basis of the fee. Further discussions with the development community in the summer and fall of 1991 resulted in the recommendation that projects continue to dedicate adjacent right-of-way and that only right-of-way for off-site and City built improvements be funded by the traffic impact fee. The inclusion of all right-of-way had added about 28% to the fee. As proposed in this report, the inclusion of only right-of-way for off-site and City built improvements adds about 11% to the fee. The material regarding traffic impact fee methodology has been extracted from the June 11, 1991, agenda packet adjusted for this change, and provided as Attachment #2.

Light Industrial Trip Generation Rates

The trip generation rate for the Light Industrial land use zones (M-1 & M-L) has been adjusted to more accurately reflect the actual types of developments being built in these land use zones. The trip generation rate has been adjusted down from 8.56 to 6.97 trips per thousand square feet. The impact on the fee for these land use zones is shown in Attachment No. 2.

Previously Proposed Changes to the Traffic Impact Fee

The June 11, 1992, Agenda Packet included the following proposed changes to the traffic impact fee that are described in more detail in Attachment #2:

1. Provide for the payment of interest on reimbursements to developers;
2. Provide for reimbursement to the General Fund for staff time required to process reimbursements to developers;
3. Calculate credits and reimbursements for the developer's cost to provide conditioned improvements based on a list of unit costs rather than the previous method of unofficial bids;
4. The circulation system improvements have been adjusted to reflect requirements based on traffic data available from the 2020 General Plan;
5. Roadway cross sections have been increased to accommodate increased traffic load;
6. Secondary and collector roadways have been added to the list of arterial roadways to include the cost of the complete circulation system;
7. The trips for retail land uses and hotel/motel are adjusted for peak trips and these adjustments have been revised based on trip data from the 2020 General Plan.
Environmental Determination

The Community Development Director has previously provided notice that the recommended actions will not produce a significant environmental effect and that the City intends to adopt Negative Declaration No. 92-20 (Attachment No. 8).

Effective Date

By State law the earliest effective date for increases to development fees is sixty days after adoption. To minimize confusion regarding the implementation of the policies and fees set by the two resolutions and the ordinance recommended for adoption, it is proposed that the effective date for all three be September 14, 1992.

Financial Impact

Each annual increase during the phased increase in the traffic impact fees will result in an increase in annual revenue of about $700,000 or more depending on the level of development activity. At the end of the phased increases in FY 94-95 the increased annual revenue will be about $2.0 million. If the full increase were adopted rather than a phased increase and development were to occur over the next three years at an average rate, an additional $2.1 million in revenue would be generated by the fees. On the other hand, each additional year that the increase is delayed will result in a loss of about $2.0 million in revenue. It is expected that the phased approach for the traffic impact fee increase may encourage projects which are able to obtain financing to move ahead sooner.
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Review with the Development Community

Draft versions of the development infrastructure and processing fee reports were provided to representatives of the development community on May 23, 1991 and reviewed at a meeting with staff from the Fire, Parks & Recreation, Community Development, and Public Works Departments on May 28, 1991. On June 11, 1991, City Council held a public hearing on processing and infrastructure fees.

On June 19 and June 24, 1991, staff again met with representatives from the Oxnard Chamber of Commerce and the development community to gain further comments and suggestions.

On June 25, 1991, City Council again considered the fees. At that meeting it was decided that the processing fees would be further reviewed and adopted prior to adoption of the infrastructure fees. On July 9, 1991, City Council held a study session on development processing fees and directed staff to meet with the development community to provide further information. The target for adoption of the processing fees was set for August 6, 1991. A series of meetings was held with five representatives of the development community (Paul Tryon, BIA; Steve Zimmer, Baldwin Co.; Steve Maulhardt, Chamber of Commerce; George Sakioka, Sakioka Farms; Ellen Michiel, Raznick & Son) and staff from the City Manager's Office, Public Works, Community Development, Parks & Recreation, Fire Department, and the Finance Department. The meetings were each two to three hours in length and were held on Wednesday, July 17, 1991 at 9:00 a.m., Friday, July 19, 1991 at 1:30 p.m., on Tuesday, July 23, 1991 at 10:00 a.m., and Thursday, July 25, 1991 at 9:00 a.m. At these meetings the fee calculation methodology was reviewed step by step and additional backup information was provided by staff as requested by the representatives of the development community. The processing fees were adopted by City Council on August 6, 1991.

On July 23, 1991 and August 13, 1991, City Council held study sessions on infrastructure fees spending the majority of the time on Traffic Fees. It was determined that staff would continue meeting with developers on infrastructure fees but return to City Council first with a recommendation on the water, wastewater, and storm drain fees. Staff met with representatives of the development community on August 23, 1991, September 6, 1991, September 27, 1991, and September 30, 1991. The Building Industry Association (BIA) in cooperation with the other representatives of the development community hired two consultants: one to review the traffic fee, Les Card, P.E. of LSA Associates, Inc., and one to review the water, wastewater, and storm drain fees, Charles H. Lawrence, P.E., Lawrence, Fisk & McFarland, Inc. The BIA then limited the scope of Mr. Lawrence's task to the review of the wastewater treatment fee.

Staff met with Mr. Card on August 21, 1991 and with Mr. Lawrence on September 4, 1991, and September 25, 1991, and fulfilled requests for information made at the meetings and via letter and telephone.

This review resulted in several revisions discussed in September 27, 1991 report to City Council in the section on "Revisions Since the June 3, 1991 Staff Report". The representatives of the development community were willing to accept the staff recommendations of that report with the understanding that they still have concerns that they intend to raise again when the fees are revised to reflect the new master plans and the new general plan. These issues include the allocation of Wastewater Treatment Plant costs between current and future users and the impact of population growth not related to new construction.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Trip Factors</th>
<th>1990 Current Fee</th>
<th>1991 Recommended Fee</th>
<th>% Change</th>
<th>Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1990</td>
<td>1991</td>
<td>$253.76 /trip</td>
<td>$347.79 /trip</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RESIDENTIAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single Family (R-1, R-1-PD, etc.)</td>
<td>11.00 Unit</td>
<td>11.00 Unit</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>$2,791.36 /Unit</td>
<td>$3,825.69 /Unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobile Home (M, H, P)</td>
<td>4.80 Unit</td>
<td>4.80 Unit</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>$1,218.04 /Unit</td>
<td>$1,669.39 /Unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Condominium (R-P-D, R-2, R-2-PD)</td>
<td>8.60 Unit</td>
<td>8.60 Unit</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>$2,182.33 /Unit</td>
<td>$2,990.99 /Unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apartment (R-3, R-3-PD)</td>
<td>6.50 Unit</td>
<td>6.50 Unit</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>$1,649.44 /Unit</td>
<td>$2,260.63 /Unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Rise (R-4, R-4-PD)</td>
<td>7.10 Unit</td>
<td>7.10 Unit</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>$1,801.69 /Unit</td>
<td>$2,469.30 /Unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMMERCIAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office (C-O, C-O-PD)</td>
<td>14.90 TSF</td>
<td>15.00 TSF</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>$3,781.02 /TSF</td>
<td>$5,216.85 /TSF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical Office (C-O, C-O-PD)</td>
<td>34.17 TSF</td>
<td>34.17 TSF</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>$8,670.97 /TSF</td>
<td>$11,883.98 /TSF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood (C-1, C-1-PD)</td>
<td>80.91 TSF</td>
<td>80.91 TSF</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>$10,119.94 /TSF</td>
<td>$17,250.38 /TSF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General (C-2, C-2-PD)</td>
<td>39.88 TSF (1)</td>
<td>49.60 TSF (3)</td>
<td>24.4%</td>
<td>$6,331.31 /TSF</td>
<td>$10,788.44 /TSF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotel/Motel (various zones)</td>
<td>50.60 TSF</td>
<td>50.60 TSF</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>$1,093.70 /TSF</td>
<td>$2,305.84 /TSF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10.10 TSF</td>
<td>10.10 TSF</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>$2,892.86 /TSF</td>
<td>$3,964.80 /TSF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INDUSTRIAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research and Development (B-R-P)</td>
<td>11.40 TSF</td>
<td>11.40 TSF</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>$2,892.86 /TSF</td>
<td>$3,964.80 /TSF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Light Manufacturing (M-1, M-1-PD,</td>
<td>8.56 TSF</td>
<td>6.97 TSF</td>
<td>−18.6%</td>
<td>$2,172.18 /TSF</td>
<td>$2,424.09 /TSF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heavy Manufacturing (M-2, M-2-PD,</td>
<td>5.43 TSF</td>
<td>5.43 TSF</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>$1,377.91 /TSF</td>
<td>$1,888.49 /TSF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1) 50.7% reduction for lower peak trip generation by general commercial uses.
(2) 57.3% reduction for lower peak trip generation by hotel/motel uses.
(3) 38.7% reduction for lower peak trip generation by general commercial uses.
(4) 34.4% reduction for lower peak trip generation by hotel/motel uses.
June 18, 1992

TO: Vernon G. Hazen, City Manager

FROM: James E. Frandsen, Public Works Director

SUBJECT: Update on Traffic Impact Fee Committee

On May 12, 1992, City Council appointed Councilmembers Manuel Lopez and Gerry Furr to serve as a committee to work with representatives of the development community to consider changes to the Traffic Impact Fee.

The first meeting of the committee was June 3, 1992. The agenda, handouts, and list of participants are provided in Attachment No. 1. The committee formed two subcommittees, one to review Technical issues and one to review Policy issues.

The Technical Subcommittee met on June 9, 1992. Minutes of that meeting are provided in Attachment No. 2.

The Policy Subcommittee met on June 11, 1992. Minutes of that meeting are provided in Attachment No. 3.

The whole committee will meet again at 3:00 p.m., Monday, June 22, 1992, at the Library in Conference Room "B".
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Attachments
Attachment No. 1: Traffic Impact Fee Committee meeting of June 3, 1992;
Agenda, Handouts, List of Participants.


c: Tom Frutchey
Tim Nanson
Dee Boysen

643.DWB
AGENDA
OXNARD TRAFFIC IMPACT FEE
MEETING OF CITY COUNCIL SUB-COMMITTEE
WITH THE DEVELOPMENT COMMUNITY
JUNE 3, 1992, 3:00PM

1. Adoption of first year of the phased increase

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fiscal Year</th>
<th>Fee Per Trip</th>
<th>Fee Per Single Family Residence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>90-91</td>
<td>$253.76</td>
<td>$2,791.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91-92</td>
<td>$253.76</td>
<td>$2,791.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92-93</td>
<td>$336.36 + 3.4% = $347.79</td>
<td>$3,700 + 3.4% = $3,825.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93-94</td>
<td>$427.27 + CCI</td>
<td>$4,700.00 + CCI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94-95</td>
<td>$518.01 + CCI</td>
<td>$5,698.11 + CCI</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Level of Service "C"

3. Land use assumptions and trip generation

4. Level of Service lower at specific intersections

5. Financing mechanisms for major off-site improvements

6. Inclusion of 101 Freeway Interchanges in the Traffic Impact Fee

7. Inclusion of Flyovers in the Traffic Impact Fee

8. Special problems of NIAD area

9. Accuracy and reliability of the model

10. Traffic Impact Mitigations
    a. Mitigation to existing or to LOS "C"
    b. What causes a project to trigger a mitigation?
    c. Is mitigation completed prior to occupancy or phased in?

11. Use of Average Daily Trips or Peak Hour Trips in the Traffic Impact Fee; also
    Use of an adjustment for lower Peak Hour Trips for General Commercial and Hotel/Motel

12. Use of the model to review the above issues

13. Time frame for completing the above review

14.

15.

16.

17.

18.

19.

20.
# CIRCULATION SYSTEM IMPROVEMENTS

## Highway Improvements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Improvement</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Rice Bypass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Rice/101 Interchange</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Rose/101 Interchange</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Route 1/Rice Interchange/Rice Extension</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Route 101 —— Vineyard to Johnson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Del Norte/101 Interchange</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Total Highway Improvements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Improvement</th>
<th>Current Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rice Bypass</td>
<td>$61,300,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rice/101 Interchange</td>
<td>$20,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rose/101 Interchange</td>
<td>$16,300,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Route 1/Rice Interchange/Rice Extension</td>
<td>$35,815,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Route 101 —— Vineyard to Johnson</td>
<td>$41,800,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Del Norte/101 Interchange</td>
<td>$12,000,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Interior Roadways

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Cost Base</th>
<th>CCI</th>
<th>Right of Way</th>
<th>Less %</th>
<th>Dedic. Right of Way</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>$113,451,000</td>
<td>5988</td>
<td>$45,900,000</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>$25,704,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>73,564,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>34,931,000</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>$19,561,360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collector</td>
<td>8,587,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>3,244,000</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>$1,816,640</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Subtotals: $195,602,000 $84,075,000 $47,082,000

Total Interior Roadways: $242,684,000

### Drainage Facilities (Non-Master Planned) within Master Planned Streets

- $23,632,000

### Traffic Signals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Cost Base</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CCI</td>
<td>$12,095,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest Cost</td>
<td>3.74% X $284,326,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Processing Cost</td>
<td>0.65% X $284,326,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Periodic Masterplan Updates

- $300,000

### TOTAL COST OF IMPROVEMENTS

- $348,533,000

### Other Sources of Funding

- 1 General Fund Contribution: ($5,700,000)
- 2 FAU Contribution: (13,290,000)
- 3 State Share of Projects: (105,400,000)
- 4 Port of Hueneme: (3,000,000)
- 5 City of Ventura Share of Projects: (8,400,000)

Total Other Sources: ($135,790,000)

### NET COST OF IMPROVEMENTS

- $212,743,000

### Total Number of Trips to Buildout

- 672,821

### COST PER TRIP

- $318.01

---

**Sources of Funding**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Highway Improvements</th>
<th>Oxnard</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Port</th>
<th>Ventura</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Rice Bypass</td>
<td>8,700,000</td>
<td>52,600,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>61,300,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Rice/101 Interchange</td>
<td>20,000,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Rose/101 Interchange</td>
<td>16,300,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>16,300,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Route 1/Rice Interchange/Rice Extension</td>
<td>915,000</td>
<td>31,900,000</td>
<td>3,000,000</td>
<td>8,400,000</td>
<td>35,815,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Route 101 —— Vineyard to Johnson</td>
<td>12,500,000</td>
<td>20,900,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>8,400,000</td>
<td>41,800,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Del Norte/101 Interchange</td>
<td>12,000,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12,000,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total: 70,415,000 105,400,000 3,000,000 8,400,000 187,215,000
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Trip Factors</th>
<th>1990 Current Fee</th>
<th>1991 Recommended Fee</th>
<th>Fee Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1990</td>
<td>1991</td>
<td>% Change</td>
<td>$253.76 /trip</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>RESIDENTIAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$3,291.36 /Unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single Family (R−1, R−1−PD, etc.)</td>
<td>11.00 Unit</td>
<td>11.00 Unit</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>$2,791.36 /Unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobile Home (M, H, P)</td>
<td>4.80 Unit</td>
<td>4.80 Unit</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>$1,218.04 /Unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Condominium (R−P−D, R−2, R−2−PD)</td>
<td>8.60 Unit</td>
<td>8.60 Unit</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>$2,182.33 /Unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apartment (R−3, R−3−PD)</td>
<td>6.50 Unit</td>
<td>6.50 Unit</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>$1,649.44 /Unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Rise (R−4, R−4−PD)</td>
<td>7.10 Unit</td>
<td>7.10 Unit</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>$1,801.69 /Unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>COMMERCIAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$3,781.02 /TSF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office (C−O, C−O−PD)</td>
<td>14.90 TSF</td>
<td>15.00 TSF</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>$3,781.02 /TSF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical Office (C−O, C−O−PD)</td>
<td>34.17 TSF</td>
<td>34.17 TSF</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>$8,670.97 /TSF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood (C−1, C−1−PD)</td>
<td>80.91 TSF</td>
<td>80.91 TSF</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>$10,119.94 /TSF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General (C−2, C−2−PD)</td>
<td>39.88 TSF (1)</td>
<td>49.60 TSF (3)</td>
<td>24.4%</td>
<td>$6,331.31 /TSF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotel/Motel (various zones)</td>
<td>10.10 TSF</td>
<td>10.10 TSF</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>$1,093.70 /TSF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>INDUSTRIAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$3,964.80 /TSF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research and Development (B−R−P)</td>
<td>11.40 TSF</td>
<td>11.40 TSF</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>$2,892.86 /TSF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Light Manufacturing (M−1, M−1−PD, M−L, M−L−PD)</td>
<td>8.56 TSF</td>
<td>8.56 TSF</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>$2,172.18 /TSF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heavy Manufacturing (M−2, M−2−PD, M−3)</td>
<td>5.43 TSF</td>
<td>5.43 TSF</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>$1,377.91 /TSF</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1) 50.7% reduction for lower peak trip generation by general commercial uses.
(2) 57.3% reduction for lower peak trip generation by hotel/motel uses.
(3) 38.7% reduction for lower peak trip generation by general commercial uses.
(4) 34.4% reduction for lower peak trip generation by hotel/motel uses.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Company</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>David W. Bailey</td>
<td>City of Oxnard, Public Works</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kevin Bernzott</td>
<td>McGauley Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ray Moe</td>
<td>LSA Associates, Inc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steve Zimmer</td>
<td>Chamber</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ellen Michiel</td>
<td>Raznick &amp; Sons, Inc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timothy P. Nanson</td>
<td>City of Oxnard Public Works</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gerry Furr</td>
<td>City Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bob Bierig</td>
<td>Laguna Pacific</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bob Weithofer</td>
<td>City of Oxnard Public Works</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steve Boggs</td>
<td>Standard Pacific</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephen Maulhardt</td>
<td>Maulhardt Industrial/Chamber</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Craig Kaihara</td>
<td>Sakioka Farms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dee Boysen</td>
<td>B.I.A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manuel Lopez</td>
<td>City Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fred Ferro</td>
<td>Grubb &amp; Ellis/NAIOP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeff Birdwell</td>
<td>The Sammis Company</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Weithofer indicated that technically one could not make a wholesale change in the trip generation model rates as the base model was calibrated with the Fourth Edition trip generation assumptions. He did indicate that the next version of the calibrated model (estimated to be complete in one year) would use updated rates. In review of the industrial rates, the question was raised as to how the City selected light industrial and the BRP rates, as the comparable industrial classification trip generation rates were less than the City rates. Bob Weithofer indicated that he had some backup material as to how those rates were derived and would be forwarding that information. He also indicated that he was willing to consider review of the industrial rates; however, prior to any subsequent modeling analysis, possible locations for field counts to verify appropriate Oxnard rates would be required.

**Land Use Intensity**

The primary issue discussed was whether the permitted intensities are the proper model inputs, or some lower factor reflecting historic conditions. Bob Weithofer indicated that the City is willing to go back and look at trends, and modify the intensity assumptions to the model. He shared with the group some data over 18 months old, which indicated that the M-1 and BRP zones have a significantly lower FAR than permitted development that was input into the model. He further indicated that he would desire more recent floor area intensity data for more current construction in Oxnard. Jeff Birdwell indicated that he had quite a bit of data he could provide from his projects. Steve Maulhardt indicated that he would contact Grubb and Ellis on collecting some supportive information. It was also discussed that any employee data that could be collected would also be desirable. Bob Weithofer stated that if there is a substandard reduction in a rate, he would propose that the zoning be modified so that there is not a substantial deviation between permitted and modeled.

**Level of Service Standards**

Staff agreed that, in order to test the level of service D request, the City's traffic model consultant would need to run the model for both the level of service C and D standards subsequent to determination of any adjustments to the trip generation rates and the development intensities. Bob Weithofer also indicated that staff would need to recalculate the cost estimates for both the level of service C and D model runs. There was also a discussion regarding whether there could be some intersections that operate at a level of service E if they were in industrial and not residential locations. City staff indicated that they would not be supportive of this approach. It was agreed, however, that LSA could utilize the resultant model run's ICU analysis to determine whether there would be significant savings in improvements and, hence, costs.
June 18, 1992

To: Distribution

From: Ray Moe

Subject: Technical Committee Meeting Minutes (June 9, 1992)

The Oxnard Traffic Fee Technical Committee met on June 9, 1992. Attending the meeting were Steve Maulhardt, Jeff Birdwell, Bob Weithofer, David Bailey and Ray Moe. Six technical issues were discussed. The discussion and action items are as follows:

Trip Generation Rates

The first trip generation rate issue was whether the Oxnard traffic fee should be based on daily or peak hour trip generation rates. Bob Weithofer agreed with me that the peak hour trip generation rates would provide for a better nexus, as the proposed circulation improvements were based on peak hour analysis. He further stated that staff would agree to a peak hour traffic fee if the BIA and Chamber agreed with a peak hour recommendation. Attached is a preliminary comparison of the resulting rates for the key land uses. This table was very preliminary and should be used only to give a sense as to whether a given land use fee would go up or down if the peak hour rates were used as a base instead of a daily rate. In general, residential, commercial and light manufacturing go down, and office, commercial manufacturing, hotel/motel and R&D would increase. It is only included for general comparison between an ADT versus a peak hour rate for a particular land use.

The second issue pertaining to the trip generation rates was the source for the trip generation rates. Bob Weithofer indicated that the rates included in the traffic analysis are from the fourth edition of the Institute of Traffic Engineers Trip Generation Manual. I received a copy of the Trip Generation rates used in the model for review. Subsequent to the preparation of the original fee analysis, a fifth edition of the manual has been released. Bob
**Freeway Nexus**

I raised the concern about the need for the City to demonstrate that there is a proper nexus between future Oxnard development traffic and the funding requirements for freeway interchange improvements. Bob Welthofer indicated that in the past the City has provided LSA with some background through traffic data to address nexus between freeway interchange improvements and future development traffic. He further stated that given the funding commitments by Caltrans, the Port and the County, there was a proper nexus between the future development and the remaining freeway improvement costs. I indicated that 1) the building community needs to be assured that there is a proper nexus on a facility by facility basis, 2) that the old material provided by the City to LSA is not compatible with the new model runs being requested, and 3) we need to discuss with the City’s modeling consultant how he would suggest determining total new Oxnard development trips as compared to total new trips. We did agree that a City trip is a trip that has at least one end of the trip within the City of Oxnard.

**Fairness of City Selected Mitigations for Existing Deficiencies**

The issue raised by LSA is that as part of the existing conditions deficiency analysis, the City has selected the less costly mitigations to rectify these existing deficiencies. The issue is whether it is fair for the City to pick the easier, less costly mitigations or whether the City should participate at a rate commensurate with all future development. Bob Welthofer stated that the City has a proper nexus and that if LSA, on behalf of the BIA, wants to explore this issue, the new model runs will provide the data necessary to conduct this analysis.

**Flyovers**

The committee agreed that this issue will technically be addressed upon receipt of the new level of service C and D model runs.

The Oxnard Traffic Fee Technical Committee has tentatively scheduled our next meeting on Tuesday, June 30, 1992, at 8:30 at the City. The objective at this meeting would be to resolve any outstanding trip generation rates and land use intensities.

Distribution:

Dee Boysen  
Steve Maulhardt  
Jeff Birdwell  
Bob Welthofer  
David Bailey
## IMPACT OF PROPOSED TRAFFIC FEE ON EACH LAND USE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use</th>
<th>1990 Fee</th>
<th>Proposed ADT Fee</th>
<th>Proposed Rush Hour Fee</th>
<th>Change from Proposed ADT to Rush Hour</th>
<th>Change from Current to Proposed ADT</th>
<th>Change from Current to Proposed Rush Hour</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single Family</td>
<td>$2,791</td>
<td>$8,921</td>
<td>$6,546</td>
<td>($2,375)</td>
<td>220%</td>
<td>$6,130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobil Home</td>
<td>$1,218</td>
<td>$3,693</td>
<td>$3,208</td>
<td>($685)</td>
<td>220%</td>
<td>$2,675</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Condominium</td>
<td>$2,182</td>
<td>$6,975</td>
<td>$5,892</td>
<td>($1,083)</td>
<td>220%</td>
<td>$4,793</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apartment</td>
<td>$1,649</td>
<td>$5,272</td>
<td>$4,255</td>
<td>($1,016)</td>
<td>220%</td>
<td>$3,623</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Rise</td>
<td>$1,802</td>
<td>$5,758</td>
<td>$4,582</td>
<td>($1,176)</td>
<td>220%</td>
<td>$3,956</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office</td>
<td>$3,781</td>
<td>$12,165</td>
<td>$13,747</td>
<td>$1,582</td>
<td>222%</td>
<td>$8,384</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood</td>
<td>$10,120</td>
<td>$40,224</td>
<td>$29,229</td>
<td>($10,995)</td>
<td>297%</td>
<td>$19,109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General</td>
<td>$6,331</td>
<td>$25,155</td>
<td>$16,038</td>
<td>($9,117)</td>
<td>297%</td>
<td>$18,824</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial Manufacturing</td>
<td>$3,038</td>
<td>$3,530</td>
<td>$4,582</td>
<td>$1,053</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>$492</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotel/Motel</td>
<td>$1,094</td>
<td>$3,777</td>
<td>$4,582</td>
<td>$805</td>
<td>245%</td>
<td>$2,683</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research &amp; Development</td>
<td>$2,893</td>
<td>$9,245</td>
<td>$10,965</td>
<td>$1,720</td>
<td>220%</td>
<td>$8,072</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Light Manufacturing</td>
<td>$2,172</td>
<td>$6,942</td>
<td>$6,775</td>
<td>($167)</td>
<td>220%</td>
<td>$4,603</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heavy Manufacturing</td>
<td>$1,378</td>
<td>$4,404</td>
<td>$6,219</td>
<td>$1,815</td>
<td>220%</td>
<td>$4,841</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Present at the meeting were Councilmembers Manuel Lopez and Gerry Furr, Public Works staff Timothy Nanson, Bob Weithofer and David Bailey, and representatives of the development community Steve Boggs of Standard Pacific, Dee Boysen of the BIA, Fred Farrell of Grubb & Ellis/NAIOP, and Ellen Michiel of Raznick & Sons.

The agenda for this subcommittee includes the following items from the agenda of the whole committee of June 3, 1992:

- #5 Financing Mechanisms for Major Off-Site Improvements;
- #6 Inclusion of 101 Freeway Interchanges in the Traffic Impact Fee;
- #8 Special Problems of NIAD Area; and
- #10 Traffic Impact Mitigations.

The last item, #10 Traffic Impact Mitigations, was discussed during this meeting.

Mitigation to Existing Level of Service Rather Than to Level of Service C

Currently projects which generate a significant increase in traffic are conditioned to improve impacted intersections to Level of Service C, regardless of existing deficiencies (LOS D, E or F). The Committee proposed an alternative plan that would require projects to mitigate their specific impacts on intersections within the LOS C-F range, so that no intersection would be further degraded. For example, even though a project may not cause an intersection to fall below LOS C, it would be responsible for mitigating any impact within the range of C. Projects impacting intersections within the LOS D-F range would be responsible for restoring the intersections to their existing LOS.

Limit the Cost of Mitigation

Because the cost of making the improvements necessary to bring the intersection back to the existing level of service can in some cases be very high relative to the ability of the project to obtain financing, a policy was proposed that would limit the cost of making conditioned improvements. Under the proposed policy, projects would be conditioned to make improvements up to a value equal to twice the traffic impact fee for that project.

At the time of construction the City would identify conditioned improvements required to return the level of service to the level existing prior to the project. If the list of conditioned projects exceeded the amount of twice the traffic impact fee, the City would select projects to be built up to an amount not to exceed twice the traffic impact fee and the project would pay the remainder up to that amount in cash. If the conditioned improvements were greater than twice the traffic impact fee and the City determined that building a portion of the improvements at a cost of less than twice the traffic impact fee was not reasonable, the City would accept payment of twice the traffic impact fee in lieu of the conditioned improvements. If the conditioned improvements were valued at less than twice the traffic impact fee, the project would build all of the conditioned improvements.
For purposes of reimbursement, those projects that paid twice the traffic impact fee in lieu of building conditioned improvements would be reimbursed as if the project had built conditioned improvements equal to that amount. The amount in excess of the traffic impact fee would be reimbursed according to the policy of the City at 10% per year or $20,000 per year whichever is greater.

An alternative to setting the limit at twice the traffic impact fee was discussed. Under the alternative the limit would be set according to the following scale:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Traffic Impact Fee</th>
<th>Limit on Additional Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$0 to $500,000</td>
<td>+100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$500,001 to $1,000,000</td>
<td>+75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>more than $1,000,000</td>
<td>+50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There was disagreement on the appropriateness of the scale and the method of setting the limit will need to be resolved later.

Exclusion of Frontage Improvements from the Traffic Impact Fee

The Committee proposed excluding the cost of master planned improvements along the frontage of the project from the traffic impact fee calculation. The project would dedicate the right-of-way and build the master planned improvements along the project's frontage without credit toward the traffic impact fees and without reimbursement of costs. Public Works staff will develop a cost estimate for such master planned improvements in order to estimate the impact of removing this cost from the traffic impact fee calculation. The City Attorney's Office will be asked to review the legal issues of conditioning frontage improvements without giving credits or reimbursements.

The Timing of Payment of Fees

A policy for deferring a portion of the fee payment was proposed for non-residential development. The remaining fee after credits for conditioned improvements would be paid 50% at the time of building permit with the balance to be paid one year later. A temporary certificate of occupancy would be issued for one year. Issuance of a permanent certificate of occupancy after that period would require payment of the balance of the traffic impact fee. This policy would not apply to residential or fast food restaurants.

Adjourned 10:00 A.M.

David Bailey
Sr. Management Analyst
City of Oxnard Public Works
TRAFFIC IMPACT FEE METHODOLOGY

Development Unit

Development is converted to a common unit which can most equitably measure the impact of a given project on the requirement for infrastructure. These units for the traffic fee are average vehicular trips per day. An estimate is made of the gross total number of development units expected to be realized in the City through build-out. Previous fee calculations included an adjustment downward to the total number of traffic vehicular trips to accommodate the public project factor under the assumption that some public projects may be exempt from the payment of traffic infrastructure fees. However, the City has negotiated payments in lieu of fees from several public projects. Because the City intends to recover as much of the cost of infrastructure as possible through negotiation, it is proposed that the adjustment for public projects be discontinued. The number of public projects exempt from fees and with which payments in lieu of fees cannot be negotiated is deemed to be negligible.

Reimbursements Policies

Reimbursement Interest Costs. Developers who construct master plan facilities are eligible for reimbursement of costs in excess of the fees levied on their development. Current policy allows the reimbursements to occur over a period of up to ten years depending on the size of the reimbursement. Up to now most reimbursements have been paid in a lump sum once the amount of credit received was known and the amount of reimbursement could be calculated. However, reimbursements are beginning to be spread over more than one year when sufficient funds are not available in the first year. It is proposed that interest rate be paid on the outstanding reimbursements. The rate paid will be tied to the Local Agency Investment Fund (LAIF) average rate for the fiscal year. The current projection of the average LAIF rate is 8%. The interest has been added to the total cost of providing the required facilities. The estimate of interest costs as a percent of the total cost of required facilities is 3.74%. The calculation of this estimate is shown in Attachment No. 1.

Reimbursement Processing Fee. The engineering time required to process reimbursements is considerable. This service is provided by the Engineering Development Section of the Public Works Department and charged to the developer reimbursement budget of the Traffic Circulation System Improvement Fund, since the processing of the reimbursements is a cost of providing the required facilities. The cost of the reimbursement processing is estimated to be 0.65% of the total cost of required facilities. This cost has been added to the cost of required facilities. The calculation of these estimates is provided in Attachment No. 1.

Reimbursements Policies. Improvements built and dedicated will be reimbursed based on the policies in effect at the time of map recordation. Developments with development agreements which freeze fees or limit fee increases to an inflation index will be reimbursed based on the policy in effect at the time of the agreement.
Traffic Impact Fee Methodology

Turn lanes and traffic signals located on master planned roadways but which are not master planned facilities (e.g., local intersections and driveways) are not eligible for reimbursement.

The cost of severance for parcels which lose their economic viability due to dedication of right-of-way and the cost of relocation or buying of businesses which must be condemned to obtain right-of-way are not currently in the cost basis of the traffic impact fee nor are they eligible for reimbursement costs. At the request of representatives of the development community, staff will develop cost estimates for including these costs in the next revision of the traffic impact fee.

It is proposed that the method of calculating a developer's cost of providing master planned facilities be changed. These costs are calculated for the purpose of providing reimbursement for the portion of the costs that exceed the amount of the fees payable by that development which provided the master planned facilities. Currently the cost is estimated by requiring that the developer provide three bids from contractors for the construction of the facilities. The lowest bid is used as the cost estimate for the facilities. The drawbacks of this method are that the bids are not provided through an actual bidding process and the actual construction of the facilities is not necessarily provided by the three bidders. The construction of the master planned facilities are generally part of a larger construction project for the developer. The cost estimates resulting from this method vary greatly from project to project and generally result in higher costs than those estimates upon which the infrastructure fees are based.

It is proposed that the cost estimate for reimbursement of master planned facilities provided by developers be based on a unit cost calculation. Lists of unit costs for construction of master planned facilities will be maintained by the Public Works Department (Attachment No. 5) and used both as the basis for estimating the basis of the infrastructure facilities fees and as the basis for reimbursing developers for the provision of those facilities. The accuracy of the list of unit costs will be monitored and adjusted as needed to maintain its validity as a method of cost estimating. When the unit cost list will be adjusted for both the basis of calculating the infrastructure fee and for calculating reimbursements to developers.

Also, the resolution on credit and reimbursement policies has the added stipulation that credits and reimbursements are processed upon written request from the person eligible for a credit or reimbursement. This has been the practice and is added to the resolution for clarity.

Planned Traffic Circulation Facilities Fees

In February of 1985, the City Council imposed planned traffic circulation facilities fees, sometimes called the Circulation System Improvement Fee (CSIF). The fee was amended in July, 1985. The purpose of the fee is to fund roadway improvements that are necessary due to new development and to spread the cost of these improvements fairly among the new developments.
Basic Assumption. The basic assumption is that beginning with the inception of the fee in 1985, there are certain circulation system improvement costs which are expected to be incurred, a portion of which is the responsibility of new development. All new developments in the City after 1985 should share proportionately in that cost.

Development Time Frame. The CSIF has been adjusted to reflect the information in the recently adopted 2020 General Plan.

Required Circulation System Improvements. The list of required improvements to be funded by the CSIF has been adjusted in the following ways:

1. The roadway cross-section has been increased where necessary to accommodate estimated increases in the traffic load.

2. Roadway improvements have been added where necessary to maintain a Level of Service "C" as adopted in the 2020 General Plan.

3. Required improvements to secondary and collector roadways have been added to the list of arterial roadways in order to spread the cost of the complete Circulation System. Previously, secondary and collector roadways were not included in the master plan. Only the cost of arterial roadway improvements was spread to all developers through the CSIF. The cost of providing secondary and collector roadways was the responsibility of the adjacent developments. By adding secondary and collector roadway improvements to the fee these costs can be distributed to other developments that benefit from the construction of the secondary and collector roadways.

4. The cost of acquiring right-of-way for off-site or City built improvements but not the developer's cost of dedicating right-of-way required for the circulation system improvements has been added to the fee calculation. Previously, the total cost of right-of-way was borne by the developments conditioned to build the improvements or by other resources if the City built the improvements. By including the cost of off-site right-of-way in the basis of the fee, these costs can be distributed more fairly to all developments which benefit from the roadway improvements. Although the fee increases greatly due to the inclusion of right-of-way costs, those developers providing off-site right-of-way will now be eligible for reimbursement of right-of-way costs in excess of the fees paid.

Other Sources of Funding. A portion of the cost of the required facilities is offset by other sources of revenue. Only the unfunded portion of the cost of required facilities will be distributed to future development through the CSIF. Each revenue source is discussed below:

1. City General Fund.

An average of $180,000 in General Fund money has been appropriated to eligible CSIF projects during the five years following implementation of the fee (FY
Traffic Impact Fee Methodology

1985-86 through 1989-90). The General Fund contribution to the Circulation System Improvement Program is therefore estimated to be $190,000 per year during the period from 1991 through build-out in the year 2020. The total estimated contribution is $5.7 million.

2. Federal Funds (Federal Aid to Urban Roads FAU).

The City’s average annual funding from FAU is $443,000. The FAU contribution for the 30 year period through build-out is estimated to be $13.29 million. FAU funding has not been reauthorized by Congress. It is expected that a new Federal program will replace it. Once a new program is adopted it may be necessary to revise the estimate of funding from Federal sources.

3. State Funding and Project Cost Sharing with the Port of Hueneme and the City of Ventura.

Outlined below are the proposed funding assumptions regarding five major projects which are eligible for State funding cost sharing with the Port of Hueneme and the City of Ventura:

(1) Rice Bypass (86% State - 14% City).

The Rice Bypass Project consists of the conversion of Rice Avenue from a point south of Fifth Street to US-101 from a six-lane arterial to a freeway. This includes the construction of a grade separation at the Southern Pacific Railroad (100% state funded), a freeway to freeway interchange at US-101 (100% state funded), two local interchanges at Gonzales Road and at Colonia Road (50% state funded, 50% local funded) and roadway improvements (100% state funded). The total project cost is estimated at $61,300,000 of which $52,600,000 will be provided by the state and $8,700,000 by the City.

(2) Rice/101 Interchange (0% State - 100% City).

Because of the high accident rate and congestion levels, the Rice/Highway 101 Interchange has been identified by Caltrans as an interchange which is a State responsibility to reconstruct. While the reconstruction is all State responsibility, the current lack of State funding and the projected need for a reconstructed facility within the next five years will probably mean that local funds will be required to complete this project in a time frame which meets City needs. Therefore, it is assumed that the City will provide the total project cost currently estimated at $20,000,000.

(3) Rose/101 Interchange (0% State - 100% City).

At the present time, the reconstruction of the Rose/Highway 101 Interchange has been identified by Caltrans as a local responsibility because of its low accident rate and congestion levels. As the congestion levels and accident rates increase, by the mid-1990’s this facility’s reconstruction will be required. Therefore, it is assumed that the City will provide the total project cost currently estimated at $16,300,000.
(4) **Route 1/Rice Avenue/Pleasant Valley Road Interchange (89% State - 8% Port of Hueneme - 3% City).**

The reconstruction of the Route 1/Rice Avenue/Pleasant Valley Road Interchange has been programmed in the State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) for construction in the 1996-97. $31,900,000 of the cost is being funded by Caltrans. The extension of Rice Avenue to Hueneme Road will be necessary for the expansion of the Port of Hueneme and the construction of the Ormond Beach development. It is estimated that $3,000,000 of the $3,915,000 will be provided by the Port of Hueneme for this project. The total project cost is $35,815,000 of which $31,900,000 will be provided by the State, $3,000,000 by the Port of Hueneme and $915,000 by the City. The following table summarizes the funding assumptions.

**Route 1/Rice Avenue/Pleasant Valley Road Funding**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>State Share</th>
<th>Port Share</th>
<th>Oxnard Share</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Construction and Engineering</td>
<td>$35.8</td>
<td>$31.9</td>
<td>$3.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(5) **Route 101-Vineyard to Johnson (50% State - 20% Ventura - 30% City).**

The reconstruction of the Highway 1/101 Interchange is by definition a State responsibility, since it is a state-to-state facility and an adopted freeway agreement exists for the improvements (although some modifications are being proposed). While this project is included as the Ventura County Transportation Commission's (VCTC) top priority, local funding will probably be required by the State, partially because of the perceived ''developer benefits.''

Also, this project has been combined with the widening of Route 101, including the widening of the Santa Clara River Bridge, which is a very costly project. The Caltrans Project Study Report estimates construction cost at $38 million. Caltrans has committed to a 50% share with a $19 million cap on construction funding with adjustments for inflation. The DKS consultant report suggests a local cost split of 60% Oxnard and 40% Ventura. The following table summarizes the resulting funding shares.

**Route 101 - Vineyard Avenue to Johnson Drive Funding**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>State Share</th>
<th>Ventura Share</th>
<th>Oxnard Share</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>$38.0</td>
<td>$19.0</td>
<td>$11.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$41.8</td>
<td>$20.9</td>
<td>$12.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Traffic Impact Fee Methodology

(6) Del Norte/Route 101 Interchange (100% City).

The current interchange will need to be replaced with a partial cloverleaf interchange as the Northeast Industrial Area approaches build-out. Since the need for a new interchange is primarily due to increased development, it is assumed that the City will provide the total project cost currently estimated at $12,000,000.

Based on all of the revenue projections outlined above, the estimated funding gap for projects identified by the Circulation System Improvement Program is computed as follows (See Attachment Nos. 2 and 3).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Estimated CSIF Cost</td>
<td>$484,323,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less: Generated Fund Contribution</td>
<td>($5,700,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAU Contribution</td>
<td>($13,290,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Share of Projects</td>
<td>($105,400,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Port of Hueneme Share of Projects</td>
<td>($3,000,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Ventura Share of Projects</td>
<td>($8,400,000)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Funding From Other Sources ($135,790,000)

Net Revenue Requirement $348,533,000

Development Estimate: Trip Generation. The information used to estimate average daily trips per acre and trips per unit and per 1,000 square foot floor space is based on the current industry standards from the Institute of Transportation Engineers Trip Generation Report, 4th Edition.

To establish the total average daily trips projected, these trip generation factors are applied to the undeveloped units and floor area as shown in the 2020 General Plan. The trips for retail land uses and hotel/motel are adjusted for peak trips (see Attachment No. 4). The total resulting trips are 672,821.

Computation. By dividing the total estimated revenue requirement of $348,533,000 by 672,821 trips, the resulting base fee is $518.01 per vehicular trip. While this represents a 104.1 percent increase over the current fee of $253.76, staff believes that the adjustment is balanced by the increased reimbursement for right-of-way and collector roadway improvements.
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Attachments
#1 - Interest on Reimbursement & Reimbursement Processing Fees
#2 - Traffic Primary, Secondary & Collector Improvements
#3 - Circulation System Improvements
#4 - Trip Generation
#5 - Eligible Items & Unit Costs for Reimbursement and Cost Basis of Facility Fees
## ESTIMATE OF INTEREST ON REIMBURSEMENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>High</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Projects built by developers as percent of cost of all required facilities</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Value in excess of fees (Reimbursible portion)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Portion not reimbursed immediately</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Resultant portion reimbursed over time</td>
<td>(1) X (2) X (3)</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Average number of years to reimburse</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Rate of interest</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Total interest paid as percent of amount reimbursed</td>
<td></td>
<td>16.41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Total interest paid as percent of total cost of all required facilities</td>
<td>(4) X (7)</td>
<td>1.97%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Average of High and Low estimates</td>
<td>3.74%</td>
<td>3.74%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## ESTIMATE OF REIMBURSEMENT PROCESSING FEES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Mid</th>
<th>High</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Projects built by developers as percent of cost of all required facilities</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Time to process reimbursement</td>
<td>60 hrs</td>
<td>40 hrs</td>
<td>20 hrs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(checking quantities, bids, contract documents, verification of ownership, processing contingent and excess reimbursement, issuing purchase orders and record keeping)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Full cost rate per hour</td>
<td>$66</td>
<td>$66</td>
<td>$66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Value of project (Millions)</td>
<td>$1.0</td>
<td>$0.1</td>
<td>$0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Total cost to process based on cost of project</td>
<td>(2) X (3) / (4)</td>
<td>$3,960</td>
<td>$2,640</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Total cost to process as percent of total cost of required facilities</td>
<td>(1) X (5) / (4)</td>
<td>0.24%</td>
<td>1.85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Estimated weighting of project costs</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Weighted average of process costs</td>
<td>Cost to facilities plan</td>
<td>0.65%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STREET</td>
<td>CONSTRUCTION CITY</td>
<td>CONSTRUCTION R.O.W.</td>
<td>R.O.W. GRAND</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PRIMARY</td>
<td>SECONDARY</td>
<td>COLLECTOR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 BARD ROAD</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$1,730</td>
<td>$502</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 &quot;C&quot; STREET</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$250</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 CHANNEL ISLAND BL.</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$3,730</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 COLOMA ROAD</td>
<td>$6,365</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 DEL NORTE BL.</td>
<td>$1,290</td>
<td>$1,130</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 DORIS AVE.</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$1,010</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 EVAN ST.</td>
<td>$1,350</td>
<td>$1,796</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 LAKESIDE BL.</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$1,203</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 MILL ROAD</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$1,770</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 FIFTH STREET</td>
<td>$7,730</td>
<td>$7,270</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 GONZALEZ ROAD</td>
<td>$21,300</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 &quot;H&quot; STREET</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$160</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 HARBOR BL.</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$10,575</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 HEMLOCK STREET</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$140</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 BOBSON WAY</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$90</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 HUNERSON ROAD</td>
<td>$4,301</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 &quot;J&quot; STREET</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$100</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 LAFTON AVENUE</td>
<td>$4,118</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 LOMBARD STREET</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$4,050</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 GODFRED BL. RENT.</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 PACIFIC AVENUE</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$390</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 PATTERSON ROAD</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$1,400</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 PLEASANT VALLEY RD.</td>
<td>$5,950</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 RICE AVENUE</td>
<td>$1,201</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 ROSE AVENUE</td>
<td>$10,205</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 SANTA CLARA AVE.</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27 SAVIERS ROAD</td>
<td>$1,825</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 SECOND STREET</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$55</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29 STAYMAN BL.</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$50</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 STURM STREET</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$2,800</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 STUNIS ROAD</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$1,215</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32 TELA CLUB ROAD</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$1,800</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33 THIRD STREET</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$50</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34 VENTURA BL.</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$2,220</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 VENTURA ROAD</td>
<td>$8,005</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36 VIA DEL NORTE</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$50</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37 VICTORIA AVENUE</td>
<td>$1,770</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38 VINEYARD AVENUE</td>
<td>$3,090</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39 WAGON WHEEL ROAD</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$2,100</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 WOOLEY ROAD</td>
<td>$3,210</td>
<td>$1,100</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41 WOOLSEY AVE.</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$1,620</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SUBTOTAL</strong></td>
<td>$134,696</td>
<td>$57,982</td>
<td>$29,810</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CONTINGENCY 20%</strong></td>
<td>$26,998</td>
<td>$11,596</td>
<td>$6,962</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AKE 25%</strong></td>
<td>$34,931</td>
<td>$17,176</td>
<td>$7,064</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>$113,451</td>
<td>$73,564</td>
<td>$8,587</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CIRCULATION SYSTEM IMPROVEMENTS

Highway Improvements
1 Rice Bypass
2 Rice/101 Interchange
3 Rose/101 Interchange
4 Route 1/Rice Interchange/Rice Extension
5 Route 101 —— Vineyard to Johnson
6 Del Norte/101 Interchange

Total Highway Improvements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cost Base</th>
<th>CCI = 5988</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>Right of Way</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>$113,451,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>73,564,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collector</td>
<td>8,587,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Subtotals $195,602,000 $84,075,000 $47,082,000
Total Interior Roadways $242,684,000 $246,413,000

Drainage Facilities (Non-Master Planned) within Master Planned Streets
$25,632,000

Traffic Signals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reimbursement</th>
<th>CCI = 5988</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interest Cost</td>
<td>3.74% X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Processing Cost</td>
<td>0.65% X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Periodic Masterplan Updates
$300,000

TOTAL COST OF IMPROVEMENTS $484,323,000

Other Sources of Funding
1 General Fund Contribution $(5,700,000)
2 FAU Contribution $(13,290,000)
3 State Share of Projects $(105,400,000)
4 Port of Hueneme $(3,000,000)
5 City of Ventura Share of Projects $(8,400,000)

Total Other Sources $(135,790,000)

NET COST OF IMPROVEMENTS $348,533,000

Total Number of Trips to Buildout 672,821

COST PER TRIP $518.01

Sources of Funding

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Highway Improvements</th>
<th>Oxnard</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Port</th>
<th>Ventura</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Rice Bypass</td>
<td>8,700,000</td>
<td>52,600,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>61,300,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Rice/101 Interchange</td>
<td>20,000,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Rose/101 Interchange</td>
<td>16,300,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>16,300,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Route 1/Rice Interchange/Rice Extension</td>
<td>915,000</td>
<td>31,900,000</td>
<td>3,000,000</td>
<td>8,400,000</td>
<td>35,815,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Route 101 —— Vineyard to Johnson</td>
<td>12,500,000</td>
<td>20,900,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>8,400,000</td>
<td>41,800,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Del Norte/101 Interchange</td>
<td>12,000,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12,000,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total 70,415,000 105,400,000 3,000,000 8,400,000 187,215,000

C:\123DATA\DATADEV\CSIF.WK1 06-Jul-92
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>USE</th>
<th>1989</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>CHANGE FROM 1989 TO 2020</th>
<th>ADJUSTED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Res - Low (SFD)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Res - Medium (SFA)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Res - Medium /High</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Apartments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Elderly Residential</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Mobile Homes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Office (0-99 TSF)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Office (100 TSF+)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Government Office</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Medical Office</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 General Commercial</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Regional Commercial</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Community Commercial</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Nghbrd Commercial</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Crunc Commercial</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Restaurant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 Fast-Food Restaurant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 Motel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 Hotel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 Auto Dealer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 Business Park</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 Warehouse</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 Light Ind (Exist)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 Light Ind (Future)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 Industrial</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 Agriculture</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27 Elementary School</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 Junior High School</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29 High School</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 College</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 Golf Course</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32 Civic Auditorium</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33 Church</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34 Park</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 Harbor Related</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36 Hospital</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37 Health Club</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38 Transportation Cntr</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39 Theatre</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 Airport</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41 Service Station</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42 Bank</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43 Cemetery</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44 Car Wash</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45 Self - Storage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46 Auto Repair</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47 Edison Power Plant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48 Landfill</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49 Beach</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 Marina</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51 Day Care Center</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52 Cultural/Perf Arts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>77,878</td>
<td>108,796</td>
<td>1,175,334</td>
<td>1,923,516</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### UNIT COST FOR REIMBURSEMENT

**IMPROVEMENT COSTS**  
*BY PROJECT SIZE*

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UNIT COST</td>
<td>UNIT</td>
<td>PROJECT SIZE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>CONC. CURB</td>
<td>$10.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>CONC. CURB &amp; GUTTER</td>
<td>$10.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MEDIAN CURB</td>
<td>$10.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>CONC. SIDEWALK</td>
<td>$3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>PVMT. AC. (PER IN. TH.)</td>
<td>$0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PVMT. BASE (PER IN. TH.)</td>
<td>$0.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>LANDSCAPING &amp; IRRIGATION</td>
<td>$6.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>BOMANITE</td>
<td>$8.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>TRAFFIC SIGNAL INTERCONNECT</td>
<td>$10.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>SIGNS &amp; STRIPES</td>
<td>$3.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>LIGHTING &amp; TRENCHING</td>
<td>$10.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
UNIT COST FOR REIMBURSEMENT

SEWER IMPROVEMENT COSTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PIPE SIZE</th>
<th>UNIT COST</th>
<th>UNIT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 10&quot; V.C.P.</td>
<td>$25.00</td>
<td>L.F.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 12&quot; V.C.P.</td>
<td>$30.00</td>
<td>L.F.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 15&quot; V.C.P.</td>
<td>$37.50</td>
<td>L.F.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 18&quot; V.C.P.</td>
<td>$45.00</td>
<td>L.F.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 21&quot; V.C.P.</td>
<td>$52.50</td>
<td>L.F.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 24&quot; V.C.P.</td>
<td>$60.00</td>
<td>L.F.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7 FT. MANHOLE PRECAST
48" DIAM.
$200 PER VERT. FT.
(ADD $20/FT.
FOR DROP M.H.)

8 MANHOLE RING & COVER
(CAST IRON)

$400.00 EACH

FOR PIPE INSTALLATION IN UNPAVED
(NEW) STREETS & OTHER AREAS,
REDUCE UNIT COST BY 25%.
## Unit Cost for Reimbursement

### Water Improvement Costs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Size</th>
<th>Unit Cost</th>
<th>Unit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 10&quot; PIPE, IN PLACE</td>
<td>$27.00</td>
<td>L.F.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 12&quot; PIPE, IN PLACE</td>
<td>$32.00</td>
<td>L.F.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 14&quot; PIPE, IN PLACE</td>
<td>$36.00</td>
<td>L.F.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 16&quot; PIPE, IN PLACE</td>
<td>$42.00</td>
<td>L.F.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 20&quot; PIPE, IN PLACE</td>
<td>$52.00</td>
<td>L.F.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 10&quot; TEE, IN PLACE</td>
<td>$400.00</td>
<td>EACH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 12&quot; TEE, IN PLACE</td>
<td>$500.00</td>
<td>EACH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 16&quot; TEE, IN PLACE</td>
<td>$1,400.00</td>
<td>EACH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 20&quot; TEE, IN PLACE</td>
<td>$2,000.00</td>
<td>EACH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 10&quot; CROSS, IN PLACE</td>
<td>$550.00</td>
<td>EACH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 12&quot; CROSS, IN PLACE</td>
<td>$650.00</td>
<td>EACH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 16&quot; CROSS, IN PLACE</td>
<td>$1,500.00</td>
<td>EACH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 20&quot; CROSS, IN PLACE</td>
<td>$2,200.00</td>
<td>EACH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 12&quot;x10&quot; REDUCER, IN PLACE</td>
<td>$250.00</td>
<td>EACH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 16&quot;x10&quot; REDUCER, IN PLACE</td>
<td>$1,000.00</td>
<td>EACH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27 20&quot;x10&quot; REDUCER, IN PLACE</td>
<td>$1,500.00</td>
<td>EACH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 2&quot; BLOW-OFF, IN PLACE</td>
<td>$400.00</td>
<td>EACH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29 6&quot; BLOW-OFF, IN PLACE</td>
<td>$1,200.00</td>
<td>EACH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 10&quot; ELL 90 OR 45 DEG., IN PLACE</td>
<td>$300.00</td>
<td>EACH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 12&quot; ELL 90 OR 45 DEG., IN PLACE</td>
<td>$350.00</td>
<td>EACH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32 16&quot; ELL 90 OR 45 DEG., IN PLACE</td>
<td>$1,000.00</td>
<td>EACH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33 20&quot; ELL 90 OR 45 DEG., IN PLACE</td>
<td>$1,500.00</td>
<td>EACH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34 10&quot; VALVE, IN PLACE</td>
<td>$800.00</td>
<td>EACH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 12&quot; VALVE, IN PLACE</td>
<td>$900.00</td>
<td>EACH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36 16&quot; VALVE, IN PLACE</td>
<td>$2,000.00</td>
<td>EACH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37 20&quot; VALVE, IN PLACE</td>
<td>$3,000.00</td>
<td>EACH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38 1&quot; AIR RELEASE</td>
<td>$400.00</td>
<td>EACH</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For installation of all new items in unpaved (new) streets & other areas, reduce cost by 25%.
UNIT COST FOR REIMBURSEMENT

DRAINAGE IMPROVEMENT COSTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PIPE SIZE</th>
<th>UNIT COST</th>
<th>UNIT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 18&quot; R.C.P., IN PLACE</td>
<td>$45.00</td>
<td>L.F.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 21&quot; R.C.P., IN PLACE</td>
<td>$50.00</td>
<td>L.F.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 24&quot; R.C.P., IN PLACE</td>
<td>$60.00</td>
<td>L.F.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 30&quot; R.C.P., IN PLACE</td>
<td>$75.00</td>
<td>L.F.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 36&quot; R.C.P., IN PLACE</td>
<td>$83.00</td>
<td>L.F.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 42&quot; R.C.P., IN PLACE</td>
<td>$97.00</td>
<td>L.F.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 42&quot; R.C.P., IN PLACE</td>
<td>$110.00</td>
<td>L.F.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 60&quot; R.C.P., IN PLACE</td>
<td>$132.00</td>
<td>L.F.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 72&quot; R.C.P., IN PLACE</td>
<td>$150.00</td>
<td>L.F.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 STANDARD MANHOLE</td>
<td>$2,500.00</td>
<td>EACH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 JUNCTION STRUCTURES</td>
<td>$1,500.00</td>
<td>EACH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 STANDARD CATCH BASIN</td>
<td>$3,000.00</td>
<td>EACH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 CLASS A REINFORCED CONC. (MORE THAN 100 C.Y.)</td>
<td>$320.00</td>
<td>CU. YD.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 CLASS A REINFORCED CONC. (LESS THAN 100 C.Y.)</td>
<td>$380.00</td>
<td>CU. YD.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FOR PIPE INSTALLATION IN UNPAVED (NEW) STREETS & OTHER AREAS, REDUCE UNIT COST BY 25%.
UNIT COST FOR REIMBURSEMENT

RIGHT - OF - WAY COSTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LAND USE</th>
<th>COST PER ACRE</th>
<th>COST PER SQ.FT.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. AGRICULTURAL</td>
<td>$110,000</td>
<td>$2.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. RESIDENTIAL</td>
<td>$220,000</td>
<td>$5.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. LIGHT MANUFACTURING</td>
<td>$275,000</td>
<td>$6.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. COMMERCIAL</td>
<td>$475,000</td>
<td>$10.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. COASTAL DEVELOPMENT</td>
<td>$330,000</td>
<td>$7.58</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Above costs include appraisal costs, legal costs, & condemnation costs, if any.
CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF OXNARD
RESOLUTION NO.

RESOLUTION SETTING PLANNED TRAFFIC CIRCULATION FACILITIES FEES

WHEREAS, Division 5 of Article V-A of Chapter 27 of the Code of the City of Oxnard imposes planned traffic circulation facilities fees on development projects producing additional vehicle trips, such fees to be set by resolution; and

WHEREAS, City staff has presented to City Council a report entitled "Adjustments to Traffic Circulation System Improvement Fees", dated July 6, 1992 which explains the basis on which the fees set herein were calculated; and

WHEREAS, the City Council finds that the fees adopted herein satisfy the requirements of law, including the Code of the City of Oxnard;

NOW, THEREFORE, the City Council of the City of Oxnard hereby resolves as follows:

1. Development Projects. All development projects producing additional vehicle trips shall pay the planned traffic circulation facilities fees set by this resolution.

2. Staff Report.
   a. The staff report dated July 6, 1992, is attached hereto as Exhibit A and is hereby approved and incorporated in full herein by this reference. Such report provides the basis for the City Council's determination that there is a reasonable relationship between the amount of the planned traffic circulation facilities fees set herein and the cost of the traffic circulation facilities or portion thereof attributable to the development project on which the fees are imposed.
   b. The City Council further determines that there is a reasonable relationship between the fee's use and the type of development project on which the fee is imposed, and between the need for traffic circulation facilities and the type of
development project on which the fee is imposed. The master plan of traffic circulation, the circulation element of the General Plan, the report referred to in subsection (a) of this section, and the provisions of Division 5 of Article V-A of Chapter 27 of the Oxnard City Code provide the basis for such determinations.

3. Fees. The total fee per additional trip is $347.79.

4. Calculation of Fees. The fees imposed on each development project will be calculated as follows:

a. The Public Works Director shall be responsible for calculating the fees imposed on each development project.

b. Development projects subject to the fees include modifications or additions to existing buildings that generate more average daily vehicle trips than can be reasonably attributed to the current size, condition or use of the property. The Public Works Director shall consider changes in use of the property and/or additions to the gross floor area.

c. For non-office commercial land uses, the total number of trips generated shall be adjusted using the peak to average trip ratio for commercial uses divided by the same statistic for all other land uses. This adjustment shall be made to account for the fact that commercial uses generate proportionately less peak time travel than other uses and, therefore, such uses impact the circulation system to a lesser degree than would be suggested from use of unadjusted average trip data. The peak to average trip ratio is found to be 6.99 percent for general commercial uses and 7.48 percent for hotels, while the peak to average trip ratio for other uses is determined to be 11.41 percent. The adjustment factor is, therefore, 6.99/11.41 = .613 for general non-office commercial and 7.48/11.41 = .656 for hotel/motel uses.
d. Trip generation rates have been prepared based upon statistical data collected and analyzed by the Institute of Transportation Engineers and published in its Trip Generation Report, 4th Edition.

e. Trip generation rates and the resulting fees shall be as follows for specific types of development projects:

(1) Residential
   (a) Single Family Detached (R-1 Zones)
       11.0 Trips/Unit \times \$347.79 = \$3,825.69/\text{unit}
   (b) Condominium (R-P-D and R-2 Zones)
       8.6 Trips/Unit \times \$347.79 = \$2,990.99/\text{unit}
   (c) Apartment (R-3 Zones)
       6.5 Trips/Unit \times \$347.79 = \$2,260.63/\text{unit}
   (d) Mobile Home (M-H-P Zone)
       4.8 Trips/Unit \times \$347.79 = \$1,669.39/\text{unit}

(2) Commercial
   (a) General Retail and Service (C-2 Zones)
       31.02 Trips/1000 gross square feet of floor area
       \times \$347.79 = \$10,788.44/1,000 gross square feet.
       Note: The trip estimate has been modified pursuant paragraph 3.c.
   (b) General Office (C-O Zones)
       15.0 Trips/1,000 square feet of gross floor area
       \times \$347.79 = \$5,216.85/1,000 gross square feet.
   (c) Medical Office (C-O Zones)
       34.17 Trips/1,000 square feet of gross floor area
       \times \$347.79 = \$11,883.98/1,000 gross square feet.
   (d) Motel/Hotel (Various Zones)
       6.63 Trips/1,000 square feet of gross floor area
       \times \$347.79 = \$2,305.84/1,000 gross square feet.
(e) Neighborhood (C-1 Zones)
49.60 Trips/1,000 square feet of gross floor area.
$347.79 per trip = $17,250.38/1,000 square feet.

Note: This trip estimate has been modified pursuant to paragraph 3.c.

(3) Industrial
(a) Research and Development (B-R-P Zone)
11.40 Trips/1,000 square feet of gross floor area
$347.79 per trip = $3,964.80/1,000 square feet.

(b) Light Industrial (M-1 and M-L Zones)
6.97 Trips/1,000 square feet of gross floor area
$347.79 per trip = $2,424.09/1,000 square feet.

(c) Heavy Industrial (M-2 and M-3 Zones)
5.43 Trips/1,000 square feet of gross floor area
$347.79 per trip = $1,888.49/1,000 square feet.

(4) Special Projects
Traffic generation rates for developments and redevelopments not adequately represented above shall be determined according to the most similar current designation for which the Institute of Transportation Engineers provides trip generation statistics, or a project specific study acceptable to the Public Works Director.

5. The Community Development Director has provided public notice that adoption of this resolution will produce no significant impacts on the environment and of the intent of the City Council to adopt a declaration to that effect. The City Council has reviewed such notice along with the initial study and staff report and hereby finds that there will be no significant environmental impact from the adoption of this resolution and adopts the
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negative declaration in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act.

6. The effective date of this resolution shall be September 14, 1992.

7. Resolution No. 10,016 is repealed, effective on the date this resolution becomes effective.

PASSED AND ADOPTED this ___ day of ____, 1992 by the following vote.

AYES:

NOES:

ABSENT:

NAO TAKASUGI, MAYOR

ATTEST:

MABI PLISKY, CITY CLERK

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

GARY L. GILLIG, CITY ATTORNEY
The City Council of the City of Oxnard does ordain as follows:

Part 1. Subsection (e) is hereby added to Section 27-88.8 of the Oxnard City Code, to be placed after subsection (d) and to read as follows:

"(e) Notwithstanding subsection (b) above, 50% of the amount by which planned traffic circulation facilities fees exceed credits for the provision of planned traffic circulation facilities must be paid prior to issuance of a building permit for a development project. The remaining amount must be paid prior to the sale or transfer of all or any part of the project or issuance of any temporary or permanent certificate of occupancy for all or any part of the project, whichever first occurs. This subsection does not apply to residential, fast food restaurant or neighborhood commercial development projects."

Part 2. Conflicts. In the event of a conflict between the provisions of this ordinance and the provisions of any other ordinance or resolution establishing or amending development fees or procedures, the provisions of this ordinance shall govern.

Part 3. Severability. If any section, subsection, sentence, clause, phrase or portion of this ordinance is for any reason held to be invalid or unconstitutional by the final decision of any court of competent jurisdiction, such decision shall not affect the validity of the remaining portions of this ordinance. The City Council declares that each section, subsection, sentence, clause, phrase or portion thereof would have been adopted regardless of the fact that any one or more sections, subsections, sentences, clauses, phrases, or portions thereof be declared invalid or unconstitutional.
Part 4. All ordinances, or parts of ordinances, in conflict herewith are hereby repealed.

Part 5. The director of community development has provided public notice that adoption of this ordinance will produce no significant impacts on the environment and of the intent of the City Council to adopt a declaration to that effect. The City Council has reviewed such notice along with the initial study and staff report and hereby finds that there will be no significant environmental impact from the adoption of this ordinance and adopts said negative declaration in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act.

Part 6. Within fifteen days after passage, the City Clerk shall cause this ordinance to be published one time in a newspaper of general circulation, published and circulated in the City.

Ordinance No. __________ was first read on ________________, 1992 and finally adopted on ____________________________, 1992, to become effective on September 14, 1992.

AYES:

NOES:

ABSENT:

__________________________
Nao Takasugi, Mayor

ATTESTED:

__________________________
Mabi Covarrubias Plisky, City Clerk

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

__________________________
Gary L. Gillig, City Attorney
RESOLUTION ESTABLISHING REQUIREMENTS FOR TRAFFIC AND TRANSPORTATION STUDIES AND MITIGATION PROCEDURES

WHEREAS, the City Council desires to maintain current or improved levels of vehicular circulation throughout the City, thus preserving the current quality of life; and

WHEREAS, some costs of constructing traffic circulation facilities required by the City may be eligible for reimbursement or credits pursuant to the City's adopted standards and policies; and

WHEREAS, according to the City's General Plan, intersection congestion must be no worse than Level of Service "C" or existing; and

WHEREAS, the City's transportation model has been designated as the method for analysis of growth projections and evaluations of growth management mitigation measures; and

WHEREAS, the City's transportation model provides a consistent base for traffic studies; and

WHEREAS, the City must comply with standards and limits established by Ventura County's Congestion Management Plan; and

WHEREAS, the Air Pollution Control District has established controls for levels of automobile emissions allowed throughout the County; and

WHEREAS, automobile emissions are exacerbated in areas of increased traffic congestion; and

WHEREAS, transportation studies will provide a method for proper and appropriate examination of traffic and circulation impacts of proposed projects; and

WHEREAS, mitigation procedures will provide the City with an effective method by which to correct current and potential nonconforming roadways and intersections;
NOW, THEREFORE, the City Council of the City of Oxnard hereby resolves that the Public Works Department shall require transportation studies and/or mitigation procedures according to the following standards and procedures.

1. Standards for identification of projects which require traffic studies:
   A. Projects which will result in an increase of 100 or more vehicle trips in the morning or afternoon peak hours. Project types represented by the above-stated vehicle trip increase include, but are no limited to:
      (1) Residential development of 90 dwelling units or more;
      (2) Commercial office projects of 45,000 square feet or more;
      (3) Medical office projects of 25,000 square feet or more;
      (4) Other commercial projects of 25,000 square feet or more;
      (5) Fast food restaurant projects;
      (6) Manufacturing projects of 60,000 square feet or more; and
      (7) Any other project which the Public Works Director determines to need a traffic study because of potential impact to critical intersections.
   B. Any existing project which is submitted for revision or amendment which will result in an increase of 50 or more vehicle trips in the morning or afternoon peak hours.

2. Traffic studies shall examine the following scenarios:
   A. If the project is in conformance with the General Plan, all of the following must be studied:
      (1) Existing (roadway counts reflecting all completed and occupied construction projects to date);
      (2) Existing, plus approved (projects which have been approved by the City but are not yet occupied), plus pending (projects for which applications have been filed and are currently being processed, but have not yet received final approval);
      (3) Existing, plus approved, plus pending, plus project (the subject proposed project, not yet finally approved by the City);
(4) Year 2000 projected (the straight-line projected development of the City to the year 2000 based on standards within the 2020 General Plan); and
(5) Year 2000 projected, plus project.

(B) If the project is part of a General Plan amendment, consideration must be given to the ultimate impact on the master plan network. Thus, the following additional scenarios must be studied:
(1) Year 2020; and
(2) Year 2020 plus project.

3. Traffic studies must analyze all critically impacted intersections, which are those that may reflect a change in LOS with the addition of the project. Guidelines for determining critically impacted intersections include, but are not limited to, the following:
(A) An intersection with an increase in vehicle movements due to the project, as determined by the City of Oxnard's traffic model, of:
   (1) More than 40 through movements on a single approach in a peak hour;
   (2) More than 20 left turn movements on a single approach in a peak hour; or
   (3) More than 75 vehicles per peak hour utilizing the intersection.
(B) Any intersection that is presently bordering on or operating at LOS D, as determined by the City's Traffic and Transportation Manager.
(C) All internal site circulation intersections.
(D) All access points from the exiting or proposed roadway network.

4. Traffic studies must also analyze the availability of and project impact on:
(A) Pedestrian access;
(B) Mass transit; and
(C) Bicycle facilities.

5. The following circulation system improvements must be designed into any proposed project and included in the traffic analysis:
(A) If the project is located on an arterial:
   (1) Right-of-way must be dedicated in accordance with the Streets
       Master Plan; and
   (2) The project must include construction of half of the Master Plan
       roadway facility abutting the project plus one lane.

(B) If the project is not on an arterial, dedication and improvement of
    roadways will be required according to standards determined by the
    Public Works Department.

6. Mitigation measures will be required for any project which will worsen the
   Intersection Capacity Utilization (ICU numeric value of Level of Service)
   at any intersection studied (see Section 3), if such intersection is
   projected to be at Level of Service (LOS) C, D, E, or F—including existing,
   plus approved, plus pending projects or LOS D, E, or F with project
   generated traffic (see Section 2(A)(2)).

   (A) Mitigation measures will be required that will improve the ICU at such
       intersections by at least the amount that the project's impact will
       worsen the ICU.

   (B) The cost of mitigation measures will be limited to twice the amount of
       the traffic impact fee (mitigation limit) for the project.

   (1) If the cost of mitigation measures exceeds the mitigation limit, the
       City will select mitigation measures which cost up to the mitigation
       limit. The project will pay the remainder, if any, of the mitigation
       limit. The City may determine that the construction of a portion of
       the mitigation measures at a cost less than the mitigation limit is
       not feasible, in which case the project will pay the amount of the
       mitigation limit.

   (2) If the cost of the mitigation measures is less than the mitigation
       limit, the project will build the mitigation measures.

7. If the project is not in compliance with the General Plan, the project must
   pay, in addition to all other applicable fees, its fair share of the cost
   of improvement of any LOS D intersection under the year-2020-plus-project
   scenario. The developer:
(A) Must supply a "fair share formula" acceptable to the Public Works Director.

(B) May choose to construct the facility or pay its "fair share".

(C) Shall pay for staff costs for revisions to the Master Plan which incorporate increased vehicle volumes as a result of the proposed project.

8. The effective date of this resolution is September 14, 1992.

PASSED AND ADOPTED this _____ day of _____, 1992, by the following vote:

AYES:

NOES:

ABSENT:

______________________________
NAO TAKASUGI, MAYOR

ATTEST:

______________________________
MABI COVARRUBIAS PLISKY, CITY CLERK

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

______________________________
GARY L. GILLIG, CITY ATTORNEY
REvised ND 92-20

NOTICE OF INTENT TO ADOPT A NEGATIVE DECLARATION

THIS NOTICE AMENDS PREVIOUSLY PUBLISHED ND 92-20

The City of Oxnard Planning Division has reviewed an application on the following proposed project:

Adoption of resolution increasing planned traffic circulation system facilities fees and adoption of guidelines for requiring traffic and transportation studies and mitigation measures for projects. Filed by the City of Oxnard Public Works and Community Development Departments.

On the basis of an initial study, and in accordance with Section 15070 of the California Administrative Code, the Community Development Director has determined that there is no substantial evidence that the proposed project may have a significant effect on the environment, and that a negative declaration be adopted.

The proposed negative declaration identified as "Negative Declaration No. 92-20," and the initial study are available for public inspection at the City of Oxnard, Planning Division, 305 West Third Street, Oxnard, California, from 8:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m., Monday through Thursday and from 8:00 a.m. to 12:00 p.m. on Fridays.

Any person wishing to comment on the intent of the City of Oxnard of the City of Oxnard to adopt a negative declaration for the project described above may file a written comment with the City of Oxnard Planning Division by 5:00 p.m. on June 4, 1992. Persons aggrieved by the decision to adopt a negative declaration may appeal this decision to the City Council in accordance with the City Council resolution establishing environmental review procedures.

Richard J. Maggio, Director
Community Development Department

RJM:MGW:DST:ne

cc: County Clerk
James Frandsen, Public Works Department
Paula Kimbrell, Assistant City Attorney
Bob Weithofer, Traffic and Transportation Manager
Dave Bailey, Public Works

Publish one time only - Thursday, May 14, 1992
Send Affidavit of Publication to the Planning Division.
Charge Account 100-035-0201-8230, City of Oxnard

ATTACHMENT