

Public Facilities Impact Fee Program Nexus Study— 2025 Update

The Economics of Land Use



Prepared for:
City of Roseville

Prepared by:
Economic & Planning Systems, Inc. (EPS)

*Economic & Planning Systems, Inc.
455 Capitol Mall, Suite 701
Sacramento, CA 95814
916 649 8010 tel
916 649 2070 fax*

*Oakland
Sacramento
Denver
Los Angeles*

www.epsys.com

EPS #242059

September 2025

Table of Contents

| | | |
|----|---|----|
| 1. | Introduction and Executive Summary | 1 |
| | Purpose of This 2025 Nexus Study | 1 |
| | Authority | 1 |
| | Summary | 2 |
| | Updates in the 2025 Program | 5 |
| | Nexus Study Requirements | 6 |
| | Organization of Report | 7 |
| 2. | Fee Update Method, Land Use, and Service Population Assumptions | 9 |
| | Fee Update Method | 9 |
| | Cost Allocation Methodology..... | 9 |
| | Land Use Assumptions | 10 |
| | Population and Employment Assumptions | 12 |
| 3. | Planned Public Facilities | 21 |
| | Planned Public Facilities Costs and Funding | 21 |
| | Planned Public Facilities Descriptions..... | 27 |
| 4. | Cost Allocation and Fee Calculation | 33 |
| 5. | Implementation | 37 |
| | Implementing Ordinances/Resolutions..... | 37 |
| | Fee Administration | 37 |
| | PFF Exemptions, Reimbursements, and Credits..... | 38 |
| | Fee Program Update | 38 |
| | Non-Fee Revenue Sources | 40 |
| 6. | Nexus Findings | 41 |
| | California Government Code Section 66001..... | 41 |
| | California Government Code Section 66016.5 (AB 602) | 45 |
| A. | Land Use Assumptions | 50 |
| | Residential Land Use Assumptions | 50 |
| | Nonresidential Land Use Assumptions..... | 50 |

Appendix A: Land Use Assumptions

Appendix B: PFF Capital Improvement Program

List of Tables

| | |
|---|----|
| Table 1-1 Summary of Proposed Fee Rates..... | 3 |
| Table 1-2 Public Facilities Fee Comparison by Component - Excluding Administration..... | 4 |
| Table 2-1 Existing and Projected Development..... | 11 |
| Table 2-2 Estimated Population/Employees | 15 |
| Table 2-3 Estimated Persons Served..... | 19 |
| Table 3-1 PFF Fund Balance Distribution..... | 22 |
| Table 3-2 Public Facilities Costs and Funding Sources Summary..... | 23 |
| Table 3-3 Planned Public Facilities Costs And Funding Sources | 25 |
| Table 3-4 Interfund Loan Repayments and Bond Debt Service | 28 |
| Table 3-5 PFF Summary Costs – Parks, Recreation, and Libraries | 31 |
| Table 4-1 Cost Allocation for General City and Public Safety Facilities | 35 |
| Table 4-2 Cost Allocation for Parks, Recreation, and Libraries | 36 |

1. Introduction and Executive Summary

This 2025 Public Facilities Impact Fee Program Update Nexus Study (2025 Nexus Study) provides the City of Roseville (City) with the necessary technical documentation to support the adoption of an updated Public Facilities Fee (PFF). The City originally adopted a PFF Program in 1991 and subsequently updated the program in 2003, 2007, 2015, and 2020.

The PFF Program funds new development's obligations to construct public facilities serving residents and employees in the City. Fee program-eligible public improvements include Police and Public Safety Facilities; General Public Facilities such as Civic Centers, Corporation Yards, and other basic infrastructure; and Community Facilities such as libraries, parks and recreation facilities, community centers, and cultural facilities.

This report provides the nexus findings and analysis and the associated calculations of the maximum supportable citywide fees that could be charged. The City may elect to adopt fees below the maximum supportable level based on economic or policy considerations. For example, the City may choose to reduce the fees in specific locations or on certain types of uses to encourage new development in underutilized areas or to promote certain residential densities. Such fee reductions would require either a reduction in the overall capital facilities standards or the identification of alternative sources of capital funding.

Purpose of This 2025 Nexus Study

As a development impact fee, the PFF can be charged only to new development and must be based on the impact of new development on public facilities infrastructure. The purpose of this 2025 Nexus Study is to update the nexus (or reasonable relationship) between new development that occurs in the City and the need for additional public facility improvements as a result of this new development. This PFF update is based on the standards identified in the City General Plan and the City's planned public facility amenities.

Authority

This study serves as the basis for requiring development impact fees under Assembly Bill (AB) 1600 legislation, as codified by the Mitigation Fee Act (California Government Code sections 66000 *et. seq.*). This section of the Mitigation Fee Act sets forth the procedural requirements for establishing and collecting development impact fees. These procedures require that a reasonable relationship, or nexus, must exist between a governmental exaction and the purpose of the condition.

Summary

As new development continues to occur in the City, additional public facilities will be required to serve future residents and employees. The public facility costs allocated to new development reflect the public facility improvements needed to accommodate future development. This 2025 Nexus Study computes future development's share of future public facility improvement costs based on planned facilities as determined by the City and calibrated by existing level-of-service standards. The PFF will not fund the construction of public facility improvements required to cure existing level-of-service deficiencies. Public facilities included in the PFF Program include the following general categories of facilities:

- General City and Public Safety Facilities, including civic centers, parking structures, and information technology infrastructure
- Community Facilities such as libraries, community centers, cultural facilities, parks, and recreational facilities

Table 1-1 summarizes the maximum justifiable PFF by cost component and land use category by square foot ranges for residential development and by building square foota for commercial development for this 2025 Nexus Study. **Table 1-2** compares the total proposed PFF to the current PFF for each cost component. In total, the proposed fee ranges from approximately 22 to 85 percent greater than the current fee, depending on the land use.

In response to the provisions of AB 602, the PFF Fee has been updated to reflect a cost allocation methodology that calculates the fee by dwelling unit sizes.

In 2023, South Placer Regional Transportation Authority (SPRTA) staff, representatives from each member agency, and a consultant team started a process to update the SPRTA travel demand model (TDM) as well as the Tier I and II Regional Impact Fee programs. In January 2024, SPRTA updated the SPRTA Tier I fee, pursuant to the requirements of the Mitigation Fee Act, including the new method of computing fees for residential land uses based on requirements mandated by AB-602 and SB-13, which went into effect in 2022. With the guidance of City Staff and stakeholders, the PFF study has adopted the same square foot ranges to calculate residential fees proportionately to the square footage of the dwelling units.

Table 1-1 Summary of Proposed Fee Rates

| Land Use | Proposed Fees | | | | Total Proposed Fee |
|-----------------------------------|---|----------------------------------|----------------|---------------------|--------------------|
| | General City and Public Safety Facilities | Parks, Recreation, and Libraries | Subtotal | Administration (2%) | |
| Residential | | | | | |
| <i>Per Unit</i> | | | | | |
| Residential | | | | | |
| <1,500 sq. ft. | \$1,873 | \$3,095 | \$4,968 | \$99 | \$5,067 |
| 1,500 to 2,500 sq. ft. | \$2,322 | \$3,836 | \$6,158 | \$123 | \$6,281 |
| 2,500 to 3,500 sq. ft. | \$2,516 | \$4,156 | \$6,672 | \$133 | \$6,805 |
| >3,500 sq. ft. | \$2,656 | \$4,388 | \$7,044 | \$141 | \$7,185 |
| Age-Restricted | | | | | |
| <1,500 sq. ft. | \$1,275 | \$2,107 | \$3,382 | \$68 | \$3,450 |
| 1,500 to 2,500 sq. ft. | \$1,583 | \$2,616 | \$4,199 | \$84 | \$4,283 |
| 2,500 to 3,500 sq. ft. | \$1,715 | \$2,834 | \$4,549 | \$91 | \$4,640 |
| >3,500 sq. ft. | \$1,759 | \$2,906 | \$4,665 | \$93 | \$4,758 |
| Multifamily | | | | | |
| <1,500 sq. ft. | \$1,264 | \$2,089 | \$3,353 | \$67 | \$3,420 |
| 1,500 to 2,500 sq. ft. | \$1,567 | \$2,589 | \$4,156 | \$83 | \$4,239 |
| 2,500 to 3,500 sq. ft. | \$1,697 | \$2,804 | \$4,501 | \$90 | \$4,591 |
| >3,500 sq. ft. | \$1,792 | \$2,961 | \$4,753 | \$95 | \$4,848 |
| Multifamily Age-Restricted | | | | | |
| <1,500 sq. ft. | \$880 | \$1,453 | \$2,333 | \$47 | \$2,380 |
| 1,500 to 2,500 sq. ft. | \$1,068 | \$1,765 | \$2,833 | \$57 | \$2,890 |
| 2,500 to 3,500 sq. ft. | \$1,157 | \$1,912 | \$3,069 | \$61 | \$3,130 |
| >3,500 sq. ft. | \$1,187 | \$1,961 | \$3,148 | \$63 | \$3,211 |
| Nonresidential | | | | | |
| <i>Per Bldg. Sq. Ft.</i> | | | | | |
| Commercial | | | | | |
| Neighborhood Commercial | \$0.59 | \$0.47 | \$1.06 | \$0.02 | \$1.08 |
| Community Commercial | \$0.59 | \$0.47 | \$1.06 | \$0.02 | \$1.08 |
| Regional Commercial | \$0.59 | \$0.47 | \$1.06 | \$0.02 | \$1.08 |
| Business Professional | \$0.79 | \$0.63 | \$1.42 | \$0.03 | \$1.45 |
| Central Business District | \$0.79 | \$0.63 | \$1.42 | \$0.03 | \$1.45 |
| Industrial | | | | | |
| Light Industrial | \$0.40 | \$0.31 | \$0.71 | \$0.01 | \$0.72 |
| General Industrial | \$0.24 | \$0.19 | \$0.43 | \$0.01 | \$0.44 |

Source: City of Roseville and EPS

Table 1-2 Public Facilities Fee Comparison by Component - Excluding Administration

| Land Use | 2024 Current Fee (excluding 2% admin.) | | | Proposed Fee (excluding 2% admin.) | | | Difference [1] | | | Percentage Difference | | |
|-----------------------------------|--|----------------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|----------------------------------|----------------|-------------------------------------|----------------------------------|----------------|-------------------------------------|----------------------------------|----------------|
| | General City and Public Safety Fac. | Parks, Recreation, and Libraries | Total <i>(eff. July 1, 2025)</i> | General City and Public Safety Fac. | Parks, Recreation, and Libraries | Total | General City and Public Safety Fac. | Parks, Recreation, and Libraries | Total | General City and Public Safety Fac. | Parks, Recreation, and Libraries | Total |
| Residential | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| <i>Per Unit</i> | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Residential | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| <1,500 sq. ft. | | | | \$1,873 | \$3,095 | \$4,968 | (\$181) | \$1,186 | \$1,005 | (8.8%) | 62.1% | 25.4% |
| 1,500 to 2,500 sq. ft. | \$2,054 | \$1,909 | \$3,963 | \$2,322 | \$3,836 | \$6,158 | \$268 | \$1,927 | \$2,195 | 13.0% | 101.0% | 55.4% |
| 2,500 to 3,500 sq. ft. | | | | \$2,516 | \$4,156 | \$6,672 | \$462 | \$2,247 | \$2,709 | 22.5% | 117.7% | 68.4% |
| >3,500 sq. ft. | | | | \$2,656 | \$4,388 | \$7,044 | \$602 | \$2,479 | \$3,081 | 29.3% | 129.9% | 77.7% |
| Age-Restricted | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| <1,500 sq. ft. | | | | \$1,275 | \$2,107 | \$3,382 | (\$94) | \$835 | \$741 | (6.8%) | 65.6% | 28.1% |
| 1,500 to 2,500 sq. ft. | \$1,369 | \$1,272 | \$2,641 | \$1,583 | \$2,616 | \$4,199 | \$214 | \$1,344 | \$1,558 | 15.7% | 105.6% | 59.0% |
| 2,500 to 3,500 sq. ft. | | | | \$1,715 | \$2,834 | \$4,549 | \$346 | \$1,562 | \$1,908 | 25.3% | 122.7% | 72.2% |
| >3,500 sq. ft. | | | | \$1,759 | \$2,906 | \$4,665 | \$390 | \$1,634 | \$2,024 | 28.5% | 128.4% | 76.6% |
| Multifamily | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| <1,500 sq. ft. | | | | \$1,264 | \$2,089 | \$3,353 | (\$105) | \$817 | \$712 | (7.6%) | 64.2% | 27.0% |
| 1,500 to 2,500 sq. ft. | \$1,369 | \$1,272 | \$2,641 | \$1,567 | \$2,589 | \$4,156 | \$198 | \$1,317 | \$1,515 | 14.5% | 103.5% | 57.4% |
| 2,500 to 3,500 sq. ft. | | | | \$1,697 | \$2,804 | \$4,501 | \$328 | \$1,532 | \$1,860 | 24.0% | 120.4% | 70.4% |
| >3,500 sq. ft. | | | | \$1,792 | \$2,961 | \$4,753 | \$423 | \$1,689 | \$2,112 | 30.9% | 132.7% | 80.0% |
| Multifamily Age-Restricted | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| <1,500 sq. ft. | | | | \$880 | \$1,453 | \$2,333 | (\$489) | \$181 | (\$308) | (35.7%) | 14.2% | (11.7%) |
| 1,500 to 2,500 sq. ft. | \$1,141 | \$1,060 | \$2,201 | \$1,068 | \$1,765 | \$2,833 | (\$301) | \$493 | \$192 | (22.0%) | 38.7% | 7.3% |
| 2,500 to 3,500 sq. ft. | | | | \$1,157 | \$1,912 | \$3,069 | (\$212) | \$640 | \$428 | (15.5%) | 50.3% | 16.2% |
| >3,500 sq. ft. | | | | \$1,187 | \$1,961 | \$3,148 | (\$182) | \$689 | \$507 | (13.3%) | 54.1% | 19.2% |
| Nonresidential | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| <i>Per Bldg. Sq. Ft.</i> | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Commercial | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Neighborhood Commercial | \$0.51 | \$0.23 | \$0.74 | \$0.59 | \$0.47 | \$1.06 | \$0.08 | \$0.24 | \$0.32 | 15.2% | 106.4% | 43.2% |
| Community Commercial | \$0.51 | \$0.23 | \$0.74 | \$0.59 | \$0.47 | \$1.06 | \$0.08 | \$0.24 | \$0.32 | 15.2% | 106.4% | 43.2% |
| Regional Commercial | \$0.51 | \$0.23 | \$0.74 | \$0.59 | \$0.47 | \$1.06 | \$0.08 | \$0.24 | \$0.32 | 15.2% | 106.4% | 43.2% |
| Business Professional | \$0.69 | \$0.31 | \$1.00 | \$0.79 | \$0.63 | \$1.42 | \$0.10 | \$0.32 | \$0.42 | 14.6% | 103.0% | 42.0% |
| Central Business District | \$0.69 | \$0.31 | \$1.00 | \$0.79 | \$0.63 | \$1.42 | \$0.10 | \$0.32 | \$0.42 | 14.6% | 103.0% | 42.0% |
| Industrial | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Light Industrial | \$0.34 | \$0.15 | \$0.49 | \$0.40 | \$0.31 | \$0.71 | \$0.06 | \$0.16 | \$0.22 | 17.0% | 109.3% | 44.9% |
| General Industrial | \$0.21 | \$0.09 | \$0.30 | \$0.24 | \$0.19 | \$0.43 | \$0.03 | \$0.10 | \$0.13 | 14.3% | 104.6% | 42.1% |

fee comp2

Source: City of Roseville and EPS

[1] Total difference may not exactly equal proposed fee less current fee because of rounding.

Land Use Assumptions

The future land uses used in this study represent the growth the City is anticipated to experience through buildout of the General Plan in 2035. Future development projections are estimated as buildout development less existing development, with some adjustments to account for anticipated lower levels of development in some areas of the City than specified in the General Plan. The buildout development is based on the allocated development specified in the General Plan for each of the City's 16 plan areas (14 Specific Plan Areas and 2 Planning Areas). The estimated existing development is based on building permit data from the City.

PFF Facilities Costs, Fee Calculation, and Cost Allocation

This 2025 Nexus Study provides detail regarding facility requirements based on the fee methodology described above. Based on the future facility requirements and unit cost estimates as determined by EPS and the City, total facility costs and the proportion of the costs attributable to future development are calculated.

Costs are allocated to future development based on the benefit derived from the public facility improvement by land use category for each fee component. This study uses a persons-served cost allocation methodology to apportion public facility costs in accordance with the benefit received by land use category. PFF facility requirements, the associated costs, cost allocation, and fee calculations are discussed in more detail in the chapters to follow.

Updates in the 2025 Program

This 2025 Nexus Study updates the 2020 Public Facilities Impact Fee Nexus Study (2020 Nexus Study) with the following information and revisions:

- Updated existing and future facility improvements and associated cost assumptions.
- Updated land use assumptions for existing and future development.
- Updated fee calculations based on a housing development project's proportionately to the square footage of proposed units of the project.

Nexus Study Requirements

California Government Code 66000

The purpose of a Nexus Study is to establish the legally required nexus (or reasonable relationship) between projected new residential and nonresidential development and the capital facilities that will be required to serve that new development.

As briefly described in the previous section, the nexus requirements for imposing development impact fees were established under AB 1600 legislation, as codified by the Mitigation Fee Act (the Act; California Government Code section 66000 and following). The Act sets forth the procedural requirements for establishing and collecting development impact fees. The procedures require that a “reasonable relationship or nexus must exist between a governmental exaction and the purpose of the condition.”¹ Specifically, each local agency imposing a fee must:

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

Assembly Bill 602

In addition, in 2021, AB 602 amended the requirements that would apply to new or updated impact fees by creating a “standards and practices” section to the Act, codified as Government Code Section 66016.5. This section is both declaratory of previously existing law and has added certain new requirements. A new provision that pertains to this report requires that a nexus study “shall calculate a fee imposed on a housing development project proportionately to the square footage of proposed units of the development” [66016.5(a)(5)(A)], and “large jurisdictions shall adopt a capital improvement plan as a part of the nexus study” [66016.5(a)(6)].

Water and sewer systems are specifically exempt from the requirements of Section 66016.5. An exemption to the square footage allocation method may be made for other backbone infrastructure if the nexus study makes the following three findings:

- An explanation as to why square footage is not an appropriate metric to calculate fees imposed on a housing development project.

¹ *Public Needs & Private Dollars*; William Abbott, Marian E. Moe, and Marilee Hanson, page 109.

- An explanation that an alternative basis of calculating the fee bears a reasonable relationship between the fee charged and the burden posed by the development.
- That other policies in the fee structure support smaller developments or otherwise ensure that smaller developments are not charged disproportionate fees.

Section 66016.5 [66016.5(a)(5)(C)] also states that the square footage allocation method “does not prohibit an agency from establishing different fees for different types of developments.”

In response to these provisions of AB 602, this Nexus Study Update provides findings that justify the use of the residential fee land uses summarized above for the various fee components. **Chapter 6** details all required nexus findings.

Organization of Report

This report is divided into 6 chapters including this **Introduction and Executive Summary**:

- **Chapter 2** describes the fee update methodology, land uses, and future development analyzed in this report.
- **Chapter 3** describes the facility requirements and estimated facility costs.
- **Chapter 4** details the cost allocation methodology and calculation of the maximum justifiable fee for the PFF Program.
- **Chapter 5** describes how the PFF Program will be implemented.
- **Chapter 6** presents the nexus findings for the PFF Program.

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

2. Fee Update Method, Land Use, and Service Population Assumptions

This chapter outlines the major assumptions used in this 2025 Nexus Study, including an overview of the fee update and cost allocation methodologies, land use assumptions for existing and future development, and population and employment growth calculations.

Fee Update Method

Development impact fees must be related to the demand for facilities generated by new development. As outlined in the previous chapter, several findings regarding the demand and need for new facilities generated by new land uses are required to levy a fee on future development. The fee imposed must demonstrate rough proportionality to the demand generated, or benefit received by each land use category on which the fee is imposed.

Several methods exist to determine impact fees for new development. This 2025 Nexus Study relies on a plan-based fee method to establish the relationship between costs and updated PFF. The plan-based fee method determines planned facilities based on a facility master plan that identifies facilities designed to serve a defined geographic area or specific service population. Planned facilities are determined based on an evaluation of the adequacy of existing facilities, location, and type of projected future development, additional demand to be generated, and facility improvements required to create sufficient capacity to meet demand. The City has identified a specific set of public facility needs, as well as new development's proportionate share of those needs, further details can be found in Appendix B: PFF Capital Improvement Program. Because this nexus study utilizes the plan based approach and PFF costs are only being allocated to future development this study does not quantify the existing levels of service.

Cost Allocation Methodology

This 2025 Nexus Study employs a persons-served cost allocation methodology to apportion costs amongst the various land use categories based on each land use category's proportionate benefit from each facility type.

Under the persons-served cost allocation methodology, public facility costs are allocated based on the City's existing and future residential and employee populations. To comply with the requirements in AB 602, the residential land use categories are based on ranges of unit square feet and on nonresidential land uses in accordance with the number of employees per 1,000 building square feet.

An adjustment factor is applied to the employee population to account for varying demand characteristics of nonresidential land uses as compared to residential land uses.

Land Use Assumptions

Working with the City Development Services Department, EPS established the existing, future, and 2035 General Plan buildout land use assumptions documented in **Table 2-1. Appendix A** offers a detailed description of the basis for these land use assumptions, discussed in summary form below.

Existing development estimates, current as of January 2025, were created based on building permit data provided by the City. Buildout land use assumptions were derived based on City analysis of development capacity by development area and land use allocation data by development area from the City's General Plan, as well as a review of relevant Specific Plan data and land use plans. Projected future development was derived based on the difference between projected buildout and current development levels and reflects development anticipated to occur within the fee program planning horizon period of 2025 to 2035.

As shown in **Table 2-1**, the City is projected to add approximately 14,700 dwelling units between 2025 and 2035. Residential land uses include the following land use categories:

- Residential
 - <1,500 sq. ft. Residential
 - 1,500 to 2,500 sq. ft. Residential
 - 2,500 to 3,500 sq. ft. Residential
 - >3,500 sq. ft. Residential
- Age-Restricted
 - <1,500 sq. ft. Age-Restricted
 - 1,500 to 2,500 sq. ft. Age-Restricted
 - 2,500 to 3,500 sq. ft. Age-Restricted
 - >3,500 sq. ft. Age-Restricted
- Multifamily
 - <1,500 sq. ft. Residential
 - 1,500 to 2,500 sq. ft. Residential
 - 2,500 to 3,500 sq. ft. Residential
 - >3,500 sq. ft. Residential
- Multifamily Age-Restricted
 - <1,500 sq. ft. Residential
 - 1,500 to 2,500 sq. ft. Residential
 - 2,500 to 3,500 sq. ft. Residential
 - >3,500 sq. ft. Residential

Table 2-1 Existing and Projected Development

| Land Use | Dwelling Units / Building Square Feet | | |
|-----------------------------|---------------------------------------|-------------------|-------------------|
| | Existing | Future [1] | Buildout |
| Residential | | | |
| Source | City of Roseville | | |
| Residential | <u>dwelling units</u> | | |
| Low Density | 39,522 | 2,820 | 42,342 |
| Medium Density | 8,727 | 2,681 | 11,408 |
| High Density | 10,789 | 9,213 | 20,002 |
| Subtotal Residential | 59,038 | 14,714 | 73,752 |
| Age-Restricted | 3,210 | - | 3,210 |
| Total Residential | 62,248 | 14,714 | 76,962 |
| Nonresidential | | | |
| Source | Table A-6 | Table A-7 | |
| Commercial | <u>bldg. sq. ft.</u> | | |
| Neighborhood Commercial | 128,125 | 207,681 | 335,806 |
| Community Commercial | 11,685,023 | 2,693,625 | 14,378,648 |
| Regional Commercial | 4,577,369 | 680,196 | 5,257,565 |
| Business Professional | 8,302,191 | 3,042,711 | 11,344,902 |
| Central Business District | 959,444 | 1,236,193 | 2,195,637 |
| Subtotal Commercial | 25,652,152 | 7,860,406 | 33,512,558 |
| Industrial | | | |
| Light Industrial | 7,983,868 | 3,576,384 | 11,560,252 |
| General Industrial | 4,054,299 | 4,522,652 | 8,576,951 |
| Subtotal Industrial | 12,038,167 | 8,099,036 | 20,137,203 |
| Total Nonresidential | 37,690,319 | 15,959,442 | 53,649,761 |

Source: City of Roseville and EPS

[1] Future units estimated as buildout units less existing units.

Future nonresidential development consists of approximately 7.8 million square feet of commercial development and 8.1 million square feet of industrial development, for a total of 16.0 million square feet from 2025 through 2035. The categories of commercial and industrial development are listed below:

- Commercial
 - Neighborhood Commercial
 - Community Commercial
 - Regional Commercial
 - Business Professional
 - Central Business District

- Industrial
 - Light Industrial
 - General Industrial

All impact fees have been calculated per residential dwelling unit and per nonresidential building square foot, based on the population and employment densities discussed in the section to follow.

Population and Employment Assumptions

PFF Program costs are allocated in accordance with the population or employees generated by each of the various land use categories discussed above. EPS estimated the existing population via a review of California Department of Finance population data. For each residential category, future population was estimated by applying persons-per-household assumptions to estimated future development. The persons-per-household data was obtained from the U.S. Census Bureau’s American Housing Survey. As shown in **Table 2-2**, the estimated current City population is roughly 154,000 residents. Future residential development is anticipated to generate an additional 35,000 residents, for a total residential population at General Plan buildout of roughly 189,000.

Existing and future employees were estimated by applying standard square feet per employee assumptions to each nonresidential land use category, as shown in **Table 2-2**. EPS and the City estimate that based on the existing nonresidential land use distribution and United States Census Bureau data, the current employee population totals approximately 89,000 employees. New nonresidential development will create an estimated 34,000 permanent jobs, generating a buildout General Plan employee population of approximately 123,000 employees.

Residential Estimates and Projections

This section details the methodology for estimating existing and projecting new residential development and population by residential land use through buildout.

Existing Estimates

The estimated existing dwelling units in the City reflect data provided by the City’s Development Services Department. The estimated total population in the City reflect data provided by the California Department of Finance (DOF) estimates for Roseville as of January 1, 2024, the most recent DOF data available. The DOF reports population in total only, so a breakdown by single-family, multifamily, and age-restricted units is not available and is not shown in **Table 2-2**.

Projections Through Buildout

The remaining development and population projections through buildout are shown in **Table 2-1** and **Table 2-2** in the “Future” columns. Note that these projections for new development in the City are used in the fee calculations.

Development

The projected new residential dwelling units through buildout are the estimated remaining dwelling units in the current City limits based on data provided by the City’s Development Services Department. The projections were derived from a variety of sources, including City staff, the General Plan, and respective specific area plans.

Population

For each land use, the population is estimated as the projected number of new dwelling units through City buildout multiplied by the estimated persons per household (PPH). The PPH factors vary for single-family and age-restricted units and were derived from the City’s Fiscal Year 2025-2026 Budget and sourced from ESRI and the US Census Bureau American Community Survey (ACS) data for the City.

Total Projections

The total projected dwelling units and population in the City at buildout are calculated as the sum of the estimated existing and new units and population, respectively. In total, it is projected that the City will have approximately 77,000 dwelling units and a population of 190,000 after buildout. The existing dwelling units and population estimates account for just over 80 percent of these totals.

Nonresidential Estimates and Projections

This section details the methodology for estimating existing and projecting new nonresidential development and employees by nonresidential land use through buildout. The development estimates and projections shown in **Table 2-1** are further detailed in **Tables A-6** through **A-10**.

Existing Estimates

City staff provided existing nonresidential building square feet by nonresidential land use. Total existing employees were derived based on dividing existing building square feet by an estimate of the average building square feet per employee by commercial land use. These estimates were used to estimate the total number of employees through 2024 and is shown in **Table 2-1**.

Projections Through Buildout

The nonresidential development and employee projections through buildout are shown in **Table 2-1** in the “Future” columns. Note that these projections for new development in the City are used in the fee calculations.

Development

The projected new nonresidential building square feet by land use through buildout are a combination of the estimated remaining building square feet in the current City. The projections were derived from subtracting the existing building square footage from the total building square footage at buildout. The projections are based on the remaining nonresidential acres by land use in the City. For each nonresidential development type, a floor area ratio (FAR) is applied to the remaining acres to estimate remaining building square feet.

Table A-6 summarizes the existing nonresidential square feet in the City by land use. **Tables A-7** through **A-10** provide the backup detail for future building sq. ft. plus any adjustments made to account for anticipated reduced levels of development as described in further detail in **Appendix A**.

Employees

For each nonresidential land use, the employees are estimated as the projected number of new building square feet through City buildout divided by an estimate of building square feet per employee. The building square feet per employee factors vary by nonresidential land use and are based on industry standards and the 2020 Nexus Study.

Total Projections

The total projected nonresidential building square feet and employees in the City after buildout are calculated as the sum of the estimated existing and new building square feet and employees, respectively. In total, it is projected that the City will have approximately 53.6 million nonresidential building square feet and 123,000 employees after buildout. The existing nonresidential development and employee estimates account for approximately 70 and 73 percent of this total respectively.

Table 2-2 Estimated Population/Employees

| Land Use | PPH Factor [1] | PPH/ Sq. Ft. per Emp. [2] | Dwelling Units / Square Feet | | | Population / Employees | | | | | |
|----------------------------------|----------------|---------------------------|------------------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-----------------------------|---------------|----------------|------------------|--|--|
| | | | Existing | Future | Buildout | Existing [3] | Future | Buildout | | | |
| Residential | | | <i>PPH</i> | | | <i>Dwelling Units</i> | | | <i>Residents</i> | | |
| Single Family Residential | | | | | | | | | | | |
| <1,500 sq. ft. | 0.81 | 2.13 | 10,789 | 9,213 | 20,002 | - | 19,624 | 19,624 | | | |
| 1,500 to 2,500 sq. ft. [4] | 1.00 | 2.64 | 8,727 | 2,681 | 11,408 | - | 7,078 | 7,078 | | | |
| 2,500 to 3,500 sq. ft. | 1.08 | 2.86 | 39,522 | 2,820 | 42,342 | - | 8,065 | 8,065 | | | |
| >3,500 sq. ft. | 1.14 | 3.02 | - | - | - | - | - | - | | | |
| Subtotal Residential | | | 59,038 | 14,714 | 73,752 | - | 34,767 | 34,767 | | | |
| Age-Restricted | | | | | | | | | | | |
| <1,500 sq. ft. | 0.81 | 1.45 | 3,110 | - | 3,110 | - | - | - | | | |
| 1,500 to 2,500 sq. ft. [5] | 1.00 | 1.80 | 100 | - | 100 | - | - | - | | | |
| 2,500 to 3,500 sq. ft. | 1.08 | 1.95 | - | - | - | - | - | - | | | |
| >3,500 sq. ft. | 1.11 | 2.00 | - | - | - | - | - | - | | | |
| Subtotal Age-Restricted | | | 3,210 | - | 3,210 | - | - | - | | | |
| Subtotal Residential [3] | | | 62,248 | 14,714 | 76,962 | 154,329 | 34,767 | 189,096 | | | |
| Nonresidential | | | <i>Sq. Ft. per Emp.</i> | | | <i>Building Square Feet</i> | | | <i>Employees</i> | | |
| Commercial | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Neighborhood Commercial | | 400 | 128,125 | 207,681 | 335,806 | 320 | 519 | 839 | | | |
| Community Commercial | | 400 | 11,685,023 | 2,693,625 | 14,378,648 | 29,213 | 6,734 | 35,947 | | | |
| Regional Commercial | | 400 | 4,577,369 | 680,196 | 5,257,565 | 11,443 | 1,700 | 13,143 | | | |
| Business Professional | | 300 | 8,302,191 | 3,042,711 | 11,344,902 | 27,674 | 10,142 | 37,816 | | | |
| Central Business District | | 300 | 959,444 | 1,236,193 | 2,195,637 | 3,198 | 4,121 | 7,319 | | | |
| Subtotal Commercial | | | 25,652,152 | 7,860,406 | 33,512,558 | 71,848 | 23,216 | 95,064 | | | |
| Industrial | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Light Industrial | | 600 | 7,983,868 | 3,576,384 | 11,560,252 | 13,306 | 5,961 | 19,267 | | | |
| General Industrial | | 1,000 | 4,054,299 | 4,522,652 | 8,576,951 | 4,054 | 4,523 | 8,577 | | | |
| Subtotal Industrial | | | 12,038,167 | 8,099,036 | 20,137,203 | 17,360 | 10,484 | 27,844 | | | |
| Subtotal Nonresidential | | | 37,690,319 | 15,959,442 | 53,649,761 | 89,208 | 33,700 | 122,908 | | | |
| Total All Land Uses | | | | | | 243,537 | 68,467 | 312,004 | | | |

Source: City of Roseville, EPS, and California Department of Finance (DOF)

[1] PPH factors are based on the average person's per household based on the national average of persons per household by dwelling unit size category from the 2023 American Housing Survey. See Table A-1 for additional detail.
 [2] Persons per Household is 2.64 as cited in the City's FY 2025-26 budget and is sourced from ESRI and the U.S. Census Bureau.
 [3] Existing population equals January 1, 2024 household population from CA DOF. Existing PPH assumptions applied to future dwelling units to derive future population. A breakdown of existing population by unit type is not available from CA DOF. Total buildout population is calculated as total existing population plus total future population. Development Impact Fees are based on net new population.
 [4] Assumed to be the average unit size. DOF PPH factors were based on 1,500-2,500 sq. ft. units.
 [5] Previous study established 1.8 PPH in single family age-restricted housing. This analysis assumes the same factor as the previous study.

Residential Demographic Information by Dwelling Unit Size

Persons per Household Factors by Residential Unit Size Ranges

As discussed in **Chapter 1**, in response to the provisions of AB 602, the single-family and multifamily fees charged by dwelling unit square foot range. These fee components and fee categories by square foot range are summarized below. Note that single-family and multifamily development will each have the same fee categories. The square foot ranges were aligned between single-family and multifamily units based on available data and to simplify fee administration.

Single-Family, Multifamily, Single Family Age-Restricted, and Multifamily Age-Restricted Categories

- <1,500 sq. ft. Residential
- 1,500 to 2,500 sq. ft. Residential
- 2,500 to 3,500 sq. ft. Residential
- >3,500 sq. ft. Residential

Persons per Household are used in cost allocations needed to establish the PFF fees. Because each of these fee components will have fees that are charged by dwelling unit square foot range, persons per household must be established for the single-family, age-restricted and multifamily square foot ranges summarized above. The methods for estimating the persons per household by square foot range are detailed below.

Persons per Household by Square Foot Range

Table 2-2 summarizes the calculation of the single-family and multifamily PPH by residential square foot range. The methodology for estimating the single-family and multifamily PPH by square foot range is outlined in the steps below:

1. Compile 2023 AHS national data on PPH by square foot range for all occupied units. **Table A-1** summarizes the following data needed to calculate the PPH by square foot range:
 - Number of households surveyed by number of persons per household (1 to 7 PPH) for each fee category square foot range.
 - Resulting total number of units and persons per square foot range.
 - Average national PPH for each square foot range, calculated as total persons divided by total units surveyed.
 - Average PPH adjustment factor for each square foot range, calculated as average PPH for the square foot range divided by PPH for the 1,500 to 2,500 square foot range.

2. Using the PPH adjustment factors from step 1, estimate PPH by fee category square foot range for single family and age-restricted units as shown in **Table 2-2**. This table includes the following pertinent information:
 - PPH adjustment factor for each square foot range from step 1.
 - Average PPH (2.64) and age-restricted PPH (1.8) by unit size. Recall the average persons per household in Roseville is 2.64 and is based on the City’s FY 2025-2026 Budget documents.
 - PPH factor for each single-family square foot range, calculated as the average single-family PPH (2.64) multiplied by the PPH adjustment factor for the range.
 - PPH factor for each age-restricted square foot range, calculated as the average age-restricted PPH (1.8) multiplied by the PPH adjustment factor for the range, with a maximum PPH for age-restricted set at 2.

Tables A-3 through A-5 detail the calculation of the multifamily PPH and multifamily age-restricted PPH by residential square foot range. The methodology for estimating the multifamily and multifamily age-restricted PPH is outlined below:

3. Compile 2023 AHS national data on PPH by square foot range for single family and multifamily units. **Table A-4** summarizes the following data needed to calculate the PPH by square foot range:
 - Number of households surveyed by number of persons per household (1 to 7 PPH) for each fee category, single family and multi-family.
 - Resulting total number of units and persons per square foot range.
 - Average national PPH calculated as total persons divided by total units surveyed.
 - Adjustment factor for multifamily units calculated as dividing the average PPH for multifamily units by the average PPH for single family units.
4. Using the PPH adjustment factor from step 3, estimate average PPH for multifamily age-restricted units. **Table A-5** summarizes the following data needed to calculate the PPH for multifamily age-restricted units.
 - PPH adjustment factor for multifamily units step 1.
 - Average age-restricted PPH (1.8) in single family age-restricted units.
 - Multifamily age-restricted PPH, calculated as the average single-family PPH (1.8) multiplied by the PPH multifamily adjustment factor from step 3.

Service Population Estimates

Table 2-3 provides the service population estimates used as the basis to allocate PFF Program costs. Service population estimates apply an adjustment factor to total employees to reflect their lower demand for public facilities as compared to residents. This study uses two service population estimates for purposes of cost allocation:

General City and Public Safety Facilities. These facilities include all facilities in the PFF Program excluding parks, recreation, and library facilities. The service population is derived assuming an employee weighting factor of 0.27, meaning that an employee generates roughly 27 percent of the demand generated by a resident. As detailed in **Table 2-3**, this estimate is derived based on the estimated proportionate time spent in the jurisdiction by an employee relative to a resident.

Parks, Recreation, and Library Facilities. Because the users of these facilities predominantly originate from residential uses, the employee weighting factor used to derive the service population for these facilities was reduced by 50 percent. For these facilities, the report is based on the assumption that an employee is equivalent to 0.13 residents.

For each of these service population estimates, **Table 2-3** includes the percentage of the total service population at buildout that is attributable to existing and future development. For General City and Public Safety Facilities, approximately 80 percent of the buildout service population is attributable to existing development, and 20 percent is attributable to future development. For Parks, Recreation, and Libraries, approximately 81 percent of the buildout service population is attributable to existing development, and 19 percent is attributable to future development.

Table 2-3 Estimated Persons Served

| Item | Persons Served Factor [1] | Persons Served | | |
|---|---------------------------|----------------|---------------|----------------|
| | | Existing | Future | Buildout |
| Population/Employees | | | | |
| Residential Population | | 154,329 | 34,767 | 189,096 |
| Nonresidential Employees | | 89,208 | 33,700 | 122,908 |
| Persons Served - General City and Public Safety Facilities | | | | |
| Residential | 1.00 | 154,329 | 34,767 | 189,096 |
| Nonresidential | 0.27 | 24,086 | 9,099 | 33,185 |
| Total | | 178,415 | 43,866 | 222,281 |
| Percentage of Total (Rounded) | | 80% | 20% | 100% |
| Persons Served - Parks, Recreation, and Libraries | | | | |
| Residential | 1.00 | 154,329 | 34,767 | 189,096 |
| Nonresidential | 0.13 | 11,597 | 4,381 | 15,978 |
| Total | | 165,926 | 39,148 | 205,074 |
| Percentage of Total (Rounded) | | 81% | 19% | 100% |

Source: City of Roseville and EPS

[1] Persons served are based on the relative amount of time spent in the City and relative benefit received by residents and employees from public facilities, as detailed below:

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

3. Planned Public Facilities

As summarized in the previous chapter, the PFF-funded public facilities are classified into two categories for the purposes of establishing the PFF, as summarized below:

- **General City and Public Safety Facilities**
 - General City Facilities such as civic centers, corporation yards, parking structures, and other basic infrastructure.
 - Police and Public Safety Facilities.
- **Parks, Recreation, and Library Facilities**

This chapter presents a list of City public facilities required to serve new development and are based on City staff estimates of public facilities needed to serve projected new residents and employees.

Planned Public Facilities Costs and Funding

As the City continues to grow, City staff anticipates that additional public facilities will be required to serve new residents, businesses, and employees at similar levels currently provided to existing residents and employees. The City provided an inventory of planned public facility amenities to be funded all or in part by the PFF Program.

Table 3-1 summarizes the net cost of the PFF-funded improvements by fee component. For each of the two fee components, the net cost is calculated as the PFF-funded improvement cost less the existing fund balance. The existing fund balance is distributed to each of the fee components based on the relative PFF-funded cost of each component and is included on **Table 3-1**.

Table 3-2 summarizes the total estimated cost of each public facility, new development's share of that cost included in the fee program, and other funding sources that have been identified either to fund existing development's share of the costs or to reduce future development's cost share. See **Table 3-3** for additional details on other funding sources.

The net cost of planned public facilities attributable to future development and included in the PFF Program total approximately \$121.1 million (see **Table 3-1**). This cost estimate takes into account existing development's share of total costs, other available funding sources, and application of the existing fund balance to offset PFF Program costs.

Table 3-1 PFF Fund Balance Distribution

| Item | PFF-Funded Improvement Cost [1] | Available Fund Balance [2] | Total |
|--|--|-----------------------------------|---------------------|
| General City and Public Safety Facilities | \$56,573,484 | (\$17,991,295) | \$38,582,189 |
| PR&L Development Projects | \$64,524,384 | (\$7,637,296) | \$56,887,089 |
| Total PFF Funded Cost | \$121,097,869 | (\$25,628,591) | \$95,469,278 |

Source: City of Roseville and EPS

[1] See Table 3-2.

[2] See Table B-3 for additional details regarding current fund balances.

Table 3-2 Public Facilities Costs and Funding Sources Summary

| Facility | Total Cost | Improvement Cost | | |
|--|----------------------|-----------------------|----------------------|----------------------|
| | | % New Development [1] | PFF Funded | Other Funding |
| Remaining Public Facilities | | | | |
| Downtown Development Projects | | | | |
| 316 Vernon Street - Interfund Loan Repayment [2] [3] | \$1,236,194 | 100.0% | \$1,236,194 | \$0 |
| 316 Vernon Street - Debt Service [2] [3] | \$3,812,081 | 100.0% | \$3,812,081 | \$0 |
| Oak Street Parking Garage - Interfund Loan Repayment [2] [3] | \$364,746 | 100.0% | \$364,746 | \$0 |
| Historic Old Town Parking Structure | \$26,500,000 | 54.1% | \$14,344,729 | \$12,155,271 |
| Subtotal | \$31,913,021 | | \$19,757,751 | \$12,155,271 |
| Public Safety Facilities | | | | |
| Public Safety Expansion [4] | \$43,274,213 | 70.3% | \$30,413,333 | \$12,860,880 |
| Animal Control Facility Phase 2 | \$12,000,000 | 50.0% | \$6,000,000 | \$6,000,000 |
| Subtotal | \$55,274,213 | | \$36,413,333 | \$18,860,880 |
| IT Projects | | | | |
| East Site Communication Tower | \$2,965,306 | n/a | \$402,401 | \$2,562,905 |
| Subtotal | \$2,965,306 | | \$402,401 | \$2,562,905 |
| Total Planned General City and Public Safety Facilities | \$90,152,540 | | \$56,573,484 | \$33,579,056 |
| PR&L Development Projects [5] | | | | |
| Pistachio Regional Park [6] | \$132,209,440 | 35.0% | \$46,273,304 | \$85,936,136 |
| Splash Pad and Playground at Pistachio Regional Park | \$2,496,946 | 35.0% | \$873,931 | \$1,623,015 |
| West Roseville Skate Park | \$6,609,962 | 22.2% | \$1,465,441 | \$5,144,521 |
| Universally Accessible and Destination Playgrounds | \$3,400,000 | 35.0% | \$1,190,000 | \$2,210,000 |
| Citywide Park | \$94,003,300 | 15.7% | \$14,721,708 | \$79,281,592 |
| Total PR&L Development Projects | \$238,719,648 | | \$64,524,384 | \$174,195,264 |
| Total Planned Public Facilities | \$328,872,188 | | \$121,097,869 | \$207,774,319 |

Source: City of Roseville and EPS

- [1] Costs attributable to new development are equal to the percentage allocation from the 2020 Nexus Study Update unless otherwise indicated.
- [2] See Table 3-4 for details on remaining debt service payments.
- [3] 316 Vernon Street and the Oak Street Parking Garage are completed projects. Costs listed here are equal to the total construction costs and do not include interest payments as a result of paid, and remaining, debt service payments.
- [4] See Table B-1 for detailed information on the breakdown in cost allocation for the public safety expansion.
- [5] PFF Funded Costs are based on future persons served as percentage of total persons served. See Table B-2 for detailed cost allocation and Table 2-3 for service population estimates.
- [6] Pistachio Park includes the following facilities: West Roseville Community Center & Library, BMX, Pickleball Complex, and Parking.

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

Table 3-3 Planned Public Facilities Costs And Funding Sources

| Facility | Total Cost | % New Development [1] | PFF Funded [2] | Other Funding | Other Funding Sources | | | | |
|--|----------------------|-----------------------|----------------------|----------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|----------------------------|---------------------|
| | | | | | Existing Development [2] | WRSP City-wide Park Fund | SVSP City-wide Park Fund | Strategic Improvement Fund | Other Funding [3] |
| General City and Public Safety Facilities | | | | | | | | | |
| Downtown Development Projects | | | | | | | | | |
| 316 Vernon Street - Interfund Loan Repayment [4] | \$1,236,194 | 100% | \$1,236,194 | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 316 Vernon Street - Debt Service [4] | \$3,812,081 | 100% | \$3,812,081 | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Oak Street Parking Garage - Interfund Loan Repayment [4] | \$364,746 | 100% | \$364,746 | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Historic Old Town/Amtrak Parking Lot and Structure [5] | \$26,500,000 | 54% | \$14,344,729 | \$12,155,271 | \$12,155,271 | - | - | - | - |
| Subtotal | \$31,913,021 | | \$19,757,751 | \$12,155,271 | \$12,155,271 | - | - | - | - |
| Public Safety Facilities | | | | | | | | | |
| Police Department Expansion & Alterations [6] | \$43,274,213 | 70% | \$30,413,333 | \$12,860,880 | \$12,860,880 | - | - | - | - |
| Animal Control Facility Phase 2 | \$12,000,000 | 50% | \$6,000,000 | \$6,000,000 | - | - | - | - | \$6,000,000 |
| Subtotal | \$55,274,213 | | \$36,413,333 | \$18,860,880 | \$12,860,880 | - | - | - | \$6,000,000 |
| IT Projects | | | | | | | | | |
| East Site Communication Tower | \$2,965,306 | n/a | \$402,401 | \$2,562,905 | - | - | - | \$1,513,414 | \$1,049,491 |
| Subtotal | \$2,965,306 | | \$402,401 | \$2,562,905 | - | - | - | \$1,513,414 | \$1,049,491 |
| Total Planned General City and Public Safety Facilities | \$90,152,540 | | \$56,573,484 | \$33,579,056 | \$25,016,151 | - | - | \$1,513,414 | \$7,049,491 |
| PR&L Development Projects | | | | | | | | | |
| Pistachio Regional Park [7] | \$132,209,440 | 35% | \$46,273,304 | \$85,936,136 | \$58,627,386 | \$4,000,000 | - | - | \$23,308,750 |
| West Roseville Community Center & Library | \$123,308,750 | 35% | \$43,158,063 | \$80,150,688 | \$56,841,938 | - | - | - | \$23,308,750 |
| BMX, Pickleball Complex, and Parking | \$8,900,690 | 35% | \$3,115,241 | \$5,785,448 | \$1,785,448 | \$4,000,000 | - | - | - |
| Splash Pad and Playground at Pistachio Regional Park | \$2,496,946 | 35% | \$873,931 | \$1,623,015 | \$623,015 | \$1,000,000 | - | - | - |
| West Roseville Skate Park | \$6,609,962 | 22% | \$1,465,441 | \$5,144,521 | - | \$5,144,521 | - | - | - |
| Universally Accessible and Destination Playgrounds | \$3,400,000 | 35% | \$1,190,000 | \$2,210,000 | \$2,210,000 | - | - | - | - |
| Citywide Park | \$94,003,300 | 16% | \$14,721,708 | \$79,281,592 | - | - | \$34,281,592 | - | \$45,000,000 |
| Total PR&L Development Projects | \$238,719,648 | | \$64,524,384 | \$174,195,264 | \$61,460,401 | \$10,144,521 | \$34,281,592 | - | \$68,308,750 |
| Total Planned Public Facilities | \$328,872,188 | | \$121,097,869 | \$207,774,319 | \$86,476,551 | \$10,144,521 | \$34,281,592 | \$1,513,414 | \$75,358,241 |

Source: City of Roseville and EPS

[1] See Table B-1 and Table B-2 for cost allocation details.

[2] PFF Funded Costs are based on future persons served as percentage of total persons served. See Table 2-3 for service population estimates.

[3] Other funding sources could include general fund revenue, development exactions, other fee programs, general obligation bonds, joint use facilities/partnerships, grants, donations, or other sources. The City will likely rely on a combination of many funding sources to fully finance projects in the PFF Capital Improvement Plan and will continue to seek and leverage all available funding mechanisms for public facility development.

[4] Costs reflect net present value of outstanding interfund loan repayments and outstanding debt service. See Table 3-4.

[5] PFF Funded Costs are based on the same future persons served cost allocation as the 2020 Nexus Study Update. See Table B-1 for detailed cost allocation details.

[6] Phases 1 and 2 are expansions and all costs are allocated to future development. Phase 3 alterations are based on future persons served as percentage of total persons served. See Table B-1 for detailed cost allocation and Table 2-3 for service population estimates.

[7] Pistachio Park includes the following facilities: West Roseville Community Center & Library, BMX, Pickleball Complex, and Parking.

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

Planned Public Facilities Descriptions

Each improvement included in **Table 3-3**, the Capital Improvement Program (CIP) is described below.

Downtown Development Projects

Civic Center Expansion—316 Vernon Street

The 316 Vernon Street project consists of an approximately 80,000-square-foot 4-story building on the site of the existing City Hall Annex. The project has been completed and provides downtown office space necessary to house City staff and administration functions through 2035. Currently some of the existing square footage is being used for additional training rooms and the City is considering options for the remaining square footage. Ground-floor retail also will be provided, as required by the Downtown Code, but the cost to construct this portion of the project is not included in the PFF Program.

The total remaining PFF-funded cost reflects the net present value of the remaining payments on an interfund loan from the Strategic Improvement Fund and a portion of the debt service on the bonds that were issued to fund the project. The scheduled loan and debt service payments are detailed in **Table 3-4** and have a total estimated net present value of \$5 million.

Oak Street Parking Garage

The Oak Street Parking Garage is a seven-story, 429-space parking garage located between Oak Street and the 200-block of Vernon Street. The project has been completed and provides free public parking for the downtown community. The PFF-eligible improvements include pedestrian connections between the parking garage and Oak, Lincoln, and Vernon Streets.

The total remaining PFF-funded cost reflects the net present value of the remaining payments on an interfund loan from the Automobile Replacement Fund. The scheduled payments are detailed in **Table 3-4** and have a total estimated net present value of \$365,000.

Table 3-4 Interfund Loan Repayments and Bond Debt Service

| Fiscal Year | Interfund Loan and Debt Service Payment Schedules | | |
|-------------------------------------|---|--------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| | Oak Street Parking Garage [1] | 316 Vernon Street [2] | 316 Vernon Street Debt Svc.[3] |
| 2025 | \$41,955 | \$431,711 | \$400,000 |
| 2026 | \$41,173 | \$424,154 | \$400,000 |
| 2027 | \$40,390 | \$416,598 | \$400,000 |
| 2028 | \$39,607 | - | \$400,000 |
| 2029 | \$38,824 | - | \$400,000 |
| 2030 | \$38,042 | - | \$400,000 |
| 2031 | \$37,259 | - | \$400,000 |
| 2032 | \$36,476 | - | \$400,000 |
| 2033 | \$35,694 | - | \$400,000 |
| 2034 | \$34,911 | - | \$400,000 |
| 2035 | \$34,128 | - | \$400,000 |
| Total | \$418,459 | \$1,272,463 | \$4,400,000 |
| NPV of Loan Repayments (@3%) | \$364,746 | \$1,236,194 | \$3,812,081 |

Source: City of Roseville and EPS

[1] Interfund loan from Automobile Replacement Fund.

[2] Interfund loan from Strategic Improvement Fund.

[3] Reflects remaining debt service to be paid out of PFF Debt service payments will extend beyond 2035, but only payments through 2035 are included since the fee update is based on development through the General Plan timeframe of 2035.

[3] Total debt service to be paid out of PFF = \$12 million. \$2,515,034.67 has been paid to date, leaving \$9,484,965 to be paid. Debt service payments will extend beyond 2035, but only payments through 2035 are included since the fee update is based on development through the General Plan timeframe of 2035.

Historic Old Town Parking Structure

The Historic Old Town Parking Structure is planned to be a multi-story 297 space parking garage located to the east of Lincoln Street, south of Sierra Boulevard, and west of and adjacent to the Union Pacific Railroad tracks. The total estimated cost of the project is \$26.5 million, with PFF funding of \$14.3 million.

Public Safety Facilities

Public Safety Expansion

The Police Department has continued to grow and expand since moving in its current location in 1998. In addition, the Public Safety IT team was moved to the police department several years ago and that division also continues to grow. Existing facilities are near capacity, and as new public safety personnel are added to serve the resident and employee population generated by new development, existing facilities will require expansion. Although the Professional Standards Unit was previously relocated, available space will not be sufficient to accommodate the personnel that will be needed to support projected growth.

The total cost to expand the public safety facilities is estimated at \$43.3 million.

Animal Control Facility

Public safety facility needs include development of a new Domestic Animal Care Facility, which will be located on a 2.2-acre site located at the corner of Yosemite Street and Tahoe Avenue. Fee program-eligible costs include the following improvements:

- Renovation and conversion of an existing 15,818-square-foot 1-story building into a public-orientated Adoption Center and administrative area.
- Expansion of an existing 1,770-square-foot mezzanine to 4,370 square feet.
- Addition of a new 20,334-square-foot, 1-story building to house a Holding and Support Area, Educational Center, and a public Veterinary Clinic.

Phase 1 of this project has been completed, including the existing building renovation, the new Education Center, and the majority of the site work (parking, drive aisle, new underground utilities). The Veterinary Clinic component is already funded and currently under construction. Phase 2 will include the Holding and Support Area at an estimated cost of \$12.0 million, with half of the cost (\$6 million) to be PFF-funded and the remaining half to be funded by leveraging multiple revenue sources, as identified in **Chapter 5** and **Appendix B**.

Information Technology Projects

East Site Communication Tower

Because of the current East site limitations and resulting lack of standards to meet Public Safety needs, a new communications site is needed in East Roseville. The project requires property acquisition and an 180-foot tower along with a shelter, generator and fuel tank to meet the City’s short and long-term needs. The existing East site has limitations including lack of:

- Radio coverage
- Emergency power
- Capacity for growth both within the electrical closet and on top of the building
- City control resulting in operational and financial risk

The new communications site is estimated to cost approximately \$3 million. Approximately \$400,000 is allocated for land acquisition of the still undetermined site, and the remainder is for construction. The City Strategic Improvement Fund and other sources of funding as identified in **Chapter 5** and **Appendix B** will provide funding for approximately \$2.6 million of the tower.

Parks, Recreation, and Library Development Projects

Citywide Park and Community Facilities

The City has plans to construct a variety of park and community facilities. A portion of these facilities will be funded by the PFF. Potential Citywide park and community facilities are listed below:

- Pistachio Regional Park
 - West Roseville Community Center and Library
 - BMX, Pickleball Complex, and Parking
- Water/Splash Pad
- West Roseville Specific Plan Skate Park
- Universally Accessible and Destination Playgrounds
- Citywide Park (Parcel KT-50)

Table 3-5 summarizes the costs of each of these facilities. The total cost is estimated at \$238.8 million with 27 percent of the costs, or approximately \$64.6 million, to be funded by the PFF.

Citywide Park Parcel KT-50

Located in the Sierra Vista Specific Plan, KT-50 is envisioned as a regional multiple-field baseball facility, including a stadium. Total costs are anticipated to be approximately \$94.0 million, with partial funding of approximately \$34.3 million provided by the Citywide park fund. The PFF Program will fund an estimated cost of \$14.7 million and \$45.0 million of the remaining costs are anticipated to be funded by leveraging multiple revenue sources as identified in **Chapter 5** and **Appendix B**.

Table 3-5 PFF Summary Costs – Parks, Recreation, and Libraries

| Facilities | Total Costs |
|---|----------------------|
| Pistachio Regional Park | |
| West Roseville Community Center & Library | \$123,308,750 |
| BMX, Pickleball Complex, and Parking | \$8,900,690 |
| Subtotal Pistachio Regional Park | \$132,209,440 |
| Splash Pad and Playground at Pistachio Regional Park | \$2,496,946 |
| West Roseville Skate Park | \$6,609,962 |
| Universally Accessible and Destination Playgrounds | \$3,400,000 |
| Citywide Park | \$94,003,300 |
| Total Parks, Recreation, and Library Facilities | \$238,719,648 |

Source: City of Roseville and EPS

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

4. Cost Allocation and Fee Calculation

Having established the costs of planned public facilities needed to serve new development, those costs need to be distributed equitably over various anticipated land uses in the form of a maximum justifiable fee per unit by sq. ft. range for residential development, and a fee per square foot for nonresidential development. This section describes the methodology used to allocate the cost of future development's share of planned public facility costs to residential and nonresidential land uses. These calculations result in a maximum justifiable fee per residential unit and per nonresidential square foot.

The purpose of allocating certain improvement costs among the various land uses is to provide an equitable method to fund required facilities. The keys to apportioning the cost of citywide improvements to different land uses are the assumptions that the demands placed on public facilities are related to land use type and that such demands can be stated in relative terms for all land uses. It is by relating demand for facilities to land use types that a nexus, or reasonable relationship, can be established to apportion the fair share costs to that land use.

This study uses a common-use factor to relate the demand for public facilities generated by residents and employees. Public facility costs are allocated to residential and nonresidential land uses on a "persons-served basis," whereby costs are attributed to both future residents and employees. The common-use factor for residential land uses is the number of persons per household for each residential land use category.

The general steps to allocate the costs and estimate the fees shown in **Table 4-1** and **Table 4-2** for each backbone infrastructure and public facilities fee component are outlined below:

1. Determine the PFF Program costs. These costs were detailed in the previous chapter.
2. Determine the PPH/Bldg. sq. ft. factor for each land use that serves as a measure of demand placed on the improvement relative to the demand of a Single-family 1,500 to 2,500 sq. ft. dwelling unit.
3. For each land use, multiply the factor by the number of PPH/Emp. per sq. ft. (dwelling units or 1,000 commercial bldg. sq. ft.) and sum across land uses to derive the total service population.
4. Calculate the cost per person as the total cost divided by the total service population.
5. For each land use, calculate the cost per unit by range or building square foot as the PPH/Emp. per sq. ft. multiplied by the cost per person.
 - Multifamily fees by sq. ft. range are calculated by multiplying each single family fee by sq. ft. range by the multifamily adjustment factor, shown in **Table A-4**.

- Multifamily age-restricted fees by sq. ft. range are calculated by multiplying each single family fee by sq. ft. range by the multifamily age-restricted adjustment factor, shown in **Table A-5**

Cost Allocation by Component

As outlined above, PPH/Emp. by sq. ft. factors are used to allocate improvement costs to each land use based on the land use's demand placed on an improvement type relative to the demand from a single-family unit.

The common-use factor for nonresidential land uses is based on the number of employees generated per 1,000 sq. ft. for commercial, office, and industrial development. For purposes of the facility cost allocation, the total number of projected employees is adjusted to reflect the demand for public facilities by an employee as it relates to the demand for the facilities generated by a resident. For purposes of cost allocation, the employee adjustment factor varies depending on the type of facility:

- **General City and Public Safety Facilities.** The relative demand of an employee for all public facilities excluding parks, recreation, and library facilities is calculated based on time spent in the jurisdiction as compared to that of a resident. Assuming one employee spends 45 hours per week in the jurisdiction, one employee is assumed to equal 0.27 residents (45 hours per week divided by 168 hours per week).
- **Parks, Recreation, and Library Facilities.** This study is based on the assumption that the benefit an employee derives from parks, recreation, and library facilities will be substantially lower than that derived from other public facilities. For cost allocation purposes, therefore, the employee adjustment factor is reduced by 50 percent, and one employee is assumed to equal 0.13 residents.

Tables 4-1 and **4-2** detail the allocation of costs for each category of public facilities. The total service population generated by each land use category is estimated based on the total number of future residential units or nonresidential square feet and the corresponding resident or employee density. The appropriate adjustment factor is applied to the number of employees generated by each land use category to derive the total service population. Public facility costs then are distributed to each land use category based on that land use category's percentage share of the total service population. Dividing by the total number of projected future units or nonresidential square footage generates the total public facility cost per residential unit by square foot range or nonresidential square foot. Addition of a 2 percent administration charge generates the total maximum justifiable fee for each land use category.

Table 4-1 Cost Allocation for General City and Public Safety Facilities

| Land Use | Costs Per person | PPH/ Bldg. Sq. Ft. Factor | PPH/ Emp. Per Sq. Ft. | Employee Weight Factor | Cost Per Unit/ Bldg. Sq. Ft. |
|---------------------------------------|------------------|---------------------------------|--------------------------------|------------------------------|------------------------------------|
| Total Cost | \$56,887,089 | | | | |
| Service Population | 39,148 | | | | |
| Cost Per Person | \$1,453 | | | | |
| <hr/> | | | | | |
| Residential | | | <i>PPH</i> | | <i>per unit</i> |
| Residential | | | | | |
| <1,500 sq. ft. | | 0.81 | 2.13 | - | \$3,095 |
| 1,500 to 2,500 sq. ft. | | 1.00 | 2.64 | - | \$3,836 |
| 2,500 to 3,500 sq. ft. | | 1.08 | 2.86 | - | \$4,156 |
| >3,500 sq. ft. | | 1.14 | 3.02 | - | \$4,388 |
| Age-Restricted | | | | | |
| <1,500 sq. ft. | | 0.81 | 1.45 | - | \$2,107 |
| 1,500 to 2,500 sq. ft. | | 1.00 | 1.80 | - | \$2,616 |
| 2,500 to 3,500 sq. ft. | | 1.08 | 1.95 | - | \$2,834 |
| >3,500 sq. ft. [1] | | 1.11 | 2.00 | - | \$2,906 |
| Multifamily [2] | | | | | |
| <1,500 sq. ft. | | 0.81 | 1.44 | - | \$2,089 |
| 1,500 to 2,500 sq. ft. | | 1.00 | 1.78 | - | \$2,589 |
| 2,500 to 3,500 sq. ft. | | 1.08 | 1.93 | - | \$2,804 |
| >3,500 sq. ft. | | 1.14 | 2.04 | - | \$2,961 |
| Multifamily Age-Restricted [3] | | | | | |
| <1,500 sq. ft. [4] | | 0.82 | 1.00 | - | \$1,453 |
| 1,500 to 2,500 sq. ft. | | 1.00 | 1.21 | - | \$1,765 |
| 2,500 to 3,500 sq. ft. | | 0.74 | 1.32 | - | \$1,912 |
| >3,500 sq. ft. | | 0.76 | 1.35 | - | \$1,961 |
| <hr/> | | | | | |
| Nonresidential | | | <i>emp per 1,000 sq ft</i> | | <i>per bldg. sq. ft.</i> |
| Commercial Weighting Factor | | A | $B = 1,000 / A$ | $C = B * 0.13$ | $D = 1,533 * C / 1,000$ |
| Commercial | | | | | |
| Neighborhood Commercial | | 400 | 2.50 | 0.33 | \$0.47 |
| Community Commercial | | 400 | 2.50 | 0.33 | \$0.47 |
| Regional Commercial | | 400 | 2.50 | 0.33 | \$0.47 |
| Business Professional | | 300 | 3.33 | 0.43 | \$0.63 |
| Central Business District | | 300 | 3.33 | 0.43 | \$0.63 |
| Subtotal Commercial | | | | | |
| Industrial | | | | | |
| Light Industrial | | 600 | 1.67 | 0.22 | \$0.31 |
| General Industrial | | 1,000 | 1.00 | 0.13 | \$0.19 |

Source: City of Roseville and EPS

- [1] The PPH Factor has been adjusted downward to cap the maximum persons per household at two for age-restricted units.
- [2] The multifamily fee is calculated by multiplying the single family fee in each sq. ft. range by the multifamily adjustment factor of 0.67. See Table A-4 for details.
- [3] The multifamily age-restricted fee is calculated by multiplying the single family age restricted fee in each sq. ft. range by the multifamily age-restricted adjustment factor of 0.67. See Table A-5 for details.
- [4] The PPH Factor has been adjusted upward to set the minimum persons per household to one for multifamily age-restricted units.

Table 4-2 Cost Allocation for Parks, Recreation, and Libraries

| Land Use | Costs Per person | PPH/ Bldg. Sq. Ft. Factor | PPH/ Emp. Per Sq. Ft. | Employee Weight Factor | Cost Per Unit/ Bldg. Sq. Ft. |
|---------------------------------------|------------------|---------------------------|----------------------------|------------------------|------------------------------|
| Total Cost | \$56,887,089 | | | | |
| Service Population | 39,148 | | | | |
| Cost Per Person | \$1,453 | | | | |
| Residential | | | | | |
| | | | <i>PPH</i> | | <i>per unit</i> |
| Residential | | | | | |
| <1,500 sq. ft. | | 0.81 | 2.13 | - | \$3,095 |
| 1,500 to 2,500 sq. ft. | | 1.00 | 2.64 | - | \$3,836 |
| 2,500 to 3,500 sq. ft. | | 1.08 | 2.86 | - | \$4,156 |
| >3,500 sq. ft. | | 1.14 | 3.02 | - | \$4,388 |
| Age-Restricted | | | | | |
| <1,500 sq. ft. | | 0.81 | 1.45 | - | \$2,107 |
| 1,500 to 2,500 sq. ft. | | 1.00 | 1.80 | - | \$2,616 |
| 2,500 to 3,500 sq. ft. | | 1.08 | 1.95 | - | \$2,834 |
| >3,500 sq. ft. [1] | | 1.11 | 2.00 | - | \$2,906 |
| Multifamily [2] | | | | | |
| <1,500 sq. ft. | | 0.81 | 1.44 | - | \$2,089 |
| 1,500 to 2,500 sq. ft. | | 1.00 | 1.78 | - | \$2,589 |
| 2,500 to 3,500 sq. ft. | | 1.08 | 1.93 | - | \$2,804 |
| >3,500 sq. ft. | | 1.14 | 2.04 | - | \$2,961 |
| Multifamily Age-Restricted [3] | | | | | |
| <1,500 sq. ft. [4] | | 0.82 | 1.00 | - | \$1,453 |
| 1,500 to 2,500 sq. ft. | | 1.00 | 1.21 | - | \$1,765 |
| 2,500 to 3,500 sq. ft. | | 0.74 | 1.32 | - | \$1,912 |
| >3,500 sq. ft. | | 0.76 | 1.35 | - | \$1,961 |
| Nonresidential | | | | | |
| | | | <i>emp per 1,000 sq ft</i> | | <i>per bldg. sq. ft.</i> |
| Commercial Weighting Factor | | | | | |
| | A | $B = 1,000 / A$ | $C = B * 0.13$ | | $D = 1,533 * C / 1,000$ |
| Commercial | | | | | |
| Neighborhood Commercial | 400 | 2.50 | 0.33 | | \$0.47 |
| Community Commercial | 400 | 2.50 | 0.33 | | \$0.47 |
| Regional Commercial | 400 | 2.50 | 0.33 | | \$0.47 |
| Business Professional | 300 | 3.33 | 0.43 | | \$0.63 |
| Central Business District | 300 | 3.33 | 0.43 | | \$0.63 |
| Subtotal Commercial | | | | | |
| Industrial | | | | | |
| Light Industrial | 600 | 1.67 | 0.22 | | \$0.31 |
| General Industrial | 1,000 | 1.00 | 0.13 | | \$0.19 |

Source: City of Roseville and EPS

- [1] The PPH Factor has been adjusted downward to cap the maximum persons per household at two for age-restricted units.
- [2] The multifamily fee is calculated by multiplying the single family fee in each sq. ft. range by the multifamily adjustment factor of 0.67. See Table A-4 for details.
- [3] The multifamily age-restricted fee is calculated by multiplying the single family age restricted fee in each sq. ft. range by the multifamily age-restricted adjustment factor of 0.67. See Table A-5 for details.
- [4] The PPH Factor has been adjusted upward to set the minimum persons per household to one for multifamily age-restricted units.

5. Implementation

The PFF presented in this report is based on the best facility improvement cost estimates, funding source information, administrative cost estimates, and land use information available at this time. If costs change significantly, if the type or amount of new development changes, if other assumptions significantly change, or if other funding becomes available (as a result of legislative action on state and local government finance, for example), the fee program should be updated accordingly.

After the fees presented in this report are established, the City should conduct periodic reviews of facility improvement costs and other assumptions used as the basis of this nexus study. Based on these reviews, the City may make necessary adjustments to the fee program through subsequent fee program updates.

The cost estimates presented in this report are in constant 2025 dollars. The City may automatically adjust the costs and fees for inflation each year as outlined in this chapter.

Implementing Ordinances/Resolutions

The proposed fee would be adopted by the City through one or more ordinances authorizing collection of the fee and through one or more fee resolutions establishing the fee. The fee will be effective 60 days following the City’s final action on the ordinances authorizing collection of the fee and on the fee resolutions establishing the fee. The new ordinances or resolutions should reference the automatic inflation adjustment factor discussed in this chapter.

Fee Administration

The PFF will be collected from new development in areas subject to the fee at the time of the building permit issuance; use of these funds may need to wait until a sufficient fund balance can be accrued. According to Government Code Section 66000, the City is required to deposit, invest, account for, and expend the fees in a prescribed manner.

PFF Exemptions, Reimbursements, and Credits

Under certain and limited circumstances, as determined by the City, the Impact Fee Resolution could allow developers subject to the fee to obtain credits, reimbursements, or exemptions.

As more specifically set forth in the authorizing ordinance, projects that rebuild or remodel without increasing the square footage of the project will be exempt from the PFF, except under the following circumstances:

1. If the development or project changes to a different land use, it shall be charged the appropriate fee for the new land use category less any PFF amount previously paid.
2. Where the development or project expands or remodels the same land use, only the expanded square footage would be subject to the PFF.
3. Remodeling or expansion of an existing dwelling unit shall be exempt from fee payments, unless additional dwelling units are added.

All other fee credits, reimbursements, or exemptions should not be allowed by right but rather should be subject to review by City staff and the City Council to ensure that such credits or reimbursements are warranted and appropriate. Exemptions where the City elects not to impose fees for certain categories of development are an option, though alternative funding sources to offset a loss in fee revenue would need to be provided.

Furthermore, the developer of any project subject to the PFF may apply for a reduction or adjustment to the fee based on the absence of any reasonable relationship or nexus between the impacts of the project and either the amount of the fee or the facilities to be financed by the fee. The City will consider any such applications in accordance with the implementing fee program ordinance.

Fee Program Update

The PFF is subject to automatic annual inflation adjustments, periodic updates, and a 5-year review requirement. The purpose of each update is described in this section.

Automatic Annual Inflation Adjustment

The proposed fee shall be automatically adjusted by the City annually to account for the inflation of construction, land acquisition, and environmental or design costs.

This 2025 Nexus Study recommends that in June of each calendar year, using the procedures set forth in California Government Code Section 66017, the PFF should be adjusted by the average of the change in the San Francisco Construction Cost Index (CCI) and the change in the 20-city CCI as reported in the Engineering News Record for the 12-month period ending May of each year.

Periodic Fee Updates

The proposed PFF is subject to periodic update based on changes in developable land, cost estimates, or outside funding sources. The City will periodically review the costs and fee to determine if any updates to the fee are warranted. During the periodic reviews, the City will analyze the following items:

- Changes to the required facilities listed in the 2025 Nexus Study.
- Changes in the cost to update or administer the fee.
- Changes in costs greater than inflation.
- Changes in assumed land uses.
- Changes in other funding sources.

Any changes to the fee based on the periodic update will be presented to the City Council for approval before an increase or decrease in the fee.

The City Council also may specify during a periodic update which improvements should receive funding from the PFF Program before other improvements. Based on facility evaluations, the location of approved new development that will add significant housing or jobs, or other considerations, the City has the ability to spend the fee revenues on any of the projects identified in the PFF Capital Improvement Plan (CIP) regardless of project location and the location of collected fees.

Five-Year Review

Fees will be collected from new development in the City immediately; use of these funds, however, may need to wait until a sufficient fund balance can be accrued. According to Government Code Section 66006, the City is required to deposit, invest, account for, and expend the fees in a prescribed manner. The fifth fiscal year following the first deposit into the fee account or fund, and every 5 years thereafter, the City is required to make all of the following findings with respect to that portion of the account or fund remaining unexpended:

- Identify the purpose for which the fee is to be put.
- Demonstrate a reasonable relationship between the fee and the purpose for which it is charged.
- Identify all sources and amounts of funding anticipated to complete financing in incomplete plan area improvements.
- Designate the approximate dates the funding referred to in the above paragraph is expected to be deposited in the appropriate account or fund.

The City must refund the unexpended or uncommitted revenue portion of the fee for which a need could not be demonstrated in the above findings, unless the administrative costs exceed the amount of the refund.

Non-Fee Revenue Sources

The City has and will continue to rely on multiple funding sources, including the PFF, to fund development of public facilities. Costs attributable to existing development must be funded from non-fee program sources. This study identifies several revenue sources that, when combined with the proposed impact fees, result in a full funding for all CIP facilities with the exception of Citywide park improvements. For those improvements for which full funding has been identified, if the City were to increase the scope of planned improvements, it would be necessary to fund existing development's fair share of the additional costs with non-fee funding sources. Major sources of funding for existing development's share of public facilities costs may include the following mechanisms:

- **General Fund Revenue** is generated primarily by property taxes, sales taxes, and transient occupancy taxes and is used for operational and capital facility uses.
- **Development Exactions** are conditions imposed by land use jurisdictions on development to mitigate anticipated impacts on public facilities and infrastructure.
- **Other Fee Programs** (e.g., park development fee program) has been identified as funding a portion of the PFF Program costs.
- **General Obligation Bonds** are voter-approved bonds that are used for capital improvements and then repaid through property tax assessments. A two-thirds voter majority is required to approve General Obligation bonds.
- **Joint Use Facilities/Partnerships** can be an effective way to combine the resources of multiple agencies. For example, school districts frequently partner with park and recreation departments to maximize usage of ball fields, community centers, etc.
- **Grants** can be obtained from a variety of public and private sources.
- **Donations** can be made by philanthropic organizations and individuals.
- **Other sources** include public land trusts, property exchanges, exactions, and revenue bonds.

As is the case with all municipalities, the City does not control the future availability of funds for capital facility development from most sources. Grants are competitive, bonds require voter approval, and General Fund resources are used to meet a variety of operational and capital facility needs. The City will continue to seek and leverage all available funding mechanisms for public facility development. The City likely will rely on a combination of many funding sources to fully finance projects in the PFF Capital Improvement Plan.

6. Nexus Findings

Government Code Section 66000 et seq. establishes specific requirements for the imposition of impact fee programs. To impose development impact fees, the local jurisdiction must establish the necessary “nexus” between new development and the proposed facilities funded by the fee program. Nexus findings address (1) the **purpose** of the fee and a related description of the facility for which fee revenue will be used, (2) the specific **use** of fee revenue, (3) the **relationship** between the facility and the type of development, (4) the relationship between the **need** for the facility and the type of development, and (5) the relationship between the amount of the fee and the **proportionality** of cost specifically attributable to new development.

In particular, CGC Section 66001 includes specific requirements for establishing a reasonable relationship or nexus between the development impact fee, and CGC Section 66016.5 (added in 2021 to address the newly enacted AB 602) includes additional requirements for development impact fees. The remainder of this chapter addresses the requirements of CGC Section 66001 and CGC Section 66016.5.

California Government Code Section 66001

CGC Section 66001 requires that a “reasonable relationship or nexus must exist between a governmental exaction and the purpose of the condition.”² Specifically, each local agency imposing a development impact fee must make the following findings:

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

This section details these findings for each PFF Fee Program component that is addressed in this report.

² *Public Needs & Private Dollars*; William Abbott, Marian E. Moe, and Marilee Hanson, page 109.

General City and Public Safety Facilities

Purpose of Fee

The proposed General City and Public Safety Facilities component of the PFF Fee will fund public safety infrastructure and general city facilities necessary to serve new residential and nonresidential development in the City. New development in the City will increase the service population and, therefore, the need for new or expanding public facilities.

Use of Fees

The General City and Public Safety Facilities component of the PFF Infrastructure Facilities Fee charged to new development will be used to fund needed additions and improvements to public safety and general city facilities to accommodate the expansion and alterations to facilities as public safety personnel and city staff are added to serve the resident and employee population generated by new development. General city and public safety additions and improvements may include land acquisition, planning, engineering, and design of public facilities, infrastructure, utilities, and other site improvements, vertical construction, capital equipment, furnishings, vehicles, and financing costs associated with the above (if applicable).

Relationship between Use of Fees and Type of Development

The PFF Program General City and Public Safety fees will be used to construct general city and public safety improvements needed to adequately serve an increased service population as the result of the new development. A reasonable relationship exists between the use of the General City and Public Safety fee and the residential and commercial development on which the fees are imposed because the fees will be used to construct the general city and public safety facilities needed to serve the new residents and employees generated by the new development.

Relationship between Need for Facility and Type of Project

New residential and commercial development in Roseville will need a police station and associated vehicles and equipment to provide expanded law enforcement and services and meet required emergency response times.

A reasonable relationship exists between the need for a new police station, vehicles, and equipment and the type of new residential and nonresidential development projects because the police station must be expanded to accommodate the new development.

New residential and nonresidential development in Roseville will need new government facilities and associated vehicles and equipment so that the City can continue to provide general City services at the current levels of service to the new residents and employees.

A reasonable relationship exists between the need for improved government facilities and equipment and the type of new residential and nonresidential development projects because the improvements are necessary to serve the new development.

Relationship between Amount of Fees and Cost of or Portion of Facility Attributed to Development on which Fee is Imposed

The total cost of improvements funded by the General City and Public Safety Facility Fee is allocated among the projected new residential and nonresidential land uses in the City at buildout based on the relative demand each land use is anticipated to place upon the improvements. Cost allocation factors based on persons per household and employees per 1,000 commercial building square feet are used to measure the relative demand generated by each land use and to allocate the public safety expansion costs and general city facility costs across all benefiting land uses in the City. A reasonable relationship exists between the amount of the General City and Public Safety Facility fees and the costs of the facilities attributable to the new residential and nonresidential development on which the fees are imposed because the fees are derived using appropriate cost allocation factors as measures of the proportional demand generated by each development type.

Parks

Purpose of Fee

The purpose of the PFF Fee Program Parks, Recreation and Library Facilities fee is to provide funding to construct new parks, recreation, and library facilities required to serve new residents.

Use of Fees

The PFF Fee Program Parks, Recreation and Library Facilities Fees will be used to construct park improvements needed to accommodate increased demand projected as a result of new development. The park fees will be used to fund construction of Pistachio Regional Park, West Roseville Community Center and Library, BMX, Pickleball Complex, and Parking at Pistachio Park, a Water/Splash Pad, the West Roseville Specific Plan Skate Park, Universally Accessible and Destination Playgrounds and a Citywide Park.

Relationship between Use of Fees and Type of Development

The PFF Fee Program Parks, Recreation and Library Facilities Fees will be used to construct the parks system needed to adequately serve the new residents and employees as a result of new development. A reasonable relationship exists between the use of the Parks, Recreation and Library Facilities Fees and the development on which the fees are imposed because the fees will be used to construct the parks needed to serve the new residents and employees generated by new development.

Relationship between Need for Facility and Type of Project

New development in the City will generate new residents and employees that will result in the need for new neighborhood and community parks. A reasonable relationship exists between the need for new parks and the type of new development projects because the new parks must be constructed to accommodate the new development types that will benefit from the parks.

Relationship between Amount of Fees and Cost of or Portion of Facility Attributed to Development on which Fee is Imposed

The facilities funded by the PFF Fee Program Parks, Recreation and Library Facilities Fees is allocated among the projected new remaining land uses in the City at buildout based on the relative demand each land use is anticipated to place upon the improvements. Cost allocation factors based on people who will use the parks, as measured by persons per household and employees per 1,000 commercial building square feet and applying an adjustment factor to total employees to reflect a lower demand for public facilities as compared to residents, are used to measure the relative demand generated by each land use and to allocate the park costs across all benefitting land uses in the City. A reasonable relationship exists between the amount of the PFF Fee Program Parks, Recreation and Library Facilities Fees and the costs of the improvements attributable to the new development on which the fees are imposed because the fees are derived using appropriate cost allocation factors as measures of the proportional demand generated by each development type.

Administration

The administration component of the PFF funds City costs associated with fee program administration and implementation, including credit and reimbursement agreement negotiations and implementation, credit and reimbursement tracking, annual reporting requirements, periodic updates to the Nexus Study, and other related costs. Collection and implementation of the PFF Program fees, inclusive of the constituent fee components described above, is reliant upon funding from the administration component.

For each land use, the administration component is calculated as two percent of the total of all other PFF Program components. Costs of the administration component are therefore based on each fee component and subcomponent, and associated nexus findings for the administration component are established by the nexus finding for each fee component documented above.

California Government Code Section 66016.5 (AB 602)

As noted earlier in this document, this nexus analysis must consider the newly created CGC Section 66016.5. This section stipulates that a jurisdiction must calculate residential development impact fees proportionately to the square footage of the dwelling units, with the exception of water and sewer fees and any other fees for which specific findings can be made as to why the fees should not be enacted on a square foot basis.

In this report, residential fees are calculated as shown below:

- **General City and Public Safety Facilities**
Fees by dwelling unit square foot ranges
- **Parks, Recreation, and Library Facilities**
Fees by dwelling unit square foot ranges

The required findings detailed in CGC Section 66016.5 must be made for General City and Public Safety Facilities, and Parks, Recreation, and Library Facilities. The specific requirements and findings for the components listed above are detailed in the remainder of this chapter.

Requirements for Exceptions to Fee Proportional to Housing Square Footage

CGS Section 66016.5(a)(5)(A) states, among other things, that fees “imposed on a housing development project proportionately to the square footage of the proposed units of the development shall be deemed to have used a valid method to establish a reasonable relationship between the fee charged and the burden posed by the development.” However, Section 66016.5(a)(5)(B) states that a nexus study “is not required to comply with this proportionality requirement if the local agency makes the following findings:

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

General City and Public Safety Facilities

a) An explanation as to why square footage is not an appropriate metric to calculate fees imposed on a housing development project.

The PFF Program General City and Public Safety Facilities costs are allocated to dwelling units on a persons served basis in the form of persons per unit. The persons per household data provided in this report supports identification of an increasing number of people per household as a dwelling unit size increases. However, the data present limitations on both the lower/smaller unit size range and on the higher/larger unit size range. For example, regardless of how small a dwelling unit may be, the minimum assumed persons per unit would be 1. Similarly, as home size continues to increase, the data are not as conclusive that the number of persons per unit continues to increase in a linear or otherwise determinant fashion. For these reasons, deriving a fee directly calculated on residential building square footage alone is not an appropriate metric to calculate the PFF Program General City and Public Safety Facilities fees.

b) An explanation that an alternative basis of calculating the fee bears a reasonable relationship between the fee charged and the burden posed by the development.

As detailed in **Chapter 2**, the number of people per household shows a pattern of increasing as unit size increases. Thus, implementing the fee based on ranges of building square feet for residential development bears a reasonable relationship between the fee charged and the burden posed by the development because units that fall in the lower building unit size range pay a lower fee than units that fall in a higher building unit size range, which is proportional to the estimated number of people per household by unit size within each size range.

c) That other policies in the fee structure support smaller developments, or otherwise ensure that smaller developments are not charged disproportionate fees.

Implementation of the PFF Program General City and Public Safety Facility fees for residential development by building square foot range achieves the objective that smaller residential units would be charged a lower fee than larger units and ensures proportionality of fees based on relative demand for the facilities, as documented in this report.

Parks, Recreation, and Library Facilities

a) An explanation as to why square footage is not an appropriate metric to calculate fees imposed on a housing development project.

The PFF parks, recreation, and library facility costs are allocated to dwelling units on a persons served basis in the form of persons per unit. The persons per household data provided in this report supports identification of an increasing number of people per household as a dwelling unit size increases. However, the data present limitations on both the lower/smaller unit size range and on the higher/larger unit size range. For example, regardless of how small a dwelling unit may be, the minimum assumed persons per unit would be 1. Similarly, as home size continues to increase, the data are not as conclusive that the number of persons per unit continues to increase in a linear or otherwise determinant fashion. For these reasons, deriving a fee directly calculated on residential building square footage alone is not an appropriate metric to calculate the PFF parks, recreation, and library facility fees.

b) An explanation that an alternative basis of calculating the fee bears a reasonable relationship between the fee charged and the burden posed by the development.

As detailed in **Chapter 2**, the number of people per household shows a pattern of increasing as unit size increases. Thus, implementing the fee based on ranges of building square feet for residential development bears a reasonable relationship between the fee charged and the burden posed by the development because units that fall in the lower building unit size range pay a lower fee than units that fall in a higher building unit size range, which is proportional to the estimated number of people per household by unit size within each size range.

c) That other policies in the fee structure support smaller developments, or otherwise ensure that smaller developments are not charged disproportionate fees.

Implementation of the PFF parks, recreation, and library facility fees for residential development by building square foot range achieves the objective that smaller residential units would be charged a lower fee than larger units and ensures proportionality of fees based on relative demand for the facilities, as documented in this report.



APPENDICES:

Appendix A: Land Use Assumptions

Appendix B: PFF Capital Improvement
Program (CIP)



APPENDIX A: Land Use Assumptions

| | | |
|------------|---|------|
| Table A-1 | Persons per Household Factors by Residential Square Foot Size Category..... | A-3 |
| Table A-2 | Single Family Persons per Household | A-4 |
| Table A-3 | Multifamily Persons per Household | A-5 |
| Table A-4 | Persons per Household—Multifamily Adjustment | A-6 |
| Table A-5 | Persons per Household—Multifamily Age Restricted Adjustment | A-7 |
| Table A-6 | Existing Nonresidential Development..... | A-8 |
| Table A-7 | Buildout Nonresidential Development | A-9 |
| Table A-8 | Adjusted Buildout Nonresidential Development— Infill Area | A-10 |
| Table A-9 | Adjusted Buildout Nonresidential Development— Downtown Specific Plan | A-11 |
| Table A-10 | Adjusted Buildout Nonresidential Development — Other Plan Areas (Not DT/Infill)..... | A-12 |

A. Land Use Assumptions

EPS worked with City Development Services Department staff to develop the land use assumptions for purposes of the PFF Program. This appendix details the methodology EPS and the City used to arrive at updated existing, future, and buildout land use assumptions, which are discussed in summary form in **Chapter 2**.

Residential Land Use Assumptions

The City provided existing and buildout single-family and multifamily dwelling units by unit type and plan area. The existing units are based on City building permits and records of residential development in each plan area. The buildout units are based on the number of units allocated to each plan area in the General Plan and on subsequent amendments to some plan area allocations. The future units by unit type are calculated as buildout units less existing units.

The residential units are summarized by land use type in **Table 2-1**. No backup tables are needed, so there are not further residential tables included in this appendix.

Nonresidential Land Use Assumptions

The existing and buildout nonresidential building square feet by nonresidential land use were derived from a variety of sources. The future building square feet by land use are calculated as buildout building square feet less existing building square feet. The tables in this appendix detail the existing and buildout building square feet estimates.

- **Table A-6** summarizes the existing nonresidential building square feet by land use. The existing building square feet are calculated as the sum of the following two components:
 1. Building square feet the 2020 Nexus Study.
 2. Building square feet constructed through 2024 based on City building permit records.
- **Table A-7** summarizes the buildout nonresidential building square feet by land use. The following steps are taken to estimate the buildout square feet.
 1. The 2015 Nexus Study floor area ratio (FAR) and base buildout acres and buildout square feet prior to any adjustments are obtained from the 2015 Nexus Study.
 2. The buildout acres are obtained from the City's General Plan. The General Plan categorizes the acres into Commercial, Business Professional, and Industrial land uses. The acres are distributed to the more detailed land uses in this Nexus Study based on the proportional distribution of the acres from the 2020 Nexus Study (discussed in Step 1).

3. The buildout square feet by land use are estimated by applying the FAR from Step 1 to the buildout acres.
 4. Adjustments are made to the buildout square feet to account for anticipated reduced levels of development in the Infill Area and the Downtown Specific Plan (DTSP), and Other Plan Areas. These adjustments are detailed in Table A-4, Table A-5, and Table A-6. The final buildout building square feet are estimated as the building square feet in Step 3 adjusted downward by the Infill Area and DTSP reductions.
- **Table A-8** details the Infill Area adjustment. The following steps are taken to estimate the Infill Area adjusted building square feet.
 1. The Infill Area building square feet by nonresidential land use at buildout are obtained from the 2020 Nexus Study.
 2. The existing building square feet by land use are deducted from the buildout building square feet to obtain the future building square feet by land use prior to an adjustment. Table A-4 details the calculation of the existing building square feet for the Infill Area.
 3. A 25 percent reduction is applied to the future building square feet to estimate the adjusted future building square feet for the Infill Area. This percentage reduction is consistent with the reduction established in the 2015 Nexus Study.
 - **Table A-9** details the DTSP adjustment. The following steps are taken to estimate the DTSP adjusted building square feet.
 1. The DTSP building square feet by nonresidential land use at buildout are obtained from the 2020 Nexus Study.
 2. The existing building square feet by land use are deducted from the buildout building square feet to obtain the future building square feet by land use prior to an adjustment.
 3. A 75 percent reduction is applied to the future building square feet to estimate the adjusted future building square feet for the DTSP. This percentage reduction is consistent with the reduction established in the 2020 Nexus Study.
 - **Table A-10** details the adjustment for all other plan areas. The existing building square feet are calculated as:
 1. Total general plan buildout net DTSP buildout and infill area buildout.
 2. The existing building square feet by land use are deducted from the buildout building square feet to obtain the future building square feet by land use prior to an adjustment.
 3. No reduction is applied to the future building square feet for all other plan areas as all other plan areas were not adjusted downward in 2015 and 2025

Table A-1
Roseville Public Facilities Fee Program Nexus Study Update
Persons per Household Factors by Residential Square Foot Size Category [1]

| Persons per Household | Less than 1,500 sq. ft. | | 1,500 sq. ft. to 2,500 sq. ft. | | 2,500 to 3,500 sq. ft. | | Greater than 3,500 sq. ft. | | Total | |
|-----------------------|-------------------------|--------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------|------------------------|--------------------|----------------------------|--------------------|--------------------------|--------------------|
| | Units | Percent of Units | Units | Percent of Units | Units | Percent of Units | Units | Percent of Units | Units | Percent of Units |
| <i>Formula</i> | <i>B</i> | <i>C = B / Σ B</i> | <i>E</i> | <i>F = E / Σ E</i> | <i>H</i> | <i>I = H / Σ H</i> | <i>J</i> | <i>K = J / Σ J</i> | <i>L = B + E + H + J</i> | <i>M = L / Σ L</i> |
| 1 | 23,688 | 41% | 8,722 | 21% | 1,912 | 14% | 1,211 | 14% | 35,532 | 29% |
| 2 | 18,533 | 32% | 15,840 | 38% | 5,234 | 39% | 3,060 | 35% | 42,666 | 35% |
| 3 | 7,720 | 13% | 6,726 | 16% | 2,013 | 15% | 1,228 | 14% | 17,687 | 14% |
| 4 | 5,052 | 9% | 6,274 | 15% | 2,515 | 19% | 1,683 | 20% | 15,523 | 13% |
| 5 | 2,214 | 4% | 2,839 | 7% | 1,105 | 8% | 888 | 10% | 7,046 | 6% |
| 6 | 752 | 1% | 912 | 2% | 389 | 3% | 351 | 4% | 2,403 | 2% |
| 7+ | 459 | 1% | 534 | 1% | 195 | 1% | 201 | 2% | 1,388 | 1% |
| Total | 58,418 | 100% | 41,847 | 100% | 13,361 | 100% | 8,620 | 100% | 122,245 | 100% |
| Average PPH | 2.10 | | 2.61 | | 2.82 | | 2.98 | | 2.42 | |
| PPH Factor | 0.81 | | 1.00 | | 1.08 | | 1.14 | | | |

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, American Housing Survey, 2023 National Household Demographics, All Occupied Units; EPS

[1] Includes data for both Multifamily and Single Family (Attached and Detached).

Table A-2
Roseville Public Facilities Fee Program Nexus Study Update
Single Family Persons per Household

| Persons per Household | Less than 1,500 sq. ft. | | 1,500 sq. ft. to 2,500 sq. ft. | | 2,500 to 3,500 sq. ft. | | Greater than 3,500 sq. ft. | | Total | |
|-----------------------|-------------------------|--------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------|------------------------|--------------------|----------------------------|--------------------|---------------------|--------------------|
| | Units | Percent of Units | Units | Percent of Units | Units | Percent of Units | Units | Percent of Units | Units | Percent of Units |
| <i>Formula</i> | <i>B</i> | $C = B / \Sigma B$ | <i>E</i> | $F = E / \Sigma E$ | <i>H</i> | $I = H / \Sigma H$ | <i>H</i> | $I = H / \Sigma H$ | $L = B + E + H + J$ | $M = L / \Sigma L$ |
| 1 | 10,771 | 32% | 8,124 | 20% | 1,907 | 14% | 1,211 | 14% | 22,012 | 23% |
| 2 | 11,170 | 33% | 15,144 | 38% | 5,234 | 39% | 3,060 | 35% | 34,607 | 36% |
| 3 | 5,087 | 15% | 6,596 | 16% | 2,013 | 15% | 1,228 | 14% | 14,924 | 16% |
| 4 | 3,688 | 11% | 6,114 | 15% | 2,515 | 19% | 1,683 | 20% | 13,999 | 15% |
| 5 | 1,848 | 5% | 2,798 | 7% | 1,105 | 8% | 888 | 10% | 6,639 | 7% |
| 6 | 752 | 2% | 912 | 2% | 389 | 3% | 351 | 4% | 2,403 | 3% |
| 7+ | 459 | 1% | 534 | 1% | 195 | 1% | 201 | 2% | 1,388 | 1% |
| Total | 33,775 | 100% | 40,222 | 100% | 13,356 | 100% | 8,620 | 100% | 95,972 | 100% |
| Average PPH | 2.37 | | 2.63 | | 2.82 | | 2.98 | | 2.60 | |
| PPH Factor | 0.90 | | 1.00 | | 1.07 | | 1.13 | | | |

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, American Housing Survey, 2023 National Household Demographics, All Occupied Units; EPS

[1] Includes data for both attached and detached single family units.

Table A-3
Roseville Public Facilities Fee Program Nexus Study Update
Multifamily Persons per Household

| Persons per Household | Less than 1,500 sq. ft. | | 1,500 sq. ft. to 2,500 sq. ft. | | Total [1] | |
|-----------------------|-------------------------|--------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------|---------------------|--------------------|
| | Units | Percent of Units | Units | Percent of Units | Units | Percent of Units |
| <i>Formula</i> | <i>B</i> | $C = B / \Sigma B$ | <i>E</i> | $F = E / \Sigma E$ | $L = B + E + H + J$ | $M = L / \Sigma L$ |
| 1 | 12,917 | 52% | 598 | 37% | 13,520 | 51% |
| 2 | 7,363 | 30% | 696 | 43% | 8,059 | 31% |
| 3 | 2,633 | 11% | 130 | 8% | 2,763 | 11% |
| 4 | 1,364 | 6% | 160 | 10% | 1,524 | 6% |
| 5 | 366 | 1% | 41 | 3% | 407 | 2% |
| 6 | 0 | 0% | 0 | 0% | 0 | 0% |
| 7+ | 0 | 0% | 0 | 0% | 0 | 0% |
| Total | 24,643 | 100% | 1,625 | 100% | 26,273 | 100% |
| Average PPH | 1.74 | | 1.98 | | 1.75 | |

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, American Housing Survey, 2023 National Household Demographics; EPS

[1] Multifamily PPH data for sq. ft. ranges above 2,500 sq ft. is a very small number, i.e. five units, and are not shown here but are included in the total.

Table A-4
Roseville Public Facilities Fee Program Nexus Study Update
Persons per Household - Multifamily Adjustment

| Persons per Household | Single Family | | Multifamily | | Total | |
|--------------------------|---------------|--------------------|---------------|--------------------|----------------|--------------------|
| | Units | Percent of Units | Units | Percent of Units | Units | Percent of Units |
| <i>Formula</i> | <i>B</i> | $C = B / \Sigma B$ | <i>E</i> | $F = E / \Sigma E$ | <i>H</i> | $I = H / \Sigma H$ |
| 1 | 22,012 | 23% | 13,520 | 51% | 35,532 | 29% |
| 2 | 34,607 | 36% | 8,059 | 31% | 42,666 | 35% |
| 3 | 14,924 | 16% | 2,763 | 11% | 17,687 | 14% |
| 4 | 13,999 | 15% | 1,524 | 6% | 15,523 | 13% |
| 5 | 6,639 | 7% | 407 | 2% | 7,046 | 6% |
| 6 | 2,403 | 3% | 0 | 0% | 2,403 | 2% |
| 7+ | 1,388 | 1% | 0 | 0% | 1,388 | 1% |
| Total | 95,972 | 100% | 26,273 | 100% | 122,245 | 100% |
| Average PPH | 2.60 | | 1.75 | | 2.42 | |
| Adjustment Factor | | | 0.67 | | | |

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, American Housing Survey, 2023 National Household Demographics, All Occupied Units; EPS

Table A-5
Roseville Public Facilities Fee Program Nexus Study Update
Persons per Household - Multifamily Age-Restricted Adjustment

| | Persons per Household | Single Family Age-Restricted [1] | Multifamily Age-Restricted |
|------------------------------|------------------------------|---|-----------------------------------|
| Average PPH [1] | | 1.80 | 1.21 |
| Adjustment Factor [2] | | | 0.67 |

Source: City of Roseville; EPS.

- [1] The 2020 PFF Nexus study established 1.8 PPH in single family age-restricted housing. This analysis assumes the same factor.
- [2] Average multifamily PPH is 67 percent of average PPH for single-family homes based on the average multifamily PPH of 1.75 divided by the national average of 2.6 PPH in single family homes. See Table A-4. This analysis applies the multifamily adjustment factor of 67 percent to the average PPH for single family age-restricted units to estimate the average PPH for multifamily age-restricted units.

Table A-6
Roseville Public Facilities Fee Program Nexus Study Update
Existing Nonresidential Development (as of 12/31/2023)

| Land Use | Existing Building Square Feet | | | Total |
|-----------------------------|-------------------------------|------------------|----------------------|-------------------|
| | Downtown | Infill | All Other Plan Areas | |
| Commercial | | | | |
| Neighborhood Commercial | - | 114,325 | 13,800 | 128,125 |
| Community Commercial | 189,523 | 2,472,872 | 9,022,628 | 11,685,023 |
| Regional Commercial | - | - | 4,577,369 | 4,577,369 |
| Business Professional | - | 789,611 | 7,512,580 | 8,302,191 |
| Central Business District | 959,444 | - | - | 959,444 |
| Subtotal Commercial | 1,148,967 | 3,376,808 | 21,126,377 | 25,652,152 |
| Industrial | | | | |
| Light Industrial | 2,152,591 | - | 5,831,277 | 7,983,868 |
| General Industrial | 140,190 | - | 3,914,109 | 4,054,299 |
| Subtotal Industrial | 2,292,781 | - | 9,745,386 | 12,038,167 |
| Total Nonresidential | 3,441,748 | 3,376,808 | 30,871,763 | 37,690,319 |

Source: City of Roseville; EPS

**Table A-7
Roseville Public Facilities Fee Program Nexus Study Update
Buildout Nonresidential Development**

| Land Use | FAR at Buildout [1] | Buildout Nonresidential Development | | | | | | | | |
|-------------------------------|---------------------|---------------------------------------|-------------------|--------------|-------------------|--------------------------------------|--------------------|------------------|--------------------|---------------------------|
| | | 2015 Nexus Study Prior to Adjustments | | General Plan | | Building Square Feet Adjustments [4] | | | | Adjusted Buildout Sq. Ft. |
| | | Acres | Sq. Ft. | Acres [2] | Sq. Ft. | Infill | DTSP | Other Plan Areas | Total | |
| <i>Source</i> | | | | | | <i>Table A-8</i> | <i>Table A-9</i> | | | |
| <i>Formula</i> | $A=C/B/43,560$ | <i>B</i> | <i>C</i> | <i>D</i> | $E=A*D*43,560$ | <i>F</i> | <i>G</i> | <i>H</i> | $I = F+G+H$ | <i>E+I</i> |
| Commercial | | | | | | | | | | |
| Neighborhood Commercial | 0.37 | 23 | 365,720 | 23 | 373,533 | (37,727) | - | - | (37,727) | 335,806 |
| Community Commercial | 0.20 | 1,814 | 16,187,915 | 1,869 | 16,278,761 | (692,594) | (1,207,520) | - | (1,900,114) | 14,378,648 |
| Regional Commercial | 0.35 | 335 | 5,062,509 | 345 | 5,259,140 | (1,575) | - | - | (1,575) | 5,257,565 |
| Central Business District [4] | 2.59 | 38 | 4,305,998 | 39 | 4,436,906 | (134,323) | (2,106,946) | - | (2,241,269) | 2,195,637 |
| Subtotal | | 2,210 | 25,922,142 | 2,276 | 26,348,340 | (866,219) | (3,314,465) | - | (4,180,684) | 22,167,656 |
| Business Professional | 0.34 | 786 | 11,527,491 | 792 | 11,729,837 | (384,935) | - | - | (384,935) | 11,344,902 |
| Subtotal Commercial | | 2,995 | 37,449,633 | 3,068 | 38,078,177 | (1,251,154) | (3,314,465) | - | (4,565,619) | 33,512,558 |
| Industrial | | | | | | | | | | |
| Light Industrial | 0.21 | 1,375 | 12,848,566 | 1,298 | 11,876,738 | (316,486) | - | - | (316,486) | 11,560,252 |
| General Industrial | 0.21 | 1,134 | 10,595,327 | 1,071 | 9,793,927 | (1,190,731) | (26,245) | - | (1,216,976) | 8,576,951 |
| Subtotal Industrial | | 2,509 | 23,443,893 | 2,369 | 21,670,664 | (1,507,216) | (26,245) | - | (1,533,461) | 20,137,203 |
| Total Nonresidential | | 5,504 | 60,893,526 | 5,437 | 59,748,841 | (2,758,370) | (3,340,710) | - | (6,099,080) | 53,649,761 |

Source: City of Roseville and EPS

- [1] FAR at buildout based on 2015 Nexus Study buildout acres and building square feet prior to adjustments. Rounded to nearest hundredth.
Note that FARs shown in Table 2-1 and Table A-1 of the 2015 Nexus Study are based on existing development and differ in some cases from the FARs in this table.
- [2] Acres from Land Use Element of Roseville General Plan (through 2035). General Plan acres categories are Commercial, Business Professional, and Industrial. Commercial and Industrial General Plan acres spread proportionately to subcategories based on the 2015 Nexus Study distribution
- [3] 2015 Nexus Study acres and square feet are sum of infill and downtown square feet. Acres exclude approximately 20 acres of downtown multifamily development.
- [4] Building square footage adjustments are equal to the remaining, buildout less existing, square footage multiplied by the reduction percentage as defined the 2015, and 2020 PFF Nexus Study Updates. For additional detail regarding dial down reductions see source tables for respective areas.

Table A-8
Roseville Public Facilities Fee Program Nexus Study Update
Adjusted Buildout Nonresidential Development - Infill Area

| Land Use | Infill Area | | | | |
|----------------------------------|-------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------|--------------------|----------------------------|
| | Buildout Sq. Ft. [1] | Less Existing Sq. Ft. | Future Sq. Ft. | Less Reduction | Adjusted Future Sq. Ft. |
| Percentage Adjustment [2] | | | | 25% | |
| Commercial | | | | | |
| Neighborhood Commercial | 265,231 | (114,325) | 150,906 | (37,727) | 113,180 |
| Community Commercial | 5,243,248 | (2,472,872) | 2,770,376 | (692,594) | 2,077,782 |
| Regional Commercial | 6,300 | - | 6,300 | (1,575) | 4,725 |
| Business Professional | 2,329,351 | (789,611) | 1,539,740 | (384,935) | 1,154,805 |
| Central Business District | 537,293 | - | 537,293 | (134,323) | 402,970 |
| Subtotal Commercial | 8,381,423 | (3,376,808) | 5,004,615 | (1,251,154) | 3,753,461 |
| Industrial | | | | | |
| Light Industrial | 3,418,533 | (2,152,591) | 1,265,942 | (316,486) | 949,457 |
| General Industrial | 4,903,112 | (140,190) | 4,762,922 | (1,190,731) | 3,572,192 |
| Subtotal Industrial | 8,321,645 | (2,292,781) | 6,028,864 | (1,507,216) | 4,521,648 |
| Total Nonresidential | 16,703,068 | (5,669,589) | 11,033,479 | (2,758,370) | 8,275,109 |

Source: City of Roseville and EPS

[1] From 2015 Roseville PFF Nexus Study Update (Table A-2).

[2] Percentage adjustment from 2015 Roseville PFF Nexus Study Update for Infill Area development through 2025.

Table A-9
Roseville Public Facilities Fee Program Nexus Study Update
Adjusted Buildout Nonresidential Development - Downtown Specific Plan

| Land Use | Building Square Feet | | | | |
|-------------------------------|-------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------|--------------------|----------------------------|
| | Buildout Sq. Ft. [1] | Less Existing Sq. Ft. | Future Sq. Ft. | Less Reduction | Adjusted Future Sq. Ft. |
| Commercial | | | | | |
| Percentage Adjustment [2] | | | | 75% | |
| Neighborhood Commercial | - | - | - | - | - |
| Community Commercial | 1,799,549 | (189,523) | 1,610,026 | (1,207,520) | 402,507 |
| Regional Commercial | - | - | - | - | - |
| Business Professional | - | - | - | - | - |
| Central Business District [3] | 3,768,705 | (959,444) | 2,809,261 | (2,106,946) | 702,315 |
| Subtotal Commercial | 5,568,254 | (1,148,967) | 4,419,287 | (3,314,465) | 1,104,822 |
| Industrial | | | | | |
| Percentage Adjustment [2] | | | | 50% | |
| Light Industrial | - | - | - | - | - |
| General Industrial | 52,490 | - | 52,490 | (26,245) | 26,245 |
| Subtotal Industrial | 52,490 | - | 52,490 | (26,245) | 26,245 |
| Total Nonresidential | 5,620,744 | (1,148,967) | 4,471,777 | (3,340,710) | 1,131,067 |

Source: City of Roseville and EPS

[1] From 2015 Roseville PFF Nexus Study Update (Table A-3).

[2] Percentage adjustment from 2015 Roseville PFF Nexus Study Update for DTSP development through 2025.

[3] Excludes approximately 20 acres of CBD development that is planned for multifamily units.

Table A-10
Roseville Public Facilities Fee Program Nexus Study Update
Adjusted Buildout Nonresidential Development - Other Plan Areas (Not DT/Infill)

| Land Use | Building Square Feet | | | | |
|-----------------------------|----------------------|--------------------------|-------------------|-----------------------|----------------------------|
| | Buildout Sq. Ft. | Less Existing Sq. Ft. | Future Sq. Ft. | Less Reduction [1] | Adjusted Future Sq. Ft. |
| Commercial | | | | | |
| Percentage Adjustment [1] | | | | 0% | |
| Neighborhood Commercial | 108,302 | (13,800) | 94,502 | - | 94,502 |
| Community Commercial | 9,235,964 | (9,022,628) | 213,336 | - | 213,336 |
| Regional Commercial | 5,252,840 | (4,577,369) | 675,471 | - | 675,471 |
| Business Professional | 9,400,486 | (7,512,580) | 1,887,906 | - | 1,887,906 |
| Central Business District | 130,908 | - | 130,908 | - | 130,908 |
| Subtotal Commercial | 24,128,500 | (21,126,377) | 3,002,123 | - | 3,002,123 |
| Industrial | | | | | |
| Percentage Adjustment [1] | | | | 0% | |
| Light Industrial | 8,458,205 | (5,831,277) | 2,626,928 | - | 2,626,928 |
| General Industrial | 4,838,325 | (3,914,109) | 924,216 | - | 924,216 |
| Subtotal Industrial | 13,296,529 | (9,745,386) | 3,551,143 | - | 3,551,143 |
| Total Nonresidential | 37,425,029 | (30,871,763) | 6,553,266 | - | 6,553,266 |

Source: City of Roseville and EPS

[1] In the 2015 and 2020 Nexus Study Updates did not adjust downward for other plan areas.



APPENDIX B: Capital Improvement Program (CIP)

| | | |
|-----------|---|-----|
| Table B-1 | Public Safety Facilities Cost Summary and Allocation..... | B-2 |
| Table B-2 | PR&L Facilities Cost Summary and Allocation | B-3 |
| Table B-3 | CIP Detailed Costs - Downtown Development Projects..... | B-4 |
| Table B-4 | CIP Detailed Costs - Parks, Recreation, & Libraries..... | B-5 |
| Table B-5 | CIP Detailed Costs - Public Safety Facilities..... | B-7 |
| Table B-6 | CIP Detailed Costs - IT Projects | B-9 |

**Table B-1
Roseville Public Facilities Fee Program Nexus Study Update
Public Safety Facilities Cost Summary and Allocation**

| |
|-------------|
| 2025 |
|-------------|

| Facilities | Improvement Costs | | |
|---|---------------------|------------|---------------------|
| | Total Cost | Allocation | PFF Funded |
| Downtown Development Projects | | | |
| Historic Old Town/Amtrak Parking Lot and Structure [1] | \$26,500,000 | 54% | \$14,344,729 |
| Public Safety Costs | | | |
| Expansion [2] | | | |
| Phase 1 | \$9,198,113 | 100% | \$9,198,113 |
| Phase 2 | \$18,000,000 | 100% | \$18,000,000 |
| Subtotal Expansion | \$27,198,113 | | \$27,198,113 |
| Alterations [3] | | | |
| Phase 3 | \$16,076,100 | 20% | \$3,215,220 |
| Subtotal Phases 1, 2, and 3 | \$43,274,213 | 70% | \$30,413,333 |
| Animal Control Facility | \$12,000,000 | 50% | \$6,000,000 |
| Total Public Safety Costs | \$55,274,213 | | \$36,413,333 |

Source: City of Roseville and EPS

[1] Assumes the same future development cost allocation as the 2020 PFFP Nexus Study Update.

[2] Assumes that expansion costs are 100% attributable to new development as a result in the increased demand from growth in new development requires new/expanded facilities that would otherwise not be required if there was no new growth.

[3] 20 percent of the service population for Public Safety is a result of growth from new development. Alteration costs attributable to new development is equal to the percentage of growth as a result of new development.

Table B-2
Roseville Public Facilities Fee Program Nexus Study Update
PR&L Facilities Cost Summary and Allocation

| |
|-------------|
| 2025 |
|-------------|

| Facilities | Improvement Costs | | |
|--|--------------------------|------------|---------------------|
| | Total Cost | Allocation | PFF Funded |
| Pistachio Regional Park | | | |
| West Roseville Community Center and Library | \$123,308,750 | 35% | \$43,158,063 |
| BMX, Pickleball Complex, and Parking | \$8,900,690 | 35% | \$3,115,241 |
| Subtotal Pistachio Regional Park | \$147,986,779 | 35% | \$46,273,304 |
| Splash Pad and Playground at Pistachio Regional Park | \$2,496,946 | 35% | \$873,931 |
| West Roseville Skate Park | \$6,609,962 | 22% | \$1,465,441 |
| Universally Accessible and Destination Playgrounds | \$3,400,000 | 35% | \$1,190,000 |
| Citywide Park | \$94,003,300 | 16% | \$14,721,708 |
| Total Parks, Recreation, and Library Facilities | \$386,706,427 | | \$64,524,384 |

Source: City of Roseville and EPS

**Table B-3
 Roseville Public Facilities Fee Program Nexus Study Update
 CIP - Downtown Development Projects**

| |
|-------------|
| 2025 |
|-------------|

| Facility | Improvement Costs | | |
|--|--------------------------|------------|---------------------|
| | Cost Per SF/LF/Unit | SF/LF/Unit | Total Cost |
| Future Downtown Development Projects | | | |
| Historic Old Town Parking Structure/Amtrak Parking Lot | - | - | \$26,500,000 |
| Total Downtown Development Project Costs | | | \$26,500,000 |

Source: City of Roseville and EPS

Table B-4
Roseville Public Facilities Fee Program Nexus Study Update
CIP Detailed Costs - Parks, Recreation, & Libraries

| |
|-------------|
| 2025 |
|-------------|

| Facilities | Costs | | |
|--|------------------------|------------|----------------------|
| | Cost Per SF/LF/Unit | SF/LF/Unit | Total Cost |
| Parks, Recreation, and Library Facilities | | | |
| Pistachio Regional Park | | | |
| West Roseville Community Center & Library | | | |
| Building - 1st Floor | \$1,150 | 55,000 | \$63,250,000 |
| Building - 2nd floor | \$1,210 | 27,500 | \$33,275,000 |
| Foundation & Site Work | \$50 | 82,500 | \$4,125,000 |
| Design & Eengineering | - | - | \$350,000 |
| Permitting | - | - | \$650,000 |
| Special Inspections | - | - | \$275,000 |
| Secondary Labor | - | - | \$300,000 |
| FF&E | - | - | \$5,000,000 |
| Subtotal | | | \$107,225,000 |
| Contingency | 15% | - | \$16,083,750 |
| Total Cost | | | \$123,308,750 |
| BMX, Pickleball Complex, and Parking | | | |
| BMX | \$104 | 10,100 | \$1,050,400 |
| Pickleball Courts | \$300,000 | 6 | \$1,800,000 |
| Fencing | \$275 | 550 | \$151,250 |
| Parking | \$2,500 | 250 | \$625,000 |
| Lighting | - | - | \$750,000 |
| Restroom | - | - | \$250,000 |
| Futsal | \$200,000 | 2 | \$400,000 |
| Shade Structures | \$80,000 | 4 | \$320,000 |
| Walkways & Plazas | - | - | \$1,530,000 |
| Subtotal BMX, Pickleball Complex, and Parking | - | - | \$6,876,650 |
| 4 Year Escalation | 3% | - | \$7,739,730 |
| Contingency | 15% | - | \$1,160,960 |
| Total BMX, Pickleball Complex, and Parking | | | \$8,900,690 |
| Total Pistachio Regional Park | | | \$147,986,779 |

Table B-4
Roseville Public Facilities Fee Program Nexus Study Update
CIP Detailed Costs - Parks, Recreation, & Libraries

| |
|-------------|
| 2025 |
|-------------|

| Facilities | Costs | | |
|---|------------------------|------------|----------------------|
| | Cost Per SF/LF/Unit | SF/LF/Unit | Total Cost |
| Splash Pad and Playground at Pistachio Regional Park | | | |
| Splash Pad | - | - | \$1,092,048 |
| Playground | - | - | \$200,000 |
| Play area containment | - | - | \$214,000 |
| Walkways | \$15 | 3,500 | \$52,500 |
| Lighting | - | - | \$45,650 |
| Fencing | \$60 | 1,100 | \$66,000 |
| Subtotal Splash Pad and Playground | | | \$1,670,198 |
| Soft Costs | 30% | - | \$501,059 |
| Subtotal Splash Pad and Playground (Plus Soft Costs) | | | \$2,171,257 |
| Contingency | 15% | - | \$325,689 |
| Total Splash Pad and Playground | | | \$2,496,946 |
| West Roseville Skate Park | | | |
| Skate and pump track | \$104 | 32,310 | \$3,360,240 |
| Parking Lot | \$2,500 | 150 | \$375,000 |
| Fencing | - | - | \$438,000 |
| Walkways | \$15 | 32,240 | \$483,600 |
| Lighting | - | - | \$250,000 |
| Restroom | - | - | \$200,000 |
| Subtotal Skate Park | | | \$5,106,840 |
| 4 Year Escalation | 3% | - | \$5,747,793 |
| Contingency | 15% | - | \$862,169 |
| Total Skate Park | | | \$6,609,962 |
| Universally Accessible and Destination Playgrounds | | | \$3,400,000 |
| Citywide Park | | | |
| Baseball Facilities | - | - | \$63,042,000 |
| Field House | \$1,100 | 17,000 | \$18,700,000 |
| Subtotal Citywide Park | | | \$81,742,000 |
| Contingency | 15% | - | \$12,261,300 |
| Total Citywide Park | | | \$94,003,300 |
| Total Parks, Recreation, and Library Facilities | | | \$247,887,025 |

Source: City of Roseville and EPS

**Table B-5
Roseville Public Facilities Fee Program Nexus Study Update
CIP Detailed Costs - Public Safety Facilities**

| |
|-------------|
| 2025 |
|-------------|

| Facilities | Improvement Costs | | |
|--|------------------------|------------|---------------------|
| | Cost Per SF/LF/Unit | SF/LF/Unit | Total Cost |
| Public Safety Expansion 1A | | | |
| Parking Lot Expansion | | | |
| Parking Development (86,223 SF +/-) | \$25 | 86,223 | \$2,155,575 |
| Gateways | \$60,000 | 2 | \$120,000 |
| Fencing/Perimeter Walls 10' height (LF) | \$350 | 1,000 | \$350,000 |
| Electrical Infrastructure only (L2) | \$8,000 | 20 | \$160,000 |
| Electrical Infrastructure only (DCFC 60KW) | \$10,000 | 15 | \$150,000 |
| Electrical Infrastructure only (DCFC 150KW) | \$25,000 | 10 | \$250,000 |
| Transformers and Switchgear | \$400,000 | 1 | \$400,000 |
| Security | \$100,000 | 1 | \$100,000 |
| Solar, ESS, and Canopy | \$500,000 | 1 | \$500,000 |
| Landscape | \$200,000 | 1 | \$200,000 |
| Subtotal Parking Lot Expansion Costs | | | \$4,385,575 |
| Corporation Yard Road | | | |
| North Side Gutter | \$150 | 810 | \$121,500 |
| Culvert Extension and Storm Drain | \$250,000 | 1 | \$250,000 |
| Dig-outs and Repave - Road Repairs | \$80,000 | 1 | \$80,000 |
| Cap and Seal | \$40,000 | 1 | \$40,000 |
| Guardrails and Incidental | \$20,000 | 1 | \$20,000 |
| Subtotal Corporation Yard Road Costs | | | \$511,500 |
| Relocation and Expansion of Street Maintenance Building | | | |
| New PEMB Building (Equivalent SF) | \$120 | 3,000 | \$360,000 |
| Site Development (driveway/parking/infrastructure) | \$25 | 33,000 | \$825,000 |
| Landscape | \$50,000 | 1 | \$50,000 |
| Subtotal Relocation and Expansion Costs | | | \$1,235,000 |
| Subtotal Phase 1A | | | \$6,132,075 |
| Contingency | 30% | | \$1,839,623 |
| Permitting and Design | 20% | | \$1,226,415 |
| Total Phase 1A Costs | | | \$9,198,113 |
| Phase 2 | | | |
| RPD Expansion | \$600 | 20,000 | \$12,000,000 |
| Contingency | 30% | | \$3,600,000 |
| Permitting and Design | 20% | | \$2,400,000 |
| Total Phase 2 | | | \$18,000,000 |

Table B-5
Roseville Public Facilities Fee Program Nexus Study Update
CIP Detailed Costs - Public Safety Facilities

| |
|-------------|
| 2025 |
|-------------|

| Facilities | Improvement Costs | | |
|--|------------------------|------------|---------------------|
| | Cost Per SF/LF/Unit | SF/LF/Unit | Total Cost |
| Phase 3 - Building Alternations | | | |
| 1st Floor | | | |
| Mark White Meeting room (Front) | \$1,100 | 1,151 | \$1,266,100 |
| Side Meeting Room Addition | \$800 | 346 | \$276,800 |
| Property Storage | \$600 | 1,725 | \$1,035,000 |
| Evidence Transfer | \$350 | 127 | \$44,450 |
| Dispatch Remodel | \$600 | 2,215 | \$1,329,000 |
| Dispatch Addition | \$900 | 315 | \$283,500 |
| IT Expansion | \$1,200 | 268 | \$321,600 |
| Subtotal 1st Floor Costs | | | \$4,556,450 |
| 2nd Floor | | | |
| Locker Room | \$500 | 3,774 | \$1,887,000 |
| Lactation | \$250 | 87 | \$21,750 |
| Gym (Converted from Locker Room) | \$500 | 656 | \$328,000 |
| Gym Addition over (E) floor | \$800 | 1,134 | \$907,200 |
| Gym/Locker addition over roof | \$1,000 | 2,018 | \$2,018,000 |
| Restroom Remodels | \$900 | 1,110 | \$999,000 |
| Subtotal 2nd Floor Costs | | | \$6,160,950 |
| Subtotal Building Alteration Costs | | | \$10,717,400 |
| Contingency | 30% | | \$3,215,220 |
| Permitting and Design | 20% | | \$2,143,480 |
| Subtotal Phase 3 | | | \$16,076,100 |
| Total Public Safety Expansion | | | \$43,274,213 |
| Animal Control Facility | | | |
| City Portion | - | - | \$12,000,000 |
| Land Acquisition [1] | - | - | \$0 |
| Subtotal Animal Control Facility | | | \$12,000,000 |
| Total Public Safety Expansion Costs | | | \$55,274,213 |

Source: City of Roseville and EPS

[1] Assumes dedication of land at no cost to the City.

**Table B-6
 Roseville Public Facilities Fee Program Nexus Study Update
 CIP Detailed Costs - IT Projects**

| |
|-------------|
| 2025 |
|-------------|

| Facilities | Improvement Costs | | |
|-------------------------------|--------------------------|------------|--------------------|
| | Cost Per SF/LF/Unit | SF/LF/Unit | Total Cost |
| IT Projects | | | |
| East Site Communication Tower | - | - | \$2,965,306 |
| Total IT Projects | | | \$2,965,306 |

Source: City of Roseville and EPS