CITY OF CHINO

DEVELOPMENT IMPACT FEE NEXUS STUDY UPDATE

DRAFT

JUNE 4, 2026

WILLDAN Financial Services

Oakland Office
66 Franklin Street
Suite 300
Oakland, CA 94607
Tel: (510) 832-0899

Corporate Office
27368 Via Industria
Suite 200
Temecula, CA 92590
Tel: (800) 755-6864
Fax: (888) 326-6864

Other Regional Offices
Aurora, CO
Orlando, FL
Phoenix, AZ
Plano, TX
Seattle, WA
Washington, DC

www.willdan.com

This page intentionally left blank.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Executive Summary

This report summarizes an analysis of development impact fees needed to support future development in the City of Chino through 2045. It is the City's intent that the costs representing future development's share of public facilities and capital improvements be imposed on that development in the form of a development impact fee, also known as a public facilities fee. The public facilities and improvements included in this analysis are divided into the fee categories listed below:

- Law Enforcement
- Fire Suppression
- Circulation System
- Storm Drainage System
- Water System
- Sewer System
- General Facilities
- Park Infrastructure
- Miscellaneous Residential Amenities

Background and Study Objectives

The primary policy objective of a development impact fee program is to ensure that new development pays the capital costs associated with growth. The primary purpose of this report is to calculate and present fees that will enable the City to expand its inventory of public facilities, as new development creates increases in service demands.

The City imposes public facilities fees under authority granted by the *Mitigation Fee Act (*the *Act)*, contained in *California Government Code* Sections 66000 *et seq*. This report provides the necessary findings required by the *Act* for adoption of the fees presented in the fee schedules contained herein.

The *Mitigation Fee Act* findings required to implement impact fees in California demonstrate the *essential nexus* between new development and a fee to fund facilities needed to serve that development. The term *essential nexus* refers to the relationship between new development and the need for facilities (and corresponding impact fees) to serve that development. The findings also require that this study demonstrates *rough proportionality* of the fees- meaning that the amount of the exactions must roughly correspond to the burden placed on the government, resulting from the proposed development project. To ensure that fees are roughly proportional to demand for facilities from new development, this study first allocates facilities costs to new development using the allocation methods described below, then to individual units of new development based on the demand characteristics of each unit, by land use type. This is described in detail in each chapter and summarized in Chapter 14.

All development impact fee-funded capital projects are programmed through the City's Capital Improvement Plan (CIP). Using a CIP can help the City identify and direct its fee revenue to public facilities projects that will accommodate future growth. By programming fee revenues to specific capital projects, the City can help ensure a reasonable relationship between new development and the use of fee revenues as required by the *Mitigation Fee Act*.

Facility Standards and Costs

There are several approaches typically used to calculate facilities standards and allocate the costs of planned facilities to accommodate growth in compliance with the *Mitigation Fee Act* requirements.

The **system plan** approach is based on a master facility plan in situations where the needed facilities serve both existing and new development. This approach allocates existing and planned

facilities across existing and new development to determine new development's fair share of facility needs. This approach is used when it is not possible to differentiate the benefits of new facilities between new and existing development. Often the system plan is based on increasing facility standards, so the City must find non-impact fee revenue sources to fund existing development's fair share of planned facilities. This approach is used for the fire suppression, general facilities and miscellaneous residential amenities fees in this report.

The **planned facilities** approach allocates costs based on the ratio of planned facilities that serve new development to the increase in demand associated with new development. This approach is appropriate when specific planned facilities that only benefit new development can be identified, or when the specific share of facilities benefiting new development can be identified. Examples include street improvements to avoid deficient levels of service or a sewer trunk line extension to a previously undeveloped area. This approach is used for the law enforcement, circulation, storm drain, water and sewer fees in this report.

The **existing inventory** approach is based on a facility standard derived from the City's existing level of facilities and existing demand for services. This approach results in no facility deficiencies attributable to existing development. This approach is to calculate the park fees in this report.

Use of Fee Revenues

The Mitigation Fee Act requires that this analysis "Identify the use to which the fee is to be put. If the use is financing public facilities, the facilities shall be identified. That identification may, but need not, be made by reference to a capital improvement plan as specified in Section 65403 or 66002, may be made in applicable general or specific plan requirements, or may be made in other public documents that identify the public facilities for which the fee is charged."[1] Each chapter in this report identifies the appropriate use of impact fee revenues for each particular impact fee category.

Impact fee revenue must be spent on new facilities or expansion of current facilities to serve new development. Facilities can be generally defined as capital acquisition items with a useful life greater than five years. Impact fee revenue can be spent on capital facilities to serve new development, including but not limited to land acquisition, construction of buildings, infrastructure, the acquisition of vehicles or equipment, information technology and equipment.

Development Impact Fee Schedule Summary

Table E.1 summarizes the development impact fees that meet the City's identified needs and comply with the requirements of the *Mitigation Fee Act*.

1 *California Government Code* §66001 (a) (2).

E.1: Maximum Justified Development Impact Fee Schedule - General City

Land Use	Law Enforcement	Fire Suppression	Circulation System	Storm Drainage System	Water System	Sewer System	General Facilities	Park Infrastructure	Residential Amenities	DIF Administration (3%)	Total
Residential - per Square Foot											
Single Family	$ 0.17	$ 0.32	$ 3.35	$ 0.69	$ 0.84	$ 0.06	$ 0.93	$ 6.18	$ -	$ 0.38	$ 12.92
Multifamily	0.32	0.60	4.48	1.09	0.86	0.11	1.74	11.56	-	0.62	21.38
Residential - per Average Sized Unit [1]											
Single Family	$ 564	$ 1,062	$ 11,122	$ 2,291	$ 2,789	$ 199	$ 3,088	$ 20,518	$ -	$ 1,249	$ 42,882
Multifamily	448	840	6,272	1,526	1,204	154	2,436	16,184	-	872	29,936
Nonresidential											
Commercial/Retail	$ 0.54	$ 0.45	$ 14.49	$ 1.85	$ 2.51	$ 0.12	$ 0.59	$ -	$ -	$ 0.62	$ 21.17
Office/Business Park	0.58	0.49	15.57	2.12	2.73	0.13	0.64	-	-	0.67	22.93
Industrial	0.17	0.15	6.81	1.39	0.81	0.08	0.19	-	-	0.29	9.89
Commercial Lodging I	$ 128	$ 108	$ 3,460	$ 297	$ 612	$ 97	$ 2,437	$ -	$ -	$ 214	$ 7,353

[1] Fees for the assumed average sized single family unit of 3,320 square feet and multifamily unit of 1,400 square feet are show n for comparison purposes. Fees are charged per square foot of living space.

Sources: Tables 3.6, 4.7, 5.6, 6.6, 7.5, 8.5, 9.7, and 10.8.

E.2: Maximum Justified Development Impact Fee Schedule - The Preserve

Land Use	Law Enforcement	Fire Suppression	Circulation System	Storm Drainage System	Water System	Sewer System	General Facilities	Park Infrastructure	Residential Amenities	DIF Administration (3%)	Total
Residential											
Single Family	$ 0.17	$ 0.32	$ 5.96	$ 1.62	$ 1.52	$ 0.72	$ 0.93	$ 7.04	$ 0.62	$ 0.57	$ 19.47
Multifamily	0.32	0.60	7.96	2.57	1.55	1.39	1.74	13.18	1.17	0.91	31.39
Residential - per Average Sized Unit [1]											
Single Family	$ 564	$ 1,062	$ 19,787	$ 5,378	$ 5,046	$ 2,390	$ 3,088	$ 23,373	$ 2,058	$ 1,882	$ 64,630
Multifamily	448	840	11,144	3,598	2,170	1,946	2,436	18,452	1,638	1,280	43,952
									-		
Nonresidential											
Commercial/Retail	$ 0.54	$ 0.45	$ 25.75	$ 4.35	$ 4.55	$ 1.46	$ 0.59	$ -	$ -	$ 1.13	$ 38.82
Office/Business Park	0.58	0.49	27.67	4.99	4.96	1.63	0.64	-	-	1.23	42.19
Industrial	0.17	0.15	12.10	3.27	1.47	0.96	0.19	-	-	0.55	18.86
Commercial Lodging I	$ 128	$ 108	$ 6,148	N/A	N/A	N/A	$ 2,437	$ -	$ -	$ 265	$ 9,085

[1] Fees for the assumed average sized single family unit of 3,320 square feet and multifamily unit of 1,400 square feet are show n for comparison purposes. Fees are charged per square foot of living space.

Sources: Tables 3.6, 4.7, 5.7, 6.6, 7.5, 8.5, 9.7, 10.8, and 11.6.

Other Funding Needed

Impact fees may only fund the share of public facilities related to new development in Chino. They may not be used to fund the share of facility needs generated by existing development or by development outside of the City. As shown in **Table E.2,** approximately $265.1 million in additional funding will be needed to complete the facility projects the City currently plans to develop. The "Additional Funding Required" column shows non-impact fee funding required to fund a share of the improvements partially funded by impact fees. Non-fee funding is needed because these facilities are needed partially to remedy existing deficiencies and partly to accommodate new development.

The City will need to develop alternative funding sources to fund existing development's share of the planned facilities. Potential sources of revenue include but are not limited to existing or new general fund revenues, existing or new taxes, special assessments, and grants.

Table E.3: Non-Impact Fee Funding Required

Fee Category	Net Project Cost[1]	Development Fee Revenue	Additional Funding Required
Law Enforcement	$ 7,231,312	$ 7,231,312	$ -
Fire Suppression	23,359,200	11,170,853	12,188,347
Circulation System	436,506,491	298,636,061	137,870,430
Storm Drainage System	146,161,767	72,254,363	73,907,404
Water System	59,887,254	51,838,897	8,048,357
Sewer System	23,474,715	23,474,715	-
General Facilities	61,199,637	29,450,563	31,749,074
Park Infrastructure	192,730,948	192,730,948	-
Residential Amenities	11,399,662	10,089,644	1,310,018
Total	$ 961,950,986	$ 696,877,356	$ 265,073,630

[1] Project cost net of existing fund balances.

Sources: Tables 3.5, 4.6, 5.3, 5.3,6.3, 6.4, 6.5, 7.3, 7.4, 8.3, 8.4, 9.6, 10.5,10.6 and 11.5.

1. Introduction

This report presents an analysis of the need for public facilities to accommodate new development in the City of Chino. This chapter provides background for the study and explains the study approach under the following sections:

- Public Facilities Financing in California;
- Study Objectives;
- Fee Program Maintenance;
- Study Methodology; and,
- Organization of the Report.

Public Facilities Financing in California

The changing fiscal landscape in California during the past 45 years has steadily undercut the financial capacity of local governments to fund infrastructure. Four dominant trends stand out:

- The passage of a string of tax limitation measures, starting with Proposition 13 in 1978 and continuing through the passage of Proposition 218 in 1996;
- Declining popular support for bond measures to finance infrastructure for the next generation of residents and businesses;
- Unfunded state and federal mandates; and,
- Steep reductions in federal and state assistance.

Faced with these trends, many cities and counties have had to adopt a policy of "growth pays its own way." This policy shifts the burden of funding infrastructure expansion from existing ratepayers and taxpayers onto new development. This funding shift has been accomplished primarily through the imposition of assessments, special taxes, and development impact fees also known as public facilities fees. Assessments and special taxes require the approval of property owners and are appropriate when the funded facilities are directly related to the developing property. Development impact fees, on the other hand, are an appropriate funding source for facilities that benefit all development jurisdiction-wide. Development impact fees need only a majority vote of the legislative body for adoption.

Study Objectives

The primary policy objective of a public facilities fee program is to ensure that new development pays the capital costs associated with growth. *Growth Management Action LCC-1.H* of the General Plan states, "Continue to use Community Facility Districts, Development Impact Fees (DIFs) and other financing tools to fund and maintain public facility improvements. Transportation System Management Policy INF-3.7 of the General Plan states, "Ensure that new development pays a fair share of costs to provide local and regional transportation improvements and to mitigate cumulative traffic deficiencies and impacts, including through payment of Development Impact Fees." The primary purpose of this report is to update the City's impact fees based on the most current available facility plans and growth projections. The proposed fees will enable the City to expand its inventory of public facilities as new development leads to increases in service demands. This report supports the General Plan policies stated above.

The City imposes public facilities fees under authority granted by the Mitigation Fee Act (the Act), contained in California Government Code Sections 66000 et seq. This report provides the

necessary findings required by the Act to demonstrate the *essential nexus* between new development and the impact fees needed to support that development. The findings demonstrate that the fees are proportional to demand for facilities from new development and are necessary to allow the City to adopt the fee schedules presented in this report.

Chino is forecast to have significant growth through this study's planning horizon of 2045, which is not assigned to a particular year. This growth will create an increase in demand for public services and the facilities required to deliver them. Given the revenue challenges described above, Chino has decided to use a development impact fee program to ensure that new development funds the share of facility costs associated with growth. This report makes use of the most current available growth forecasts and capital facilities planning documents to update the City's existing fee program to ensure that the fee program accurately represents the facility needs resulting from new development.

Fee Program Changes

Aside from updating assumptions to reflect current conditions, this study makes two notable changes to the City's current fee program. First, residential impact fees are calculated per square foot by type of unit (single family and multifamily, respectively) to comply with direction from AB 602. Currently residential fees are charged as a flat rate per type of unit. Second, the congestion management program fee is proposed to be discontinued. The City will spend the existing fund balance on an eligible project of regional significance, improvements to the SR 71 and Pine interchange, and discontinue collection of the fee.

Fee Program Maintenance

Once a fee program has been adopted it must be properly maintained to ensure that the revenue collected adequately funds the facilities needed by new development. To avoid collecting inadequate revenue, the inventories of existing facilities and costs for planned facilities must be updated periodically for inflation, and the fees recalculated to reflect the higher costs. The use of established indices for each facility included in the inventories (land, buildings, and equipment), such as the *California Construction Cost Index*, is necessary to accurately adjust the impact fees.

While fee updates using inflation indices are appropriate for annual or periodic updates to ensure that fee revenues keep up with increases in the costs of public facilities, it is recommended to conduct more extensive updates of the fee documentation and calculation (such as this study) when significant new data on growth forecasts and/or facility plans become available. For further detail on fee program implementation, see Chapter 13.

Administrative Costs

Administration of an impact fee program to comply with the requirements of the Mitigation Fee Act imposes costs on the City for capital budgeting, fee adjustments, mandated annual reports and 5-year reviews of the impact fee program, as well as periodic impact fee update studies and legal review. It is common practice in California for cities to add a small administrative charge to impact fees to cover those costs.

This study uses an assumption of 3% of the maximum justified fee to estimate the administrative costs associated with the fee program, consistent with the last impact fee study. The City has validated this assumption based on the actual costs of administering its impact fee program.

Study Methodology

Development impact fees are calculated to fund the cost of facilities required to accommodate growth. The six steps followed in this development impact fee study include:

1. **Estimate existing development and future growth:** Identify a base year for existing development and a growth forecast that reflects increased demand for public facilities;
2. **Identify facility standards:** Determine the facility standards used to plan for new and expanded facilities;
3. **Determine facilities required to serve new development:** Estimate the total amount of planned facilities, and identify the share required to accommodate new development;
4. **Determine the cost of facilities required to serve new development:** Estimate the total amount and the share of the cost of planned facilities required to accommodate new development;
5. **Calculate fee schedule:** Allocate facilities costs per unit of new development to calculate the development impact fee schedule; and
6. **Identify alternative funding requirements:** Determine if any non-fee funding is required to complete projects.

The key public policy issue in development impact fee studies is the identification of facility standards (step #2, above). Facility standards document a reasonable relationship between new development and the need for new facilities. Standards ensure that new development does not fund deficiencies associated with existing development.

Types of Facility Standards

There are three separate components of facility standards:

- *Demand standards* determine the amount of facilities required to accommodate growth, for example, park acres per thousand residents, square feet of library space per capita, or gallons of water per day. Demand standards may also reflect a level of service such as the vehicle volume-to-capacity (V/C) ratio used in traffic planning.
- *Design standards* determine how a facility should be designed to meet expected demand, for example, park improvement requirements and technology infrastructure for City office space. Design standards are typically not explicitly evaluated as part of an impact fee analysis but can have a significant impact on the cost of facilities. Our approach incorporates the cost of planned facilities built to satisfy the City's facility design standards.
- *Cost standards* are an alternate method for determining the amount of facilities required to accommodate growth based on facility costs per unit of demand. *Cost standards* are useful when demand standards were not explicitly developed for the facility planning process. *Cost standards* also enable different types of facilities to be analyzed based on a single measure (cost or value) and are useful when different facilities are funded by a single fee program. Examples include facility costs per capita, cost per vehicle trip, or cost per gallon of water per day.

New Development Facility Needs and Costs

A number of approaches are used to identify facility needs and costs to serve new development. This is often a two-step process: (1) identify total facility needs, and (2) allocate to new development its fair share of those needs.

There are three common methods for determining new development's fair share of planned facilities costs: the **system plan method**, the **planned facilities method,** and the **existing inventory method**. The formula used by each approach and the advantages and disadvantages of each method is summarized below:

System Plan Method

This method calculates the fee based on the value of existing facilities plus the cost of planned facilities, divided by demand from existing plus new development:

$$\frac{\text{Value of Existing Facilities + Cost of Planned Facilities}}{\text{Existing + New Development Demand}} = \$/\text{unit of demand}$$

This method is useful when planned facilities need to be analyzed as part of a system that benefits both existing and new development. It is difficult, for example, to allocate a new fire station solely to new development when that station will operate as part of an integrated system of fire stations that together achieve the desired level of service.

The system plan method ensures that new development does not pay for existing deficiencies. Often facility standards based on policies such as those found in General Plans are higher than the existing facility standards. This method enables the calculation of the existing deficiency required to bring existing development up to the policy-based standard. The local agency must secure non-fee funding for that portion of planned facilities required to correct the deficiency to ensure that new development receives the level of service funded by the impact fee. This approach is used for the fire suppression, general facilities, and miscellaneous residential amenities fees in this report.

Planned Facilities Method

The planned facilities method allocates costs based on the ratio of planned facility costs to demand from new development as follows:

$$\frac{\text{Cost of Planned Facilities}}{\text{New Development Demand}} = \$/\text{unit of demand}$$

This method is appropriate when planned facilities will entirely serve new development, or when a fair share allocation of planned facilities to new development can be estimated. An example of the former is a Wastewater trunk line extension to a previously undeveloped area. An example of the latter is a portion of a roadway that has been identified as necessary to mitigate the impact from new development through traffic modeling analysis. Under this method new development will fund the expansion of facilities at the standards used in the applicable planning documents. This approach is used for the law enforcement, circulation, storm drain, water and sewer fees in this report.

Existing Inventory Method

The existing inventory method allocates costs based on the ratio of existing facilities to demand from existing development as follows:

$$\frac{\text{Current Value of Existing Facilities}}{\text{Existing Development Demand}} = \$/\text{unit of demand}$$

Under this method new development will fund the expansion of facilities at the same standard currently serving existing development. By definition the existing inventory method results in no facility deficiencies attributable to existing development. This approach is to calculate the park fees in this report.

Organization of the Report

The determination of a public facilities fee begins with the selection of a planning horizon and development of growth projections for population and employment. These projections are used throughout the analysis of different facility categories and are summarized in Chapter 2.

Chapters 3 through 11 identify facility standards and planned facilities, allocate the cost of planned facilities between new development and other development, and identify the appropriate development impact fee for each of the following facility categories:

- Law Enforcement
- Fire Suppression
- Circulation System
- Storm Drainage System
- Water System
- Sewer System
- General Facilities
- Park Infrastructure
- Miscellaneous Residential Amenities

Chapter 12 describes how this study complies with the requirements of AB 602.

Chapter 13 details the procedures that the City must follow when implementing a development impact fee program. Impact fee program adoption procedures are found in *California Government Code* Sections 66016 through 66018.

The five statutory findings required for adoption of the proposed public facilities fees in accordance with the Mitigation Fee Act are documented in Chapter 14.

2. Growth Forecasts

Growth projections are used as indicators of demand to determine facility needs and allocate those needs between existing and new development. This chapter explains the source for the growth projections used in this study based on a 2025 base year and a planning horizon of 2045, which is not assigned a particular year.

Estimates of existing development and projections of future growth are critical assumptions used throughout this report. These estimates are used as follows:

- The estimate of existing development in 2025 is used as an indicator of existing facility demand and to determine existing facility standards.
- The estimate of total development in 2045 is used as an indicator of future demand to determine total facilities needed to accommodate growth and remedy existing facility deficiencies, if any.
- Estimates of growth from 2025 through 2045 are used to (1) allocate facility costs between new development and existing development, and (2) estimate total fee revenues.

The demand for public facilities is based on the service population, dwelling units or nonresidential development creating the need for the facilities.

Land Use Types

To ensure a reasonable relationship between each fee and the type of development paying the fee, growth projections distinguish between different land use types. The land use types that impact fees have been calculated for are defined below.

- **Single Family Residential:** Detached and attached one-unit dwellings. Fees are calculated per square foot of living space.
- **Multifamily Residential:** All attached multifamily dwellings including duplexes and condominiums. Fees are calculated per square foot of living space, excluding common areas and garages.
- **Commercial Lodging:** Hotel, motel and resort development. Fees charged per lodging room.
- **Commercial/Retail:** All commercial, retail and educational development.
- **Office/Business Park:** A business park consists of a group of flex-type or incubator one- or two-story buildings served by a common roadway system. The space may include offices, retail and wholesale stores, restaurants, recreational areas and warehousing, manufacturing, light industrial, or scientific research functions.
- **Industrial:** All manufacturing and other industrial development, warehouse and distribution center development.

Some developments may include more than one land use type, such as a mixed-use development with both residential and commercial uses. Another similar situation would be a warehousing facility that contains office space. In those cases, the facilities fee would be calculated separately for each land use type included within the building.

The City has the discretion to determine which land use type best reflects a development project's characteristics for purposes of imposing an impact fee and may adjust fees for special or unique uses to reflect the impact characteristics of the use.

Impact Fee Zones

To ensure the requisite nexus between the fee and the development, in some cases, fees in this study are calculated for different geographies. The law enforcement facilities, fire suppression facilities, and general facilities fees are calculated Citywide because those facilities comprise a network of facilities that provide benefit to anyone in the City regardless of where they are located. However, the circulation facilities, sewer facilities, water facilities and parks facilities fees make a distinction between facilities needed to serve the General City area and the Preserve Specific Plan area of the City. Residential amenities fees are only charged in the Preserve area. Consequently, growth projections are presented for the entire City, for the General City area and for the Preserve Specific Plan area separately.

Existing and Future Development

Table 2.1, 2.2 and 2.3 shows the estimated number of residents, dwelling units, employees, and building square feet in Chino, both in 2025 and in 2045 for the entire City, the General City area, and the Preserve Specific Plan area, respectively. The base year estimates of residents and dwelling units come from the California Department of Finance. The projection of total dwelling units in 2045 is identified in City's General Plan Environmental Impact Report (EIR). Total dwelling units in 2045 is then used to estimate population in 2045 by multiplying the count of units by the occupant densities of 3.41 residents per single family unit and 2.69 residents per multifamily unit, based on data for Chino from the American Community Survey.

Base year employees were estimated based on data obtained from the U.S. Census Bureau's OnTheMap Application. The increase in employees is identified in the General Plan EIR. Equivalent building square feet in 2025 was calculated based on the current employment count and density factors in Table 2.2. Building square feet in 2045 is identified the Preserve Specific Plan, and informed by the projected increase of employees from the General Plan EIR.

Table 2.1: Existing and New Development Citywide (General City Area + The Preserve)

Citywide	2025	Increase 2025 - 2045	2045
Residents [1]	88,714	29,721	118,435
Dwelling Units [2]			
Single Family	21,889	2,775	24,664
Multifamily	6,999	7,531	14,530
Total Dwelling Units	28,888	10,306	39,194
Employment [3]			
Commercial/Retail	19,641	2,845	22,486
Office/Business Park	15,232	2,443	17,675
Industrial	18,763	3,695	22,458
Total Employment	53,636	8,983	62,619
Commercial Lodging (Rooms) [4]	399	428	827
Nonresidential Building Square Feet (000s) [5]			
Commercial/Retail	9,398	1,651	11,049
Office/Business Park	6,681	1,601	8,282
Industrial	27,593	10,522	38,114
Total	43,672	13,774	57,445

[1] Current household population from California Department of Finance (DOF). Excludes people living in group quarters. Increase based on projected increase in dwelling units identified in 2045 and occupant density assumptions in Table 2.4.

[2] Dwelling Units: Current estimated of dwelling units from DOF. Total units in 2045 identified in General Plan EIR.

[3] Current estimates of total jobs from the US Census' OnTheMap application. Projection derived from increase in workers identified in General Plan EIR Table 3-2. Assumes current ratio among land uses will be maintained.

[4] Current commercial lodging room count verified with Google maps. Projection based on The Preserve Specific Plan.

[5] Current building square feet (in thousands) estimated based on count of existing jobs and assumptions in Table 2.4; projection based on The Preserve Specific Plan and assumptions in Table 2.4.

Sources: California Department of Finance (DOF), Table E-5, 2025; Final Program Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for the Chino 2045 General Plan Update, August, 2025, Table 3-2; The Preserve Specific Plan, 2016, amended 2021, Table 1; US Census OnTheMap, http://onthemap.ces.census.gov; Table 2.4, Willdan Financial Services.

Table 2.2: Existing and New Development (General City Area)

General City Area	2025	Increase 2025 - 2045	2045
Residents[1]	68,129	13,126	81,255
Dwelling Units[2]			
Single Family	16,821	10	16,831
Multifamily	5,771	4,867	10,638
Subtotal	22,592	4,877	27,469
Employment[3]			
Commercial/Retail	18,066	1,851	19,917
Office/Business Park	13,937	1,436	15,373
Industrial	17,308	2,003	19,311
Subtotal	49,311	5,290	54,601
Commercial Lodging (Rooms)[4]	399	-	399
Nonresidential Building Square Feet (000s)[5]			
Commercial/Retail	8,644	886	9,530
Office/Business Park	6,113	630	6,743
Industrial	25,453	2,946	28,399
Subtotal	40,211	4,461	44,671

[1] Current household population from California Department of Finance (DOF). Projection based on dwelling unit forecast from General Plan and occupant density assumptions in Table 2.4.

[2] Dwelling Units: Current and projected values derived from DOF, Chino General Plan EIR, The Preserve Specific Plan.

[3] Estimates of current and projected jobs derived from the US Census' OnTheMap application, General Plan EIR Preserve Specific Plan using occupancy density assumptions from Table 2.4.

[4] Current commercial lodging room count verified with Google maps. Projection based on The Preserve Specific Plan.

[5] Current building square feet (in thousands) estimated based on count of existing jobs and density assumptions in Table 2.4. Projection based on occupancy density assumptions in Table 2.4 and projected increase in jobs.

Sources: California Department of Finance (DOF), Table E-5, 2025; Final Program Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for the Chino 2045 General Plan Update, August, 2025, Table 3-2; The Preserve Specific Plan, amended 2021, Table 1; US Census OnTheMap, http://onthemap.ces.census.gov; Table 2.4, Willdan Financial Services.

Table 2.3: Existing and New Development (The Preserve)

The Preserve	2025	Increase 2025 - 2045	2045
Residents [1]	20,585	16,595	37,180
Dwelling Units [2]			
Single Family	5,068	2,765	7,833
Multifamily	1,228	2,664	3,892
Subtotal	6,296	5,429	11,725
Employment [3]			
Commercial/Retail	1,575	994	2,569
Office/Business Park	1,295	1,007	2,302
Industrial	1,455	1,692	3,147
Subtotal	4,325	3,693	8,018
Commercial Lodging (Rooms) [4]	-	428	428
Nonresidential Building Square Feet (000s) [5]			
Commercial/Retail	754	765	1,519
Office/Business Park	568	971	1,539
Industrial	2,140	7,576	9,716
Subtotal	3,461	9,313	12,774

[1] Current household population from California Department of Finance (DOF). Projection based on dwelling unit forecast from The Preserve Specific Plan and occupant density assumptions in Table 2.4.

[2] Dwelling Units: Current and projected values derived from DOF, Chino General Plan EIR, The Preserve Specific Plan.

[3] Estimates of current and projected jobs derived from the US Census' OnTheMap application, General Plan EIR Preserve Specific Plan using occupancy density assumptions from Table 2.4.

[4] Current commercial lodging room count verified with Google maps. Projection based on The Preserve Specific Plan.

[5] Current building square feet (in thousands) estimated based on count of existing jobs and assumptions in Table 2.4 and count of existing workers. Projection of building square feet derived from the Preserve Specific Plan, Table 1.

Sources: California Department of Finance (DOF), Table E-5, 2025; Final Program Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for the Chino 2045 General Plan Update, August, 2025, Table 3-2; The Preserve Specific Plan, amended 2021, Table 1; US Census OnTheMap, http://onthemap.ces.census.gov; Table 2.4, Willdan Financial Services.

Occupant Densities

All fees in this report are calculated based on dwelling units or building square feet. Occupant density assumptions ensure a reasonable relationship between the size of a development project, the increase in service population associated with the project, and the amount of the fee. The densities ensure that the fee per unit of new development is roughly proportional to the demand for facilities from various types of development.

Occupant densities (residents per dwelling unit or workers per building square foot or commercial lodging room) are the most appropriate characteristics to use for most impact fees. The fee imposed should be based on the land use type that most closely represents the probable occupant density of the development.

The average occupant density factors used in this report are shown in **Table 2.4.** The residential density factor was calculated using the most recent data from the American Community Survey specifically for the City of Chino. The nonresidential occupancy factors are derived from data from the Institute of Traffic Engineers Trip Generation Manual, 12th Edition for commercial/retail, office/business park and industrial land uses. The occupancy density factor for commercial lodging was calculated based on local data from a neighboring jurisdiction in San Bernardino County.

Table 2.4: Occupant Density

Residential		
Single Family	3.41	Residents per dwelling unit
Multifamily	2.69	Residents per dwelling unit
Nonresidential		
Commercial Lodging	0.50	Employees per room
Commercial/Retail	2.09	Employees per 1,000 square feet
Office/Business Park	2.28	Employees per 1,000 square feet
Industrial	0.68	Employees per 1,000 square feet

Sources: U.S. Census Bureau, 2024 American Community Survey 1-Year Estimates, Tables B25024 and B25033; ITE Trip Generation Manual, 12th Edition; Willdan Financial Services.

3. Law Enforcement Facilities

The purpose of the law enforcement facilities impact fee is to fund the law enforcement facilities needed to serve new development. A maximum justified fee is presented based on the planned facilities standard of law enforcement facilities per capita. The *essential nexus* for this facility category is between the demand for new law enforcement facilities from the projected increase in service population and the additional law enforcement facilities needed to meet those service demands. The fees are roughly proportional to demand because they ensure that new development will pay no more than its proportionate share of the identified planned facilities needed to serve the City through the planning horizon, and the fees are scaled based on the number of residents occupying a new dwelling unit, or the number of jobs associated with nonresidential land uses.

Service Population

Law enforcement facilities serve both residents and businesses. Therefore, demand for services and associated facilities are based on the City's service population including residents and workers. **Table 3.1 s**hows the current law enforcement facilities service population and the estimated service population at the planning horizon of 2045.

To calculate service population for law enforcement facilities, residents are weighted at 1.00. A worker is weighted at 1.54 of one resident to reflect the higher per capita need for law enforcement services associated with businesses. The worker weighting factor is based on an analysis of call data response by land use type, which indicated varying levels of demand for law enforcement services between residential and nonresidential land uses. A detailed analysis of call data is presented in the appendix, in **Appendix Table A.1**.

Table 3.1: Law Enforcement Facilities Service Population

Land Use Type	A Persons	B Weighting Factor[1]	A x B = C Service Population
Citywide			
Residents			
Existing (2025)	88,714	1.00	88,714
New Development	29,721	1.00	29,721
Total (2045)	118,435		118,435
Workers [1]			
Existing (2025)	53,636	1.54	82,599
New Development	8,983	1.54	13,834
Total (2045)	62,619		96,433
Combined Residents and Weighted Workers			
Existing (2025)			171,313
New Development			43,555
Total (2045)			214,868

[1] Workers are weighted at 1.54 of residents based on an analysis of calls for service within the City in 2025.

Sources: Table 2.1, Appendix A.1; Willdan Financial Services.

Facility Inventories and Standards

This section describes the City's law enforcement facility inventory and facility standards.

Existing Inventory

Law enforcement services in the City of Chino are presently based out of two facilities. **Table 3.2** summarizes the City's current inventory of law enforcement land, buildings and other capital assets. The unit cost for land is based on an appraisal that the City commissioned in 2025. The appraisal identified differing land values for properties in the General City area and the Preserve. The General City are cost is used in this chapter, because the existing facilities are located in the General City area. The replacement cost assumptions for buildings and contents were sourced from the City's insured property schedule.

Table 3.2: Existing Law Enforcement Facilities Inventory

	Address	Quantity	Units	Unit Cost	Replacement Cost
Land					
Police Station	13250 Central Avenue	4.44	acres	$ 840,000	$ 3,729,600
Police Station	5450 Guardian Way	9.43	acres	840,000	7,921,200
Subtotal		13.87	acres		$ 11,650,800
Buildings					
Police Station	13250 Central Avenue	28,976	sq. ft.	$ 368	$ 10,676,400
Police Station	5450 Guardian Way	102,700	sq. ft.	399	40,958,400
Subtotal		131,676	sq. ft.		$ 51,634,800
Contents					
Police Station	13250 Central Avenue				$ 2,241,750
Police Station	5450 Guardian Way				7,946,400
Subtotal					$ 10,188,150
Total Law Enforcement Facilities Inventory					$ 73,473,750

Source: City of Chino; Appraisal Report, City of Chino Parks, Epic Appraisals, LLC, October 3, 2025.

Planned Facilities

Table 3.3 summarizes the planned law enforcement facilities needed to serve the City through 2045. The projects have been sourced from the City's prior development impact fee study and from the City's police department. Legacy projects have been adjusted for inflation using the Engineering News Record's Construction Cost Index (CCI). In total, $9.9 million of law enforcement facility needs has been identified to serve the City through 2045.

Table 3.3: Planned Law Enforcement Facilities

Project No.		Cost
LE-002	Additional Patrol/Investigation/Specialty/Staff Vehicles[1]	$ 3,724,386
LE-003	Sworn Officer Assigned Equipment[1]	915,702
LE-004	Additional Specialty Equipment[1]	612,925
LE-005	Computers/Electronics/Communications Equipment[1]	1,156,942
LE-007	Crisis Negotiations/Technical Operations Support Vehicle[1]	396,093
NEW LE-011	Armored Rescue Vehicle	500,000
NEW LE-012	Real-Time Crime Center Modernization, License Plate Readers	1,500,000
NEW LE-013	Unmanned Aerial Systems / Drone First Responder Program	800,000
NEW LE-014	Police Department Substation Tenant Improvements and Facility Outfitting	275,000
Total		$ 9,881,048

[1] Costs from 2017 study adjusted for inflation into current dollars using the Engineering News Record's Construction Cost Index.

Sources: Engineering News Record; Development Impact Fee Nexus and Calculation Report For the City of Chino, California; Willdan Financial Services.

Cost Allocation

Existing Level of Service

Table 3.4 expresses the City's current law enforcement facilities level of service in terms of an existing cost per capita. This cost per capita is not used in the fee calculation, rather it is shown here for informational purposes only.

The identified planned facilities represent a lower level of service than currently exists. As such, new development can fully fund the identified planned facilities and will still be paying less than its proportionate share of law enforcement facilities needs.

Table 3.4: Existing Level of Service

Value of Existing Facilities	$73,473,750
DIF Fund 231 - Existing Balance	2,649,736
Total Value of Existing Facilities	$76,123,486
Existing Service Population	171,313
Cost per Capita	$ 444
Facility Standard per Resident	$ 444
Facility Standard per Worker[1]	684

[1] Based on a weighting factor of 1.54.

Sources: City of Chino; Tables 3.1 and 3.2, Willdan Financial Services

Future Level of Service

Table 3.5 shows new development's cost per capita needed to fully fund the planned facilities. The level of service indicated by the planned facility is lower than the existing standard. This level of service drives the fee calculation. This value is calculated by dividing the cost of planned facilities by the increase in service population. The cost per capita is multiplied by the worker weighting factor of 1.54 to determine the cost per worker.

Table 3.5: Law Enforcement Facilities Planned Facilities Standard

Cost of Planned Facilities	$ 9,881,048
Less DIF Fund 231 - Existing Balance	2,649,736
Net Cost of Planned Facilities	$ 7,231,312
Growth in Service Population (2025 to 2045)	43,555
Cost per Capita	$ 166
Cost Allocation per Resident	$ 166
Cost Allocation per Worker[1]	256

[1] Based on a weighting factor of 1.54.

Sources: City of Chino; Tables 3.1 and 3.3, Willdan Financial Services.

Use of Fee Revenue

The City can use law enforcement facilities fee revenues for the construction or purchase of buildings, land, and equipment that are part of the system of law enforcement facilities serving new development. A list of planned facilities is included in Table 3.3.

Fee Schedule

Table 3.6 shows the maximum justified law enforcement facilities fee schedule. The cost per capita is converted to a fee per unit of new development based on dwelling unit and employment densities (persons per dwelling unit or employees per 1,000 square feet of nonresidential building space). The fee per average sized dwelling unit is converted into a fee per square foot by dividing the fee per dwelling unit by the assumed average square footage of a dwelling unit, by type of unit.

Table 3.6: Law Enforcement Facilities Fee Schedule

	A	*B*	*C = A x B*	*D*	*E = C / D*
Land Use	**Cost Per Capita**	**Density**	**Base Fee[1]**	**Sq. Ft. per Unit[2]**	**Fee per Sq. Ft.**
Residential					
Single Family	$ 166	3.41	$ 566	3,320	$ 0.17
Multifamily	166	2.69	447	1,400	0.32
Commercial Lodging - per room					
Lodging	$ 256	0.50	$ 128	N/A	N/A
Nonresidential - per 1,000 Sq. Ft.					
Commercial/Retail	$ 256	2.09	$ 535	1,000	$ 0.54
Office/Business Park	256	2.28	584	1,000	0.58
Industrial	256	0.68	174	1,000	0.17

[1] Fee per average sized dwelling unit, per commercial lodging room, or per 1,000 square feet of nonresidential building space.

[2] Assumes an average of 3,320 square feet per single family dwelling unit and 1,400 square feet per multifamily dwelling unit in the City of Chino based on an analysis of future residential projects in the City.

Sources: Tables 2.4 and 3.5.

4. Fire Suppression Facilities

The purpose of the fire suppression facilities impact fee is to fund the fire suppression facilities needed to serve new development. A maximum justified fee schedule is presented based on the system plan facilities standard of fire facilities per capita. The *essential nexus* for this facility category is between the demand for new fire suppression facilities from the projected increase in service population and the additional fire suppression facilities needed to meet those service demands. The fees are roughly proportional to demand because they ensure that new development will pay no more than its proportionate share of the identified planned facilities needed to serve the City through the planning horizon, and the fees are scaled based on the number of residents occupying a new dwelling unit, or the number of jobs associated with nonresidential land uses.

Service Population

Fire suppression facilities are used to provide services to both residents and businesses. The service population used to determine the demand for fire facilities includes both residents and workers. **Table 4.1** shows the current fire facilities service population and the estimated service population at the planning horizon of 2045.

To calculate service population for fire suppression facilities, residents are weighted at 1.00. A worker is weighted at 0.69 of one resident to reflect the lower per capita need for fire services associated with businesses. The 0.69 factor is consistent with the factor used by the City of Chino Hills in its recent nexus study. Both jurisdictions are served by the same fire protection district so it is appropriate to use the factor in this analysis.

Table 4.1: Fire Suppression Facilities Service Population

Land Use Type	A Persons	B Weighting Factor[1]	A x B = C Service Population
Residents			
Existing (2025)	88,714	1.00	88,714
New Development	29,721	1.00	29,721
Total (2045)	118,435		118,435
Workers [1]			
Existing (2025)	53,636	0.69	37,009
New Development	8,983	0.69	6,198
Total (2045)	62,619		43,207
Combined Residents and Weighted Workers			
Existing (2025)			125,723
New Development			35,919
Total (2045)			161,642

[1] Workers are weighted at 0.69 of residents based on Willdan's recent experience in Chino Hills.

Sources: Table 2.1, Appendix A.2; Willdan Financial Services.

Facility Inventories and Standards

This section describes the City's fire facility inventory and facility standards.

Existing Inventory

Table 4.2 summarizes the City's current inventory of fire suppression facilities. Fire protection services are provided from four stations located throughout the City. The unit cost for land is based on an appraisal that the City commissioned in 2025. The appraisal identified differing land values for properties in the General City area and the Preserve. The General City are cost is used in this chapter, because the existing facilities are located in the General City area. The replacement cost assumptions for buildings were sourced from the City's insured property schedule.

Table 4.2: Existing Fire Suppression Facilities Inventory

	Address	Quantity	Units	Unit Cost	Replacement Cost
Land					
Fire Station #1/Training Center	5092 Schaefer Ave.	3.84	Acres	$ 840,000	$ 3,225,600
Fire Station #3	7550 Kimball St.	1.03	Acres	840,000	865,200
Fire Station #5	12220 Ramona Ave.	0.87	Acres	840,000	730,800
Fire Station #7	5980 Riverside Dr.	1.17	Acres	840,000	982,800
Subtotal - Land		6.91	Acres		$ 5,804,400
Buildings					
Fire Station #1	5092 Schaefer Ave.	13,230	Sq. Ft.	$ 429	$ 5,671,050
Training Building	5092 Schaefer Ave.	6,630	Sq. Ft.	429	2,841,300
Training Tower	5092 Schaefer Ave.	4,000	Sq. Ft.	379	1,516,200
Fire Station #3	7550 Kimball St.	11,667	Sq. Ft.	429	5,003,250
Fire Station #5	12220 Ramona Ave.	8,000	Sq. Ft.	424	3,393,600
Fire Station #7	5980 Riverside Dr.	7,986	Sq. Ft.	298	2,377,200
Subtotal - Buildings		51,513	Sq. Ft.		$ 20,802,600
Total Value - Fire Suppression Facilities Inventory					$ 26,607,000

Sources: City of Chino; Appraisal Report, City of Chino Parks, Epic Appraisals, LLC, October 3, 2025.

Planned Facilities

Table 4.3 summarizes the planned facilities needed to serve the City through 2045. The project list is based on the remaining projects from the City's prior 2017 impact fee study and has been supplemented with revised project needs and costs informed by Chino Valley Fire District staff. In total, $23.7 million worth of capacity expanding projects have been identified to serve the City through 2045.

Table 4.3: Planned Fire Suppression Facilities

Project No.	Item	Quantity	Units	Unit Cost	Total Cost
FD-001	Expansion - Fire Station #65[1]	1,160	Sq. Ft.	$ 1,200	$ 1,392,000
FD-002	2nd Company Response Engine for Station #65[1]	1	Engine	1,500,000	1,500,000
FD-003	Land Acquisition for Mid-Preserve Area Station[2]	0.55	Acres	1,120,000	616,000
FD-003	New Fire Station - Mid-Preserve Area	7,160	Sq. Ft.	1,200	8,592,000
FD-004	Response Engine for Station #69	1	Engine	2,500,000	2,500,000
FD-005	District Tractor Drawn Aerial Truck	1	Truck	2,500,000	2,500,000
FD-007	Mobile Air, Lighting, And Rehabilitation Specialty Vehicle	1	Vehicle	2,500,000	2,500,000
FD-008	Remaining Debt to RDA for Fire Station #1 & Training Center				4,076,791
	Total - Planned Fire Suppression Facilities				$ 23,676,791

[1] In prior DIF study espansion w as projected for Station 67. It has been updated to Station 65 in this revision.
[2] Assumes FAR of 0.30.

Source: Chino Valley Fire District; City of Chino; Development Impact Fee Nexus and Calculation Report For the City of Chino, California; Willdan Financial Services.

Cost Allocation

Existing Level of Service

Table 4.4 expresses the City's current fire facilities level of service in terms of an existing cost per capita. This cost per capita is not used in the fee calculation, rather it is shown here for informational purposes only.

Table 4.4: Existing Level of Service

Value of Existing Facilities	$26,607,000
DIF Fund 232 - Existing Balance	317,591
Total Value of Existing Facilities	$26,924,591
Existing Service Population	125,723
Cost per Capita	$ 214
Facility Standard per Resident	$ 214
Facility Standard per Worker[1]	148

[1] Based on a weighting factor of 0.69.

Sources: City of Chino; Tables 4.1 and 4.2, Willdan Financial Services.

Future Level of Service

Table 4.5 shows new development's projected per capita investment in fire suppression facilities at the planning horizon. This level of service drives the fee calculation. This value is calculated by dividing cost of existing and planned facilities by the service population at the planning horizon. The cost per worker is calculated by multiplying the cost per resident by the worker weighting factor.

Table 4.5: Fire Suppression Facilities System Plan Facilities Standard

Replacement Cost of Existing Facilities	$26,607,000
Cost of Planned Facilities	23,676,791
Total System Value (2045)	$50,283,791
Future Service Population (2045)	161,642
Cost per Capita	$ 311
Cost Allocation per Resident	$ 311
Cost Allocation per Worker[1]	215

[1] Based on a weighting factor of 0.69.

Sources: City of Chino; Tables 4.1, 4.2 and 4.3, Willdan Financial Services.

Use of Fee Revenue

The City can use fire suppression facilities fee revenues for the construction or purchase of buildings, land, vehicles, apparatus and fire suppression equipment that are part of the system of fire facilities serving new development. A list of planned facilities is included in Table 4.3.

Non-Fee Funding Required

Completing the planned facilities will provide a higher value of facilities per capita than is currently provided in Chino. Impact fee revenue may not be used to increase the level of service provided to existing development. Therefore, impact fee revenue will not fully fund the planned fire suppression facilities, and some non-fee funding will be required. **Table 4.6** shows the projected fee revenue and the non-fee funding required through 2045. After accounting for the projected future impact fee revenue, $12.2 million in non-fee funding will be needed to complete the planned fire suppression facilities. The City will need to use alternative funding sources to fund existing development's share of the planned facilities. Potential sources of revenue include but are not limited to existing or new general fund revenues, existing or new taxes, special assessments, and grants.

Table 4.6: Revenue Projection - System Plan Standard

Cost per Capita	$	311
Growth in Service Population (2025 to 2045)		35,919
Fee Revenue	$	11,170,853
Net Cost of Planned Facilities	$	23,676,791
Less Projected Fee Revenue		11,170,853
Less Existing Fund Balance		317,591
Non-Fee Revenue To Be Identified	$	12,188,347

Sources: Tables 4.1, 4.3 and 4.5.

Fee Schedule

Table 4.7 shows the maximum justified fire suppression facilities fee schedule. The cost per capita is converted to a fee per unit of new development based on dwelling unit and employment densities (persons per dwelling unit or employees per 1,000 square feet of nonresidential building space). The fee per average sized dwelling unit is converted into a fee per square foot by dividing the fee per dwelling unit by the assumed average square footage of a dwelling unit, by type of unit.

Table 4.7: Fire Suppression Facilities Fee Schedule

	A	*B*	*C = A x B*	*D*	*E = C / D*
Land Use	**Cost Per Capita**	**Density**	**Base Fee[1]**	**Sq. Ft. per Unit[2]**	**Fee per Sq. Ft.**
Residential					
Single Family	$ 311	3.41	$ 1,061	3,320	$ 0.32
Multifamily	311	2.69	837	1,400	0.60
Commercial Lodging					
Per Room	$ 215	0.50	$ 108	N/A	N/A
Nonresidential - per 1,000 Sq. Ft.					
Commercial/Retail	$ 215	2.09	$ 449	1,000	$ 0.45
Office/Business Park	215	2.28	490	1,000	0.49
Industrial	215	0.68	146	1,000	0.15

[1] Fee per average sized dwelling unit, per commercial lodging room, or per 1,000 square feet of nonresidential building space.

[2] Assumes an average of 3,320 square feet per single family dwelling unit and 1,400 square feet per multifamily dwelling unit in the City of Chino based on an analysis of future residential projects in the City.

Sources: Tables 2.4 and 4.5.

5. Circulation Facilities

This chapter summarizes an analysis of the need for various transportation improvements to accommodate new development. The *essential nexus* for this facility category is between the demand for new circulation facilities from the projected increase in vehicle trips and the additional facilities needed to meet those service demands. The fees are roughly proportional to demand because they ensure that new development will pay no more than its proportionate share of the identified planned facilities needed to serve the City through the planning horizon, and the fees are scaled based on the number trips generated by residential and nonresidential land uses.

Trip Demand

The need for traffic improvements is based on the trip demand placed on the system by development. A reasonable measure of demand is the number of average daily vehicle trips, adjusted for the type of trip. Vehicle trip generation rates are a reasonable measure of demand on the City's system of street improvements across all modes because alternate modes (transit, bicycle, pedestrian) often substitute for vehicle trips.

The two types of trip adjustments made to trip generation rates to calculate trip demand are described below:

- Pass-by trips are deducted from the trip generation rate. Pass-by trips are intermediates stops between an origin and a destination that require no diversion from the route, such as stopping to get gas on the way to work.
- The trip generation rate is adjusted by the average length of trips for a specific land use category compared to the average length of all trips on the street system.

These adjustments allow for a holistic quantification of trip demand that takes trip purpose and length into account for fee calculation purposes.

Table 5.1 shows the calculation of trip demand factors by land use category based on the adjustments described above. Trip rates are based on the latest data available from the Institute of Traffic Engineers (ITE). The trip purpose and trip length assumptions are based on extensive and detailed trip surveys conducted in the San Diego region by the San Diego Association of Governments (SANDAG). The SANDAG is used to supplement the trip generation rates, because the SANDAG surveys provide one of the most comprehensive databases available of pass-by trips factors for a wide range of land uses. It should be noted that the projections of current and future trip demand generation in this report are based on data specific to the City.

Table 5.1: Trip Demand Factors

Land Use Type	Pass-by Trips[1]	Primary and Diverted Trips	Average Trip Length[2]	Adjust-ment Factor[3]	ITE Category	PM Peak Hour Trips[4]	Trip Demand Factor[5]
	A	*B = 1 - A*	C	*D = B x C / Avg.*		*E*	*F = D x E*
Residential - per Dwelling Unit							
Single Family	3%	97%	7.9	1.11	Single Family Housing (210)	0.93	1.03
Multifamily	3%	97%	7.9	1.11	Multifamily Housing (Low-Rise) (220)	0.52	0.58
Commercial Lodging - per room							
Per Room	4%	96%	7.6	1.06	Motel (320)	0.30	0.32
Nonresidential - per 1,000 Sq. Ft.							
Commercial	22%	78%	3.6	0.41	Shopping Center (820)	3.26	1.34
Office	4%	96%	8.8	1.22	General Office (710)	1.18	1.44
Industrial	2%	98%	9.0	1.28	General Light Industrial (110)	0.49	0.63

[1] Percent of total trips. A pass-by trip is made as an intermediate stop on the way from an origin to a primary trip destination without a route diversion. Pass-by trips are not considered to add traffic to the road network. Based on SANDAG data.

[2] In miles. Based on SANDAG data.

[3] The trip adjustment factor equals the percent of non-pass-by trips multiplied by the average trip length and divided by the systemwide average trip length of 6.9 miles.

[4] Trips per dwelling unit, commercial lodging room, or per 1,000 building square feet.

[5] The trip demand factor is the product of the trip adjustment factor and the trip rate.

Sources: Institute of Traffic Engineers, Trip Generation Manual, 12th Edition; San Diego Association of Governments, Brief Guide of Vehicular Traffic Generation Rates for the San Diego Region, April 2002; Willdan Financial Services.

Trip Growth

The planning horizon for this analysis is 2045. **Table 5.2** lists the 2025 and 2045 land use assumptions used in this study for the General City area and for the Preserve, respectively. The trip demand factors calculated in Table 5.1 are multiplied by the existing and future dwelling units and building square feet for each area of the City to determine the increase in trips generated by new development.

Table 5.2: Land Use Scenario and Total Trips

Land Use	Trip Demand Factor	2025 Units or 1,000 SF	2025 Trips	Growth - 2025 to 2045 Units or 1,000 SF	Growth - 2025 to 2045 Trips	Total - 2045 Units or 1,000 SF	Total - 2045 Trips
General City Area							
Residential - per Dwelling Unit							
Single Family	1.03	16,821	17,326	10	10	16,831	17,336
Multifamily	0.58	5,771	3,347	4,867	2,823	10,638	6,170
Subtotal		22,592	20,673	4,877	2,833	27,469	23,506
Commercial Lodging - per room							
Per room	0.32	399	128	-	-	399	128
Nonresidential - per 1,000 Sq. Ft.							
Commercial	1.34	8,644	11,583	885	1,187	9,530	12,770
Office	1.44	6,113	8,803	629	906	6,743	9,709
Industrial	0.63	25,453	16,035	2,945	1,856	28,399	17,891
Subtotal		40,211	36,421	4,460	3,949	44,671	40,370
Total - General City Area			57,222		6,782		64,004
			89.4%		10.6%		100%
The Preserve Area							
Residential - per Dwelling Unit							
Single Family	1.03	5,068	5,220	2,765	2,848	7,833	8,068
Multifamily	0.58	1,228	712	2,664	1,545	3,892	2,257
Subtotal		6,296	5,932	5,429	4,393	11,725	10,325
Commercial Lodging - per room							
Per room	0.32	-	-	428	137	428	137
Nonresidential - per 1,000 Sq. Ft.							
Commercial	1.34	754	1,010	765	1,025	1,519	2,035
Office	1.44	568	818	971	1,399	1,539	2,217
Industrial	0.63	2,140	1,348	7,576	4,773	9,716	6,121
Subtotal		3,461	3,176	9,313	7,197	12,774	10,373
Total - The Preserve Area			9,108		11,727		20,835
			43.7%		56.3%		100%

Sources: Tables 2.2, 2.3 and 5.1.

Project Costs

Cost estimates are summarized in **Table 5.3** for the General City Area, in **Table 5.4** for the Preserve and were sourced from the City's existing impact fee program. Any funding that has been identified for these projects is netted out of the total cost. The net costs are allocated to either the General City or the Preserve. Note that none of the projects are rectifying existing deficiencies, so all project costs can be funded through the impact fees.

Table 5.3: Circulation Facilities Projects and Cost Allocation to New Development (General City)

Project No.	Description	Total Project Cost	Allocation to Other Funding		Allocation to General City		Allocation to the Preserve	
Projects Located in the General City								
TR-004/005	Traffic Control Communications Expansion	$ 834,950	0.0%	$ -	100.0%	$ 834,950	0.0%	$ -
TR-006	Traffic Signal - Magnolia/Walnut	721,875	0.0%	-	100.0%	721,875	0.0%	-
TR-007	Traffic Signal - Monte Vista/Walnut	1,364,063	0.0%	-	100.0%	1,364,063	0.0%	-
TR-013	Signal Interconnect	1,000,000	0.0%	-	100.0%	1,000,000	0.0%	-
TR-014	Traffic Signal - Walnut/Oaks	721,875	0.0%	-	100.0%	721,875	0.0%	-
TR-015	Traffic Signal - Chino/Monte Vista	2,000,000	0.0%	-	100.0%	2,000,000	0.0%	-
TR-016	Traffic Signal/ Intersection - Chino/Benson	618,750	0.0%	-	100.0%	618,750	0.0%	-
TR-017	Traffic Signal - Chino/Oaks	721,875	0.0%	-	100.0%	721,875	0.0%	-
TR-018	Traffic Signal - Chino/Magnolia	721,875	0.0%	-	100.0%	721,875	0.0%	-
TR-019	Traffic Signal - College Park/Parking Lot - East	721,875	0.0%	-	100.0%	721,875	0.0%	-
TR-020	Traffic Signal - College Park/Ayala Park - West	721,875	0.0%	-	100.0%	721,875	0.0%	-
TR-023	Traffic Signal - El Prado Road/Mountain	721,875	0.0%	-	100.0%	721,875	0.0%	-
TR-024	Intersection - El Prado Road/Pine	618,750	0.0%	-	42.1%	260,556	57.9%	358,194
TR-028	Intersection & Traffic Signal Improvements - Merrill/Euclid	5,754,869	0.0%	-	42.1%	2,423,375	57.9%	3,331,494
TR-029	Pine - El Prado Road to Euclid	8,244,616	64.8%	5,342,511	22.0%	1,813,816	13.2%	1,088,289
TR-030	East End - Philadelphia to Country Road	566,306	0.0%	-	100.0%	566,306	0.0%	-
TR-031	El Prado - Central to Pine	5,170,188	0.5%	27,919	43.5%	2,246,447	56.0%	2,895,822
TR-032	Chino - Pipeline to Euclid	6,597,179	0.0%	-	100.0%	6,597,179	0.0%	-
TR-033	Edison - East	8,095,372	0.0%	-	100.0%	8,095,372	0.0%	-
TR-034	Central - Philadelphia/Walnut	1,843,773	0.0%	-	100.0%	1,843,773	0.0%	-
TR-035	Pine Avenue Connection El Prado Road to SR-71 (Bridge)	148,500,000	95.8%	132,500,000	6.7%	10,000,000	4.0%	6,000,000
TR-036	SR-60 Freeway Interchange Improvements at Ramona	5,830,500	0.0%	-	6.0%	349,830	94.0%	5,480,670
TR-038	SR-60 Freeway Interchange Improvements at Mountain	6,842,500	0.0%	-	6.0%	410,550	94.0%	6,431,950
TR-039	SR-60 Freeway Interchange Improvements at Euclid	1,322,500	0.0%	-	6.0%	79,350	94.0%	1,243,150
TR-040	SR-60 Freeway Interchange Improvements at Grove	333,500	0.0%	-	6.0%	20,010	94.0%	313,490
TR-041	SR-60 Freeway Interchange Improvements at Vineyard	2,357,500	0.0%	-	6.0%	141,450	94.0%	2,216,050
TR-042	Riverside Drive - South Garey/Euclid	16,560,962	0.0%	-	100.0%	16,560,962	0.0%	-
TR-047	12,400 LF of Secondary Roadway Oaks/Eucalyptus/Mountain	3,058,388	0.0%	-	100.0%	3,058,388	0.0%	-
TR-049	Intersection - Euclid/Riverside	721,875	0.0%	-	100.0%	721,875	0.0%	-
TR-050	Intersection - Euclid/Edison	721,875	0.0%	-	100.0%	721,875	0.0%	-
NEW	Euclid - Chino Ave to Riverside	16,169,830	0.0%	-	75.4%	12,192,052	24.6%	3,977,778
Subtotal		$ 250,181,371		$ 137,870,430		$ 78,974,053		$ 33,336,888

Sources: City of Chino; Proactive Engineering Consultants, April 24, 2026.

Table 5.4: Circulation Facilities Projects and Cost Allocation to New Development (The Preserve)

Project No.	Description	Total Project Cost	Allocation to Other Funding	Allocation to General City	Allocation to the Preserve
Projects Located in the Preserve					
TR-101	Market Street - West Preserve Loop to Hellman	$ 7,614,404	0.0% $ -	0.0% $ -	100.0% $ 7,614,404
TR-102	Legacy Park - NS Chino-Corona to Hellman	5,969,370	0.0% -	0.0% -	100.0% 5,969,370
TR-103	Bickmore - East Preserve Loop to Hellman	939,785	0.0% -	0.0% -	100.0% 939,785
TR-105	EW Chino-Corona Road - NS Chino-Corona to Hellman	10,441,530	0.0% -	0.0% -	100.0% 10,441,530
TR-109	NS Chino-Corona - Pine/EW Chino/Corona	6,579,925	0.0% -	0.0% -	100.0% 6,579,925
TR-110	East Preserve Loop - Bickmore/Legacy Park	7,995,850	0.0% -	0.0% -	100.0% 7,995,850
TR-111	West Preserve Loop - Pine/Legacy Park	9,198,890	0.0% -	0.0% -	100.0% 9,198,890
TR-115	Mayhew (Sultana) - Bickmore/Kimball	4,983,230	0.0% -	0.0% -	100.0% 4,983,230
TR-116	Mayhew (Sultana) - Bickmore/Pine	4,854,630	0.0% -	0.0% -	100.0% 4,854,630
TR-118	Hellman-Kimball E/W Chino-Corona	8,965,356	0.0% -	0.0% -	100.0% 8,965,356
TR-119	Euclid Avenue Parkway/Median	400,000	0.0% -	0.0% -	100.0% 400,000
TR-121	Kimball - Euclid/Hellman	14,386,147	0.0% -	0.0% -	100.0% 14,386,147
TR-122	Pine - Euclid/Hellman	39,098,100	0.0% -	0.0% -	100.0% 39,098,100
TR-123	Intersection - Pine/Main	721,875	0.0% -	0.0% -	100.0% 721,875
TR-130	Intersection - Euclid/Pine	3,492,542	0.0% -	0.0% -	100.0% 3,492,542
TR-133	Intersection - Hellman/Chandler	360,938	0.0% -	0.0% -	100.0% 360,938
TR-134	Intersection - EW Chino-Corona/Main	541,406	0.0% -	0.0% -	100.0% 541,406
TR-137	Traffic Signal - Legacy Park/Main	721,875	0.0% -	0.0% -	100.0% 721,875
TR-138	Traffic Signal - Legacy Park/NS Chino-Corona	541,406	0.0% -	0.0% -	100.0% 541,406
TR-141	Traffic Signal - Pine/Rincon Meadows	360,938	0.0% -	0.0% -	100.0% 360,938
TR-142	Traffic Signal - Pine/Mayhew	721,875	0.0% -	0.0% -	100.0% 721,875
TR-144	Traffic Signal - Bickmore/Main Street	721,875	0.0% -	0.0% -	100.0% 721,875
TR-147	Traffic Signal - Bickmore/Mayhew	360,938	0.0% -	0.0% -	100.0% 360,938
TR-158	Traffic Signal - Pine/Mill Creek	180,470	0.0% -	0.0% -	100.0% 180,470

Sources: City of Chino; Proactive Engineering Consultants, April 24, 2026.

Table 5.4: Circulation Facilities Projects and Cost Allocation to New Development (The Preserve) Continued

Project No.	Description	Total Project Cost	Allocation to Other Funding		Allocation to General City		Allocation to the Preserve	
TR-160	Intelligent Transportation System	$ 1,727,116	0.0%	-	0.0%	-	100.0%	$ 1,727,116
TR-161	Transit System Interim Landscaping	1,370,846	0.0%	-	0.0%	-	100.0%	1,370,846
TR-162	Gateway Monuments	4,600,000	0.0%	-	0.0%	-	100.0%	4,600,000
TR-164	Miscellaneous Land Acquisition	6,548,516	0.0%	-	0.0%	-	100.0%	6,548,516
TR-169	East Preserve Loop - Bickmore to Main	2,710,400	0.0%	-	0.0%	-	100.0%	2,710,400
TR-170	West Preserve Loop - Pine/Main	4,309,525	0.0%	-	0.0%	-	100.0%	4,309,525
TR-171	Main Street	9,733,158	0.0%	-	0.0%	-	100.0%	9,733,158
TR-173	Traffic Signal - Pine/West Preserve Loop	360,938	0.0%	-	0.0%	-	100.0%	360,938
TR-176	Merrill (South Half) - Euclid/Carpenter	650,000	0.0%	-	0.0%	-	100.0%	650,000
TR-177	Bickmore - Euclid/East Preserve Loop	6,250,174	0.0%	-	0.0%	-	100.0%	6,250,174
TR-179	East Preserve Loop (South Half) - Legacy Park/Main	9,365,015	0.0%	-	0.0%	-	100.0%	9,365,015
TR-181	West Preserve Loop (South Half) - Legacy Park/Main	6,388,360	0.0%	-	0.0%	-	100.0%	6,388,360
TR-201	Circulation System Master Plan	87,314	0.0%	-	75.4%	65,835	24.6%	21,479
ST085	Euclid Avenue - Kimball to Merrill	10,430,439	0.0%	-	75.4%	7,864,551	24.6%	2,565,888
ST023	Euclid Avenue - Bickmore to Kimball	6,557,363	0.0%	-	75.4%	4,944,252	24.6%	1,613,111
ST023	Euclid Avenue - s/o Pine Avenue	7,283,059	0.0%	-	75.4%	5,491,426	24.6%	1,791,633
	Developer Balance Remaining	9,561,435	0.0%	-	0.0%	-	100.0%	9,561,435
Subtotal		$ 218,087,013		$ -		$ 18,366,064		$ 199,720,949
Total		$ 468,268,384		$ 137,870,430		$ 97,340,117		$ 233,057,837

Sources: City of Chino; Proactive Engineering Consultants, April 24, 2026.

Fee per Trip Demand Unit

Every impact fee consists of a dollar amount, or the cost of projects that can be funded by a fee, divided by a measure of development. In this case, all fees are first calculated as a cost per trip demand unit. Then these amounts are translated into housing unit (cost per dwelling unit) and employment space (cost per 1,000 building square feet) by multiplying the cost per trip by the trip generation rate for each land use category. These amounts become the fee schedule.

Table 5.5 calculates the cost per trip demand unit for the General City area and for the Preserve by dividing the total project costs attributable to new development from Table 5.3 and 5.4, by the total growth in trips calculated in Table 5.2 for each area, respectively. The existing fund balances for each area are netted out of the total cost, so only the unfunded cost of the facilities is driving the fee calculation.

Table 5.5: Cost per Trip to Accommodate Growth

	Calculation	
General City Area		
Cost Allocated to New Development	*A*	$ 97,340,117
DIF Fund 220 (Citywide) - Existing Balance	*B*	24,012,763
Net Cost of Planned Facilities	*C = A - B*	$ 73,327,354
Growth in Trip Demand (2025 to 2045)	*D*	6,782
Cost per Trip	*E = C / D*	$ 10,812
The Preserve Area		
Cost Allocated to New Development	*A*	$ 233,057,837
DIF Fund 260 (Preserve) - Existing Balance	*B*	7,749,130
Net Cost of Planned Facilities	*C = A - B*	$ 225,308,707
Growth in Trip Demand (2025 to 2045)	*D*	11,727
Cost per Trip	*E = C / D*	$ 19,213

Sources: City of Chino; Willdan Financial Services, Tables 5.2 and 5.3.

Smart Growth and VMT Efficient Housing Discounts

Housing development projects that meet certain smart growth or VMT (Vehicle Miles Traveled) efficient criteria must be charged a lower impact fee to reflect lower levels of demand for transportation facilities.[2]

The Smart Growth criteria are:

[2] Government Code, section 66005.1

1. The housing development is located within one-half mile of a transit station and there is direct access between the housing development and the transit station along a barrier-free walkable pathway not exceeding one-half mile in length.
2. The housing development is located within one-half mile from three or more of the following:
    a. A supermarket or grocery store.
    b. A public park.
    c. A community center.
    d. A pharmacy or drugstore.
    e. A medical clinic or hospital.
    f. A public library.
    g. A school that maintains a kindergarten or any of grades 1 to 12, inclusive.
    h. A licensed childcare facility.
    i. A restaurant.
3. The housing development provides no more than one onsite parking space for zero- to two-bedroom units, and two onsite parking spaces for three or more bedroom units.

Eligible housing projects that meet the criteria would receive a 15% discount on the transportation impact fees based on Smart Growth Trip Generation Study (SANDAG, June 2010). The average reduction in trip generation from the SANDAG Study was shown to be approximately 15% relative to the Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) based trip generation factors for housing developments without these characteristics.

As used in this section, "housing development" means a development project with common ownership and financing consisting of residential use or mixed use where not less than 50 percent of the floor space is for residential use.

For the purposes of this section, "transit station" has the meaning set forth in paragraph (4) of subdivision (b) of Section 65460.1. "Transit station" includes planned transit stations otherwise meeting this definition whose construction is programmed to be completed prior to the scheduled completion and occupancy of the housing development. Transit headway criteria of 10 minutes or less at a transit hub served by three or more transit service lines is defined as cumulative headway versus individual service line headways.

The applicant/developer will be responsible for conducting the initial analysis of the relationship of the new project to the criteria to consider eligibility for the discount. The City will need to verify accuracy for final determination of project's eligibility for the discount.

Fee Schedule

Table 5.6 shows the maximum justified circulation fee schedule for the General City area and **Table 5.7** shows the fee schedule for the Preserve. The maximum justified fees are based on the costs per trip shown in Table 5.5. The cost per trip is multiplied by the trip demand factors in Table 5.1 to determine a fee per unit of new development. The fee per average sized dwelling unit is converted into a fee per square foot by dividing the fee per dwelling unit by the assumed average square footage of a dwelling unit, by type of unit.

Table 5.6: Maximum Justified Circulation System Facilities Fee Schedule (General City)

Land Use	A Cost Per Trip	B Trip Demand Factor	C = A x B Base Fee[1]	D Sq. Ft. per Unit[2]	E = C / D Fee per Sq. Ft.
General City Area					
Residential					
Single Family	$10,812	1.03	$ 11,136	3,320	$ 3.35
Multifamily	10,812	0.58	6,271	1,400	4.48
Smart Growth Residential[3]					
Single Family					$ 2.85
Multifamily					3.81
Commercial Lodging - per room					
Per room	$10,812	0.32	$ 3,460	N/A	N/A
Nonresidential - per 1,000 Sq. Ft.					
Commercial/Retail	$10,812	1.34	$ 14,488	1,000	$ 14.49
Office/Business Park	10,812	1.44	15,569	1,000	15.57
Industrial	10,812	0.63	6,812	1,000	6.81

[1] Fee per average sized dwelling unit, per commercial lodging room, or per 1,000 square feet of nonresidential building space.
[2] Assumes an average of 3,320 square feet per single family dwelling unit; and 1,400 square feet per multifamily dwelling unit in the City of Chino based on an analysis of future residential projects in the City.
[3] Discount of 15% for smart growth and VMT efficient housing projects.

Sources: Tables 5.1, 5.2 and 5.4.

Table 5.7: Maximum Justified Circulation System Facilities Fee Schedule (The Preserve)

Land Use	A Cost Per Trip	B Trip Demand Factor	C = A x B Base Fee[1]	D Sq. Ft. per Unit[2]	E = C / D Fee per Sq. Ft.
The Preserve Area					
Residential					
Single Family	$19,213	1.03	$ 19,789	3,320	$ 5.96
Multifamily	19,213	0.58	11,144	1,400	7.96
Smart Growth Residential[3]					
Single Family					$ 5.07
Multifamily					6.77
Commercial Lodging - per room					
Per room	$19,213	0.32	$ 6,148	N/A	N/A
Nonresidential - per 1,000 Sq. Ft.					
Commercial/Retail	$19,213	1.34	$ 25,745	1,000	$ 25.75
Office/Business Park	19,213	1.44	27,667	1,000	27.67
Industrial	19,213	0.63	12,104	1,000	12.10

[1] Fee per average sized dwelling unit, per commercial lodging room, or per 1,000 square feet of nonresidential building space.
[2] Assumes an average of 3,320 square feet per single family dwelling unit; and 1,400 square feet per multifamily dwelling unit in the City of Chino based on an analysis of future residential projects in the City.
[3] Discount of 15% for smart growth and VMT efficient housing projects.

Sources: Tables 5.1, 5.2 and 5.4.

6. Storm Drainage Facilities

This chapter summarizes an analysis of the need for storm drain facilities to accommodate growth within the City of Chino. This chapter documents a reasonable relationship between new development, and a storm drain fee calculated using the planned facilities method approach to fund storm drain facilities that serve new development. The *essential nexus* for this facility category is between the demand for storm drainage facilities from the projected increase in impervious surface generated by new development and the additional storm drains needed to meet those service demands. The fees are roughly proportional to demand because they ensure that new development will not pay for more than the storm drain facilities that are needed to accommodate increased demand, and the fees are scaled based on the amount of impervious surface generated by different types of development.

Storm Drain Demand

Most new development generates storm water runoff that must be controlled through storm drain facilities by increasing the amount of land that is impervious to precipitation. **Table 6.1** shows the calculation of equivalent dwelling unit (EDU) demand factors based on impervious surface coefficient by land use category. The impervious surface coefficients are based on data from San Bernardino County Hydrology Manual. EDU factors relate demand for storm drain facilities in terms of the demand created by a single-family dwelling unit. Use of EDU factors to estimate demand and allocate fees ensures that the fees are roughly proportional to the impervious surface generated by each unit of new development.

Table 6.1: Storm Drain Facilities Equivalent Dwelling Units

Land Use Type	DU, Rooms or KSF per acre[1]	Impervious Surface Coefficient	Equivalent Dwelling Unit (EDU)
Residential - per Dwelling Unit			
Single Family	8.00	0.74	1.00
Multifamily	13.00	0.81	0.67
Commercial Lodging - per room			
Lodging	73.00	0.85	0.13
Nonresidential - per 1,000 Sq. Ft.			
Commercial	11.02	0.83	0.81
Office	9.76	0.84	0.93
Industrial	15.18	0.85	0.61

[1] Units per acre for residential, rooms per acre for commercial lodging, or 1,000 square feet per acre for nonresidential.

Sources: Development Impact Fee Nexus and Calculation Report for the City of Chino, 2017, ammended 2022, Appendix B (revised); San Bernardino Hydrology Manual (1986). Williamson and Schmidt, Irvine, CA , Figure C-4.

EDU Generation by New Development

Table 6.2 shows the estimated EDU generation from new development through 2045 for the General City area and for the Preserve. New development will generate approximately 6,370 new EDUs in the General City area, representing 11.5 percent of total storm drain demand in 2045. New development will comprise 56.3% of total storm drain demand in the Preserve by 2045.

Table 6.2: Storm Drain Demand Projections

		2025		Growth - 2025 to 2045		Total - 2045	
Land Use	EDU Factor	Units or 1,000 SF	EDUs	Units or 1,000 SF	EDUs	Units or 1,000 SF	EDUs
General City Area							
Residential - per Dwelling Unit							
Single Family	1.00	16,821	16,821	10	10	16,831	16,831
Multifamily	0.67	5,771	3,867	4,867	3,260	10,638	7,127
Subtotal		22,592	20,688	4,877	3,270	27,469	23,958
Commercial Lodging - per room							
Lodging	0.13	399	52	-	-	399	52
Nonresidential - per 1,000 Sq. Ft.							
Commercial	0.81	8,644	7,002	885	717	9,530	7,719
Office	0.93	6,113	5,685	629	586	6,743	6,271
Industrial	0.61	25,453	15,526	2,945	1,797	28,399	17,323
Subtotal		40,211	28,213	4,460	3,100	44,671	31,313
Total - General City Area			48,953		6,370		55,323
			88.5%		11.5%		100%
The Preserve Area							
Residential - per Dwelling Unit							
Single Family	1.00	5,068	5,068	2,765	2,765	7,833	7,833
Multifamily	0.67	1,228	823	2,664	1,785	3,892	2,608
Subtotal		6,296	5,891	5,429	4,550	11,725	10,441
Commercial Lodging - per room							
Lodging	0.13	-	-	428	56	428	56
Nonresidential - per 1,000 Sq. Ft.							
Commercial	0.81	754	610	765	620	1,519	1,230
Office	0.93	568	528	971	904	1,539	1,432
Industrial	0.61	2,140	1,305	7,576	4,622	9,716	5,927
Subtotal		3,461	2,443	9,313	6,146	12,774	8,589
Total - The Preserve Area			8,334		10,752		19,086
			43.7%		56.3%		100%

Sources: Tables 2.1, 2.2 and 6.1.

Planned Facilities

Table 6.3 identifies the planned storm drain facilities which drive the fee calculations for the General City area. **Table 6.4** identifies the costs which are needed to serve the Preserve. The facilities were identified in the City's prior nexus study, and costs have been updated to current conditions for use in this analysis by Proactive Engineering Consultants. The allocations to the General City are and the Preserve are consistent with the prior nexus study. Note that the City is currently pursuing a storm drain master plan to identify capacity expanding needs in the General City area.

Table 6.3: Planned Storm Drain Facilities (General City)

Project No.	Project Titles / Descriptions	Project Costs	Allocation to Other Funding		General City Allocation	
SD-002	Oaks - 600' NO Edison/Edison & Edison-Oaks/Central	$ 1,121,483	40.0%	$ 448,593	60.0%	$ 672,890
SD-003	Chino-Oaks/Benson Et Al to Benson-Schaefer/Edison	3,250,000	0.0%	-	100.0%	3,250,000
SD-005	Philadelphia-Ramona/Norton, Norton-Francis/Chino SD	1,300,000	0.0%	-	100.0%	1,300,000
SD-006	Philadelphia-Bridge/Monte Vista & Monte Vista - Independence/CSB	3,500,000	40.0%	714,442	60.0%	2,100,000
SD-013	Magnolia Avenue - Salem/Chino, Carissa and Salem	690,000	40.0%	276,000	60.0%	414,000
SD-017	Rosemary-Germantown/Chino & Chino Rosemary/Cypress Channel	490,000	0.0%	-	100.0%	490,000
SD-018	Fern - 660' SO Edison/Eucalyptus	830,000	0.0%	-	100.0%	830,000
SD-019	Mains Adjoining & within College Park (minimum 48")	2,691,572	0.0%	-	100.0%	2,691,572
SD-020	Magnolia Avenue Earthen Channel - Edison/Chino Creek	1,559,124	0.0%	-	100.0%	1,559,124
SD-022	Schaefer - Ramona to Yorba	2,000,000	0.0%	-	100.0%	2,000,000
SD-202	Storm Drainage Master Plan - General City Area	500,000	0.0%	-	100.0%	500,000
	Total	$ 17,932,179		$ 1,439,035		$ 15,807,586

Source: City of Chino; Proactive Engineering Consultants, April 24, 2026.

Table 6.4: Planned Storm Drain Facilities (The Preserve)

Reach	Project Description	Cost	Allocation to General City Area		Allocation to The Preserve Area	
Grove Ave (New)						
SD138	Grove s/o Merrill	$ 2,440,625	0%	$ -	100%	$ 2,440,625
SD139	Grove n/o Merrill	333,438	0%	-	100%	333,438
SD140	Grove n/o Merrill	75,625	0%	-	100%	75,625
Subtotal - Grove Ave		$ 2,849,688		$ -		$ 2,849,688
SD- 102 Line C						
SD057	EPL - Bickmore to Pine	$ 491,563	0%	$ -	100%	$ 491,563
SD058	Pine Ave e/o EPL	1,168,501	0%	-	100%	1,168,501
SD059	Pine Ave w/o Main	1,055,838	0%	-	100%	1,055,838
SD060	Pine Ave w/o Main	147,665	0%	-	100%	147,665
SD061	Pine Ave e/o WPL	125,318	0%	-	100%	125,318
SD062	Pine Ave - Mill CK to WPL	2,813,319	0%	-	100%	2,813,319
	Pine Ave e/o WPL	80,733	0%	-	100%	80,733
SD063	Pine Ave w/o Mill Ck	2,740,416	0%	-	100%	2,740,416
SD064	Pine Ave w/o Mill Ck	158,056	0%	-	100%	158,056
SD065	Main St n/o Pine	564,314	0%	-	100%	564,314
SD066	Main St n/o Pine	239,883	0%	-	100%	239,883
SD067	WPL n/o Pine Ave	740,890	0%	-	100%	740,890
SD068	Millcreek	318,773	0%	-	100%	318,773
	Trash Capture Devices	350,000	0%	-	100%	350,000
Subtotal - Line C		$ 10,995,269		$ -		$ 10,995,269
SD-105 Line F						
SD078	EPL s/o Legacy	$ 507,141	0%	$ -	100%	$ 507,141
SD079	EPL to CCR	980,161	0%	-	100%	980,161
SD080	EPL to CCR	1,067,402	0%	-	100%	1,067,402
SD081	CCR east to Mill CK wetlands	614,446	0%	-	100%	614,446
SD082	CCR east to Mill CK wetlands	1,237,213	0%	-	100%	1,237,213
SD083	Market w/o EPL	286,921	0%	-	100%	286,921
SD084	Market e/o EPL	215,834	0%	-	100%	215,834
SD085	Main St n/o Legacy Park	493,020	0%	-	100%	493,020
SD086	Legacy e/o Main St	218,501	0%	-	100%	218,501
SD087	Legacy to EPL	226,497	0%	-	100%	226,497
SD088	Legacy to EPL	360,608	0%	-	100%	360,608
SD089	Legacy to EPL	365,723	0%	-	100%	365,723
SD091	CCR e/o Main	482,742	0%	-	100%	482,742
SD092	CCR e/o Main	314,119	0%	-	100%	314,119
SD093	CCR e/o mainline	654,844	0%	-	100%	654,844
	Trash Capture Devices	350,000	0%	-	100%	350,000
Subtotal - Line F		$ 8,375,172		$ -		$ 8,375,172

Source: City of Chino.

Table 6.4: Planned Storm Drain Facilities (The Preserve) Continued

Reach	Project Description	Cost	Allocation to General City Area		Allocation to The Preserve Area	
SD-106 Line G						
SD094	Market St e/o WPL	$ 493,020	0%	$ -	100%	$ 493,020
SD095	WPL - Legacy to Market	374,509	0%	-	100%	374,509
SD096	WPL - Legacy to Market	1,423,263	0%	-	100%	1,423,263
SD097	WPL s/o Legacy	336,078	0%	-	100%	336,078
SD098	Westgate - WPL to CCR	446,566	0%	-	100%	446,566
SD099	Westgate - WPL to CCR	1,591,816	0%	-	100%	1,591,816
SD100	CCR - Westgate to Mill Ck	386,293	0%	-	100%	386,293
SD101	CCR - Westgate to Mill Ck	2,636,948	0%	-	100%	2,636,948
SD102	Cucamonga - CCR to outlet	4,189,995	0%	-	100%	4,189,995
SD103	Legacy Park e/o Mill Ck	364,128	0%	-	100%	364,128
SD104	Mill Ck n/o Legacy Park	56,244	0%	-	100%	56,244
SD105	Mill Ck - Legacy Park to CCR	625,859	0%	-	100%	625,859
SD106	Mill Ck - Legacy Park to CCR	774,428	0%	-	100%	774,428
	Trash Capture Devices	350,000	0%	-	100%	350,000
Subtotal - Line G		$ 14,049,147		$ -		$ 14,049,147
SD-107 Line H						
SD005	Basin to Mayhew	$ 874,115	0%	$ -	100%	$ 874,115
SD006	Mayhew - Brickmore no. Xxx'	2,070,338	0%	-	100%	2,070,338
SD007	Mayhew - Bickmore so. Xxx'	1,495,553	0%	-	100%	1,495,553
SD008	Mayhew - Pine Ave no. xxx'	2,903,876	0%	-	100%	2,903,876
SD009	Pine Ave e/o Mayhew	2,300,478	0%	-	100%	2,300,478
SD011	Kimball east of Mayhew	522,053	0%	-	100%	522,053
SD012	Kimball west of Mayhew	504,419	0%	-	100%	504,419
SD013	Mayhew - Kimball so. Xxx'	97,983	0%	-	100%	97,983
SD014	Mayhew - Kimball so. Xxx'	426,697	0%	-	100%	426,697
SD015	Bickmore - e/o Mayhew	1,377,743	0%	-	100%	1,377,743
SD016	Pine Ave e/o Mayhew	689,939	0%	-	100%	689,939
	Trash Capture Devices	350,000	0%	-	100%	350,000
Subtotal - Line H		$ 13,613,194		$ -		$ 13,613,194
SD-108 Line I						
SD001	Merrill Avenue to Kimball	$ 31,381,931				
SD002	Kimball Avenue to Bickmore	16,051,677				
SD003	Bickmore Avenue to Pine	17,254,050				
SD004	Pine Avenue to Prado Lake	12,745,152				
	Trash Capture Devices	350,000				
Subtotal - SD-108[1]		$ 77,782,811	0%	$ -	8%	$ 6,000,000
SD-109 Line J						
SD033	Culvert across Pine Ave	$ 1,150,875	0%	$ -	100%	$ 1,150,875
Merrill Ave (New)						
SD141	Merrill w/o Grove	$ 127,201	0%	$ -	100%	$ 127,201
SD142	Merrill e/o Grove	756,841	0%	-	100%	756,841
Subtotal - Merrill Ave		$ 884,042		$ -		$ 884,042
Developer Balance Remaining		$ 6,155,186	0%	$ -	100%	$ 6,155,186
Total - Storm Drain Facility Projects		$ 135,855,384		$ -		$ 64,072,573

[1] Developer contribution for Line I totals $6,000,000 across all reaches.

Source: City of Chino.

Cost per Equivalent Dwelling Unit

The planned facilities cost per EDU that drives the fee schedule is calculated by dividing the cost of the planned facilities from Table 6.3 by the projected increase in storm drain EDUs identified in Table 6.2 for the General City area and the Preserve, respectively. These costs per EDU drive the fee calculations.

Also listed **Table 6.5** are fees per impervious square foot. The cost per EDU is divided by the assumed impervious square feet per EDU to determine the fee per impervious square foot. This fee can be applied to land uses that aren't reflected in the fee schedule below based on the impervious square footage of the project.

Table 6.5: Cost per EDU

	Calculation	
General City Area		
Cost Allocated to New Development	*A*	$ 15,807,586
DIF Fund 255 (Citywide) - Existing Balance	*B*	1,255,526
Net Cost of Planned Facilities	*C = A - B*	$ 14,552,060
Growth in EDUs (2025 to 2045)	*D*	6,370
Cost per EDU	*E = C / D*	$ 2,284
Fee per Impervious Square Foot[1]		$ 0.57
The Preserve Area		
Cost Allocated to New Development	*A*	$ 64,072,573
DIF Fund 263 (Preserve) - Existing Balance	*B*	6,370,270
Net Cost of Planned Facilities	*C = A - B*	$ 57,702,303
Growth in EDUs (2025 to 2045)	*D*	10,752
Cost per EDU	*E = C / D*	$ 5,367
Fee per Impervious Square Foot[1]		$ 1.33

[1] Assumes 4,029 impervious sqaure feet per EDU, based on the assumptions in Table 6.1.

Sources: City of Chino; Tables 6.2, 6.3 and 6.4, Willdan Financial Services.

Use of Fee Revenue

The City can use storm drain facilities fee revenues for the construction or purchase of storm drain infrastructure that is part of the system of storm drains serving new development. A list of planned facilities is included in Table 6.3 and Table 6.4.

Fee Schedule

The maximum justified fee for storm drain facilities is shown in **Table 6.6**. The City can adopt any fee up to this amount. The cost per EDU from Table 6.5 is converted to a fee per unit of new development based on the EDU factors shown in Table 6.1. The fee per average sized dwelling

unit is converted into a fee per square foot by dividing the fee per dwelling unit by the assumed average square footage of a dwelling unit, by type of unit.

Table 6.6: Storm Drain Facilities Impact Fee Schedule

	A	B	C = A x B	D	E = C / D
	Cost Per EDU	EDU Factor	Base Fee[1]	Sq. Ft. per Unit[2]	Fee per Sq. Ft.
General City Area					
Residential					
Single Family	$ 2,284	1.00	$ 2,284	3,320	$ 0.69
Multifamily	2,284	0.67	1,530	1,400	1.09
Commercial Lodging - per room					
Per room	$ 2,284	0.13	$ 297	N/A	N/A
Nonresidential - per 1,000 Sq. Ft.					
Commercial/Retail	$ 2,284	0.81	$ 1,850	1,000	$ 1.85
Office/Business Park	2,284	0.93	2,124	1,000	2.12
Industrial	2,284	0.61	1,393	1,000	1.39
The Preserve Area					
Residential					
Single Family	$ 5,367	1.00	$ 5,367	3,320	$ 1.62
Multifamily	5,367	0.67	3,596	1,400	2.57
Commercial Lodging - per room					
Per room	$ 5,367	0.13	$ 698	N/A	N/A
Nonresidential - per 1,000 Sq. Ft.					
Commercial/Retail	$ 5,367	0.81	$ 4,347	1,000	$ 4.35
Office/Business Park	5,367	0.93	4,991	1,000	4.99
Industrial	5,367	0.61	3,274	1,000	3.27

[1] Fee per average sized dwelling unit, per commercial lodging room, or per 1,000 square feet of nonresidential building space.

[2] Assumes an average of 3,320 square feet per single family dwelling unit and 1,400 square feet per multifamily dwelling unit in the City of Chino based on an analysis of future residential projects in the City.

Sources: Tables 6.1, 6.2 and 6.4.

7. Water System Facilities

This chapter details an analysis of the need for water system facilities to accommodate growth within the City of Chino. The essential nexus for this facility category is between the demand for water facilities from the projected increase water flow and the additional water infrastructure needed to provide water service to new development. The fees are roughly proportional to demand because they ensure that new development will pay no more than its proportionate share of the identified planned facilities needed to serve the City through the planning horizon, and the fees are scaled based on the amount of water flow generated by residential and nonresidential land uses.

Water Demand

Estimates of new development and its consequent increased water demand provide the basis for calculating the water facilities fee. The need for water facilities improvements is based on the water demand placed on the system by development. A typical measure of demand is a flow generation rate, expressed as the number of gallons per day generated by a specific type of land use. Flow generation rates are a reasonable measure of demand on the City's system of water improvements because they represent the average rate of demand that will be placed on the system per land use designation.

Table 7.1 shows the calculation of equivalent dwelling unit (EDU) demand factors based on flow generation by land use category. The flow generation estimates based on data from the City's 2022 Water Master Plan Update. EDU factors express water flow from each land use in terms of the flow generated by a residential dwelling unit, including fire flow needs. Use of EDU factors to estimate demand and allocate fees ensures that the fees are roughly proportional to the water demand generated by each unit of new development.

Table 7.1: Water Demand by Land Use

Land Use Type	Flow Generation[1]	KSF per acre[2]	Average Flow Generation per DU or 1,000 Sq. Ft. [1]	Equivalent Dwelling Unit (EDU)
Residential Dwelling Unit				
Single Family Unit			580.00	1.00
Multifamily Unit			250.00	0.43
Commercial Lodging - per room				
Lodging			125.00	0.22
Nonresidential				
Commercial	7,620	11.02	522.50	0.90
Office	8,710	9.76	570.00	0.98
Industrial	7,840	15.18	170.00	0.29

[1] Gallons per day per residential dwelling unit, per commercial lodging room, or per 1,000 square feet of nonresidential floor space.

Sources: City of Chino Water Master Plan Update, January, 2022, Tables 2-1, 2-2 and 2-3; Willdan Financial Services.

EDU Generation by New Development

Table 7.2 shows the estimated EDU generation from new development through 2045 for the General City area and for the Preserve. New development will generate approximately 4,371 new EDUs in the General City area, representing 9.7 percent of total water demand in 2045. New development will comprise 51.3% of total water demand in the Preserve by 2045.

Table 7.2: EDU Generation by New Development

Land Use	EDU Factor	2025 Units or 1,000 SF	2025 EDUs	Growth - 2025 to 2045 Units or 1,000 SF	Growth - 2025 to 2045 EDUs	Total - 2045 Units or 1,000 SF	Total - 2045 EDUs
General City Area							
Residential - per Dwelling Unit							
Single Family	1.00	16,821	16,821	10	10	16,831	16,831
Multifamily	0.43	5,771	2,482	4,867	2,092	10,638	4,574
Subtotal		22,592	19,303	4,877	2,102	27,469	21,405
Commercial Lodging - per room							
Lodging	0.22	399	88	-	-	399	88
Nonresidential - per 1,000 Sq. Ft.							
Commercial	0.90	8,644	7,780	885	797	9,530	8,577
Office	0.98	6,113	5,991	629	617	6,743	6,608
Industrial	0.29	25,453	7,381	2,945	855	28,399	8,236
Subtotal		40,211	21,152	4,460	2,269	44,671	23,421
Total - General City Area			40,543		4,371		44,914
			90.3%		9.7%		100%
The Preserve Area							
Residential - per Dwelling Unit							
Single Family	1.00	5,068	5,068	2,765	2,765	7,833	7,833
Multifamily	0.43	1,228	528	2,664	1,146	3,892	1,674
Subtotal		6,296	5,596	5,429	3,911	11,725	9,507
Commercial Lodging - per room							
Lodging	0.22	-	-	428	94	428	94
Nonresidential - per 1,000 Sq. Ft.							
Commercial	0.90	754	678	765	689	1,519	1,367
Office	0.98	568	557	971	952	1,539	1,509
Industrial	0.29	2,140	621	7,576	2,197	9,716	2,818
Subtotal		3,461	1,856	9,313	3,838	12,774	5,694
Total - The Preserve Area			7,452		7,843		15,295
			48.7%		51.3%		100%

Sources: Tables 2.1, 2.3 and 7.1.

Facility Needs and Costs

Table 7.3 below, identifies the planned water facilities to be funded by the fee. Projects were sourced from the City's prior nexus study, which have been adjusted for inflation for use in this analysis, and in the City's 2022 Water Master Plan. The costs for projects in the Preserve have been adjusted to current conditions by Proactive Engineering Consultants for use in this analysis. Any funding that has been identified for these projects is netted out of the total cost. The allocation of responsibility to the General City Area and to the Preserve are consistent with the prior nexus study.

Table 7.3: Planned Water Facilities

Project No.	Project Title	Total Project Cost	Allocation to Other Funding Sources		Allocation to General City Area		Allocation to The Preserve Area	
WT-006	12" & Greater Potable Water Lines - College Park Area[1]	$ 3,179,309	0%	$ -	100.0%	$ 3,179,309	0.0%	$ -
WT-007	College Park 8" Recycled Water Lines[1]	1,001,258	0%	-	100.0%	1,001,258	0.0%	-
WT-008	College Park 12" Recycled Water Lines[1]	1,140,749	100%	1,140,749	0.0%	-	0.0%	-
WT-009	Pine 12" Recycled Line, Euclid/El Prado[1]	898,213	0%	-	100.0%	898,213	0.0%	-
WT-010	Schaefer - Reservoir #7 to Euclid[1]	2,673,630	0%	-	100.0%	2,673,630	0.0%	-
WT-101	Well No. 16	250,000	0%	-	0.0%	-	100.0%	250,000
WT-101	Well No. 17 (not equipped, City to develop)	2,200,000	0%	-	0.0%	-	100.0%	2,200,000
WT-101	Well No. 20 (does not exist) - Bon View	2,900,000	0%	-	0.0%	-	100.0%	2,900,000
WT-105	24" Zone 890 Pipeline	3,000,000	0%	-	0.0%	-	100.0%	3,000,000
WT-106	18" Potable Line - Chino - Mountain/Bon View	1,341,250	0%	-	0.0%	-	100.0%	1,341,250
WT-107	18" Potable Line - Bon View - Chino/Schaefer	382,800	0%	-	0.0%	-	100.0%	382,800
WT-108	8" Trans./Dist. Pipeline Potable/Recycled	3,810,950	0%	-	0.0%	-	100.0%	3,810,950
WT-109	12" Transmission/Distribution Pipeline Potable and Recylced	9,380,972	0%	-	0.0%	-	100.0%	9,380,972
WT-110	16" & 18" Transmission/Distribution Pipeline Potable and Recy	1,071,675	0%	-	0.0%	-	100.0%	1,071,675
WT-112	Land Acquisition Within the Preserve	1,500,000	0%	-	0.0%	-	100.0%	1,500,000
WT-113	Well Connection Pipelines (City Project)	3,085,010	0%	-	0.0%	-	100.0%	3,085,010
WT-114	Well Pumping Back-up Power	882,310	0%	-	0.0%	-	100.0%	882,310
WT-121	Mayhew Avenue - Pine / Bickmore (RW061)	330,000	0%	-	0.0%	-	100.0%	330,000
WT-122	NS Chino Corona - Pine / Legacy Park (RW062)	748,000	0%	-	0.0%	-	100.0%	748,000
WT-123	NS Chino Corona - Legacy Park / EW Chino Corona (RW070)	502,425	0%	-	0.0%	-	100.0%	502,425
WT-124	EW Chino Corona - Main / Legacy Park (RW082)	716,100	0%	-	0.0%	-	100.0%	716,100
WT-126	EW Chino Corona - Westgate / Main (RW085)	271,425	0%	-	0.0%	-	100.0%	271,425
WT-130	EW Chino Corona - NS Chino Corona / Westgate (RW100)	296,450	0%	-	0.0%	-	100.0%	296,450
NEW	Reservoir at Eastside Site[2]	14,184,000	48.7%	6,907,608	0.0%	-	51.3%	7,276,392
	Developer Balance Remaining	5,643,358	0%	-	72.8%	4,106,072	27.2%	1,537,286
		$ 61,389,884		$ 8,048,357		$ 11,858,482		$ 41,483,045

[1] Costs from 2017 study adjusted for inflation into current dollars using the Engineering News Record's Construction Cost Index.
[2] Identified in 2022 City of Chino Water Master Plan Update.

Sources: Proactive Engineering Consultants, April 24, 2026; 022 City of Chino Water Master Plan Update; Willdan Financial Services.

Cost per EDU

The cost of planned facilities allocated to new development net of existing fund balances, is divided by the total growth in EDUs to determine a cost per EDU, which drives planned facilities component of the water system facilities fee for each area, respectively. **Table 7.4** displays these calculations.

Table 7.4: Cost per EDU

General City Area		
Cost Allocated to New Development	*A*	$ 11,858,482
DIF Fund 253 (Citywide) - Existing Balance	*B*	(312,253)
Net Cost of Planned Facilities	*C = A - B*	$ 12,170,735
Growth in EDUs (2025 to 2045)	*D*	4,371
Cost per EDU	*E = C / D*	$ 2,784
The Preserve Area		
Cost Allocated to New Development	*A*	$ 41,483,045
DIF Fund 261 (Preserve) - Existing Balance	*B*	1,814,883
Net Cost of Planned Facilities	*C = A - B*	$ 39,668,162
Growth in EDUs (2025 to 2045)	*D*	7,843
Cost per EDU	*E = C / D*	$ 5,058

Sources: City of Chino; Willdan Financial Services, Tables 7.2 and 7.3.

Fee Schedule

The maximum justified fee for water system facilities is shown in **Table 7.5.** The City can adopt any fee up to this amount. The cost per EDU is converted to a fee per unit of new development based on the EDU factors shown in Table 7.1. The fee per average sized dwelling unit is converted into a fee per square foot by dividing the fee per dwelling unit by the assumed average square footage of a dwelling unit, by type of unit.

Table 7.5: Maximum Justified Water Facilities Fee Schedule

Land Use Type	A Cost Per EDU	B EDU Factor	C = A x B Base Fee[1]	D Sq. Ft. per Unit[2]	E = C / D Fee per Sq. Ft.
General City Area					
Residential - per Dwelling Unit					
Single Family	$ 2,784	1.00	$ 2,784	3,320	$ 0.84
Multifamily	2,784	0.43	1,197	1,400	0.86
Commercial Lodging - per room					
Lodging	$ 2,784	0.22	$ 612	N/A	N/A
Nonresidential - per 1,000 Sq. Ft.					
Commercial/Retail	$ 2,784	0.90	$ 2,506	1,000	$ 2.51
Office/Business Park	2,784	0.98	2,728	1,000	2.73
Industrial	2,784	0.29	807	1,000	0.81
The Preserve Area					
Residential - per Dwelling Unit					
Single Family	$ 5,058	1.00	$ 5,058	3,320	$ 1.52
Multifamily	5,058	0.43	2,175	1,400	1.55
Commercial Lodging - per room					
Lodging	$ 5,058	0.22	$ 1,113	N/A	N/A
Nonresidential - per 1,000 Sq. Ft.					
Commercial/Retail	$ 5,058	0.90	$ 4,552	1,000	$ 4.55
Office/Business Park	5,058	0.98	4,957	1,000	4.96
Industrial	5,058	0.29	1,467	1,000	1.47

[1] Fee per average sized dwelling unit, per commercial lodging room, or per 1,000 square feet of nonresidential building space.

[2] Assumes an average of 3,320 square feet per single family dwelling unit and 1,400 square feet per multifamily dwelling unit in the City of Chino based on an analysis of future residential projects in the

Sources: Tables 7.1 and 7.4.

8. Sewer Facilities

This chapter details an analysis of the need for sewer facilities to accommodate growth within the City of Chino. The *essential nexus* for this facility category is between the demand for sewer facilities from the projected increase in sewer flow and the additional sewer facilities needed to meet those demands. The fees are roughly proportional to demand because they ensure that new development will pay no more than its proportionate share of the identified planned facilities needed to serve the City through the planning horizon, and the fees are scaled based on the amount of wastewater flow generated by residential and nonresidential land uses.

Sewer Demand

Estimates of new development and its consequent increased sewer demand provide the basis for calculating the sewer facilities fee. The need for sewer facilities improvements is based on the sewer demand placed on the system by development. A typical measure of demand is a flow generation rate, expressed as the number of gallons per day generated by a specific type of land use. Flow generation rates are a reasonable measure of demand on the City's system of sewer improvements because they represent the average rate of demand that will be placed on the system per land use designation.

Table 8.1 shows the calculation of equivalent dwelling unit (EDU) demand factors based on flow generation by land use category. The flow generation estimates are derived from data from the City's 2022 Sewer Master Plan. EDU factors express water flow from each land use in terms of the flow generated by a single family dwelling unit. Use of EDU factors to estimate demand and allocate fees ensures that the fees are roughly proportional to the sewer demand generated by each unit of new development.

Table 8.1: Sewer Demand by Land Use

Land Use Type	Flow Generation[1]	KSF per acre[2]	Average Flow Generation per DU, Room or 1,000 Sq. Ft.	Equivalent Dwelling Unit (EDU)
Residential - per dwelling unit				
Single Family			224.97	1.00
Multifamily			183.06	0.81
Commercial Lodging - per room			110.00	0.49
Nonresidential - per 1,000 Sq. Ft.				
Commercial	1,500	11.02	136.12	0.61
Office	1,500	9.76	153.69	0.68
Industrial	1,350	15.18	88.93	0.40

[1] Gallons per acre per day.

[2] 1,000 square feet of building space per acre.

Sources: City of Chino Sewer Master Plan, 2022, Tables 2.7 and 3.2; City of Chino Adopted General Plan, 2025; Development Impact Fee Nexus and Calculation Report for the City of Chino, 2017, amended 2022, table 8-1.

EDU Generation by New Development

Table 8.2 shows the estimated EDU generation from new development through 2045 for the General City area and for the Preserve. New development will generate approximately 6,098 new EDUs in the General City area, representing 12.9 percent of total sewer demand in 2045. New development will comprise 54.5% of total sewer demand in the Preserve by 2045.

Table 8.2: Sewer Facilities Equivalent Dwelling Units

		2025		Growth - 2025 to 2045		Total - 2045	
Land Use Type	EDU Factor	Units or 1,000 SF	EDUs	Units / 1,000 SF	EDUs	Units or 1,000 SF	EDUs
General City Area							
Residential - per Dwelling Unit							
Single Family	1.00	16,821	16,821	10	10	16,831	16,831
Multifamily	0.81	5,771	4,675	4,867	3,942	10,638	8,617
Subtotal		22,592	21,496	4,877	3,952	27,469	25,448
Commercial Lodging - per room							
Lodging	0.49	399	196	-	-	399	196
Nonresidential - per 1,000 Sq. Ft.							
Commercial	0.61	8,644	5,273	885	540	9,530	5,813
Office	0.68	6,113	4,157	629	428	6,743	4,585
Industrial	0.40	25,453	10,181	2,945	1,178	28,399	11,359
Subtotal		40,211	19,611	4,460	2,146	44,671	21,757
Total - General City Area			41,303		6,098		47,401
			87.1%		12.9%		100%
The Preserve Area							
Residential - per Dwelling Unit							
Single Family	1.00	5,068	5,068	2,765	2,765	7,833	7,833
Multifamily	0.81	1,228	995	2,664	2,158	3,892	3,153
Subtotal		6,296	6,063	5,429	4,923	11,725	10,986
Commercial Lodging - per room							
Lodging	0.49	-	-	428	210	428	210
Nonresidential - per 1,000 Sq. Ft.							
Commercial	0.61	754	460	765	466	1,519	926
Office	0.68	568	386	971	661	1,539	1,047
Industrial	0.40	2,140	856	7,576	3,030	9,716	3,886
Subtotal		3,461	1,702	9,313	4,157	12,774	5,859
Total - The Preserve Area			7,765		9,290		17,055
			45.5%		54.5%		100%

Sources: Tables 2.2, 2.3 and 8.1.

Facility Needs and Costs

Table 8.3 identifies the planned sewer facilities to be funded by the fee. The facilities were identified in the City's prior nexus study, and have been supplemented with two capacity enhancing projects from the City's Sewer Master Plan. The costs for projects from the prior study have been adjusted to current conditions by Proactive Engineering Consultants for use in this analysis. The allocation of responsibility to the General City Area and to the Preserve are consistent with the prior nexus study.

Table 8.3: Sewer Facilities Allocation to New Development

Project Code	Description	Cost	Allocation to Other Funding Sources		Allocation to General City Area		Allocation to The Preserve Area	
SW-000	Preserve Less Than 12"	$ 1,414,698	0%	-	0%	-	100%	1,414,698
SW-001	General City 12" And Greater Sewer Mains	2,360,354	0%	-	100%	2,360,354	0%	-
SW-006	Miscellaneous Up-Sizing's	1,400,000	0%	-	100%	1,400,000	0%	-
PCAP-7	Oaks Ave (North of Edison Ave) Pipeline Upsizing[1]	522,000	0%	-	100%	522,000	0%	-
PCAP-8	Chino Corona Rd Pipeline Upsizing[1]	1,422,000	0%	-	100%	1,422,000	0%	-
SW-104	Pine Avenue - West Preserve Loop/Main (Reach Number 8)	519,530	0%	-	0%	-	100%	519,530
SW-105	Pine Avenue - Main/East Preserve Loop (Reach Number 9)	381,398	0%	-	0%	-	100%	381,398
SW-106	Pine Avenue- East Preserve/Loop East (Reach Number 10)	371,415	0%	-	0%	-	100%	371,415
SW-107	West of Hellman - Pine/Bickmore (Reach Number 11)	489,720	0%	-	0%	-	100%	489,720
SW-108	Main Street - Bickmore/Pine (Reach Number 15)	264,880	0%	-	0%	-	100%	264,880
SW-110	Bickmore-Main/East Preserve Loop (Reach Number 17)	135,163	0%	-	0%	-	100%	135,163
SW-111	East Preserve Loop-Bickmore/Pine (Reach Number 18)	184,113	0%	-	0%	-	100%	184,113
SW-114	NS Chino-Corona - Pine/Legacy (Reach Number 23)	482,556	0%	-	0%	-	100%	482,556
SW-116	Legacy Park - NS Chino-Corona/WPL (Reach Number 25)	136,978	0%	-	0%	-	100%	136,978
SW-122	Chino-Corona E/W - Main St to west	325,875	0%	-	0%	-	100%	325,875
SW-123	SW Extension of West Preserve Loop (Reach Number 32)	345,043	0%	-	0%	-	100%	345,043
SW-128	West Preserve Loop - 1,330' NO Legacy Park/Legacy Park (37)	526,983	0%	-	0%	-	100%	526,983
SW-133	Mayhew - Bickmore/1,636' NO Bickmore (Reach Number 42)	670,711	0%	-	0%	-	100%	670,711
SW-134	Bickmore - Mayhew/ 2,2350' EO Mayhew (Reach Number 43)	325,422	0%	-	0%	-	100%	325,422
SW-135	Bickmore - Euclid/Mayhew (Reach Number 44	955,350	0%	-	0%	-	100%	955,350
SW-137	Un-Named EW Street - Euclid/Mayhew (Reach Number 46)	479,325	0%	-	0%	-	100%	479,325
	Developer Balance Remaining	15,367,074	0%	-	0%	-	100%	15,367,074
	Total - Sewage System Facility Projects	$29,080,588		$ -		$5,704,354		$23,376,234

[1] Identified in 2022 City of Chino Sewer Master Plan Update.

Source: Proactive Engineering Consultants, April 24, 2026; City of Chino Sewer Master Plan Update, 2022; Willdan Financial Services.

Cost per EDU

The cost of planned facilities allocated to new development, net of available fund balances, is divided by the total growth in EDUs to determine a cost per EDU for each area, respectively. **Table 8.4** displays this calculation.

Table 8.4: Cost per EDU

General City Area		
Cost Allocated to New Development	*A*	$ 5,704,354
DIF Fund 254 (Citywide) - Existing Balance	*B*	4,503,458
Net Cost of Planned Facilities	*C = A - B*	$ 1,200,896
Growth in EDUs (2025 to 2045)	*D*	6,098
Cost per EDU	*E = C / D*	$ 197
The Preserve Area		
Cost Allocated to New Development	*A*	$ 23,376,234
DIF Fund 262 (Preserve) - Existing Balance	*B*	1,102,415
Net Cost of Planned Facilities	*C = A - B*	$ 22,273,819
Growth in EDUs (2025 to 2045)	*D*	9,290
Cost per EDU	*E = C / D*	$ 2,398

Sources: City of Chino; Willdan Financial Services, Tables 8.2 and 8.3.

Fee Schedule

The maximum justified fee for sewer facilities is shown in **Table 8.5.** The cost per EDU is converted to a fee per unit of new development based on the EDU factors shown in Table 8.1. The fee per average sized dwelling unit is converted into a fee per square foot by dividing the fee per dwelling unit by the assumed average square footage of a dwelling unit, by type of unit.

Table 8.5: Maximum Justified Sewer Facilities Fee Schedule

Land Use Type	A Cost Per EDU	B EDU Factor	C = A x B Base Fee[1]	D Sq. Ft. per Unit[2]	E = C / D Fee per Sq. Ft.
General City Area					
Residential - per Dwelling Unit					
Single Family	$ 197	1.00	$ 197	3,320	$ 0.06
Multifamily	197	0.81	160	1,400	0.11
Commercial Lodging - per room					
Lodging	$ 197	0.49	$ 97	N/A	N/A
Nonresidential - per 1,000 Sq. Ft.					
Commercial/Retail	$ 197	0.61	$ 120	1,000	$ 0.12
Office/Business Park	197	0.68	134	1,000	0.13
Industrial	197	0.40	79	1,000	0.08
The Preserve Area					
Residential - per Dwelling Unit					
Single Family	$ 2,398	1.00	$ 2,398	3,320	$ 0.72
Multifamily	2,398	0.81	1,942	1,400	1.39
Commercial Lodging - per room					
Lodging	$ 2,398	0.49	$ 1,175	N/A	N/A
Nonresidential - per 1,000 Sq. Ft.					
Commercial/Retail	$ 2,398	0.61	$ 1,463	1,000	$ 1.46
Office/Business Park	2,398	0.68	1,631	1,000	1.63
Industrial	2,398	0.40	959	1,000	0.96

[1] Fee per average sized dwelling unit, per commercial lodging room, or per 1,000 square feet of nonresidential building space.

[2] Assumes an average of 3,320 square feet per single family dwelling unit and 1,400 square feet per multifamily dwelling unit in the City of Chino based on an analysis of future residential projects in the City.

Sources: Tables 8.1 and 8.4.

9. General Facilities

The purpose of the general facilities impact fee is to fund the general city facilities needed to serve new development. A maximum justified fee is presented based on the system standard of general facilities per capita. The *essential nexus* for this facility category is between the demand for new general facilities from the projected increase in service population and the additional general facilities needed to meet those service demands. The fees are roughly proportional to demand because they ensure that new development will pay no more than its proportionate share of the identified planned facilities needed to serve the City through the planning horizon, and the fees are scaled based on the number of residents occupying a new dwelling unit, or the number of jobs associated with nonresidential land uses.

Service Population

General facilities serve both residents and businesses. Therefore, demand for services and associated facilities are based on the City's service population including residents and workers.

Table 9.1 shows the existing and future Citywide projected service population for general facilities. While specific data is not available to estimate the actual ratio of demand per resident to demand by businesses (per worker) for this service, it is reasonable to assume that demand for these services is less for one employee compared to one resident, because nonresidential buildings are typically occupied less intensively than dwelling units. This study makes use of a worker weighting factor to estimate different levels of demand between residential and nonresidential land uses. The 0.31-weighting factor for workers is based on a 40-hour workweek divided by the total number of non-work hours in a week (128) and reflects the degree to which non-residential development are typically occupied less intensively than dwelling units and consequently create a lesser demand for facilities.

Table 9.1: General Facilities Service Population

Land Use Type	A Persons	B Weighting Factor[1]	A x B = C Service Population
Citywide			
Residents			
Existing (2025)	88,714	1.00	88,714
New Development	29,721	1.00	29,721
Total (2045)	118,435		118,435
Workers[1]			
Existing (2025)	53,636	0.31	16,627
New Development	8,983	0.31	2,785
Total (2045)	62,619		19,412
Combined Residents and Weighted Workers			
Existing (2025)			105,341
New Development			32,506
Total (2045)			137,847

[1] Workers are weighted at 0.31 of residents based on a 40 hour work week out of a possible 128 non-work hours in a week (40/128 = 0.31).

Sources: Table 2.1, Willdan Financial Services.

Existing Inventory

Table 9.2 summarizes the City's current inventory of general facilities. The quantities and replacement cost of owned buildings come from the City's insured property schedule. The unit cost for land is based on an appraisal that the City commissioned in 2025. The appraisal identified differing land values for properties in the General City area and the Preserve. The General City are cost is used in this chapter, because the existing facilities are located in the General City area. In total, the City owns $60 million worth of general facilities.

Table 9.2: Existing General Facilities Inventory

	Address	Quantity	Units	Unit Cost[1]	Total Replacement Cost[1]
Land					
City Hall	13220 Central Ave	6.06	acres	$ 840,000	$ 5,090,400
City Yard	5050 Schaefer Ave	5.23	acres	840,000	4,393,200
City Yard	4th St. and Carter S	2.00	acres	840,000	1,680,000
Subtotal		13.29	acres		$ 11,163,600
Buildings					
City Hall	13220 Central Ave.	39,493	sq. ft.	$ 586	$ 23,161,950
Chino Court House (former)	13260 Central Ave.	45,663	sq. ft.	422	19,254,900
Transit Center	83 6th St	635	sq. ft.	161	102,165
Restroom/Storage Building	83 6th St	306	sq. ft.	384	117,390
Public Works Services Center	5050 Schaefer Ave.	3,904	sq. ft.	338	1,318,590
Fleet Building	5050 Schaefer Ave.	3,250	sq. ft.	333	1,083,705
Maintenance Warehouse	5050 Schaefer Ave.	10,100	sq. ft.	282	2,846,235
Shade Shelter #1	5050 Schaefer Ave.	2,800	sq. ft.	112	314,055
Debris Bin Cover	5050 Schaefer Ave.	4,900	sq. ft.	120	590,100
Subtotal		111,051	sq. ft.		$ 48,789,090
Total					$ 59,952,690

[1] Total replacement cost and unit cost for buildings includes building and contents.

Sources: City of Chino; Insured Property Schedule Statement of Value; Willdan Financial Services.

Planned Facilities

Table 9.3 summarizes the planned general facilities needed to serve the City. A new public works yard is estimated to cost $65 million.

Table 9.3: Planned General Facilities

Project	Quantity	Units	Unit Cost	Total Cost
Public Work Yards	60,000	Sq. Ft.	$ 1,083	$ 65,000,000

Source: City of Chino.

Cost Allocation

Existing Level of Service

Table 9.4 expresses the City's current general facilities level of service in terms of the existing cost per capita. This cost per capita is not used in the fee calculation, rather it is shown here for informational purposes only.

Table 9.4: General Facilities Existing Standard

Value of Existing Facilities	$ 59,952,690
DIF Fund 233 - Existing Balance	3,663,129
Net Value of Existing Facilities	$ 63,615,819
Existing Service Population	105,341
Cost per Capita	$ 604
Facility Standard per Resident	$ 604
Facility Standard per Worker[1]	187

[1] Based on a weighting factor of 0.31.

Sources: Tables 9.1 and 9.2.

Future Level of Service

Table 9.5 shows new development's projected per capita investment in general facilities at the planning horizon. This level of service drives the fee calculation. This value is calculated by dividing cost of existing and planned facilities by the service population at the planning horizon. The value per capita is multiplied by the worker weighting factor of 0.31 to determine the cost per worker.

Table 9.5: General Facilities System Standard

Value of Existing Facilities	$ 59,952,690
Cost of Planned Facilities	65,000,000
Total System Value (2045)	$ 124,952,690
Future Service Population (2045)	137,847
Cost per Capita	$ 906
Cost Allocation per Resident	$ 906
Cost Allocation per Worker[1]	281

[1] Based on a weighting factor of 0.31.

Sources: Tables 9.1, 9.2 and 9.3.

Use of Fee Revenue

The City can use general facilities revenue for the construction or purchase of buildings, land, and equipment that are part of the system of general facilities serving new development. A list of planned facilities is included in Table 9.3.

Fee Revenue Projection

The City plans to use general facilities fee revenue to construct improvements and acquire capital facilities and equipment to add to the system of general facilities to serve new development. The City plans to acquire the facilities in Table 9.3.

Table 9.6 details a projection of fee revenue, based on the service population growth increment identified in Table 9.1. The City should program fee revenue to specific projects annually through its CIP and budget process. After accounting for the projected future impact fee revenue and existing fund balances, $31.7 million in non-fee funding will be needed to fully fund the facilities.

The City will need to use alternative funding sources to fund existing development's share of the studies. Potential sources of revenue include but are not limited to existing or new general fund revenues, existing or new taxes, and grants.

Table 9.6: Revenue Projection

Cost per Capita	$	906
Growth in Service Population (2025 to 2045)		32,506
Fee Revenue	$	29,450,563
Net Cost of Planned Facilities	$	65,000,000
Less Projected Fee Revenue		29,450,563
Less Existing Fund Balance		3,800,363
Non-Fee Revenue To Be Identified	$	31,749,074

Sources: Tables 9.1, 9.3 and 9.4.

Fee Schedule

Table 9.7 below, shows the maximum justified impact fees. The City can adopt any fee up to this amount. The cost per capita is converted to a fee per unit of new development based on dwelling unit and employment densities (persons per dwelling unit, employees per 1,000 square feet of nonresidential building space or employees per room of commercial lodging). The fee per average sized dwelling unit is converted into a fee per square foot by dividing the fee per dwelling unit by the assumed average square footage of a dwelling unit, by type of unit.

Table 9.7: Maximum Justified General Facilities Fee Schedule

Land Use	A Cost Per Capita	B Density	C = A x B Base Fee[1]	D Sq. Ft. per Unit[2]	E = C / D Fee per Sq. Ft.
Residential - per Dwelling Unit					
Single Family	$ 906	3.41	$ 3,089	3,320	$ 0.93
Multifamily	906	2.69	2,437	1,400	1.74
Commercial Lodging - per room					
Lodging	$ 906	2.69	$ 2,437	N/A	N/A
Nonresidential - per 1,000 Sq. Ft.					
Commercial/Retail	$ 281	2.09	$ 587	1,000	$ 0.59
Office/Business Park	281	2.28	641	1,000	0.64
Industrial	281	0.68	191	1,000	0.19

[1] Fee per average sized dwelling unit, per commercial lodging room, or per 1,000 square feet of nonresidential building space.

[2] Assumes an average of 3,320 square feet per single family dwelling unit and 1,400 square feet per multifamily dwelling unit in the City of Chino based on an analysis of future residential projects in the City.

Sources: Tables 2.4 and 9.5.

10. Park Facilities

The purpose of the park facilities impact fee is to fund the park facilities needed to serve new development. The maximum justified impact fee is presented based on the existing standard of park facilities per capita. Fee revenue would be used to expand the provision of parks to meet demand from future development. The *essential nexus* for this facility category is between the demand for City parks from the projected increase in residents and the additional parks needed to meet those service demands. The fees are roughly proportional to demand because they ensure that new development can maintain the City's existing ratio of park acres to residents, and the fees are scaled based on the number of residents occupying a new dwelling unit. A fee in-lieu of parkland dedication charged under the Quimby Act is also included in this chapter.

Service Population

Park and recreation facilities in Chino primarily serve residents. Therefore, demand for services and associated facilities is based on the City's residential population. **Table 10.1** shows the existing and future projected service population for park facilities.

Table 10.1: Park Facilities Service Population

	Residents
Census (2020)	91,403
Existing (2025)	88,714
New Development	29,721
Total (2045)	118,435

Sources: US Census; Willdan Financial Services, Tables 2.2 and 2.3.

Existing Parkland and Park Facilities Inventory

The City of Chino maintains several parks throughout the city. **Table 10.2** summarizes the City's existing parkland inventory in 2025. All facilities are owned by the City. In total, the inventory includes a total of 290.25 acres of City-owned parkland.

Table 10.2: Park Land Inventory

Description	Improved Acres	Unimproved Acres	Total Parkland Acres
General City Area			
City maintained			
7th Street Park	0.10	-	0.10
Aguiar Square	1.00	-	1.00
Ayala Park	140.00	-	140.00
Carolyn Owens Centennial Square	0.20	-	0.20
Central Park	2.00	-	2.00
Chino Community Building Park	1.00	-	1.00
Chino Community Garden	0.90	-	0.90
Chino Rancho Park	1.30	-	1.30
Cypress Trails Park	8.60	-	8.60
Heritage Park	10.00	-	10.00
Liberty Park	7.50	-	7.50
McLeod Park	3.50	-	3.50
Monte Vista Park	4.70	-	4.70
Mountain View Park	10.00	-	10.00
Riverside Park	0.25	-	0.25
Sebring Park	0.50	-	0.50
Shady Grove Park	5.50	-	5.50
Villa Park	10.00	-	10.00
Walnut Park	5.50	-	5.50
Subtotal City Maintained Parks	212.55	-	212.55
HOA maintained			
Classics Park	1.10	-	1.10
Constellation Park	5.00	-	5.00
Energy Park	0.70	-	0.70
Evergreen Park	0.30	-	0.30
Gallery Park	0.40	-	0.40
Inspiration Park	0.40	-	0.40
Lotus Park	0.70	-	0.70
Olympic Park	5.00	-	5.00
Stueve Family Park	7.00	-	7.00
Symphony Park	0.90	-	0.90
Subtotal - HOA Maintained Parks	21.50	-	21.50
Trails			
Equestrian trails	-	11.42	11.42
Multi-use trails	-	6.72	6.72
Subtotal Trails	-	18.14	18.14
Subtotal - General City Area Parks	234.05	18.14	252.19

Source: City of Chino Adopted General Plan, 2025, Table PRC-1.

Table 10.2: Park Land Inventory (Continued)

Description	Improved Acres	Unimproved Acres	Total Parkland Acres
The Preserve Area			
HOA maintained			
Discovery Park	3.00	-	3.00
Forest Park	3.00	-	3.00
Founders Park	8.00	-	8.00
Garden Park	3.00	-	3.00
Golden Tree Park	0.30	-	0.30
Harvest Park	0.70	-	0.70
Hidden Hollow Park	0.30	-	0.30
Meridian Park- North	7.00	-	7.00
Meridian Park- South	5.00	-	5.00
Meridian Park- West	1.25	-	1.25
Mulberry Park	0.30	-	0.30
Nature Retreat Park	6.00	-	6.00
Secret Garden Park	0.50	-	0.50
Subtotal - HOA Maintained Parks	38.35	-	38.35
Trails			
Equestrian trails	-	-	-
Multi-use trails	-	6.72	6.72
Subtotal - Trails	-	6.72	6.72
Subtotal - Preserve Area Parks	38.35	6.72	45.07
Total Park Land Inventory	272.40	24.85	297.25

Source: City of Chino Adopted General Plan, 2025, Table PRC-1.

Parkland and Park Facilities Unit Costs

Table 10.3 displays the unit costs necessary to develop parkland in Chino. The cost of acquiring a typical acre of parkland in the General City Area and in the Preserve, respectively, was identified in appraisal reports commissioned by the City in 2025. The cost to improve an acre of parkland with typical park amenities was estimated based on the average cost per acre across six local impact fee studies completed between 2019 and 2026. Costs were adjusted into 2026 dollars using the Engineering News Record's Construction Cost Index to yield an average cost per acre of $1.2 million for typical park improvements.

Table 10.3: Park Facilities Unit Costs

	Cost Per Acre
General City Area	
Standard Park Improvements	$ 1,165,300
Land Acquisition	840,000
Total Cost per Acre	$ 2,005,300
The Preserve	
Standard Park Improvements	$ 1,165,300
Land Acquisition	1,120,000
Total Cost per Acre	$ 2,285,300

Source: Appraisal Report, City of Chino Parks, Epic Appraisals, LLC, October 3, 2025; Willdan Financial Services.

Parkland and Park Facility Standards

Park facility standards establish a reasonable relationship between new development and the need for expanded parkland and park facilities. Information regarding the City's existing inventory of existing parks facilities was obtained from City staff.

The most common measure in calculating new development's demand for parks is the ratio of park acres per resident. In general, facility standards may be based on the Mitigation Fee Act (using a city's existing inventory of parkland and park facilities), or an adopted policy standard contained in a master facility plan or general plan. Facility standards may also be based on a land dedication standard established by the Quimby Act.[3] In this case, the City will use the Mitigation Fee Act to impose park impact fees for development not occurring in subdivisions and will use the Quimby Act for development occurring in subdivisions.

Mitigation Fee Act

The Mitigation Fee Act does not dictate use of a particular type or level of facility standard for public facilities fees. To comply with the findings required under the law, facility standards must not burden new development with any cost associated with facility deficiencies attributable to existing development.[4] In this case, the fees will be set to maintain the City's existing parkland standard of acres per 1,000 residents.

Quimby Act

The Quimby Act specifies that the dedication requirement must be a minimum of 3.0 acres and a maximum of 5.0 acres per 1,000 residents. A jurisdiction can require residential developers to dedicate above the three-acre minimum if the jurisdiction's existing park standard at the time it adopted its Quimby Act ordinance justifies the higher level (up to five acres per 1,000 residents). The standard used must also conform to the jurisdiction's adopted general or specific plan standards.

[3] *California Government Code* §66477.

[4] See the *Benefit* and *Burden* findings in *Background Report*.

The Quimby Act only applies to land subdivisions. The Quimby Act would not apply to residential development on future approved projects on single parcels, such as apartment complexes and other multifamily development.

The Quimby Act allows payment of a fee in lieu of land dedication. The fee is calculated to fund the acquisition of the same amount of land that would have been dedicated.

The Quimby Act allows use of in-lieu fee revenue for any park or recreation facility purpose. Allowable uses of this revenue include land acquisition, park improvements, and rehabilitation of existing parks.

City of Chino Parkland and Park Facilities Standards

Table 10.4 shows the existing standard for improved park acreage per 1,000 residents based on the type of parkland. Once accounting for impact fee fund balances, the City has an existing parkland standard of in excess of 3.0 acres per 1,000 residents, which is greater than the minimum Quimby standard of 3.0 acres per 1,000 residents. The impact fee analysis in this report will be based on maintaining a 3.0 acre per 1,000 resident standard as new development adds demand for parks in Chino. Fees in-lieu of land dedication for subdivisions are also calculated at the minimum *Quimby* standard of 3.0 acres of developed parkland per 1,000 residents.

Table 10.4: Park Standards

	Quimby Act[1]	Mitigation Fee Act (Improved Acres)[1]	Mitigation Fee Act (All Parkland Acres)[1]
Park Acreage	297.25	272.40	297.25
Fund Balance Equivalent	-	6.66	6.66
Total	297.25	279.06	303.91
Existing Service Population[1]	91,403	88,714	88,714
Existing Standard (Acres per 1,000 Residents)	3.25	3.15	3.43
Minimum Quimby Act Standard (Acres per 1,000 Residents)	3.00	3.00	3.00

[1] Quimby standard calculated as of the most recent Federal Census. Mitigation Fee Act standard calculated as of 2025.

Sources: Tables 10.1 and 10.2.

Facilities Needed to Accommodate New Development

Table 10.5 shows the park improvements needed to accommodate new development at the 3.0 acre per 1,000 resident standard. To achieve the standard by the planning horizon, new residential development must fund the improvement of 39.38 park acres in the General City and 49.78 park acres in the Preserve.

Table 10.5: Park Improvements to Accommodate New Development

	Calculation	General City	Preserve	Entire City
Park Improvements (Mitigation Fee Act)				
Facility Standard (acres/1,000 capita)	*A*	3.00	3.00	3.00
Growth in Service Population (2025 to 2045)	*B*	13,126	16,595	29,721
Facility Needs (acres)	*C = A x B/1000*	39.38	49.78	89.16
Average Cost per Acre	*D*	$ 1,165,300	$ 1,165,300	
Total	*E = C x D*	$45,889,514	$58,008,634	

Sources: Tables 10.1, 10.3, and 10.4.

Table 10.6 shows the park land needed to accommodate new development at the 3.0 acre standard. To achieve the standard by the planning horizon new development must fund the acquisition of 39.38 park acres in the General City and 49.78 park acres in the Preserve.

Table 10.6: Park Land to Accommodate New Development

	Calculation	Parkland	Total
General City Area			
Parkland Dedication In-Lieu (Quimby Act) or Land Acquisition (Mitigation Fee Act)			
Facility Standard (acres/1,000 capita)	*A*	3.00	
Growth in Service Population (2025 to 2045)	*B*	13,126	
Facility Needs (acres)	*C = A x B/1000*	39.38	
Average Land Acquisition Cost per Acre	*D*	$ 840,000	
Total	*E = C x D*		$ 33,079,200
The Preserve Area			
Parkland Dedication In-Lieu (Quimby Act) or Land Acquisition (Mitigation Fee Act)			
Facility Standard (acres/1,000 capita)	*A*	3.00	
Growth in Service Population (2025 to 2045)	*B*	16,595	
Facility Needs (acres)	*C = A x B/1000*	49.78	
Average Land Acquisition Cost per Acre	*D*	$1,120,000	
Total	*E = C x D*		$ 55,753,600

Sources: Tables 10.1, 10.3, and 10.4.

Park Facilities Cost per Capita

Table 10.7 shows the cost per capita of providing new parkland and park facilities at the 3.0-acre standard. The cost per capita is shown separately for land and improvements. The costs per capita in this table will serve as the basis of three fees:

- A Quimby Act Fee in-lieu of land dedication. This fee is payable by residential development occurring in subdivisions.
- A Mitigation Fee Act Fee for land acquisition. This fee is payable by residential and nonresidential development not occurring in subdivisions.
- A Mitigation Fee Act Fee for park improvements. This fee is payable by all development.

A development project pays either the Quimby Act Fee in-lieu of land dedication, or the Mitigation Fee Act Fee for land acquisition, not both. All development projects pay the Mitigation Fee Act fee for park improvements.

Table 10.7: Cost per Capita

	Calculation	*Land* Quimby Fee	OR	*Land* Mitigation Fee	AND	*Improvements* Impact Fee
General City Area						
Parkland Investment (per acre)	*A*	$ 840,000		$ 840,000		$ 1,165,300
Existing Standard (acres per 1,000 capita)	*B*	3.00		3.00		3.00
Total Cost per 1,000 capita	*C = A x B*	$ 2,520,000		$ 2,520,000		$ 3,495,900
Cost per Resident	*D = C / 1,000*	$ 2,520		$ 2,520		$ 3,496
The Preserve Area						
Parkland Investment (per acre)	*A*	$ 1,120,000		$ 1,120,000		$ 1,165,300
Existing Standard (acres per 1,000 capita)	*B*	3.00		3.00		3.00
Total Cost per 1,000 capita	*C = A x B*	$ 3,360,000		$ 3,360,000		$ 3,495,900
Cost per Resident	*D = C / 1,000*	$ 3,360		$ 3,360		$ 3,496

Sources: Tables 10.3 and 10.4.

Use of Fee Revenue

The City plans to use parkland and park facilities fee revenue to purchase parkland or construct improvements to add to the system of park facilities that serves new development. The City may only use impact fee revenue to provide facilities and intensify usage of existing facilities needed to serve new development. In addition to land acquisition, Quimby fee revenue can also be used to rehabilitate parks serving the subdivision that paid the fees.

Fee Schedule

To calculate fees by land use type, the investment in park facilities is determined on a per capita basis for both land acquisition and improvement. These cost factors (shown in Table 10.7) are cost per capita based on the unit cost estimates and facility standards. The fee per average sized dwelling unit is converted into a fee per square foot by dividing the fee per dwelling unit by the assumed average square footage of a dwelling unit, by type of unit.

Table 10.8 shows the maximum justified park fees for the General City area and **Table 10.9** shows the fees for the Preserve.

Table 10.8: Park Facilities Fee Schedule (General City)

General City Area Land Use	A Cost Per Capita	B Density	C = A x B Base Fee[1]	D Sq. Ft. per Unit[2]	E = C / D Fee per Sq. Ft.
Quimby Act - Subdivisions					
Single Family					
Land	$ 2,520	3.41	$ 8,593	3,320	$ 2.59
Improvements	3,496	3.41	11,921	3,320	3.59
Total	$ 6,016		$ 20,514		$ 6.18
Multifamily					
Land	$ 2,520	2.69	$ 6,779	1,400	$ 4.84
Improvements	3,496	2.69	9,404	1,400	6.72
Total	$ 6,016		$ 16,183		$ 11.56
Mitigation Fee Act - Infill					
Single Family					
Land	$ 2,520	3.41	$ 8,593	3,320	$ 2.59
Improvements	3,496	3.41	11,921	3,320	3.59
Total	$ 6,016		$ 20,514		$ 6.18
Multifamily					
Land	$ 2,520	2.69	$ 6,779	1,400	$ 4.84
Improvements	3,496	2.69	9,404	1,400	6.72
Total	$ 6,016		$ 16,183		$ 11.56

[1] Fee per average sized dwelling unit.

[2] Assumes an average of 3,320 square feet per single family dwelling unit and 1,400 square feet per multifamily dwelling unit in the City of Chino based on an analysis of future residential projects in the City.

Sources: Tables 2.4, 10.7.

Table 10.9: Park Facilities Fee Schedule (The Preserve)

The Preserve Area Land Use	A Cost Per Capita	B Density	C = A x B Base Fee[1]	D Sq. Ft. per Unit[2]	E = C / D Fee per Sq. Ft.
Quimby Act - Subdivisions					
Single Family					
Land	$ 3,360	3.41	$ 11,458	3,320	$ 3.45
Improvements	3,496	3.41	11,921	3,320	3.59
Total	$ 6,856		$ 23,379		$ 7.04
Multifamily					
Land	$ 3,360	2.69	$ 9,038	1,400	$ 6.46
Improvements	3,496	2.69	9,404	1,400	6.72
Total	$ 6,856		$ 18,442		$ 13.18
Mitigation Fee Act - Infill					
Single Family					
Land	$ 3,360	3.41	$ 11,458	3,320	$ 3.45
Improvements	3,496	3.41	11,921	3,320	3.59
Total	$ 6,856		$ 23,379		$ 7.04
Multifamily					
Land	$ 3,360	2.69	$ 9,038	1,400	$ 6.46
Improvements	3,496	2.69	9,404	1,400	6.72
Total	$ 6,856		$ 18,442		$ 13.18

[1] Fee per average sized dwelling unit.
[2] Assumes an average of 3,320 square feet per single family dwelling unit and 1,400 square feet per multifamily dwelling unit in the City of Chino based on an analysis of future residential projects in the City.

Sources: Tables 2.4, 10.7.

11. Miscellaneous Residential Amenities

The purpose of the miscellaneous residential amenities impact fee is to fund the miscellaneous residential amenities needed to serve new development. A maximum justified fee is presented based on the system plan standard of miscellaneous residential amenities per capita. The *essential nexus* for this facility category is between the demand for new miscellaneous residential amenities from the projected increase in service population and the additional miscellaneous residential amenities needed to meet those service demands. The fees are roughly proportional to demand because they ensure that new development will pay no more than its proportionate share of the identified planned facilities needed to serve the City through the planning horizon, and the fees are scaled based on the number of residents occupying a new dwelling unit, or the number of jobs associated with nonresidential land uses.

Service Population

Residential amenities primarily serve residents. Therefore, demand for services and associated facilities is based on the City's residential population.

Table 11.1 shows the existing and future projected service population for miscellaneous residential amenities.

Table 11.1: Residential Amenities Service Population

Residents - The Preserve	
Existing (2025)	20,585
New Development	16,595
Total (2045)	37,180

Sources: Table 2.3, Willdan Financial Services.

Facility Inventories and Standards

This section describes the City's public facility inventory and facility standards.

Existing Inventory

Table 11.2 summarizes the cost that developers have invested in existing miscellaneous residential amenities in the Preserve. These costs are represented by the request for DIF credits. $8.7 million worth of miscellaneous residential amenities have been built to date.

Table 11.2: Existing Residential Amenities Inventory

Approved and Estimated MRA DIF Credits	$	8,708,744

Sources: Residential Amenities DIF Credit Reconciliation Through May 31, 2025, City of Chino.

Planned Facilities

Table 11.3 summarizes the planned miscellaneous residential amenities needed to serve the Preserve through 2045. The costs were sourced from the City's prior study and adjusted for inflation into current dollars.

Table 11.3: Planned Residential Amenities

Description	Total Cost
Paseos and other Trails	$ 832,955
Perimeter Trail	3,372,964
Landscaping of Southern California Edison Easements	8,350,583
Perimeter Trail Community Core Commons	10,051,658
Total	$ 22,608,160

Source: City of Chino; ENR CCI; Willdan Financial Services.

Cost Allocation

Existing Level of Service

Table 11.4 expresses the City's current miscellaneous residential amenities level of service in terms of an existing cost per capita. This cost per capita is not used in the fee calculation, rather it is shown here for informational purposes only. Once the planned facilities have been constructed and new development has increased the City's service population the resulting facility cost per capita will be higher than the cost per capita shown in Table 11.4. The increased facility standard is needed to ensure that the City has adequate facilities to provide public amenities in the Preserve.

Table 11.4: Existing Level of Service

Value of Existing Facilities	$	8,708,744
Fund 265 - Existing Balance		2,499,754
Total	$	11,208,498
Existing Service Population		20,585
Cost per Capita	$	544

Sources: Tables 11.1 and 11.2.

Future Level of Service

Table 11.5 shows new development's projected per capita investment in miscellaneous residential amenities at the planning horizon. This level of service drives the fee calculation. This value is calculated by dividing cost of existing and planned facilities by the service population at the planning horizon.

Table 11.5: Residential Amenities System Standard

Total System Value (2045)	$	22,608,160
Future Service Population (2045)		37,180
Cost per Capita	$	608

Sources: Tables 11.1, 11.2 and 11.3.

Use of Fee Revenue

The City can use miscellaneous residential amenities fee revenues for the construction or purchase of buildings, land, and equipment that are part of the system of miscellaneous residential amenities serving new development. A list of planned facilities is included in Table 11.3.

Non-Fee Funding Required

Completing the planned facilities will provide a higher value of facilities per capita than is currently provided in Chino. Impact fee revenue may not be used to increase the level of service provided to existing development. Therefore, impact fee revenue will not fully fund the planned miscellaneous residential amenities and some non-fee funding will be required. **Table 11.6** shows the projected fee revenue and the non-fee funding required through 2045. After accounting for the projected future impact fee revenue and existing fund balances, approximately $1.3 million in non-fee funding will be needed to complete the planned miscellaneous residential amenities.

The City will need to use alternative funding sources to fund existing development's share of the planned miscellaneous residential amenities. Potential sources of revenue include but are not limited to existing or new general fund revenues, existing or new taxes, special assessments, and grants.

Table 11.6: Revenue Projection - System Standard

Cost per Capita	$	608
Growth in Service Population (2025 to 2045)		16,595
Fee Revenue	$	10,089,644
Net Cost of Planned Facilities	$	13,899,416
Less Projected Fee Revenue		10,089,644
Less Existing Fund Balance		2,499,754
Non-Fee Revenue To Be Identified	$	1,310,018

Sources: Tables 11.1, 11.3 and 11.4.

Fee Schedule

Table 11.7 shows the maximum justified miscellaneous residential amenities fee schedule, which is only charged within the Preserve. The cost per capita is converted to a fee per unit of new development based on dwelling unit and employment densities (persons per dwelling unit). The fee per average sized dwelling unit is converted into a fee per square foot by dividing the fee per dwelling unit by the assumed average square footage of a dwelling unit, by type of unit.

Table 11.7: Miscellaneous Residential Amenities Fee Schedule

	A	*B*	*C = A x B*	*D*	*E = C / D*
Land Use	**Cost Per Capita**	**Density**	**Base Fee[1]**	**Sq. Ft. per Unit[2]**	**Fee per Sq. Ft.**
Residential					
Single Family	$ 608	3.41	$ 2,073	3,320	$ 0.62
Multifamily	608	2.69	1,636	1,400	1.17

[1] Fee per average sized dwelling unit or per 1,000 square feet of nonresidential building space.
[2] Assumes an average of 3,320 square feet per single family dwelling unit and 1,400 square feet per multifamily dwelling unit in the City of Chino based on an analysis of future residential

Sources: Tables 2.2 and 11.5.

12. AB 602 Requirements

On January 1, 2022, new requirements went into effect for California jurisdictions implementing impact fees. Among other changes, AB 602 added Section 66016.5 to the Government Code, which set guidelines for impact fee nexus studies. Four key requirements from that section which concern the nexus study are reproduced here:

66016.5. (a) (2) When applicable, the nexus study shall identify the existing level of service for each public facility, identify the proposed new level of service, and include an explanation of why the new level of service is appropriate.

66016.5. (a) (4) If a nexus study supports the increase of an existing fee, the local agency shall review the assumptions of the nexus study supporting the original fee and evaluate the amount of fees collected under the original fee.

66016.5. (a) (5) A nexus study adopted after July 1, 2022, shall calculate a fee imposed on a housing development project proportionately to the square footage of proposed units of the development. A local agency that imposes a fee 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.

66016.5. (a) (6) Large jurisdictions shall adopt a capital improvement plan as a part of the nexus study.

Compliance with AB 602

The following sections describe this study's compliance with the new requirements of AB 602.

66016.5. (a) (2) - Level of Service

1. For the park fees which are calculated under the existing standard methodology, the fees are calculated such that new development funds facilities at the existing level of service. The existing level service in terms of acres per 1,000 residents is calculated in Table 10.4.
2. For fees calculated under the planned facilities methodology, the fees are calculated to ensure that the level of service does not fall to unacceptable levels. The fees calculated under this approach are the circulation, sewer facilities, water system, storm drain facilities and law enforcement facility fees. Circulation projects included in these fees met the City's congestion level of service standards at the time they were added to the impact fee program. Impact fees charged under this program will serve to ensure that the LOS does not fall to unacceptable levels. For the law enforcement facility fees, the planned facilities represent a lower level of service than current exists, so new development can fully fund the identified facilities. The sewer, water and storm drain facilities needed to serve new development were identified in the City's prior nexus study, and master planning documents as necessary to serve new development at an acceptable level of service.
3. For the fees calculated under the system standard methodology, the maximum justified fees represent an increase in the facility level of service. The fees calculated under this methodology are the fire suppression, general facilities, and miscellaneous residential amenities fees. The increased level of service is required to fund new development's fair share of facilities identified either in the City's most recent CIP, or the City's prior development impact fee studies. New development will not fund the entirety of the increase in level of service, rather, it will fund a share of the increased level of service represented by the planned facilities. The City will have to fund existing development's

share of the increased level of service through any other funding source. Each chapter for facility fee categories that are increasing the level of service includes a table that shows the existing level of service and future level of service in terms of facility investment per capita.

66016.5. (a) (4) – Review of Original Fee Assumptions

Willdan extensively reviewed the City's prior impact fee studies while conducting this fee analysis. Notable this study differs from the 2017-18 study in several ways:

1. The base year and planning horizon have been updated to align with the City's 2045 General Plan and the Preserve Specific Plan.
2. Cost assumptions have been updated to current dollars either using inflation indices, or new cost estimating from Proactive Engineering Consultants.
3. This study made use of the most current project lists and inventories of existing facilities where relevant.

Table 12.1 displays an accounting of annual revenue collected since 2020 for the impact fees included in this analysis.

Table 12.1: Collected Fee Revenue

Fee Category	FY 2020	FY 2021	FY 2022	FY 2023	FY 2024	FY 2025	Annual Average
Law Enforcement	$ 388,600	$ 246,390	$ 845,428	$ 188,974	$ 283,460	$ 207,422	$ 360,046
Fire Suppression	382,833	166,881	193,424	439,741	578,091	385,549	357,753
General Facilities	136,321	45,875	1,200,739	64,796	88,639	26,004	260,396
Public Use Facilities	1,161,830	533,476	33,601	663,934	1,013,827	544,322	658,498
General City Circulation	799,066	253,383	5,009,558	621,745	879,096	666,620	1,371,578
General City Storm Drainage	137,835	45,165	505,577	54,455	60,075	233,556	172,777
General City Water	246,003	17,355	679,159	93,217	65,072	90,676	198,580
The Preserve Circulation	6,279,966	4,125,263	5,779,422	174,596	1,215,736	203,363	2,963,058
The Preserve Congestion Management Program	3,033,688	189,317	4,304,012	299,090	262,116	599,328	1,447,925
The Preserve Storm Drain	1,558,380	1,323,667	1,750,264	502	1,672,094	1,608,438	1,318,891
The Preserve Water	879,309	959,860	596,327	1,416,557	1,732,492	(219,615)	894,155
The Preserve Sewer	428,616	51,897	134,168	185,963	727,254	439,681	327,930
The Preserve Miscellaneous Residential Amenities	264,877	158,238	-	245,610	275,094	79,112	170,489
General City Parks	1,535,479	492,882	1,553,223	596,828	868,800	1,123,923	1,028,523
The Preserve Parks	2,353,806	1,015,872	-	1,784,468	2,130,984	959,010	1,374,023

Source: City of Chino DIF Annual Report – FY 2024–25, Revised January 28, 2026.

66016.5. (a) (5) – Residential Fees per Square Foot

Impact fees for residential land uses are calculated per square foot for all fee categories and comply with AB 602.

66016.5. (a) (6) – Capital Improvement Plan

The Capital Improvement Plan for this nexus study is comprised of the identified planned facilities within each facility fee chapter. Planned facilities identified in this document are sourced from the City's current adopted CIP (which the City updates annually), the City's prior nexus study, master plans and other relevant documents. Adoption of this nexus study would approve the planned facilities identified herein as the Capital Improvement Plan for this nexus study.

13. Implementation

Impact Fee Program Adoption Process

Impact fee program adoption procedures are found in the *California Government Code* section 66016. Adoption of an impact fee program requires the City Council to follow certain procedures including holding a public hearing. The impact fee nexus study must first be adopted at a public hearing to comply with AB 602. That public hearing must be noticed at least 30 days in advance. Data, such as an impact fee report, must be made available at least 10 days prior to the public hearing. The City's legal counsel should be consulted for any other procedural requirements as well as advice regarding adoption of an enabling ordinance and/or a resolution. After adoption there is a mandatory 60-day waiting period before the fees go into effect.

Inflation Adjustment

The City can keep its impact fee program up to date by periodically adjusting the fees for inflation. Such adjustments should be completed regularly to ensure that new development will fully fund its share of needed facilities. We recommend that the California Construction Cost Index (CCCI) be used for adjusting fees for inflation.

While fee updates using inflation indices are appropriate for periodic updates to ensure that fee revenues keep up with increases in the costs of public facilities, the City will also need to conduct more extensive updates of the fee documentation and calculation (such as this study) when significant new data on growth forecasts and/or facility plans become available.

Reporting Requirements

The City complies with the annual and five-year reporting requirements of the *Mitigation Fee Act*. For facilities to be funded by a combination of public fees and other revenues, identification of the source and amount of these non-fee revenues is essential. Identification of the timing of receipt of other revenues to fund the facilities is also important.

Programming Revenues and Projects with the CIP

The City maintains a Capital Improvement Program (CIP) to plan for future infrastructure needs. The CIP identifies costs and phasing for specific capital projects. The use of the CIP in this manner documents a reasonable relationship between new development and the use of those revenues.

The City may decide to alter the scope of the planned projects or to substitute new projects as long as those new projects continue to represent an expansion of the City's facilities. If the total cost of facilities varies from the total cost used as a basis for the fees, the City should consider revising the fees accordingly.

14. Mitigation Fee Act Findings

Public facilities fees are one-time fees typically paid when a building permit is issued and imposed on development projects by local agencies responsible for regulating land use (cities and counties). To guide the widespread imposition of public facilities fees the State Legislature adopted the *Mitigation Fee Act* (the *Act*) with Assembly Bill 1600 in 1987 and subsequent amendments. The *Act,* contained in *California Government Code* Sections 66000 through 66025*,* establishes requirements on local agencies for the imposition and administration of fee programs. The *Act* requires local agencies to document five findings when adopting a fee.

The *Mitigation Fee Act* findings required to implement impact fees in California demonstrate the *essential nexus* between new development and a fee to fund facilities needed to serve that development. The term *essential nexus* refers to the relationship between new development and the need for facilities (and corresponding impact fees) to serve that development. The findings also require that this study demonstrates *rough proportionality* of the fees- meaning that the amount of the exaction must roughly correspond to the burden placed on the government, resulting from the proposed development project. To ensure that fees are roughly proportional to from new development, this study first allocates facilities costs to new development using the allocation methods described in the preceding chapters, then to individual units of new development based on the demand characteristics of each unit.

The five statutory findings required for adoption of the public facilities fees documented in this report are presented in this chapter and supported in detail by the preceding chapters. All statutory references are to the *Act.*

Purpose of Fee

- *Identify the purpose of the fee (§66001(a)(1) of the Act).*

Development impact fees are designed to ensure that new development will not burden the existing service population with the cost of facilities required to accommodate growth. The purpose of the fees proposed by this report is to provide a funding source from new development for capital improvements to serve that development. The fees advance a legitimate City interest by enabling the City to provide public facilities to serve new development.

Use of Fee Revenues

- *Identify the use to which the fees will be put. If the use is financing facilities, the facilities shall be identified. That identification may, but need not, be made by reference to a capital improvement plan as specified in §65403 or §66002, may be made in applicable general or specific plan requirements, or may be made in other public documents that identify the facilities for which the fees are charged (§66001(a)(2) of the Act).*

Fees proposed in this report, if enacted by the City, would be used to fund expanded facilities to serve new development. Facilities funded by these fees are designated to be located within the City's sphere of influence. Fees addressed in this report have been identified by the City to be restricted to funding the following facility categories: law enforcement facilities, fire suppression facilities, circulation facilities, storm drainage facilities, water system, sewer system, general facilities, facilities, park infrastructure and miscellaneous residential amenities.

Benefit Relationship

- *Determine the reasonable relationship between the fees' use and the type of development project on which the fees are imposed (§66001(a)(3) of the Act).*

The City will restrict fee revenue to the acquisition of land, construction of facilities, infrastructure and buildings, and purchase of related equipment, furnishings, vehicles, and services used to serve new development. Facilities funded by the fees are expected to provide a citywide network of facilities accessible to the additional residents and workers associated with new development. Under *the Act*, fees are not intended to fund planned facilities needed to correct existing deficiencies. Thus, a reasonable relationship can be shown between the use of fee revenue and the new development residential and non-residential use classifications that will pay the fees.

Burden Relationship

- *Determine the reasonable relationship between the need for the public facilities and the types of development on which the fees are imposed (§66001(a)(4) of the Act).*

Facilities need is based on a facility standard that represents the demand generated by new development for those facilities. For each facility category, demand is measured by a single facility standard that can be applied across land use types to ensure a reasonable relationship to the type of development. For most facility categories service population standards are calculated based upon the number of residents associated with residential development and the number of workers associated with non-residential development. To calculate a single, per capita standard, one worker is weighted less than one resident based on an analysis of the relative use demand between residential and non-residential development.

For circulation facilities demand standards are based on trip generation by various categories of new development. For storm drainage facilities demand is based on impervious surface generated by development. For sewer and water facilities demand is based on increased wastewater and water flow generated by new development, respectively.

The standards used to identify growth needs are also used to determine if planned facilities will partially serve the existing service population by correcting existing deficiencies. This approach ensures that new development will only be responsible for its fair share of planned facilities, and that the fees will not unfairly burden new development with the cost of facilities associated with serving the existing service population.

Chapter 2, Growth Forecasts provides a description of how service population and growth forecasts are calculated. Facility standards are described in the *Facility Standards* sections of each facility category chapter.

Proportionality

- *Determine how there is a reasonable relationship between the fees amount and the cost of the facilities or portion of the facilities attributable to the development on which the fee is imposed (§66001(b) of the Act).*

The reasonable relationship between each facilities fee for a specific new development project and the cost of the facilities attributable to that project is based on the estimated new development growth the project will accommodate. Fees for a specific project are based on the project's size. Larger new development projects can result in a higher service population resulting in higher fee revenue than smaller projects in the same land use classification. Thus, the fees ensure a reasonable relationship between a specific new development project and the cost of the facilities attributable to that project.

See *Chapter 2, Growth Forecasts,* or the *Service Population* sections in each facility category chapter for a description of how service populations or other factors are determined for different types of land uses. See the *Fee Schedule* section of each facility category chapter for a presentation of the proposed facilities fees.

Appendix

Appendix Table A.1: Law Enforcement Facilities Worker Weighting Factor

Category	Calls for Service[1]	Population or Employees	Calls per Capita
Residential	1,872	88,714	0.021
Nonresidential	1,741	53,636	0.032
Other[2]	5,787		
Worker Weighting Factor[3]			1.54

[1] Police department calls in 2025.

[2] "Other" calls are those that cannot be classified as residential nor nonresidential-serving calls.

[3] Nonresidential calls per capita / residential calls per capita.

Source: City of Chino.