



AMADOR COUNTY RECREATION AGENCY

PARK IMPACT FEE NEXUS STUDY

FEBRUARY 2018

FINAL REPORT

PREPARED FOR:

BOARD OF DIRECTORS

AMADOR COUNTY RECREATION AGENCY

PREPARED BY:


SCI Consulting Group

4745 MANGLES BOULEVARD
FAIRFIELD, CALIFORNIA 94534
PHONE 707.430.4300
FAX 707.430.4319
www.sci-cg.com

(THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK)

AMADOR COUNTY RECREATION AGENCY

BOARD OF DIRECTORS

Rose Oneto, Amador County Unified School District

Michael Vasquez, City of Amador City

Dan Epperson, City of Ione

Wayne Garibaldi, City of Jackson

Jon Colburn, City of Plymouth

Linda Rianda, City of Sutter Creek

Lynn Morgan, Amador County

Frank Axe, Amador County

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

Carolyn Fregulia

IMPACT FEE CONSULTANT

Blair Aas, Director of Planning Services

SCI Consulting Group

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This Park Impact Fee Nexus Study was prepared by SCI Consulting Group ("SCI") under contract with Foothill Associates as part of the Amador County Recreation Agency ("ACRA") Park and Recreation Master Plan. The work was accomplished under the general direction of Carolyn Fregulia, ACRA Executive Director and Kate Kirsh, President of Foothill Associates.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	1
PER CAPITA COST STANDARD DETERMINATION	4
LEVEL OF SERVICE STANDARDS BY JURISDICTION	4
PARK AND RECREATION FACILITY COSTS PER CAPITA BY JURISDICTION	6
REGIONAL COMMUNITY USE FACILITIES COST PER CAPITA.....	7
REGIONAL AQUATIC FACILITIES COST PER CAPITA.....	8
PARK IMPACT FEE DETERMINATION	9
PARK IMPACT FEE COST COMPONENTS.....	9
LAND USE CATEGORIES	10
AVERAGE HOUSEHOLD SIZE	11
PARK IMPACT FEE DETERMINATION.....	12
PROJECTED PARK IMPACT FEE REVENUE	13
NEXUS FINDINGS	14
FEE PROGRAM ADOPTION REQUIREMENTS	17
FEE PROGRAM ADMINISTRATION REQUIREMENTS	18
ACCOUNTING REQUIREMENTS	18
REPORTING REQUIREMENTS.....	18
ANNUAL INFLATIONARY ADJUSTMENT	19
FEE EXEMPTIONS	20
RECOMMENDATIONS	21
APPENDICES	23
APPENDIX A – ESTIMATE OF PARK DEVELOPMENT COST PER ACRE BY JURISDICTION	24
APPENDIX B – ESTIMATED COMMUNITY USE SPACE	26
APPENDIX C – ESTIMATED AQUATIC FACILITIES REPLACEMENT COST	27
APPENDIX D – MASTER PLAN CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROJECTS BY JURISDICTION.....	28

LIST OF FIGURES

FIGURE 1 – JUSTIFIED PARK IMPACT FEES	2
FIGURE 2 – TOTAL JUSTIFIED PARK IMPACT FEES BY JURISDICTION WITH ACRA FEE	3
FIGURE 3 – LEVEL OF SERVICE STANDARDS BY JURISDICTION	5
FIGURE 4 – PARK DEVELOPMENT COST PER CAPITA	6
FIGURE 5 – REGIONAL COMMUNITY USE FACILITIES COST PER CAPITA.....	7
FIGURE 6 – REGIONAL AQUATIC FACILITIES COST PER CAPITA.....	8
FIGURE 7 – PARK IMPACT FEE COST COMPONENTS BY JURISDICTION	9
FIGURE 8 – PARK IMPACT FEE COST COMPONENTS FOR ACRA REGIONAL PARK IMPACT FEE ...	10
FIGURE 9 – AVERAGE HOUSEHOLD SIZE	11
FIGURE 10 – JUSTIFIED PARK IMPACT FEES BY JURISDICTION	12
FIGURE 11 – PROJECTED PARK IMPACT FEE REVENUE BY JURISDICTION.....	13
FIGURE 12 – JUSTIFIED PARK IMPACT FEES	21
FIGURE 13 – ESTIMATE OF PARK DEVELOPMENT COST PER ACRE BY JURISDICTION	24
FIGURE 14 – ESTIMATED COMMUNITY USE SPACE.....	26
FIGURE 15 – ESTIMATED AQUATIC FACILITIES REPLACEMENT COST.....	27
FIGURE 16 – MASTER PLAN CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROJECTS BY JURISDICTION	28

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This Park Impact Fees Nexus Study (“Nexus Study”) was prepared pursuant to the “Mitigation Fee Act” as found in Government Code § 66000. The Nexus Study was prepared in conjunction with the Park and Recreation Master Plan Update (“Master Plan”) of the Amador County Recreation Agency (“ACRA”) prepared by Foothill Associates. The purpose of this Nexus Study is to establish the legal and policy basis for the imposition of updated park impact fees (“fees”) on new residential development for the cities of Amador City, Lone, Jackson, Plymouth and Sutter Creek, unincorporated Amador County and regionally for ACRA.

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

- Identify the **purpose** of the fee.
- Identify the **use** to which the fee is to be put.
- Determine how there is a reasonable relationship between the fee's use and the type of development project on which the fee is imposed (“**benefit relationship**”).
- Determine how there is a reasonable relationship between the need for the fire facilities and the type of development project on which the fee is imposed (“**impact relationship**”).
- Determine how there is a reasonable relationship between the amount of the fee and the cost of the facilities or portion of the facilities attributable to the development on which the fee is imposed (“**proportional relationship**”).

Since the need for park and recreational services is inherently population-driven, this Nexus Study utilizes a per capita standard-based methodology to determine each jurisdiction's maximum park impact fees. Under this method, the cost components are based on each jurisdiction's existing or adopted level of service (“LOS”) standard and defined on a per capita basis. The use of the existing per-capita standard ensures that new development will only fund the share of planned park and recreational facilities needed to accommodate population growth. The total per capita costs are then applied to

two residential land uses categories according to their respective average household size to establish a cost / fee per residential unit.

Since the Act also prohibits development impact fees from being used to fund existing deficiencies in public facilities, the fees must be used to fund only new or expanded park and recreational facilities that add to the park and recreational facility capacity of the jurisdiction. The use of fee proceeds for rehabilitation of existing park and recreational facilities is limited in that they may only cover the portion of the improvement that expands service capacity. For example, if a jurisdiction planned to replace a shade structure with an existing park with a significantly larger shade structure, park impact fees could fund the portion equal to the percentage increase in the square footage of the larger shade structure, or by another reasonable measurement.

Thus, consistent with the Act, this Nexus Study demonstrates that there is a reasonable relationship between new development, the amount of the fee, and park and recreational facilities funded by the fee. The maximum park impact fees for each jurisdiction justified by the Nexus Study are shown in the figure below. Each jurisdiction may establish their fees at or below these maximum amounts. If a City or the County desires to adopt lower fees than justified, the adopted fees for each land use classification must be reduced by the same percentage.

The fees for ACRA would be adopted by each jurisdiction on behalf of ACRA and levied on all new development with the County for regional park and recreational facilities, community use facilities and aquatic facilities.

FIGURE 1 – JUSTIFIED PARK IMPACT FEES

Jurisdiction	Justified Park Impact Fees (per Unit)	
	SFR	MFR
City of Amador City	\$849	\$871
City of Lone	\$420	\$506
City of Jackson	\$1,641	\$1,634
City of Plymouth	\$3,563	\$3,808
City of Sutter Creek	\$1,235	\$1,055
Unincorporated County	\$406	\$364
ACRA	\$3,293	\$3,085

FIGURE 2 – TOTAL JUSTIFIED SINGLE-FAMILY HOME PARK IMPACT FEES



The Nexus Study also details the **procedural requirements** for approval of the Nexus Study and proposed park impact fee program (“fee program”) by the ACRA Board of Directors and adoption by the City Councils and County Board of Supervisors. Also, the Act contains specific requirements for the **annual administration** of the fee program. These statutory requirements and other important information regarding the imposition and collection of the fees are provided in the last sections of the Nexus Study.

PER CAPITA COST STANDARD DETERMINATION

As mentioned earlier, this Nexus Study utilizes a per capita-standard based methodology to determine the park impact fee because the need for and demand for park and recreational services is driven by its service population. Using this open-ended approach, park and recreational facility costs are reduced to a cost per capita based on each jurisdiction's existing or adopted LOS standards for such facilities. This section first determines each jurisdiction LOS standard for park and recreational facilities. Then, the per capita cost for park and recreational facilities for each jurisdiction is established based on their respective LOS standard and the estimated development cost per acre for each jurisdiction.

LEVEL OF SERVICE STANDARDS BY JURISDICTION

Figure 3 on below presents each jurisdiction's acres of developed parks, their current population and the existing level of service expressed as developed acres per 1,000 residents. Current household population for each jurisdiction is from the California Department of Finance as of January 1, 2016. Developed acres is from the ACRA Park and Recreation Master Plan, July 2016.

FIGURE 3 – LEVEL OF SERVICE STANDARDS BY JURISDICTION

Jurisdiction	Developed Park		Existing LOS	Nexus Study	
	Acres ¹	Population ²	Standard (Per 1,000 Pop.) ³		LOS Standard ⁴
	Calc	a	b	$c = a / (b / 1,000)$	d = c
Neighborhood and Community Parks					
City of Amador City		0.3	190	1.6	1.6
City of Lone		4.0	4,257	0.9	0.9
City of Jackson		17.0	4,682	3.6	3.6
City of Plymouth		3.4	1,006	3.4	3.4
City of Sutter Creek		4.5	2,587	1.7	1.7
Unincorporated County		13.1	21,786	0.6	0.6
Regional (Countywide) Parks		86.0	34,508	2.5	2.5

Source: Foothill Associates; California Department of Finance and SCI Consulting Group

Notes:

¹ From Amador County Recreation Agency Park and Recreation Master Plan, July 2016.

² From the California Department of Finance as of January 1, 2016.

³ Represents the existing level of service standard expressed in terms of active acres per 1,000 population rounded to the nearest tenth acre.

⁴ Represents the existing level of service standard used in the determination of the fees.

PARK AND RECREATION FACILITY COSTS PER CAPITA BY JURISDICTION

Figure 4 calculates the per capita cost of park and recreational facilities in each jurisdiction. As presented, each jurisdiction's LOS standard, expressed as developed acres per 1,000 population, is multiplied by the estimated per acre cost for park development to arrive at a per capita cost. For purposes of this Nexus Study, park and recreational facilities include all park and recreational amenities such as fields, courts, trails, playgrounds, picnic areas and areas used for active recreation. Community use building, recreation buildings and aquatics facilities are excluded.

The average park development cost per acre shown represents average replacement cost (in 2016 dollars) for a neighborhood and community parks within each jurisdiction.¹ Since parks have varying levels of density of park and recreational facilities, the use of the replacement cost per acre for existing parks for each jurisdiction ensures proportionality between existing development and new development.

FIGURE 4 – PARK DEVELOPMENT COST PER CAPITA

Jurisdiction	Nexus Study LOS Standard ¹	Acres per Capita ¹	Average Park Development Cost per Acre ²	Park Development Cost per Capita
	Calc	a	b = a / 1,000	c
				d = b * c
Neighborhood and Community Parks				
City of Amador City	1.6	0.0016	\$274,000	\$438.40
City of Ione	0.9	0.0009	\$187,000	\$168.30
City of Jackson	3.6	0.0036	\$187,000	\$673.20
City of Plymouth	3.4	0.0034	\$371,000	\$1,261.40
City of Sutter Creek	1.7	0.0017	\$358,000	\$608.60
Unincorporated County	0.6	0.0006	\$278,000	\$166.80
Regional (Countywide) Parks	2.5	0.0025	\$148,000	\$370.00

Source: Foothill Associates; SCI Consulting Group

Notes:

¹ See Figure 2. Expressed as developed park acres per 1,000 residents.

² Based upon the average replacement cost per acre for existing parks within the jurisdiction in 2016 dollars. Rounded to the nearest thousand. See Appendix B for more information.

¹ Appendix B presents each jurisdiction's estimated cost per acre to develop new or expanded park and recreational facilities.

REGIONAL COMMUNITY USE FACILITIES COST PER CAPITA

Figure 5 calculates the per capita cost of regional community use facilities for ACRA. As presented, the total existing community use space in the County is divided by the total County household population to establish a Countywide LOS standard, expressed as community use building square feet per capita. The existing LOS standard is then multiplied by the estimated cost per square feet for the construction of a community use facility to arrive at a per capita cost. Appendix B provide detailed information on the community use space in the County. The resulting fees will largely go towards construction of the proposed indoor recreation center at Oro de Amador Regional Park.

FIGURE 5 – REGIONAL COMMUNITY USE FACILITIES COST PER CAPITA

Jurisdiction	Existing Community Use Space (Sq. Ft.) ¹		Existing Community Use Space LOS Standard (Sq. Ft.)	Regional Community Use Facilities Cost per Capita	
	Calc	a	b		c = a / b
ACRA		85,590	34,508	2.5	d = c * 310 \$775.00

Source: Foothill Associates; SCI Consulting Group

Notes:

¹ See Appendix B for more detail.

² From the California Department of Finance as of January 1, 2016.

REGIONAL AQUATIC FACILITIES COST PER CAPITA

Figure 6 calculates the per capita cost of regional aquatic facilities. As presented, the replacement value of the four aquatic facilities in the County is divided by the total County household population to establish an existing aquatic's facility cost per capita.

FIGURE 6 – REGIONAL AQUATIC FACILITIES COST PER CAPITA

Jurisdiction	Total Estimated Facility Replacement Cost		Facility Cost per Capita
	Cost ¹	Population ²	
	a	b	c = a / b
ACRA	\$7,300,000	34,508	\$211.55

Source: Foothill Associates; SCI Consulting Group

Notes:

¹ See Appendix C for more information.

² From the California Department of Finance as of January 1, 2016.

PARK IMPACT FEE DETERMINATION

The Act requires that development impact fees be determined in a way that ensures a reasonable relationship between the amount of the fee and the cost of the park and recreational facilities attributable to the new development on which the fee is imposed. This section presents the calculation of the total cost per capita for neighborhood and community parks each jurisdiction and regional parks, community use facilities and aquatic facilities for ACRA. The total cost per capita for each jurisdiction and ACRA is then applied to two residential land uses in proportion to the demand they create as measured by their average household size.

PARK IMPACT FEE COST COMPONENTS

The figures below summarize the per capita cost components, for each jurisdiction and ACRA Regional Park Impact Fee, calculated in the previous section and include an additional two (2) percent for administration of the fee programs. The fee program administrative cost component is designed to offset the cost of collection, documentation, annual reporting requirements, five-year report requirements, periodic Nexus Study updates and other costs reasonably related to compliance with the Act.

FIGURE 7 – PARK IMPACT FEE COST COMPONENTS BY JURISDICTION

Jurisdiction	Park Development Costs Per Capita ¹	Fee Program Admin. Cost per Capita ²	Total Cost per Capita
Calc	a	b = a * 0.02	c = a + b
City of Amador City	\$438.40	\$8.77	\$447.17
City of Lone	\$168.30	\$3.37	\$171.67
City of Jackson	\$673.20	\$13.46	\$686.66
City of Plymouth	\$1,261.40	\$25.23	\$1,286.63
City of Sutter Creek	\$608.60	\$12.17	\$620.77
Unincorporated County	\$166.80	\$3.34	\$170.14

Notes:

¹ See Figure 3.

² Estimated at 2 percent of total costs for the administration of the park impact fee program including periodic nexus study updates, collection, accounting, annual reporting and other costs reasonably related to compliance with the Act.

FIGURE 8 – PARK IMPACT FEE COST COMPONENTS FOR ACRA REGIONAL PARK IMPACT FEE

Jurisdiction	Regional Park Development Costs Per Capita ¹	Regional Community Use Facilities Cost per Capita ²	Regional Aquatic Facilities Cost per Capita ³	Fee Program Admin. Cost per Capita ⁴	Total Regional Cost per Capita
Calc	a	b	c	$d = (a + b + c) * 0.02$	$e = a + b + c + d$
ACRA	\$370.00	\$775.00	\$211.55	\$27.13	\$1,383.68

Notes:

¹ See Figure 3.

² See Figure 4.

³ See Figure 5.

⁴ Estimated at 2 percent of total costs for the administration of the park impact fee program including periodic nexus study updates, collection, accounting, annual reporting and other costs reasonably related to compliance with the Act.

According to ACRA's Park and Recreation Master Plan (Final January 11, 2017), regional parks are defined as park and recreational areas that "serve the entire County and beyond. They are usually large sites and typically include specific uses or features that make the site unique. Regional parks may also focus on a mixture of active and passive recreational activities. Regional parks also serve as the neighborhood and community park for residents who live in the local vicinity." Current and proposed regional parks are Pioneer, Mollie Joyce, Howard, and the proposed Oro de Amador and Plymouth Parks.

LAND USE CATEGORIES

The Act requires that development impact fees be determined in a way that ensures a reasonable relationship between the fee and the type of development on which the fee is imposed. Therefore, since the demand for and need for park and recreational services is driven by population and since different residential land uses have varying average household sizes, the park impact fees are expressed on a per unit basis based on their respective average household size for two residential land uses.

The two residential land use categories are as follows:

- "Single-family housing" or "SFR" means detached or attached one-family dwelling units including mobile homes; and
- "Multi-family housing" or "MFR" means buildings or structures designed for two or more families for living or sleeping purposes and having kitchen and bath facilities for each family, including condominiums and cluster developments.

AVERAGE HOUSEHOLD SIZE

Based on 2010 U.S. Census information for each jurisdiction and countywide, the figure below presents the average household sizes for the two residential land use categories for each jurisdiction. The calculation is derived from the total population in occupied housing units by units in structure divided by the occupied housing units by units in structure as provided by U.S. Census Bureau in their 2010-2014 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimate.

FIGURE 9 – AVERAGE HOUSEHOLD SIZE

Jurisdiction	Single Family Housing	Multi-family Housing
	<i>--- Average Persons per Unit ---</i>	
City of Amador City	1.90	1.95
City of Ione	2.45	2.95
City of Jackson	2.39	2.38
City of Plymouth	2.77	2.96
City of Sutter Creek	1.99	1.70
Unincorporated County	2.39	2.14
County of Amador	2.38	2.23

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 2010-2014 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates

PARK IMPACT FEE DETERMINATION

Figure 10 presents the calculation of the justified park impact fees for each jurisdiction and the ACRA Regional Fee. The maximum per unit fee for the two residential land use categories for each jurisdiction are determined by multiplying their respective total cost per capita by their respective average household size. Each jurisdiction may adopt fees lower than their justified amounts shown below, provided that they are reduced by the same percentage.

FIGURE 10 – JUSTIFIED PARK IMPACT FEES BY JURISDICTION

Jurisdiction	Total Cost		Average Household Size ²		Justified Park Impact Fees (per Unit) ³	
	Per Capita ¹		SFR	MFR	SFR	MFR
	Calc	a	b	c	c = a * b	d = a * c
Neighborhood and Community Parks						
City of Amador City		\$447.17	1.90	1.95	\$849	\$871
City of Ione		\$171.67	2.45	2.95	\$420	\$506
City of Jackson		\$686.66	2.39	2.38	\$1,641	\$1,634
City of Plymouth		\$1,286.63	2.77	2.96	\$3,563	\$3,808
City of Sutter Creek		\$620.77	1.99	1.70	\$1,235	\$1,055
Unincorporated County		\$170.14	2.39	2.14	\$406	\$364
Regional (Countywide) Parks		\$1,383.68	2.38	2.23	\$3,293	\$3,085

Notes:

¹ See Figure 6 and Figure 7.

² See Figure 8.

³ Fees are rounded down to the nearest dollar.

PROJECTED PARK IMPACT FEE REVENUE

Figure 11 projects park impact fee revenue through 2040 for each jurisdiction and for the total County. Total park impact fee revenue (in 2016 dollars) is estimated by multiplying the total cost per capita by the service population growth estimated for the period for each jurisdiction. Certainly, arguments can be made for higher or lower population growth. However, the projected population growth and fee revenue are merely estimates for planning purposes. The maximum fee amounts do not depend upon the timing and level of development.

FIGURE 11 – PROJECTED PARK IMPACT FEE REVENUE BY JURISDICTION

Jurisdiction	Current Household Population (2016) ¹	Household Population Growth (By 2040) ²	Total Cost per Capita ³	Projected Fee Revenue (2016\$)
	Calc	a	b	c
City of Amador City	190	63	\$447.17	\$27,953
City of Ione	4,257	2,123	\$171.67	\$364,411
City of Jackson	4,682	1,263	\$686.66	\$867,186
City of Plymouth	1,006	1,345	\$1,286.63	\$1,730,372
City of Sutter Creek	2,587	5,383	\$620.77	\$3,341,717
Unincorporated County	21,786	5,787	\$170.14	\$984,631
ACRA / Total County	34,508	15,964	\$1,383.68	\$22,088,413

Notes:

¹ See Figure 2.

² See Appendix A.

³ See Figure 4.

NEXUS FINDINGS

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

PURPOSE OF THE FEE

This Nexus Study must identify the purpose of the fee.

The purpose of the park impact fee is to fund new or expanded park and recreation facilities to meet the needs of the new residential population generated by new residential development. The park impact fees will ensure that new development will not burden existing development with the cost of facilities required to accommodate growth as it occurs within each jurisdiction.

USE OF FEE REVENUE

This Nexus Study must identify the use to which the fee is to be put.

Fee revenue will be used to fund the cost of new or expanded park and recreation facilities to serve new development within each jurisdiction and ACRA, such as those identified in Appendix D. In general, park and recreation facilities costs shall include, but shall not be limited to, park and recreation facilities construction in new or existing parks including associated planning, design, engineering, environmental, and construction management costs.

The ACRA Regional Fee may be used to fund new or expanded park and recreational facilities, community use facilities and aquatic facilities at Pioneer Park, Mollie Joyce Park, Howard Park, proposed Oro de Amador Park, proposed Plymouth Parks, or other regional parks that satisfy the standards in the ACRA Park and Recreation Master Plan.

Additionally, fee revenue will be used to cover fee program administration costs such as collection, documentation, annual reporting requirements, five-year report requirements, periodic Nexus Study updates and other costs reasonably related to compliance with the Act.

Fee revenue may not be used to fund operational, maintenance or repair costs.

BENEFIT RELATIONSHIP

This Nexus Study must determine how there is a reasonable relationship between the fee's use and the type of development project on which the fee is imposed.

The fee will be used to expand each jurisdiction's parks and recreational facilities required to serve new development. Each jurisdiction will deposit fee revenue into a separate park impact fee account or fund in a manner to avoid any commingling of the fees with other revenues and funds. The fee revenue will be restricted to used described in the "Use of Fee Revenues" finding. These actions ensure a development project paying the fees will benefit from their use.

IMPACT RELATIONSHIP

This Nexus Study must determine how there is a reasonable relationship between the need for the public facility and the type of development project on which the fee is imposed.

Each new residential development project will grow the service population of the jurisdiction. The growth in service population will generate additional need for park and recreational services and the associated need for additional park and recreational facilities. The need is measured in proportion to the average housing size for two residential land use categories and each jurisdiction's level of service standard for park and recreational facilities.

PROPORTIONALITY

This Nexus Study must determine how there is a reasonable relationship between the amount of the fee and the cost of the public facility or portion of the public facility attributable to the development on which the fee is imposed.

The amount of park and recreational facilities needed to serve a unit of development is based on each jurisdiction's existing LOS standard for such facilities. The use of an existing facility standard methodology to determine the park impact fee achieves proportionality between existing development and new development. The cost of park and recreational facilities construction and fee program administrative costs are defined on a cost per capita basis. These per capita costs are then applied to two land use categories in proportion to the need they create for new and expanded park and recreational facilities.

The use of the average household size to determine the park impact fee schedule achieves proportionality across the types of development on which the fee is imposed. In

general, a single-family home will generate a higher number of persons than a multi-family unit, and as a result, will pay a higher fee. Thus, the application of the park impact fee schedule to a specific project ensures a reasonable relationship between the fee and the cost of the park and recreational facilities attributable to that project.

FEE PROGRAM ADOPTION REQUIREMENTS

The following are the general requirements for approval of the Nexus Study and proposed park impact fee program ("fee program") by the ACRA Board of Directors and adoption by the City Councils and County Board of Supervisors. The specific statutory requirements for the adoption of the fee programs may be found in the Mitigation Fee Act (California Govt. Code § 66000 et seq.).

1. The ACRA Board of Directors adopts a resolution approving the Nexus Study and proposed fee program.
2. Upon approval by the ACRA Board of Directors, each City Council and the County Board of Supervisors shall conduct at least "one open and public meeting" as part of a regularly scheduled meeting on their respective proposed fee program.
3. The ACRA fee would be adopted by the County and Cities on behalf of ACRA.
4. At least 14 days before the meeting, each jurisdiction shall mail out a notice of the meeting to any interested party who filed a written request for notice of the adoption of new or increased fees.
5. At least 10 days before the meeting, each jurisdiction shall make available to the public the Nexus Study for review.
6. At least 10 days before the public hearing, a notice of the time and place of the meeting, shall be published twice in a newspaper of general circulation with at least five days intervening between the dates of first and last publication not counting such publication dates.
7. After their respective public hearings, each Council and the Board of Supervisors shall consider adoption of an ordinance or resolution establishing the proposed fee program.
8. The fee shall become effective 60 days after adoption of the ordinance or longer as specified by the ordinance.

FEE PROGRAM ADMINISTRATION REQUIREMENTS

This section contains general recommendations for the administration of the park impact fee program. The specific statutory requirements for the administration of the fee program may be found in the Mitigation Fee Act (California Govt. Code § 66000 et seq.).

ACCOUNTING REQUIREMENTS

Proceeds from the park impact fee should be deposited into a separate fund or account so that there will be no commingling of fees with other revenue. The park impact fees should be expended solely for the purpose for which they were collected. Any interest earned by such account should be deposited in that account and expended solely for the purpose for which originally collected.

REPORTING REQUIREMENTS

The following information, entitled "Annual Report", must be made available to the public within 180 days after the last day of each fiscal year:

- a brief description of the type of fee in the account;
- the amount of the fee;
- the beginning and ending balance of the account;
- the fees collected that year and the interest earned;
- an identification of each public improvement for which the fees were expended and the amount of the expenditures for each improvement;
- an identification of an approximate date by which construction of the improvement will commence if the local agency determines that sufficient funds have been collected to complete financing of an incomplete public improvement;
- a description of each inter-fund transfer or loan made from the account or fund, including the public improvement on which the transferred or loaned fees will be expended, the date on which any loan will be repaid, and the rate of interest to be returned to the account; and
- the amount of money refunded under section Govt. Code § 66001.

Each jurisdiction shall review the Annual Report at the next regularly scheduled public meeting not less than 15 days after the Annual Report is made available to the public. Notice of the time and place of the meeting, including the address where the Annual Report may be reviewed, shall be mailed, at least 15 days prior to the meeting, to any

interested party who files a written request with the jurisdiction for mailed notice of the meeting. Any written request for mailed notices shall be valid for one year from the date on which it is filed unless a renewal request is filed. Renewal requests for mailed notices shall be filed on or before April 1 of each year. The jurisdiction may establish a reasonable annual charge for sending notices based on the estimated cost of providing the service.

For the fifth fiscal year following the first receipt of any park impact fee proceeds, and every five years thereafter, each jurisdiction must comply with Government Code Section 66001(d)(1) by affirmatively demonstrating that the jurisdiction still needs unexpended park impact fees to achieve the purpose for which it was originally imposed and that the jurisdiction has a plan on how to use the unexpended balance to achieve that purpose. Specifically, the jurisdiction shall make all the following findings, entitled "Five-Year Report", with respect to that portion of the account or fund remaining unexpended, whether committed or uncommitted:

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

These findings must (1) affirmatively demonstrate that the jurisdiction intend to construct specific park improvements with the accumulated funds; (2) explain how the jurisdiction intends to use the funds to acquire or construct the park improvements; (3) specify the estimated cost of the park improvements; and (4) indicate whether the jurisdiction requires additional funds and, if so, when it anticipates receiving those funds.

ANNUAL INFLATIONARY ADJUSTMENT

All costs and the associated fees determined by this Nexus Study are in January 2016 dollars. Therefore, the fees should be annually adjusted commensurate with changes in improvement costs. The resolution or ordinance establishing the should including a provision and process for annually adjusting the fees by the percentage change in the Construction Cost Index as published by the Engineering News-Record, or its successor publication for the preceding twelve months.

FEE EXEMPTIONS

The park impact fee shall not be imposed on the following types of development:

- Nonresidential development;
- Any development entitled by State or Federal statute to an exemption from development impact fees; and
- Any modernization or rehabilitation of existing housing units.

RECOMMENDATIONS

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

1. The maximum park impact fees for each jurisdiction and ACRA, as justified by the Nexus Study, are shown in the figure below. Each jurisdiction may establish their park impact fees at or below these maximum amounts. If a City or the County desires to adopt lower fees than justified, the adopted fees for each land use classification must be reduced by the same percentage. The ACRA regional park impact fee must be adopted by each jurisdiction on behalf of ACRA for regional park and recreational facilities.

FIGURE 12 – JUSTIFIED PARK IMPACT FEES

Jurisdiction	Justified Park Impact Fees (per Unit)	
	SFR	MFR
City of Amador City	\$849	\$871
City of Ione	\$420	\$506
City of Jackson	\$1,641	\$1,634
City of Plymouth	\$3,563	\$3,808
City of Sutter Creek	\$1,235	\$1,055
Unincorporated County	\$406	\$364
ACRA	\$3,293	\$3,085

2. The resolution or ordinance establishing the new fees should include a provision establishing an automatic annual inflationary adjustment of the park impact fee. The adopted park impact fees should be adjusted annually by the percentage change in the Construction Cost Index as published by the Engineering News-Record, or its successor publication for the preceding twelve months.
3. The Cities and County should adopt and implement their respective fees in accordance with the applicable provisions of the Act (California Government Code § 66000 et seq.).
4. The Cities and County should comply with the annual reporting requirements under Government Code § 66006(b).

5. Following the fifth fiscal year after the first deposit of fee revenue and every five years thereafter, the Cities and County should comply with the reporting requirements under Government Code § 66001(d).

APPENDICES

Appendix A – Estimate of Average Park Development Cost per Acre by Jurisdiction

Appendix B – Estimated Community Use Space in the County

Appendix C – Estimated Aquatic Facilities Replacement Costs

Appendix D – Master Plan Capital Improvement Projects by Jurisdiction

APPENDIX A – ESTIMATE OF PARK DEVELOPMENT COST PER ACRE BY JURISDICTION

FIGURE 13 – ESTIMATE OF PARK DEVELOPMENT COST PER ACRE BY JURISDICTION

City of Amador City	Replacement Cost	Developed Acres	Replacement Cost per Acre
School House Park	\$82,200	0.3	\$274,000
Total Amador City	\$82,200	0.3	\$274,000

Source: 2016 ACRA Park and Recreation Master Plan Update; SCI Consulting Group

City of Ione	Replacement Cost	Developed Acres	Replacement Cost per Acre
Grover Park	\$203,000	2.0	\$101,500
Oakridge Park	\$171,800	0.7	\$245,429
Perry Earl Park	\$221,500	1.0	\$221,500
Train Park	\$152,200	0.3	\$507,333
Total City of Ione	\$748,500	4.0	\$187,125

Source: 2016 ACRA Park and Recreation Master Plan Update; SCI Consulting Group

City of Jackson	Replacement Cost	Developed Acres	Replacement Cost per Acre
Detert Park	\$1,913,500	6.5	\$294,385
Tailing Wheels Park	\$931,400	8.6	\$108,302
Gold Ridge Park	\$330,600	1.9	\$174,000
Total City of Jackson	\$3,175,500	17.0	\$186,794

Source: 2016 ACRA Park and Recreation Master Plan Update; SCI Consulting Group

City of Plymouth	Replacement Cost	Developed Acres	Replacement Cost per Acre
Lodge Hill Park	\$42,200	0.3	\$140,667
McGee Park	\$282,200	0.3	\$940,667
Sharkey Begovich Park	\$212,200	0.3	\$707,333
Veterans Memorial Park	\$169,000	1.0	\$169,000
Harold Colburn Field	\$406,400	1.1	\$369,455
Total City of Plymouth	\$1,112,000	3.0	\$370,667

Source: 2016 ACRA Park and Recreation Master Plan Update; SCI Consulting Group

City of Sutter Creek	Replacement Cost	Developed Acres	Replacement Cost per Acre
Bryson Park	\$566,000	1.5	\$377,333
Minnie Provis Park	\$780,000	2.5	\$312,000
Miners Bend Park	\$122,400	0.1	\$1,224,000
Total City of Sutter Creek	\$1,468,400	4.1	\$358,146

Source: 2016 ACRA Park and Recreation Master Plan Update; SCI Consulting Group

County of Amador (Unincorporated Area)	Replacement Cost	Developed Acres	Replacement Cost per Acre
Lions Park	\$269,000	1.0	\$269,000
Fiddletown Park	\$660,000	2.5	\$264,000
River Pines Park	\$332,400	1.6	\$207,750
Papoose Pond	\$1,828,600	6.4	\$285,719
Pine Grove Park	\$339,300	0.7	\$484,714
Volcano Memorial Park	\$49,700	0.3	\$165,667
Total Unincorporated County	\$3,479,000	12.5	\$278,320

Source: 2016 ACRA Park and Recreation Master Plan Update; SCI Consulting Group

Amador County Regional Parks	Replacement Cost	Developed Acres	Replacement Cost per Acre
Howard Park	\$9,147,500	70.0	\$130,679
Mollie Joyce Park	\$1,521,500	7.0	\$217,357
Pioneer Park	\$2,037,000	9.0	\$226,333
Total County	\$12,706,000	86.0	\$147,744

Source: 2016 ACRA Park and Recreation Master Plan Update; SCI Consulting Group

APPENDIX B – ESTIMATED COMMUNITY USE SPACE

FIGURE 14 – ESTIMATED COMMUNITY USE SPACE

Jurisdiction	Facility	Estimated Community Use Space (Sq. Ft.)
City of Amador City	Amador City Hall	900
City of Ione	Ione City Hall	880
	Evalynn Bishop Hall	12,672
City of Jackson	Jackson Civic Center	1,200
	Bill Scanlon Scout Hut	300
	The Hub	7,000
City of Plymouth	Plymouth City Hall	750
	Lodge Hill Building	3,000
City of Sutter Creek	Sutter Creek Auditorium	4,368
	Sutter Creek Community Bldg.	1,360
	Historical Sutter Grammer School	1,500
Unincorporated County	Pioneer Scout Hut	900
	Pioneer Veterans Hall	900
	Fiddletown Community Center	450
	Pine Grove Town Hall	1,000
	Armory Hall	30,410
	River Pines Park Community Bldg.	18,000
Total County		85,590

Source: Foothill Associates

APPENDIX C – ESTIMATED AQUATIC FACILITIES REPLACEMENT COST

FIGURE 15 – ESTIMATED AQUATIC FACILITIES REPLACEMENT COST

Jurisdiction	Facility	Estimated Facility Replacement Cost ¹	
		Calc	a
City of Ione	Ione Public Pool		\$1,750,000
City of Jackson	Pool at Detert Park		\$1,900,000
City of Plymouth	Plymouth Veterans Pool		\$1,750,000
City of Sutter Creek	Sutter Creek Public Pools		\$1,900,000

Source: Foothill Associates

APPENDIX D – MASTER PLAN CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROJECTS BY JURISDICTION

FIGURE 16 – MASTER PLAN CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROJECTS BY JURISDICTION

ID	Recommendation	Priority	Type	Lead Agency(s)	Estimated Cost	Use of Park Impact Fees
Amador County Recreation Agency						
Mollie Joyce Park						
PF-1	Add a children's play structure	1	Capital	ACRA	\$127,000	ACRA Regional Fees
PF-2	ADA upgrades to create an accessible route	1	Capital	ACRA	\$38,100	No. Existing deficiency.
PF-3	Parking upgrades	2	Capital	ACRA	\$355,600	No. Existing deficiency.
PF-4	Well, septic, and structural code compliance renovations to the existing house	3	Capital	ACRA	\$254,000	No. Existing deficiency.
PF-5	Establish natural surface trail system with signage, parking, and footbridge in the areas south of Highway	3	Capital	ACRA	\$179,388	Questionable. ACRA Regional Fees
PF-6	Sports field lighting	2	Capital	ACRA	\$381,000	ACRA Regional Fees Growth portion only.
					\$1,335,088	
Pioneer Park						
PF-7	Renovate the lower baseball field (i.e. grading, drainage, soil improvement, weed control)	1	Capital	ACRA	\$95,250	No. Existing deficiency.
PF-8	Sports field lighting	3	Capital	ACRA	\$190,500	Questionable. ACRA Regional Fees
PF-9	Replace missing standard at basketball court and remove asphalt curbing	1	Capital	ACRA	\$76,200	No. Existing deficiency.
PF-10	Create a larger multi-purpose sports court and/or repair tennis court surface and fence	1	Capital	ACRA	\$95,250	ACRA Regional Fees. Growth portion only.
PF-11	Add fenced dog exercise/play area	1	Capital	ACRA	\$63,500	ACRA Regional Fees
PF-12	Bring water and sewer/septic service to Scout Hut	2	Capital	ACRA	\$63,500	No. Existing deficiency.
PF-13	Repair, replace or remove gazebo/bandstand structure	2	Capital	ACRA	\$25,400	No. Existing deficiency.
PF-14	Improve ADA accessible route throughout park	1	Capital	ACRA	\$38,100	No. Existing deficiency.
PF-15	Replace block and plank benches near horseshoe pits	2	Capital	ACRA	\$25,400	No. Existing deficiency.
PF-16	Remove remnants of former par course	3	Capital	ACRA	\$2,540	No. Existing deficiency.

PF-17	Designate unpaved trail system with signage through forested area	3	Capital	ACRA	\$12,700	Questionable. ACRA Regional Fees
PF-18	Add boundary map and signage	3	Capital	ACRA	\$12,700	ACRA Regional Fees
PF-19	Climbing wall/structure	1	Capital	ACRA	\$6,350	ACRA Regional Fees
PF-20	Add a surveillance system	3	Capital	ACRA	\$6,350	No. Existing deficiency.
					\$713,740	
	Lions Park					
PF-21	Refurbish or replace picnic tables and barbeques	2	Capital	ACRA	\$35,560	No. Existing deficiency.
PF-22	Improve ADA accessible route throughout park	1	Capital	ACRA	\$25,400	County Park Impact Fee. Questionable.
PF-23	Add a picnic shelter	2	Capital	ACRA	\$101,600	County Park Impact Fee.
PF-24	Designate unpaved trail system with signage	3	Capital	ACRA	\$12,700	Questionable. County Park Impact Fee.
PF-25	Improve creek access and parking area	3	Capital	ACRA	\$164,592	No. Existing deficiency.
					\$339,852	
	Fiddletown Park					
PF-26	Repair tennis court surface	1	Capital	ACRA	\$63,500	No. Existing deficiency.
PF-27	Improve ADA access throughout the park, including the addition of a parking space	1	Capital	ACRA	\$31,750	Growth portion only. County Park Impact Fee.
					\$95,250	
	River Pines Park					
PF-28	Improve play area surfaces to provide ADA accessible route to play equipment	2	Capital	ACRA	\$2,540	No. Existing deficiency.
					\$2,540	
	The Hub					
PF-29	Add a kitchen	2	Capital	ACRA	\$31,750	County Park Impact Fee.
PF-30	Improve upstairs storage area	2	Capital	ACRA	\$12,700	No. Existing deficiency.
					\$44,450	

Amador City						
	School House Park					
PF-31	Rework the children's play area as necessary and add play equipment	1	Capital	Amador City	\$38,100	Growth portion only. County Park Impact Fee.
PF-32	Add a 3-on-3 court on the upper level	2	Capital	Amador City	\$50,800	County Park Impact Fee. s.
PF-33	Make landscape improvements, including tree and cactus removal	2	Capital	Amador City	\$12,700	No. Existing deficiency.
PF-34	Add signage and online information to help people learn of and find the park	3	Capital	Amador City	\$635	County Park Impact Fee.
					\$102,235	
Fiddletown Community						
	Fiddletown Community Center					
	No improvements are recommended					

City of lone						
	Depot Park					
PF-35	Develop an interpretive history site for the historic lone Train Depot	2	Capital	lone	\$12,700	City Park Impact Fee.
PF-36	Add children's play area	2	Capital	lone	\$101,600	City Park Impact Fee
PF-37	Add picnic tables and shade shelters	2	Capital	lone	\$63,500	City Park Impact Fee
PF-38	Add drinking fountain	2	Capital	lone	\$7,620	City Park Impact Fee
PF-39	Add landscaping	2	Capital	lone	\$247,650	Yes.
					\$433,070	
	Grover Park					
PF-40	Add new play equipment	1	Capital	lone	\$101,600	City Park Impact Fee
PF-41	Add a 3-on-3 basketball court	2	Capital	lone	\$50,800	City Park Impact Fee
PF-42	Add picnic tables and shade shelter	2	Capital	lone	\$63,500	City Park Impact Fee
PF-43	Add a drinking fountain	1	Capital	lone	\$7,620	City Park Impact Fee
PF-44	Add a walking/exercise circuit	2	Capital	lone	\$76,200	City Park Impact Fee
PF-45	Climbing wall/structure	1	Capital	lone	\$6,350	City Park Impact Fee
PF-46	Update landscaping	2	Capital	lone	\$12,700	No. Existing deficiency.
					\$318,770	
	Oakridge Park					
PF-47	Add new play equipment	1	Capital	lone	\$101,600	City Park Impact Fee
PF-48	Add a 3-on-3 basketball court	2	Capital	lone	\$50,800	City Park Impact Fee
PF-49	Add picnic tables and shade shelter	2	Capital	lone	\$63,500	City Park Impact Fee.
PF-50	Add a drinking fountain	1	Capital	lone	\$7,620	City Park Impact Fee
PF-51	Add a walking/exercise circuit	2	Capital	lone	\$76,200	City Park Impact Fee
PF-52	Add shade trees	2	Capital	lone	\$12,700	City Park Impact Fee
					\$312,420	
	Perry Earl Park					
PF-53	Add an accessible, single unisex restroom	3	Capital	lone	\$190,500	City Park Impact Fee
PF-54	Add a permanent picnic shelter	2	Capital	lone	\$57,150	City Park Impact Fee
PF-55	Add a drinking fountain	1	Capital	lone	\$7,620	City Park Impact Fee
					\$255,270	
	Train Park					
PF-56	Improve ADA access within the park, including a connection to the boardwalk overlooking Dry Creek	2	Capital	lone	\$19,050	No. Existing deficiency.
					\$19,050	

	Howard Park					
PF-57	Improve ADA access throughout the park	1	Capital	lone	\$127,000	No. Existing deficiency.
PF-58	Add barbeques to the group picnic area	2	Capital	lone	\$11,430	Questionable. ACRA Regional Fees
PF-59	Sports field lighting	2	Capital	lone	\$762,000	Questionable. ACRA Regional Fees
PF-60	Implement the complete Howard Park Master Plan over a period of time	3	Capital	lone	\$8,756,777	Questionable. ACRA Regional Fees. Growth portion only.
					\$9,657,207	
City of Jackson						
	Detert Park					
PF-61	Improve the parking areas with striping	2	Capital	Jackson	\$25,400	No. Existing deficiency.
PF-62	Climbing wall/structure	1	Capital	Jackson	\$6,350	City Park Impact Fee
PF-63	Add a safety fence and shelter at the group picnic area	1	Capital	Jackson	\$114,300	No. Existing deficiency.
					\$146,050	
	Tailing Wheels Park					
PF-64	Improve the dog park and add a shade shelter	2	Capital	Jackson	\$44,450	Growth portion only. City Park Impact Fee
PF-65	Add an accessible path to existing picnic table near accessible parking area	1	Capital	Jackson	\$1,270	No. Existing deficiency.
					\$45,720	
	Gold Ridge Park					
PF-66	Add a street sign to indicate the park's access for pedestrians and vehicles	1	Capital	Jackson	\$254	No. Existing deficiency.
PF-67	Add an accessible, single unisex restroom single	2	Capital	Jackson	\$190,500	City Park Impact Fee
PF-68	Add a small picnic shelter	2	Capital	Jackson	\$57,150	City Park Impact Fee
					\$247,904	
	Oro de Amador					
PF-69	Obtain environmental clearance and grant funding to develop as a regional park	2	Capital	Jackson	\$5,715,000	ACRA Regional Fees
					\$5,715,000	
Lake Camanche Village Owners Association						
	Papoose Pond					
PF-70	Add a children's play area with a shade structure	1	Capital	ACRA/LCVOA	\$190,500	County Park Impact Fee
PF-71	Add restrooms	1	Capital	ACRA/LCVOA	\$190,500	County Park Impact

						Fee
PF-72	Add walking trails	2	Capital	ACRA/LCVOA	\$38,100	Questionable
PF-73	Add a fishing pier	2	Capital	ACRA/LCVOA	\$25,400	County Park Impact Fee
					\$444,500	

Pine Grove Community Services District						
	Pine Grove Park					
	No improvements are recommended					
	Pine Grove Town Hall					
	No improvements are recommended					
City of Plymouth						
	Lodge Hill Park					
PF-74	Add a community garden	2	Capital	Plymouth	\$6,350	City Park Impact Fee
PF-75	Add walking paths	2	Capital	Plymouth	\$10,160	City Park Impact Fee.
PF-76	Add a play structure	2	Capital	Plymouth	\$101,600	City Park Impact Fee.
					\$118,110	
	McGee/Sharkey Begovich Park					
PF-77	Climbing wall/structure	1	Capital	Plymouth	\$6,350	City Park Impact Fee.
PF-78	Master plan for the existing parking area to repurpose it as additional parkland or plaza area for public use	3	Capital	Plymouth	\$10,160	No. Existing deficiency.
					\$16,510	
	Norm Waters Park					
PF-79	Obtain public access to the site and develop as a natural area park with walking trails and a disc golf course	3	Capital	Plymouth	\$35,100	City Park Impact Fee.
					\$35,100	
	Veterans Memorial Park					
PF-80	Add a parking area	2	Capital	Plymouth	\$39,688	City Park Impact Fee.
					\$39,688	
	Harold Colburn Field					
	No improvements are recommended					
	Plymouth Veterans Pool					
PF-81	Reline the pool	1	Capital	Plymouth	\$158,750	No. Existing deficiency.
PF-82	Upgrade the pump room	1	Capital	Plymouth	\$158,750	No. Existing deficiency.
PF-83	Upgrade the shade trellis	1	Capital	Plymouth	\$38,100	No. Existing deficiency.
					\$355,600	

City of Sutter Creek						
	Bryson Park					
PF-84	Repair and reopen the restrooms	1	Capital	Sutter Creek	\$6,350	No. Existing deficiency.
PF-85	Resurface and/or repair the basketball court	2	Capital	Sutter Creek	\$63,500	No. Existing deficiency.
PF-86	Repair the concrete loop path	2	Capital	Sutter Creek	\$1,905	No. Existing deficiency.
PF-87	Add a shade structure	1	Capital	Sutter Creek	\$57,150	City Park Impact Fee.
PF-88	Add a drinking fountain	1	Capital	Sutter Creek	\$7,620	City Park Impact Fee.
PF-89	Renovate the outdoor volleyball court	1	Capital	Sutter Creek	\$6,350	No. Existing deficiency.
PF-90	Provide an ADA accessible route to the basketball court and picnic tables	1	Capital	Sutter Creek	\$6,350	No. Existing deficiency.
					\$149,225	
	Minnie Provis Park					
PF-91	Improve ADA access throughout the park	1	Capital	Sutter Creek	\$25,400	No. Existing deficiency.
PF-92	Climbing wall/structure	1	Capital	Sutter Creek	\$6,350	City Park Impact Fee.
PF-93	Sports field lighting	1	Capital	Sutter Creek	\$190,500	Questionable. City Park Impact Fee.
					\$222,250	
	Miners Bend Park					
PF-94	Complete the park development as proposed	2	Capital	Sutter Creek	\$31,750	Uncertain. City Park Impact Fee.
					\$31,750	
	Sutter Creek Community Building					
	No improvements are recommended					

Volcano Community Services District						
	Volcano Memorial Park					
PF-95	Add an ADA accessible route	1	Capital	ACRA/VCSD	\$19,050	County Park Impact Fee.
PF-96	Add an ADA picnic table	1	Capital	ACRA/VCSD	\$3,810	County Park Impact Fee.
					\$22,860	
	Soldier's Gulch					
PF-97	Manage site vegetation	3	Capital	ACRA/VCSD	\$76,200	No. Existing deficiency.
PF-98	Create walking trails with wayfinding signage	3	Capital	ACRA/VCSD	\$38,100	County Park Impact Fee.
PF-99	Add parking	3	Capital	ACRA/VCSD	\$19,844	County Park Impact Fee.
					\$134,144	
	Armory Hall					
	No improvements are recommended					

Other Proposed Facilities						
	Special Use Facilities					
PF-100	Build water spray/play feature in a central location	1	Capital	ACRA	\$381,000	County Park Impact Fee.
PF-101	Build APAL dog park	1	Capital	ACRA/County	\$317,500	County Park Impact Fee.
PF-102	Build 3 softball fields (at Oro de Amador)	3	Capital	ACRA/Jackson	\$1,238,250	County Park Impact Fee.
PF-103	Build an indoor recreation center (at Oro de Amador)	3	Capital	ACRA/Jackson	\$8,255,000	County Park Impact Fee.
PF-104	Pool cover structure at centrally located pool	3	Capital	ACRA	\$349,250	County Park Impact Fee.
					\$10,541,000	
ESTIMATED COST FOR ALL PARKS AND RECREATION FACILITIES RECOMMENDATIONS					\$31,894,352	

(This Page Intentionally Left Blank)