

Development Exaction Comparative Analysis

Development Services Department

March 2017

Revised August 2017

[This page left intentionally blank]

Development Exaction Comparative Analysis

Development Services Department
City of Roseville

Prepared by:

Kevin Payne, Development Services Director
Mike Isom, Development Services Manager

Contact:

311 Vernon Street, Roseville CA 95678
(916) 774-5285
developmentservicesdept@roseville.ca.us

[This page left intentionally blank]

Table of Contents

OVERVIEW	1
SUMMARY OF FINDINGS	2
STUDY APPROACH	5
Exceptions	5
Exaction Categories	5
Surveyed Projects	6
FEES BY LAND USE TYPE	8
Single Family Residential Land Use	9
1. CUMULATIVE RESULTS	9
2. ROSEVILLE VS. REGIONAL MEDIAN BY EXACTION CATEGORY (SINGLE FAMILY)	11
3. SINGLE FAMILY RESIDENTIAL FINDINGS	12
Multi-Family Residential Land Use	13
1. CUMULATIVE RESULTS	13
2. ROSEVILLE VS. REGIONAL MEDIAN BY EXACTION CATEGORY (MULTI-FAMILY)	15
3. MULTI-FAMILY RESIDENTIAL FINDINGS	16
Retail Land Use	17
1. CUMULATIVE RESULTS	17
2. ROSEVILLE VS. REGIONAL MEDIAN BY EXACTION CATEGORY (RETAIL)	19
3. RETAIL LAND USE FINDINGS	20
Office Land Use	21
1. CUMULATIVE RESULTS	21
2. ROSEVILLE VS. REGIONAL MEDIAN BY EXACTION CATEGORY (OFFICE)	23
3. OFFICE LAND USE FINDINGS	24
Industrial Land Use	25
1. CUMULATIVE RESULTS	25
2. ROSEVILLE VS. REGIONAL MEDIAN BY EXACTION CATEGORY (INDUSTRIAL)	26
3. INDUSTRIAL LAND USE FINDINGS	28
APPENDIX A - JURISDICTIONAL FEE STUDY SOURCE DATA (944 PAGES - AVAILABLE UPON REQUEST)	29

List of Figures and Tables

Figure 1 - Surveyed Project Areas	8
Figure 2 - Cumulative Single Family Residential Exactions by Jurisdiction (Per-Unit)	9
Figure 3 - Processing Fees (Single Family)	11
Figure 4 - Development Impact Fees (Single Family)	11
Figure 5 - Plan Area Fees (Single Family)	11
Figure 6 - Developer Contribution (Single Family)	11
Figure 7 - School Impact Fees (Single Family)	12
Figure 8 - Cumulative Multi-Family Residential Exactions by Jurisdiction (Per-Unit).....	13
Figure 9 - Processing Fees (Multi-Family).....	15
Figure 10 - Development Impact Fees (Multi-Family).....	15
Figure 11 - Plan Area Fees (Multi-Family)	15
Figure 12 - Developer Contribution (Multi-Family)	16
Figure 13 - School Impact Fees (Multi-Family)	16
Figure 14 - Cumulative Retail Exactions by Jurisdiction (Per 1,000 Square-Feet).....	17
Figure 15 - Processing Fees (Retail)	19
Figure 16 - Development Impact Fees (Retail).....	19
Figure 17 - Plan Area Fees (Retail)	19
Figure 18 - Developer Contribution (Retail)	20
Figure 19 - School Impact Fees (Retail)	20
Figure 20 - Cumulative Retail Exactions by Jurisdiction (Per 1,000 Square-Feet).....	21
Figure 21 - Processing Fees (Office)	23
Figure 22 - Development Impact Fees (Office).....	23
Figure 23 - Plan Area Fees (Office)	23
Figure 24 - Developer Contribution (Office)	24
Figure 25 - School Impact Fees (Office)	24
Figure 26 - Cumulative Industrial Exactions by Jurisdiction (Per 1,000 Square-Feet)	25
Figure 27 - Processing Fees (Industrial).....	27
Figure 28 - Development Impact Fees (Industrial).....	27
Figure 29 - Plan Area Fees (Industrial).....	27
Figure 30 - School Impact Fees (Industrial).....	28
Table 1 - Detailed Single Family Residential Exactions by Jurisdiction.....	10
Table 2 - Detailed Multi-Family Residential Exactions by Jurisdiction	14
Table 3 - Detailed Retail Exactions by Jurisdiction (Per 1,000 Square Feet)	18
Table 4 - Detailed Office Exactions by Jurisdiction (Per 1,000 Square Feet)	22
Table 5 - Detailed Industrial Exactions by Jurisdiction (Per 1,000 Square Feet).....	26

OVERVIEW

The Development Services Department (DSD) was tasked in its Fiscal Year 2017 work program to produce a study comparing the City's development exactions to surrounding jurisdictions. The content of this report reflects and builds on a similar past effort conducted in 2012.

In 2012, the City commissioned Willdan Financial Services to provide a benchmark study comparing exactions for public services, facilities, and amenities required as a condition of land development approvals. The Willdan effort produced a side-by-side comparison of the exactions associated with six land use types and prototypical projects on twelve development sites.

In 2016 the City of Roseville, with assistance from Terry Madsen of Clear Source Financial Consulting (CSFC), performed research to update the fee data presented in the 2012 Willdan study. For consistency, CSFC's data research generally mirrored the format of the Willdan study, focusing on five specific land use types, including: single family residential, multi-family residential, retail/commercial, office, and industrial. The data presented herein compares Roseville's processing/permitting fees, development impact fees, plan area fees, required developer contributions, and school impact fees to project areas in other jurisdictions in the Sacramento region, including: Elk Grove, Folsom, Lincoln, Placer County, and the Cities of Sacramento and West Sacramento.

The purpose of this report is to present a comparative snapshot that examines the City's development exactions relative to surrounding jurisdictions. The City's intent is twofold: 1) to understand the exaction costs associated with development within the city of Roseville when compared to exactions for services and capital improvements associated with new development in other jurisdictions; and, 2) to gauge Roseville's overall cost-competitiveness for development.

Disclaimer: all development projects are unique. This document attempts to present exactions associated with "typical" land use types as a rough order of magnitude within specific geographic areas at a specific point in time. Therefore, fees assessed to individual projects may differ from what is presented in this study.

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

As indicated in Tables S1-S5, Roseville’s fee structure remains competitive with the region, and is equal to or below median in all five land use types, as follows:

- **Single Family Residential** – The five representative project areas in the City of Roseville for single family residential development range from a high of \$92,342 to a low of \$64,412 per unit. The *median* exaction of the five Roseville project areas is equal to the regional median of \$72,285 per unit.
- **Multi-Family Residential** – The four representative project areas in the City of Roseville for multi-family residential development range from a high of \$48,257 to a low of \$27,452 per unit. The *median* exaction of the four Roseville project areas is equal to the regional median of \$40,839.
- **Retail** – The four representative project areas in the City of Roseville for retail development range from a high of \$18,916 to a low of \$13,224 per thousand square feet. The *median* exaction of the four Roseville project areas is \$15,956, which is 34% lower than the regional median of \$24,022.
- **Office** – The four representative project areas in the City of Roseville for office development range from a high of \$19,040 to a low of \$13,995 per thousand square feet. The *median* exaction of the four Roseville project areas is \$16,246, which is 22% lower than the regional median of \$20,708.
- **Industrial** – The three representative project areas in the City of Roseville for industrial development range from a high of \$9,242 to a low of \$7,247 per thousand square feet. The *median* exaction among the three Roseville project areas is \$7,298, which is 32% lower than the regional median of \$10,670.

Figure S1 - Cumulative Single Family Residential Exactions by Jurisdiction (Per-Unit)




Figure S2 - Cumulative Multi-Family Residential Exactions by Jurisdiction (Per-Unit)



Figure S3 - Cumulative Retail Exactions by Jurisdiction (Per 1,000 Square-Feet)



Figure S4 - Cumulative Office Exactions by Jurisdiction (Per 1,000 Square-Feet)




Figure S5 - Cumulative Industrial Exactions by Jurisdiction (Per 1,000 Square-Feet)



STUDY APPROACH

This report relies on data collected by surveying surrounding jurisdictions and quantifying the results for the five exaction categories. It also provides a cumulative cost associated with exactions in each of these jurisdictions, as well as an individual comparison of the Roseville-project median to the comparative regional-project median in the various exaction categories.

The approach and methodology was to determine the amount of exactions imposed on comparable plan areas compared to costs associated with similar project areas that have development potential in Roseville. The survey attempts to quantify and categorize all fees associated with the construction of the typical land use types within Roseville compared to the surveyed jurisdictions.

Exceptions

Note that the information presented is a best attempt to align exactions between the surveyed jurisdictions for each land use type. Each jurisdiction has a different approach to exactions and fees. This report attempts to align the fees/exactions as closely as possible; however, exceptions to keep in mind include:

1. Fees shown are intended to represent a rough order of magnitude rather than exact figures.
2. Fees are based on interpretation of agency published fee schedules.
3. Consistent with past analyses, solid waste and electric fees have been excluded due to unreconcilable variations between service providers for the project areas analyzed.
4. The surveyed project areas were approved at different points in time, making them subject to different fee schedules and unique development-specific obligations. For example, residential development in the Westpark component of the West Roseville Specific Plan (WRSP) does not have the same fee obligations as the Fiddymont Ranch neighborhood of the WRSP, where a downtown benefit fee was implemented through the development agreement amendment associated with a specific plan amendment. This situation is also true of surrounding regional projects.
5. The date on which projects were approved has a significant influence on the cumulative fee total. For example, more recent projects are being assessed regional capital improvement fees (e.g., Tier 2 traffic fees) that might not have been in place at the time an older project was approved. The same is true for a project that does not result in regional impacts requiring mitigation.

Exaction Categories

The following defines the exactions contained in the survey results compiled by CSFC:

- **Processing Fees:** Building and permit fees charged by planning and building departments as part of the planning and land use entitlement stage.
- **Development Impact Fees:** One-time charges imposed on new development to finance infrastructure that must be built or expanded as a result of the new development. These fees are designed to offset the impact of new development and associated population growth on the municipality's infrastructure and services. Impact fees are typically for improvements in or near a specific project area, within larger zones or plan areas, or city- or county-wide capital improvements.

- **Plan Area Impact Fees:** One-time fees assessed on new development within specific plan areas necessary to fund the facilities required to accommodate growth and mitigate specific plan impacts. These fees are not typically applied on a citywide basis, but are associated with development of a specific plan area and are contained within corresponding development agreements. Examples include the community benefit fee, various joint powers authority fees, and the South Placer Regional Transportation Authority fee. Plan area fees may also include costs resulting from project litigation, such as the air quality fee in the WRSP.
- **Developer Contributions:** A Developer assumes repayment for financing of exactions not included in fee programs. These can include, but are not limited to, capital funding provisions within development agreements. Project areas may also provide credits for impact fees and reimbursements from future impact fees paid by other developers served by the same facilities.
- **School Impact Fees:** School fees are one-time fees assessed on new development that must be spent on school-related capital improvements required to increase capacity to accommodate growth. School fees are directly established and collected by the local school districts; the City exercises no control or discretion over school impact fees.

Surveyed Projects

Five typical land use types were examined from a sampling of specific/master plan areas in Roseville and surrounding jurisdictions.

Single Family Development - Thirteen project areas, including five from Roseville, were examined for single family residential development costs:

Surrounding Jurisdictions

- | | |
|--------------------------------------|--|
| ▪ Laguna Ridge – City of Elk Grove | ▪ Sunridge Park – City of Rancho Cordova |
| ▪ Broadstone – City of Folsom | ▪ Whitney Ranch- City of Rocklin |
| ▪ Lincoln Crossing – City of Lincoln | ▪ North Natomas – City of Sacramento |
| ▪ Placer Vineyards – Placer County | ▪ Southport – City of West Sacramento |

Roseville

- | | |
|-------------------------------|---|
| ▪ Amoruso Ranch Specific Plan | ▪ Creekview Specific Plan |
| ▪ Sierra Vista Specific Plan | ▪ West Roseville Specific Plan (Fiddymont Ranch and Westpark) |

Multi-Family Development - Twelve project areas, including four from Roseville, were examined for multi-family development costs:

Surrounding Jurisdictions

- | | |
|--------------------------------------|--|
| ▪ Laguna Ridge – City of Elk Grove | ▪ Sunridge Park – City of Rancho Cordova |
| ▪ Broadstone – City of Folsom | ▪ Whitney Ranch- City of Rocklin |
| ▪ Lincoln Crossing – City of Lincoln | ▪ North Natomas – City of Sacramento |
| ▪ Placer Vineyards – Placer County | ▪ Southport – City of West Sacramento |

Roseville

- West Roseville Specific Plan (Fiddymment Ranch)
- Creekview Specific Plan
- Infill
- Sierra Vista Specific Plan

Retail/Commercial Development – Fourteen project areas, including four from Roseville, were examined for retail/commercial development costs:

Surrounding Jurisdictions

- Laguna Ridge – City of Elk Grove
- Broadstone – City of Folsom
- Lincoln Crossing – City of Lincoln
- Placer Vineyards – Placer County
- Sunset Industrial – Placer County
- Sunridge Park – City of Rancho Cordova
- Whitney Ranch- City of Rocklin
- North Natomas – City of Sacramento
- Southport – City of West Sacramento
- Metro Air Park – Sacramento County

Roseville

- West Roseville Specific Plan (Fiddymment Ranch)
- North Central Roseville Specific Plan
- Infill
- Sierra Vista Specific Plan

Office Development - Fourteen project areas, including four from Roseville, were examined for retail and office development costs:

Surrounding Jurisdictions

- Laguna Ridge – City of Elk Grove
- Broadstone – City of Folsom
- Lincoln Crossing – City of Lincoln
- Placer Vineyards – Placer County
- Sunset Industrial – Placer County
- Sunridge Park – City of Rancho Cordova
- Whitney Ranch- City of Rocklin
- North Natomas – City of Sacramento
- Southport – City of West Sacramento
- Metro Air Park – Sacramento County

Roseville

- West Roseville Specific Plan (Fiddymment Ranch)
- North Central Roseville Specific Plan
- Infill
- Northeast Roseville Specific Plan

Industrial Development - Four project areas, including one from Roseville, were examined for industrial development costs:

Surrounding Jurisdictions

- Sunset Industrial – Placer County
- North Natomas – City of Sacramento
- Metro Air Park – Sacramento County


Roseville

- West Roseville Specific Plan (Westpark)
- North Industrial Plan Area
- North Central Roseville Specific Plan

Since many of the growth areas have limited or no industrial development potential, the sample size for industrial exactions is smaller than that for the other land uses surveyed and was primarily limited to Roseville and unincorporated Placer and Sacramento Counties.

Figure 1 identifies the locations of the project areas examined in this study.

Figure 1 - Surveyed Project Areas



1. Lincoln Crossings
2. Amoruso Ranch Specific Plan
3. Whitney Ranch
4. Creekview Specific Plan
5. West Roseville Specific Plan
6. Sierra Vista Specific Plan
7. North Central Roseville Specific Plan
8. Roseville Infill Area
9. Northeast Roseville Specific Plan
10. Placer Vineyards
11. Broadstone
12. North Natomas
13. Sunridge Park
14. Southport
15. Laguna Ridge

FEES BY LAND USE TYPE

This segment addresses each of the five land use types examined in the survey. The following presents a regional fee comparison that summarizes the total exactions associated with the development of each use type. The five exaction categories include: processing fees, development impact fees, plan area fees, developer contribution, and school impact fees. The five exaction categories are further highlighted to reflect how Roseville compares with surrounding jurisdictions.

Single Family Residential Land Use

The following evaluates the five exaction categories associated with development of single family residential units throughout the region. Thirteen project areas, including five from Roseville, were examined. The five Roseville projects include:

- West Roseville Specific Plan (Fiddymnt Ranch)
- Amoruso Ranch Specific Plan
- Creekview Specific Plan
- Sierra Vista Specific Plan
- West Roseville Specific Plan (Westpark)

Individual Roseville projects are higher and lower, but for purposes of comparison to the regional median, the five Roseville projects are combined and presented as the “Roseville median.”

1. CUMULATIVE RESULTS

All single-family residential exactions are presented on a per-unit basis. The cumulative results are summarized by exaction category in Figure 2.

Figure 2 - Cumulative Single Family Residential Exactions by Jurisdiction (Per-Unit)



Figure 2 indicates that the North Natomas project area in the city of Sacramento has the lowest cumulative fees at \$49,904 per unit. In contrast, the Sierra Vista Specific Plan in the city of Roseville has the highest cumulative total at \$92,342 per unit.

The five representative project areas in the City of Roseville for single family residential development range from a high of \$92,342 to a low of \$66,412 per unit. The median exaction of the five Roseville project areas is equal to the regional median of \$72,285 per unit.

Table 1 provides a detailed breakdown of costs by jurisdiction.

Table 1 - Detailed Single Family Residential Exactions by Jurisdiction

City	Elk Grove	Folsom	Lincoln	Unincorp. Placer Co.	Rancho Cordova	Rocklin	Roseville	Roseville	Roseville	Roseville	Roseville	Sacramento	West Sacramento
Development Area	Laguna Ridge	Broadstone	Lincoln Crossing	Placer Vineyards	Sunridge Park	Whitney Ranch	Fiddymt Ranch	ARSP Low Density	Creekview Low D'sity	SVSP Low D'sity	Wstprk Low D'sity	North Natomas	Southport
Processing Fees													
Processing Fees	\$3,000	\$3,600	\$3,500	\$3,800	\$3,300	\$2,900	\$2,400	\$2,400	\$2,400	\$2,400	\$2,400	\$4,500	\$3,500
Total	\$3,000	\$3,600	\$3,500	\$3,800	\$3,300	\$2,900	\$2,400	\$2,400	\$2,400	\$2,400	\$2,400	\$4,500	\$3,500
Development Impact Fees													
Drainage / Flood	\$3,169	\$958	\$1,060	\$279	\$3,169		\$451	\$451	\$451	\$451	\$451	\$4,532	\$7,998
Affordable Housing	\$4,132												
Child Care													\$620
Library													
Conservation												\$2,063	
Police		\$555											\$1,185
Public Facilities	\$2,758	\$1,474	\$8,163	\$4,189	\$3,673	\$4,187	\$3,016	\$3,016	\$3,016	\$3,016	\$3,016	\$385	\$1,565
Fire	\$1,941	\$1,003		\$1,298	\$1,133		\$1,165	\$1,165	\$1,165	\$1,165	\$1,165		\$1,207
Parks/Open Space		\$6,587	\$453			\$2,696	\$6,236	\$6,736	\$6,153	\$6,075	\$6,924	\$6,169	\$15,430
Roadway - City	\$8,221	\$7,546	\$3,636		\$1,835	\$3,774	\$4,440	\$6,920	\$6,920	\$4,589	\$2,758	\$1,864	\$13,579
Roadway - County	\$1,206	\$1,182	\$1,448	\$4,587	\$1,182	\$2,894	\$2,101	\$9,275	\$9,275	\$9,275	\$9,275	\$2,101	\$1,206
Sewer - City		\$991	\$6,444				\$345	\$345	\$345	\$345	\$345	\$162	\$3,405
Sewer - Regional	\$8,379	\$5,523		\$8,525	\$8,379	\$11,207	\$7,457	\$7,457	\$7,457	\$7,457	\$7,457	\$5,523	\$5,523
Transit		\$704											
Water	\$15,482	\$4,015	\$21,559	\$17,307	\$15,482	\$15,320	\$9,435	\$9,435	\$9,435	\$9,435	\$9,435	\$3,473	\$8,043
Other			\$2,078			\$2,654	\$2,078	\$2,078	\$2,078	\$2,078	\$2,078		\$3,974
Total	\$45,288	\$30,538	\$44,841	\$36,185	\$34,853	\$42,732	\$36,723	\$46,877	\$46,294	\$43,886	\$35,730	\$25,377	\$62,529
Plan Area Impact Fees													
Plan Area Impact Fees	\$19,442	\$0	\$0	\$33,247	\$20,635	\$4,445	\$1,187	\$0	\$0	\$18,790	\$1,279	\$9,665	\$0
Total	\$19,442	\$0	\$0	\$33,247	\$20,635	\$4,445	\$1,187	\$0	\$0	\$18,790	\$1,279	\$9,665	\$0
Developer Contribution													
Developer Contribution	\$0	\$3,100	\$0	\$0	\$3,988	\$0	\$7,631	\$1,663	\$1,592	\$1,785	\$2,908	\$0	\$0
Total	\$0	\$3,100	\$0	\$0	\$3,988	\$0	\$7,631	\$1,663	\$1,592	\$1,785	\$2,908	\$0	\$0
School Impact Fees													
School Impact Fees	\$11,022	\$14,300	\$9,636	\$7,260	\$11,022	\$8,892	\$16,487	\$24,221	\$21,998	\$25,481	\$22,096	\$10,362	\$7,392
Total	\$11,022	\$14,300	\$9,636	\$7,260	\$11,022	\$8,892	\$16,487	\$24,221	\$21,998	\$25,481	\$22,096	\$10,362	\$7,392
Total	\$78,752	\$51,538	\$57,977	\$80,492	\$73,798	\$58,969	\$64,428	\$75,161	\$72,285	\$92,342	\$64,412	\$49,904	\$73,421

Notes:

- Amounts shown are estimates and are intended to provide order of magnitude information rather than exact figures.
- Amounts are based on interpretation of agency published fee schedules and information developed as part of 2008 and 2012 regional fee comparisons.
- Amounts exclude impact/developer/mitigation fees for solid waste and electric.

2. ROSEVILLE VS. REGIONAL MEDIAN BY EXACTION CATEGORY (SINGLE FAMILY)

This section examines the median exactions for the five Roseville project areas compared to the regional median.

❖ Processing Fees

Figure 3 indicates that Roseville's processing fees for single family residential development are 20% lower than the regional median.




Figure 3 - Processing Fees (Single Family)

❖ Development Impact Fees

Figure 4 indicates that Roseville's development impact fees for single family residential development are 3% higher than the regional median.




Figure 4 - Development Impact Fees (Single Family)

❖ Plan Area Fees

Figure 5 indicates that Roseville's plan area fees for single family residential development are 7% lower than the regional median.




Figure 5 - Plan Area Fees (Single Family)

❖ Developer Contribution

Figure 6 indicates that Roseville's developer contribution for single family residential development are 12% higher than the regional median.




Figure 6 - Developer Contribution (Single Family)

❖ School Impact Fees

Figure 7 indicates that Roseville’s school impact fees for single family residential development are 100% higher than the regional median.




Figure 7 - School Impact Fees (Single Family)

3. SINGLE FAMILY RESIDENTIAL FINDINGS

At \$72,285 per unit, the City of Roseville’s *median* single family residential development exactions are equal to the regional median of \$72,285.

Multi-Family Residential Land Use

The following evaluates the five exaction categories associated with development of multi-family residential units throughout the region. Twelve project areas, including four from Roseville, were examined. The four Roseville projects include:

- West Roseville Specific Plan (Fiddymment Ranch)
- Creekview Specific Plan
- Infill
- Sierra Vista Specific Plan

Individual Roseville projects are higher and lower, but for purposes of comparison to the regional median, the four Roseville projects are combined and presented as the “Roseville median.”

1. CUMULATIVE RESULTS

All exactions are presented on a per-unit basis. The cumulative results are summarized by exaction category in Figure 8.

Figure 8 - Cumulative Multi-Family Residential Exactions by Jurisdiction (Per-Unit)




Figure 8 indicates that the North Natomas project area in the city of Sacramento has the lowest cumulative fees at \$26,331 per unit. In contrast, Southport in the city of West Sacramento has the highest cumulative total at \$50,129 per unit.

The four representative project areas in the city of Roseville for multi-family residential development range from a high of \$48,257 (SVSP) to a low of \$27,452 per unit (Infill). The median exaction of the four Roseville project areas is equal to the regional median of \$40,839 per unit.

Table 2 provides a detailed breakdown of costs by jurisdiction.

Table 2 - Detailed Multi-Family Residential Exactions by Jurisdiction

City	Elk Grove	Folsom	Lincoln	Unincorp. Placer Co.	Rancho Cordova	Rocklin	Roseville	Roseville	Roseville	Roseville	City of Sacramento	West Sacramento
Development Area	Laguna Ridge	Broadstone	Lincoln Crossing	Placer Vineyards	Sunridge Park	Whitney Ranch	Fiddymt Ranch	CVSP - Roseville	Infill - Roseville	SVSP - Roseville	North Natomas	Southport
Processing Fees												
Processing Fees	\$1,300	\$900	\$1,300	\$1,800	\$1,900	\$1,100	\$1,300	\$1,300	\$1,300	\$1,300	\$1,600	\$1,800
Total	\$1,300	\$900	\$1,300	\$1,800	\$1,900	\$1,100	\$1,300	\$1,300	\$1,300	\$1,300	\$1,600	\$1,800
Development Impact Fees												
Drainage / Flood	\$962	\$958	\$254	\$178	\$962		\$372	\$372	\$178	\$372	\$1,003	\$3,897
Affordable Housing	\$2,479											
Child Care												\$233
Library												
Conservation											\$1,021	
Police		\$629										\$934
Public Facilities	\$1,943	\$1,474	\$5,977	\$3,007	\$2,870	\$2,130	\$2,011	\$2,011	\$2,011	\$2,011	\$250	\$1,233
Fire	\$1,277	\$970		\$502	\$884							\$951
Parks/Open Space		\$4,405	\$323			\$2,368	\$4,971	\$5,622	\$2,929	\$4,304	\$3,620	\$12,653
Roadway - City	\$5,712	\$5,282	\$2,618		\$1,862	\$2,378	\$2,793	\$4,352	\$3,963	\$2,887	\$843	\$10,793
Roadway - County	\$844	\$827	\$889	\$2,816	\$827	\$1,777	\$1,301	\$5,339	\$886	\$5,846	\$827	
Sewer - City		\$775	\$5,153				\$345	\$345	\$345	\$345		\$3,065
Sewer - Regional	\$4,999	\$4,142		\$8,925	\$4,999	\$11,207	\$7,457	\$7,457	\$7,457	\$7,457	\$4,142	\$4,142
Transit		\$485										
Water	\$11,612	\$2,509	\$10,625	\$7,335	\$11,612	\$7,335	\$3,911	\$3,911	\$3,911	\$3,911	\$2,605	\$4,648
Other			\$1,515			\$1,933	\$1,515	\$1,515	\$1,515	\$1,515		\$2,925
Total	\$29,827	\$22,456	\$27,354	\$22,763	\$24,015	\$29,127	\$24,676	\$30,924	\$23,194	\$28,647	\$14,311	\$45,473
Plan Area Impact Fees												
Plan Area Impact Fees	\$12,963	\$0	\$0	\$22,755	\$15,198	\$2,657	\$3,780	\$0	\$0	\$10,644	\$6,417	\$0
Total	\$12,963	\$0	\$0	\$22,755	\$15,198	\$2,657	\$3,780	\$0	\$0	\$10,644	\$6,417	\$0
Developer Contribution												
Developer Contribution	\$0	\$2,170	\$0	\$0	\$3,988	\$0	\$5,000	\$845	\$0	\$845	\$0	\$0
Total	\$0	\$2,170	\$0	\$0	\$3,988	\$0	\$5,000	\$845	\$0	\$845	\$0	\$0
School Impact Fees												
School Impact Fees	\$4,259	\$5,525	\$3,723	\$2,805	\$4,259	\$3,856	\$7,033	\$6,821	\$2,958	\$6,821	\$4,004	\$2,856
Total	\$4,259	\$5,525	\$3,723	\$2,805	\$4,259	\$3,856	\$7,033	\$6,821	\$2,958	\$6,821	\$4,004	\$2,856
Total	\$48,349	\$31,051	\$32,377	\$50,123	\$49,359	\$36,740	\$41,789	\$39,890	\$27,452	\$48,257	\$26,331	\$50,129

Notes:

- Amounts shown are estimates and are intended to provide order of magnitude information rather than exact figures.
- Amounts are based on interpretation of agency published fee schedules and information developed as part of 2008 and 2012 regional fee comparisons.
- Amounts exclude impact/developer/mitigation fees for solid waste and electric.

2. ROSEVILLE VS. REGIONAL MEDIAN BY EXACTION CATEGORY (MULTI-FAMILY)

This section examines the median exactions for the four Roseville project areas compared to the regional median.

❖ Processing Fees

Figure 9 indicates that Roseville's processing fees for multi-family residential development are equal to the regional median.




Figure 9 - Processing Fees (Multi-Family)

❖ Development Impact Fees

Figure 10 indicates that Roseville's development impact fees for multi-family residential development are 2.5% higher than the regional median.




Figure 10 - Development Impact Fees (Multi-Family)

❖ Plan Area Fees

Figure 11 indicates that Roseville's plan area fees for multi-family residential development are 41% lower than the regional median.




Figure 11 - Plan Area Fees (Multi-Family)

❖ Developer Contribution¹

Figure 12 indicates that Roseville’s developer contribution for multi-family residential development is higher than the regional median.




Figure 12 - Developer Contribution (Multi-Family)

❖ School Impact Fees

Figure 13 indicates that Roseville’s school impact fees for multi-family residential development are 65% higher than the regional median.




Figure 13 - School Impact Fees (Multi-Family)

3. MULTI-FAMILY RESIDENTIAL FINDINGS

At \$40,839 per unit, the City of Roseville’s *median* multi-family residential development exactions are equal to the regional median of \$40,839.

¹ Values for the Developer Contribution category for multi-family development range from \$0 to \$5,000 per unit. Roseville exacts fees in this category in three of the four plan areas examined. Only five of fourteen of the surveyed project areas exact fees in this category, thus, the median value is \$0. For purposes of comparison, of the project areas assessing this fee, the regional median (excluding \$0 values) would be \$2,170 compared to the Roseville median of \$845 per unit.

Retail Land Use

The following evaluates the five exaction categories associated with development of retail projects throughout the region. Fourteen project areas, including four from Roseville, were examined. The four Roseville projects include:

- West Roseville Specific Plan (Fiddyment Ranch)
- Infill
- North Central Roseville Specific Plan
- Sierra Vista Specific Plan

Individual Roseville projects are higher and lower, but for purposes of comparison to the regional median, the five Roseville projects are combined and presented as the “Roseville median.”

1. CUMULATIVE RESULTS

All exactions are presented per-one thousand square feet. The cumulative results are summarized by exaction category in Figure 14.

Figure 14 - Cumulative Retail Exactions by Jurisdiction (Per 1,000 Square-Feet)




Figure 14 indicates that the North Central Roseville Specific Plan area in the city of Roseville has the lowest cumulative fees at \$13,224 per thousand square feet. In contrast, the Southport project area in the city of West Sacramento has the highest cumulative total at \$31,697 per thousand square feet.

The four representative project areas in the city of Roseville for retail development range from a high of \$18,916 (SVSP) to a low of \$13,224 (NCRSP) per thousand square feet. The *median* exaction of the four Roseville project areas is \$15,956, which is 34% lower than the regional median of \$24,022 per unit.

Table 3 provides a detailed breakdown of costs by jurisdiction.

Table 3 - Detailed Retail Exactions by Jurisdiction (Per 1,000 Square Feet)

City	Elk Grove	Folsom	Lincoln	Unincorp. Placer Co.	Unincorp. Placer Co.	Rancho Cordova	Rocklin	Roseville	Roseville	Roseville	Roseville	City of Sacramento	Unincorp. Sac. Co.	West Sacramento
Development Area	Laguna Ridge	Broadstone	Lincoln Crossing	Placer Vineyards	Sunset Industrial	Sunridge Park	Whitney Ranch	Fiddymant Ranch	Infill	NCRSP	SVSP	North Natomas	Metro Air Park	Southport
Processing Fees														
Processing Fees	\$600	\$1,000	\$500	\$700	\$700	\$700	\$500	\$500	\$500	\$500	\$500	\$900	\$900	\$600
Total	\$600	\$1,000	\$500	\$700	\$700	\$700	\$500	\$500	\$500	\$500	\$500	\$900	\$900	\$600
Development Impact Fees														
Drainage / Flood	\$1,957	\$536	\$519	\$37	\$195	\$1,957		\$538	\$195	\$538	\$538	\$1,570	\$1,570	\$7,723
Affordable Housing	\$680	\$1,540				\$770								
Child Care														\$465
Library														
Conservation												\$3,508		
Police		\$935												\$718
Public Facilities	\$940	\$460	\$2,395	\$560	\$560	\$460	\$1,120	\$580	\$580	\$580	\$580			\$948
Fire	\$1,640	\$611			\$420	\$597		\$312	\$0	\$312	\$312			\$732
Parks/Open Space		\$456	\$156									\$433		\$1,330
Roadway - City	\$7,450	\$11,330	\$4,861			\$3,710	\$6,038	\$5,936	\$8,423	\$4,203	\$6,136	\$499		\$14,712
Roadway - County	\$1,810	\$1,773	\$1,936	\$6,133	\$6,253	\$1,773	\$3,869	\$2,808	\$1,929	\$2,285	\$6,045	\$1,773	\$9,423	
Sewer - City		\$60	\$3,451					\$115	\$115	\$115	\$115			\$837
Sewer - Regional	\$2,681	\$1,105		\$2,842	\$2,486	\$2,681	\$3,736	\$2,486	\$2,486	\$2,486	\$2,486	\$1,105	\$1,105	\$1,105
Transit		\$363												
Water	\$1,623	\$762	\$3,260	\$3,291	\$3,851	\$1,623	\$3,851	\$1,324	\$1,324	\$1,324	\$1,324	\$378	\$696	\$1,334
Other			\$320				\$320	\$320	\$320	\$320	\$320			\$634
Total	\$18,781	\$19,930	\$16,899	\$12,863	\$13,765	\$13,571	\$18,933	\$14,419	\$15,372	\$12,164	\$17,856	\$9,266	\$12,794	\$30,537
Plan Area Impact Fees														
Plan Area Impact Fees	\$510	\$0	\$0	\$16,523	\$0	\$16,840	\$2,840	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$18,759	\$13,060	\$0
Total	\$510	\$0	\$0	\$16,523	\$0	\$16,840	\$2,840	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$18,759	\$13,060	\$0
Developer Contribution														
Developer Contribution	\$11,140	\$3,720	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Total	\$11,140	\$3,720	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
School Impact Fees														
School Impact Fees	\$560	\$560	\$560	\$560	\$560	\$560	\$560	\$560	\$560	\$560	\$560	\$560	\$560	\$560
Total	\$560	\$560	\$560	\$560	\$560	\$560	\$560	\$560	\$560	\$560	\$560	\$560	\$560	\$560
Total	\$31,591	\$25,210	\$17,959	\$30,645	\$15,025	\$31,671	\$22,833	\$15,479	\$16,432	\$13,224	\$18,916	\$29,485	\$27,314	\$31,697

Notes:
 - Amounts shown are estimates and are intended to provide order of magnitude information rather than exact figures.
 - Amounts are based on interpretation of agency published fee schedules and information developed as part of 2008 and 2012 regional fee comparisons.
 - Amounts exclude impact/developer/mitigation fees for solid waste and electric.

2. ROSEVILLE VS. REGIONAL MEDIAN BY EXACTION CATEGORY (RETAIL)

This section examines the median exactions for the four Roseville project areas compared to the regional median.

❖ Processing Fees

Figure 15 indicates that Roseville's processing fees for retail development are 17% lower than the regional median.




Figure 15 - Processing Fees (Retail)

❖ Development Impact Fees

Figure 16 indicates that Roseville's development impact fees for retail development are 8% lower than the regional median.




Figure 16 - Development Impact Fees (Retail)

❖ Plan Area Fees²

Figure 17 indicates that Roseville's plan area fees for retail development are equal to the regional median.




Figure 17 - Plan Area Fees (Retail)

² Values for the Plan Area Fees category range from \$0 to \$18,759. Roseville does not exact fees in this category for retail. Only six of fourteen of the surveyed project areas exact plan area fees for retail. Thus, the median value is \$0. For purposes of comparison, of the communities assessing this fee, the median (excluding \$0 values) would be \$14,791.

❖ Developer Contribution³

Figure 18 indicates that Roseville’s developer contribution for retail development is equal to the regional median.




Figure 18 - Developer Contribution (Retail)

❖ School Impact Fees

Figure 19 indicates that Roseville’s school impact fees for retail development are equal to the regional median.




Figure 19 - School Impact Fees (Retail)

3. RETAIL LAND USE FINDINGS

At \$15,956 per thousand square feet, the City of Roseville’s *median* retail development exactions are 34% lower than the regional median of \$24,022.

³ Values for Developer Contribution for retail development range from \$0 to \$11,140. Roseville does not exact fees in this category for retail. Only two of fourteen of the surveyed project areas exact fees in this category for retail. Thus, the median value is \$0. For purposes of comparison, of the communities assessing these fees, the median (excluding \$0 values) would be \$7,430.

Office Land Use

The following evaluates the five exaction categories associated with development of office projects throughout the region. Fourteen project areas, including four from Roseville, were examined. The four Roseville projects include:

- West Roseville Specific Plan (Fiddymment Ranch)
- Infill
- North Central Roseville Specific Plan
- Northeast Roseville Specific Plan

Individual Roseville projects are higher and lower, but for purposes of comparison to the regional median, the five Roseville projects are combined and presented as the “Roseville median.”

1. CUMULATIVE RESULTS

All exactions are presented per-one thousand square feet. The cumulative results are summarized by exaction category in Figure 20.

Figure 20 - Cumulative Office Exactions by Jurisdiction (Per 1,000 Square-Feet)




Table 4 indicates that the Northeast Roseville Specific Plan area in the city of Roseville has the lowest cumulative fees at \$13,995 per thousand square feet. In contrast, Placer Vineyards in unincorporated Placer County has the highest cumulative total at \$35,072 per thousand square feet.

The four representative project areas in the city of Roseville for office development range from a high of \$19,040 (Infill) to a low of \$13,995 (NERSP) per thousand square feet. The *median* exaction of the four Roseville project areas is \$16,246, which is 22% lower than the regional median of \$20,708 per unit.

Table 4 provides a detailed breakdown of costs by jurisdiction.

Table 4 - Detailed Office Exactions by Jurisdiction (Per 1,000 Square Feet)

City	Elk Grove	Folsom	Lincoln	Unincorp. Placer Co.	Unincorp. Placer Co.	Rancho Cordova	Rocklin	Roseville	Roseville	Roseville	Roseville	City of Sacramento	Unincorp. Sac. Co.
Development Area	Laguna Ridge	Broadstone	Lincoln Crossing	Placer Vineyards	Sunset Industrial	Sunridge Park	Whitney Ranch	Fiddymont Ranch	Infill	NCRSP	NERSP	North Natomas	Metro Air Park
Processing Fees													
Processing Fees	\$500	\$1,400	\$700	\$700	\$700	\$900	\$600	\$500	\$500	\$500	\$500	\$1,100	\$1,100
Total	\$500	\$1,400	\$700	\$700	\$700	\$900	\$600	\$500	\$500	\$500	\$500	\$1,100	\$1,100
Development Impact Fees													
Drainage	\$1,447	\$396	\$519	\$37	\$144	\$1,447		\$398	\$144	\$398	\$398	\$1,570	\$1,570
Affordable Housing	\$0	\$1,540				\$970							
Child Care													
Library													
Conservation												\$2,593	
Police		\$935											
Public Facilities	\$1,190	\$460	\$2,396	\$910	\$910	\$760	\$1,490	\$760	\$760	\$760	\$760		
Fire	\$1,640	\$611			\$420	\$991		\$442	\$442	\$442	\$442		
Parks/Open Space		\$456	\$221										\$588
Roadway - City	\$7,080	\$4,930	\$6,453			\$8,830	\$6,604	\$6,846	\$9,715	\$4,848	\$5,797	\$707	
Roadway - County	\$1,450	\$1,420	\$2,571	\$8,142	\$8,302	\$1,420	\$5,136	\$3,728	\$2,561	\$3,034	\$2,561	\$1,420	\$6,880
Sewer - City		\$42	\$3,451					\$115	\$115	\$115	\$115		
Sewer - Regional	\$2,270	\$1,105		\$2,842	\$2,486	\$2,270	\$3,736	\$2,486	\$2,486	\$2,486	\$1,105	\$1,105	\$1,105
Transit		\$363											
Water	\$1,200	\$743	\$3,327	\$3,428	\$3,912	\$1,200	\$3,912	\$1,247	\$1,247	\$1,247	\$1,247	\$306	\$515
Other			\$510				\$510	\$510	\$510	\$510	\$510		
Total	\$16,276	\$13,001	\$19,448	\$15,359	\$16,174	\$17,887	\$21,388	\$16,533	\$17,980	\$13,840	\$12,935	\$8,289	\$10,069
Plan Area Impact Fees													
Plan Area Impact Fees	\$850	\$0	\$0	\$18,453	\$0	\$1,360	\$2,249	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$13,581	\$13,100
Total	\$850	\$0	\$0	\$18,453	\$0	\$1,360	\$2,249	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$13,581	\$13,100
Developer Contribution													
Developer Contribution	\$9,280	\$3,100	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Total	\$9,280	\$3,100	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
School Impact Fees													
School Impact Fees	\$560	\$560	\$560	\$560	\$560	\$560	\$560	\$560	\$560	\$560	\$560	\$560	\$560
Total	\$560	\$560	\$560	\$560	\$560	\$560	\$560	\$560	\$560	\$560	\$560	\$560	\$560
Total	\$27,466	\$18,061	\$20,708	\$35,072	\$17,434	\$20,707	\$24,797	\$17,593	\$19,040	\$14,900	\$13,995	\$23,530	\$24,829

Notes:
 - Amounts shown are estimates and are intended to provide order of magnitude information rather than exact figures.
 - Amounts are based on interpretation of agency published fee schedules and information developed as part of 2008 and 2012 regional fee comparisons.
 - Amounts exclude impact/developer/mitigation fees for solid waste and electric.

2. ROSEVILLE VS. REGIONAL MEDIAN BY EXACTION CATEGORY (OFFICE)

This section examines the median exactions for the four Roseville project areas compared to the regional median.

❖ Processing Fees

Figure 21 indicates that Roseville's processing fees for office development are 29% lower than the regional median.




Figure 21 - Processing Fees (Office)

❖ Development Impact Fees

Figure 22 indicates that Roseville's development impact fees for office development are 6% lower than the regional median.




Figure 22 - Development Impact Fees (Office)

❖ Plan Area Fees⁴

Figure 23 indicates that Roseville's plan area fees for office development are equal to the regional median.




Figure 23 - Plan Area Fees (Office)

⁴ Values for Plan Area Fees for office development range from \$0 to \$18,453. Roseville does not exact fees in this category for office. Only six of the thirteen surveyed project areas exact fees in this category for office. Thus, the median value is \$0. For purposes of comparison, of the communities assessing these fees, the median (excluding \$0 values) would be \$13,310.

❖ Developer Contribution⁵

Figure 24 indicates that Roseville’s required developer contribution for office development is equal to the regional median.




Figure 24 - Developer Contribution (Office)

❖ School Impact Fees

Figure 25 indicates that Roseville’s school impact fees for office development are equal to the regional median.




Figure 25 - School Impact Fees (Office)

3. OFFICE LAND USE FINDINGS

At \$16,246 per thousand square feet, the City of Roseville’s *median* office development exactions are 22% lower than the regional median of \$20,708.

⁵ Values for Developer Contribution for office development range from \$0 to \$9,280. Roseville does not exact fees in this category for office. Only two of the thirteen surveyed project areas exact fees in this category for office. Thus, the median value is \$0. For purposes of comparison, of the communities assessing these fees, the median (excluding \$0 values) would be \$6,190.

Industrial Land Use

The following evaluates the five exaction categories associated with development of industrial projects throughout the region. Six project areas, including three from Roseville, were examined. The three Roseville projects include:

- West Roseville Specific Plan (Westpark)
- North Central Roseville Specific Plan
- North Industrial Plan Area

1. CUMULATIVE RESULTS

All exactions are presented per-one thousand square feet. The cumulative results are summarized by exaction category in Table 29.

Figure 26 - Cumulative Industrial Exactions by Jurisdiction (Per 1,000 Square-Feet)




Figure 26 indicates that the North Central Roseville Specific Plan area in the city of Roseville has the lowest cumulative fees at \$7,247 per thousand square feet. In contrast, Metro Air Park in Sacramento County has the highest cumulative total at \$16,279 per thousand square feet.

The three representative project areas in the city of Roseville for industrial development range from a high of \$9,242 (NIPA) to a low of \$7,247 (NCRSP) per thousand square feet. The *median* exaction of the three Roseville project areas is \$7,298, which is 32% lower than the regional median of \$10,670 per thousand square feet.

Table 5 provides a detailed breakdown of costs by jurisdiction.

Table 5 - Detailed Industrial Exactions by Jurisdiction (Per 1,000 Square Feet)

City	Unincorp. Placer Co.	Roseville	Roseville	Roseville	City of Sacramento	Unincorp. Sac. Co.
Development Area	Sunset Industrial	Westpark	NCRSP	NIPA	North Natomas	Metro Air Park
Processing Fees						
Processing Fees	\$200	\$400	\$400	\$400	\$800	\$1,000
Total	\$200	\$400	\$400	\$400	\$800	\$1,000
Development Impact Fees						
Drainage	\$121	\$334	\$334	\$334	\$1,140	\$1,140
Affordable Housing					\$820	
Child Care						
Library						
Conservation					\$2,174	
Police						
Public Facilities	\$450	\$380	\$380	\$380		
Fire	\$420	\$247	\$247	\$0		
Parks/Open Space					\$189	
Roadway - City		\$2,154	\$2,455	\$4,920	\$395	
Roadway - County	\$4,214	\$1,893	\$1,540	\$1,300	\$945	\$6,405
Sewer - City		\$14	\$14	\$14		
Sewer - Regional	\$2,842	\$298	\$298	\$298	\$552	\$552
Transit						
Water	\$3,291	\$759	\$759	\$776	\$170	\$431
Other		\$260	\$260	\$260		
Total	\$11,338	\$6,338	\$6,287	\$8,282	\$6,385	\$8,529
Plan Area Impact Fees						
Plan Area Impact Fees	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$4,726	\$6,190
Total	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$4,726	\$6,190
Developer Contribution						
Developer Contribution	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Total	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
School Impact Fees						
School Impact Fees	\$560	\$560	\$560	\$560	\$560	\$560
Total	\$560	\$560	\$560	\$560	\$560	\$560
Total	\$12,098	\$7,298	\$7,247	\$9,242	\$12,471	\$16,279

2. ROSEVILLE VS. REGIONAL MEDIAN BY EXACTION CATEGORY (INDUSTRIAL)

This section examines the median exactions for the three Roseville project areas compared to the regional median.

❖ Processing Fees

Figure 27 indicates that Roseville's processing fees for industrial development are equal to the regional median.




Figure 27 - Processing Fees (Industrial)

❖ Development Impact Fees

Figure 28 indicates that Roseville's development impact fees for industrial development are 4% lower than the regional median.




Figure 28 - Development Impact Fees (Industrial)

❖ Plan Area Fees⁶

Figure 29 indicates that Roseville's plan area fees for office development are equal to the regional median.




Figure 29 - Plan Area Fees (Industrial)

❖ Developer Contribution

None of the jurisdictions surveyed exacted a fee defined as a developer contribution for industrial land use.

⁶ Values for Plan Area Fees for industrial development range from \$0 to \$6,190. Roseville does not exact fees in this category for industrial. Only two of the six surveyed project areas exact fees in this category for industrial. Thus, the median value is \$0. For purposes of comparison, of the communities assessing these fees, the median (excluding \$0 values) would be \$5,458.

❖ School Impact Fees

Figure 30 indicates that Roseville’s school impact fees for office development are equal to the regional median.




Figure 30 - School Impact Fees (Industrial)

3. INDUSTRIAL LAND USE FINDINGS

At \$7,298 per thousand square feet, the City of Roseville’s *median* industrial development exactions are 32% lower than the regional median of \$10,670 per thousand square feet.

