



## Report to City Council

---

**TO:** Mayor and City Council

**FROM:** Betsy Adams, Parks & Community Services Director

**AGENDA DATE:** October 17, 2017

**TITLE:** A RESOLUTION SETTING THE AMOUNT OF THE QUIMBY IN-LIEU FEES PURSUANT TO CHAPTER 3.04.010 OF THE MORENO VALLEY MUNICIPAL CODE

---

### **RECOMMENDED ACTION**

#### **Recommendation:**

That the City Council adopt Resolution 2017-XX, a resolution of the City Council of the City of Moreno Valley, to set the amounts for the Quimby In-Lieu fees.

### **SUMMARY**

The Moreno Valley General Plan specifies a parkland standard of 3 acres per 1,000 of population which is the minimum allowed by the Quimby Act, within the Subdivision Map Act, for residential subdivisions. As new residential developments occur within the City, it is essential to maintain not only this current parkland level, but also the minimum standard required by the Quimby Act, in order to provide adequate parks along with recreational opportunities for the community.

To maintain the parkland acreage standard, new residential developments may either dedicate improved parkland to mitigate their impact to existing parks or they may pay a Quimby In-Lieu fee to provide funding for future parks and park improvements.

This report recommends updating the fees based on current land and improvement values for parks, which represents a 5.2% increase for single family homes and reductions in the fee for multifamily and senior housing projects from the last update in FY 2008-09.

The fee study and recommended updates for the Quimby In-Lieu fees were reviewed by the Finance Subcommittee on September 26, 2017.

## **DISCUSSION**

In 1975, the Quimby Act was passed by the State of California which allowed cities and counties to adopt ordinances that required developers to set aside land, donate conservation easements or pay fees for park improvements. In-Lieu fees are required for residential developments that contain 50 or less lots or parcels. Dedication of parkland is required of residential developments that contain 51 or more lots or parcels. The City may elect to impose payment of Quimby In-Lieu fees on such developments if the location is not conducive to the development of parks and recreation facilities. Quimby In-Lieu fees are not applied to non-residential land uses.

In 2000, the City Council adopted Ordinance 581 establishing the Quimby In-Lieu fee to be charged when developers elect not to dedicate land for parks or recreation facilities as a component of new development projects. The Quimby In-Lieu fee has been developed to mitigate the additional requirement for park resources that result as the population increases due to new development. Staff is recommending that the City Council set the Quimby Fees at the levels set forth in the attached resolution which are based on the results of a fee study performed by Willdan Financial Services.

The City contracted with Willdan Financial Services to perform a fee study to review and develop the appropriate fee level for the Quimby In-Lieu fee. Some of the factors that were analyzed in the study included population growth, land use types, average occupancy densities, existing parks and recreation facilities. Based on the conclusions from this study the following fee table has been developed and is being recommended for adoption and implementation.

Land Use	Current Fee (per Dwelling Unit)	Proposed Fee (per Dwelling Unit)
Single Family	\$1,865	\$1,962
Multifamily	\$1,634	\$1,457
Senior Housing*		\$1,022

\* For the new proposed fee, the Multifamily Land Use has been divided into a separate Senior Housing Land Use.

## **ALTERNATIVES**

1. Adopt the proposed resolution setting the Quimby In-Lieu fees. ***This alternative is recommended by staff since this will update the fee to meet the current projected needs to meet population growth.***
2. Do not adopt the proposed resolution and provide staff with additional direction. ***This alternative is not recommended since this will result in a fee structure that is not sufficient to meet requirements from projected growth levels.***

## **FISCAL IMPACT**

The actual amount of revenue that will be recognized through the Quimby In-Lieu fee will depend on the amount and type of new development that occurs in the City.

## **NOTIFICATION**

NA

## **PREPARATION OF STAFF REPORT**

Prepared By:  
Betsy Adams  
Interim Parks & Community Services Director

Department Head Approval:  
Betsy Adams  
Interim Parks & Community Services Director

Concurred By:  
Marshall Eyerman  
Chief Financial Officer/City Treasurer

## **CITY COUNCIL GOALS**

**Revenue Diversification and Preservation.** Develop a variety of City revenue sources and policies to create a stable revenue base and fiscal policies to support essential City services, regardless of economic climate.

## **CITY COUNCIL STRATEGIC PRIORITIES**

1. Economic Development
2. Public Safety
3. Library
4. Infrastructure
5. Beautification, Community Engagement, and Quality of Life
6. Youth Programs

## **ATTACHMENTS**

1. Moreno Valley - Quimby Fee - Final Draft - 7-26-17
2. Quimby Fee Schedule Resolution

## **APPROVALS**

# CITY OF MORENO VALLEY

## PARKLAND DEDICATION IN-LIEU FEE STUDY

FINAL DRAFT

JULY 26, 2017



### *Oakland Office*

1939 Harrison Street  
Suite 430  
Oakland, CA 94612  
Tel: (510) 832-0899  
Fax: (510) 832-0898

### *Corporate Office*

27368 Via Industria  
Suite 110  
Temecula, CA 92590  
Tel: (800) 755-MUNI (6864)  
Fax: (909) 587-3510

### *Other Regional Offices*

Lancaster, CA  
Memphis, TN  
Orlando, FL  
Phoenix, AZ  
Sacramento, CA  
Seattle, WA

[www.willdan.com](http://www.willdan.com)

DRAFT

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

---

1. INTRODUCTION .....	2
Background and Study Objectives	2
Public Facilities Financing in California	2
Organization of the Report	2
Facility Standards and Cost Allocation Approach	3
2. LAND USE ASSUMPTIONS.....	4
Use of Growth Projections for Impact Fees	4
Land Use Types	4
Growth Projections for Moreno Valley	4
Occupant Densities	5
3. PARKS & RECREATION FACILITIES .....	6
Existing Park and Recreation Facilities Inventory	6
Parkland and Park Facilities Unit Costs	11
Improved Parkland Equivalent	12
Parkland and Park Facility Standards	12
Facilities Needed to Accommodate New Development	14
Parkland Cost per Capita	14
Use of Fee Revenue	15
Fee Schedule	15
4. IMPLEMENTATION .....	16
Quimby Fee Program Adoption Process	16
Inflation Adjustment	16
Fee Accounting	16
Programming Revenues and Projects with the CIP	16

# 1. Introduction

---

This report summarizes an analysis of the need for public facilities and capital improvements to support future development within the City of Moreno Valley through 2040. It is the City's intent that the costs representing future development's share parkland facilities be imposed on that development in the form of parkland dedication, or a fee in-lieu of parkland dedication implemented under the City's *Quimby Act* ordinance.

## Background and Study Objectives

The primary policy objective of a public facilities fee program is to ensure that new development pays the capital costs associated with growth. To fulfill this objective, public agencies should review and update their fee programs periodically to incorporate the best available information.

The City imposes parkland dedication in-lieu fees under authority granted by the *Quimby Act*, contained in *California Government Code Sections 66477 et seq.*

Depending on the characteristics of the development project, the City may use the *Quimby Act* to calculate impact fees. The *Quimby Act* allows a jurisdiction to require developers to dedicate at least three acres and up to five acres per 1,000 residents, if the jurisdiction's existing park standard as of the last Census justifies the higher level.

## Public Facilities Financing in California

The changing fiscal landscape in California during the past 30 years has steadily undercut the financial capacity of local governments to fund infrastructure. Three dominant trends stand out:

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

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

## Organization of the Report

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

Chapter 3 is devoted to documenting the maximum justified public facilities fee for parks and recreation facilities.

Chapter 4 describes the fee implementation process.

## Facility Standards and Cost Allocation Approach

A facility standard is a policy that indicates the amount of facilities required to accommodate service demand. Examples of facility standards include building square feet per capita and park acres per capita. Standards also may be expressed in monetary terms such as the replacement value of facilities per capita. The adopted facility standard is a critical component in determining development's need for new facilities and the amount of the fee. Standards determine new development's fair share of planned facilities and ensure that new development does not fund deficiencies associated with the existing infrastructure.

The parks and recreation facilities fees calculated in this report use an existing inventory demand standard translated into facility costs per capita to determine new development's fair share of planned facility costs. A cost standard provides a reasonable method for converting disparate types of facilities, in this case parkland and special use recreational facilities, into a single measure of demand (capital cost per capita). The cost standard is based on the **existing inventory** of parks and recreation facilities. New development would fund the expansion of facilities at the same rate that existing development has provided facilities to date, thus by definition, there is no existing deficiency.



## 2. Land Use Assumptions

---

This chapter describes the projections of growth used in this study. The existing service population in 2016 is used as the base year of the study and the planning horizon is the year 2040. This chapter also describes the sources of the unit costs for land and buildings used in this study.

### Use of Growth Projections for Impact Fees

Estimates of the existing service population and projections of growth are critical assumptions used throughout this report. These estimates are used as follows:

- Estimates of total development in 2040 are used to determine the total amount of public facilities required to accommodate the future service population.
- Estimates of existing and new development are used to allocate the fair share of total planned facility costs between existing and new development.

### Land Use Types

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

- **Single family:** Detached and attached one-unit dwellings.
- **Multi-family:** All attached multi-family dwellings including duplexes and condominiums.
- **Senior Housing:** All age-restricted multifamily dwellings.

Some developments may include more than one land use type, such as a mixed use development with both multi-family and commercial uses. In those cases, the facilities fee would be calculated separately for each land use type.

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

### Growth Projections for Moreno Valley

**Table 1** shows the estimated number of in Moreno Valley, both in 2016 and in 2040. It also shows the number of residents in Moreno Valley, per the last federal census which is used to calculate the Quimby standard. The base year estimates of residents come from the California Department of Finance. Future residents are based on draft Growth Figures from SCAG's Integrated Growth Forecast from the 2016-2040 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP).

**Table 1: Park Facilities Service Population**

	Residents
Census (2010)	193,365
Existing (2016)	204,800
New Development (2016-2040)	<u>51,800</u>
<b>Total (2040)</b>	<b>256,600</b>

Sources: California Department of Finance (DOF), Table E-5, 2016; Draft Growth Figures from SCAG's Integrated Growth Forecast for the 2016-2040 RTP/SCS.

## Occupant Densities

All fees in this report are calculated based on dwelling units. Occupant density assumptions ensure a reasonable relationship between the size of a development project, the increase in service population associated with the project, and the amount of the fee.

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

The average occupant density factors used in this report are shown in **Table 2**. The residential density factors are based on data for Moreno Valley from the 2015 U.S. Census' American Community Survey.

**Table 2: Occupant Density**

<i>Residential</i>		
Single Family	3.84	Residents Per Dwelling Unit
Multifamily	2.85	Residents Per Dwelling Unit
Senior Housing	2.00	Residents Per Dwelling Unit

Sources: U.S. Census Bureau, 2011-2015 American Community Survey, Tables B25024 and B25033.

# 3. Parks & Recreation Facilities

---

The following chapter documents the nexus analysis, demonstrating the need for new park and recreation facilities demanded by new development. This analysis a parkland dedication in-lieu fee based on the *Quimby Act*.

## Existing Park and Recreation Facilities Inventory

The City of Moreno Valley maintains several park and recreation facilities throughout the city. **Table 3** summarizes the City's existing parkland inventory in 2017. All facilities are located within the City limits. The inventory also includes undeveloped raw land and distinguishes the acreage accordingly. Parks are divided into several categories depending on common characteristics. In total, the inventory includes a total of 662.21 acres of parkland.

**Table 3: Park Land Inventory**

	Developed Acreage	Undeveloped Acreage	Total Acreage
<i>Existing Parkland</i>			
Adrienne Mitchell Memorial Park	4.43	-	4.43
Aqueduct Bike Trail (Elsworth to Lassell)	22.48	4.98	27.46
Bayside Park	2.04	-	2.04
Bethune Park	6.00	-	6.00
Celebration Park	6.65	-	6.65
Cold Creek Staging Area	0.64	-	0.64
Cottonwood Equestrian Station	0.40	-	0.40
Cottonwood Golf Center	15.83	-	15.83
El Potrero Park	15.00	-	15.00
Fairway Park	5.50	-	5.50
Gateway Park	7.67	-	7.67
Hidden Springs Park	7.00	-	7.00
Hidden Springs Park Regional	17.00	-	17.00
John F. Kennedy Park	7.69	-	7.69
Lasselle Sports Park Complex	12.75	-	12.75
March Field Park (Valley Skate Park)	10.00	75.32	85.32
Markborough Property	-	43.17	43.17
Moreno Valley Community Park	15.58	-	15.58
MV Conference & Recreation Center	10.00	-	10.00
Moreno Valley Equestrian Center and Do	10.00	35.00	45.00
Morrison Park (incl 8 unde)	14.01	8.00	22.01
Parque Amistad	4.24	-	4.24
Patriot Park	0.50	-	0.50
Pedrorena Park	5.50	-	5.50
Poormans Reservoir	-	125.00	125.00
Rancho Verde Park	-	3.50	3.50
Rancho Verde Equestrian Staging Area	1.30	-	1.30
Ridge Crest Park	5.00	-	5.00
Rock Ridge Park	1.93	-	1.93
Senior Community Center	1.75	-	1.75
Shadow Mountain Park	10.00	-	10.00
Sunnymead Equestrian Station	0.50	-	0.50
Sunnymead Park	15.53	-	15.53
Sunnymead Ranch Linear Park	5.50	-	5.50
Towngate Memorial Park	16.97	-	16.97
Victoriano Park	5.00	-	5.00
Vista Lomas Park	4.00	-	4.00
Westbluff Park	5.00	-	5.00
Weston Park	4.14	-	4.14
Woodland Park	9.11	-	9.11
Subtotal	286.64	294.97	
581.61			
<i>Multi-Use/Equestrian Trails</i>	-	55.60	55.60
<i>Joint Use Agreements</i>			
College Park	18.00	7.00	25.00
Total - Existing Parkland	304.64	357.57	662.21

Source: City of Moreno Valley.

**Table 4** summarizes the City's inventory of park buildings typically included in parkland in Moreno Valley. The total value of these facilities is divided by the total developed park acres to determine the value of existing park buildings per acre.

DRAFT

**Table 4: Park Building Inventory**

Facility	Address	Square Feet	Replacement Cost
<u>Adrienne Mitchell Memorial Park</u>			
Park Shelter	22631 Bay Avenue	842	\$ 33,200
<u>Bayside Park</u>			
Park Shelter	24435 Bay Avenue	270	\$ 10,200
<u>Bethune Park</u>			
Restroom		1,305	\$ 174,400
Shelter 1	16745 Kitching Street	576	22,700
Shelter 2	16746 Kitching Street	576	22,700
Shelter 3	16747 Kitching Street	576	22,700
Shelter 4	16748 Kitching Street	576	22,700
<u>Celebration Park</u>			
Restroom	14965 Morgan Avenue	1,600	\$ 238,300
Shelter 1	14965 Morgan Avenue	2,498	108,300
Shelter 2	14965 Morgan Avenue	260	9,800
Shelter 3	14965 Morgan Avenue	260	9,800
<u>Cold Creek Trailhead</u>			
Shelter	27334 Cold Creek Court	250	\$ 9,400
<u>Cottonwood Equestrian Staging Area</u>			
Shelter	28590 Cottonwood Ave	400	\$ 15,100
<u>El Potrero Park</u>			
Restroom 1	16901 Lasselle Street	350	\$ 44,100
Restroom 2	16901 Lasselle Street	350	44,100
Shelter	16901 Lasselle Street	375	14,100
<u>Fairway Park</u>			
Restroom	27891 John F Kennedy Drive	336	\$ 44,900
Shelter	27891 John F Kennedy Drive	224	7,600
<u>Gateway Park</u>			
Restroom	23975 Manzanita Avenue	360	\$ 45,400
Shelter 1	23975 Manzanita Avenue	108	3,600
Shelter 2	23975 Manzanita Avenue	108	3,600
Shelter 3	23975 Manzanita Avenue	108	3,600
Shelter 4	23975 Manzanita Avenue	108	3,600
Shelter 5	23975 Manzanita Avenue	108	3,600
Shelter 6	23975 Manzanita Avenue	108	3,600
Shelter 7	23975 Manzanita Avenue	108	3,600
Shelter 8	23975 Manzanita Avenue	108	3,600
<u>Hidden Springs Park</u>			
Shelter	9675 Hidden Springs Drive	224	\$ 7,600
<u>JFK Park</u>			
Restroom	15115 Indian Street	160	\$ 23,100
Shelter 1	15115 Indian Street	144	4,800
Shelter 2	15115 Indian Street	144	4,800

City of Moreno Valley Public Entity Risk Management Authority, Building Detail Report - 2009.

**Table 4: Park Building Inventory - Cont.**

Facility	Address	Square Feet	Replacement Cost
<u>Lassalle Sports Park</u>			
Restroom/Concession/Storage	17155 Lasselle St	2,480	\$ 1,000,000
Shelter 1	17155 Lasselle St	1,824	107,700
Shelter 2	17155 Lasselle St	1,200	79,800
<u>Moreno Valley Community Park</u>			
Restroom / Concession	13380 Frederick Street	1,800	\$ 254,300
Shelter 1	13380 Frederick Street	180	6,000
Shelter 2	13380 Frederick Street	180	6,000
Shelter 3	13380 Frederick Street	180	6,000
Shelter 4	13380 Frederick Street	144	5,100
<u>Morrison Park</u>			
Restroom	26667 Dracaea Avenue	540	\$ 76,300
Storage Building	26667 Dracaea Avenue	374	25,700
Concession Stand	26667 Dracaea Avenue	625	87,300
Shelter 1	26667 Dracaea Avenue	144	5,100
Shelter 2	26667 Dracaea Avenue	144	5,100
Shelter 3	26667 Dracaea Avenue	400	13,600
<u>Parque Amistad</u>			
Shelter	26160 Gentian Avenue	1,040	\$ 41,000
<u>Pedrorena Park</u>			
Restroom	16009 Rancho Del Lago	540	\$ 68,100
Shelter	16009 Rancho Del Lago	224	7,600
<u>Ridgecrest Park</u>			
Restroom	28506 John F Kennedy Drive	336	\$ 42,300
Shelter 1	28506 John F Kennedy Drive	144	5,100
Shelter 2	28506 John F Kennedy Drive	375	14,100
Shelter 3	28506 John F Kennedy Drive	375	14,100
<u>Rock Ridge Park</u>			
Shelter 1	27119 Waterford Way	740	\$ 27,900
Shelter 2	27119 Waterford Way	740	27,900
<u>Sunnymead Park</u>			
Concession/Restroom	12655 Perris Blvd	1,864	\$ 263,400
Shelter 1	12655 Perris Blvd	208	7,100
Shelter 2	12655 Perris Blvd	208	7,100
<u>Town Gate Memorial Park</u>			
Restroom	13051 Elsworth Street	470	\$ 66,400
Shelter 1	13051 Elsworth Street	750	29,600
Shelter 2	13051 Elsworth Street	665	26,200
Shelter 3	13051 Elsworth Street	259	9,200

City of Moreno Valley Public Entity Risk Management Authority, Building Detail Report - 2009.

**Table 4: Park Building Inventory - Cont.**

Facility	Address	Square Feet	Replacement Cost
<u>Valley Skate Park</u>			
Restroom / Concession	15415 6th Street	936	\$ 125,100
<u>Victoriano Park</u>			
Restroom	25730 Los Cabos Drive	350	\$ 46,800
Shelter	25730 Los Cabos Drive	224	7,600
<u>West Bluff Park</u>			
Restroom	10750 Pigeon Pass Road	240	\$ 30,200
Shelter	10750 Pigeon Pass Road	260	9,200
<u>Weston Park</u>			
Restroom	13170 Lasselle Avenue	375	\$ 50,100
Shelter 1	13170 Lasselle Avenue	144	5,100
Shelter 2	13170 Lasselle Avenue	216	7,300
Shelter 3	13170 Lasselle Avenue	216	7,300
Shelter 4	13170 Lasselle Avenue	216	7,300
<u>Woodland Park</u>			
Restroom	25705 Cactus Avenue	540	\$ 73,500
Shelter 1	25705 Cactus Avenue	738	27,500
Shelter 2	25705 Cactus Avenue	300	11,200
<u>Shadow Mountain Park</u>			
Shelter	23239 Presidio Hills Dr.	1,146	\$ 45,200
Restroom	23239 Presidio Hills Dr.	271	150,000
<u>Vista Lomas Park</u>			
Shelter	26700 Iris Avenue	696	27,500
Total Replacement Cost - Park Buildings			\$ 3,934,600
Developed Park Acres			304.64
Park Buildings Cost per Acre (rounded)			\$ 12,900

Sources: City of Moreno Valley Public Entity Risk Management Authority, Building Detail Report - 2009; Willdan Financial Services.

## Parkland and Park Facilities Unit Costs

**Table 5** displays the unit costs necessary to develop parkland in Moreno Valley. The buildings, equipment and special facilities cost per acre from Table 4 is added to the cost of an acre of standard park improvements to determine the total improvement cost per acre. A value of \$167,000 per acre for land is also included, based on an analysis of recent sales comparisons in Moreno Valley using data from Loopnet.com. In total, this analysis assumes that it costs \$979,900 to acquire and develop an acre of parkland in Moreno Valley.



**Table 5: Park Facilities Unit Costs**

	Cost Per Acre	Share
Improvements		
Standard Park Improvements	\$ 800,000	
Park Buildings	<u>12,900</u>	
Subtotal	\$ 812,900	83.0%
Land Acquisition	\$ 167,000	17.0%
Total Cost per Acre	\$ 979,900	100.0%

<sup>1</sup> Based on the implied cost of improving 7 acres at Cottonwood Park from the Parks Master Plan. Excludes structures, ball fields and community center costs.

Sources: City of Moreno Valley; Loopnet.com; Willdan Financial Services.

## Improved Parkland Equivalent

Before calculating the existing parkland standard, unimproved parkland owned by the City must be converted to an equivalent amount of improved parkland. **Table 6** details this conversion. The conversion is based on the ratio of the cost of an improved acre of land (including land and improvements) relative to an acre of unimproved parkland (only land). The estimate of the value of unimproved park and the cost of park improvements are detailed above in Table 5.

**Table 6: Undeveloped Parkland Equivalent**

Unimproved Acreage	357.57
Unimproved Acre relative to Improved Acre	<u>17.0%</u>
Equivalent Improved Acres	60.94

Sources: Tables 3 and 5.

## Parkland and Park Facility Standards

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

The most common measure in calculating new development’s demand for parks is the ratio of park acres per resident. In this case facility standards are based on a land dedication standard established by the Quimby Act.<sup>1</sup>

### Quimby Act

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

The Quimby Act only applies when land is subdivided and developed into residential dwelling units. The Quimby Act does not apply to residential development occurring on single parcels that have not been subdivided, such as apartment complexes and other multi-family development.

The Quimby Act allows payment of a fee in lieu of land dedication. In situations where the development is greater than 50 dwelling units, the agency can decide if it will accept parkland, or a fee in lieu of parkland to satisfy the Quimby Act requirements. The “in-lieu” fee is calculated to fund acquisition of the same amount of land that could have been dedicated.

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

### City of Moreno Valley Parkland Dedication In-Lieu Standard

**Table 7** shows the existing standard for improved park acreage per 1,000 service population based on the type of parkland. In total the City has an existing parkland standard of 1.89 acres per 1,000 residents, which allows the City to charge at 3.0 acres per 1,000 residents under the Quimby Act.

**Table 7: Parkland Standards**

Developed Park Acreage	304.64
Undeveloped Equivalent Improved Acreage	<u>60.94</u>
Total Developed Parkland	365.58
Census 2010 Residents	<u>193,365</u>
Existing Standard (Acres per 1,000 Capita)	1.89
Quimby Standard (Acres per 1,000 Residents)	3.00

Sources: Tables 1, 3 and 6.

<sup>1</sup> California Government Code §66477.

## Facilities Needed to Accommodate New Development

**Table 8** shows the park facilities needed to accommodate new development at the Quimby standard. To achieve the standard by the planning horizon, if all residential development is subject to the Quimby Act, new development must dedicate or pay a fee in-lieu of dedication of 155.40 acres of parkland.

**Table 8: Park Facilities to Accommodate New Development**

	Calculation	Parkland
<i>Parkland (Quimby Act)</i>		
Facility Standard (acres/1,000 residents)	A	3.00
Service Population Growth (2016-2040)	B	51,800
Facility Needs (acres)	$C = (B / 1,000) \times A$	155.40
Average Unit Cost (per acre)	D	\$ 167,000
Total Cost of Parkland To Serve New Development	$E = C \times D$	\$ 25,951,800

Sources: Tables 1, 5 and 7.

## Parkland Cost per Capita

**Table 9** shows the cost per capita of providing new parkland at the Quimby standard. First, the per acre acquisition cost is multiplied by the acreage standards to determine the total amount of costs needed to serve 1,000 residents. Then, those costs are divided by 1,000 to determine the cost needed to serve one resident.

**Table 9: Cost per Capita**

	Calculation	Land
Parkland Investment (per acre)	A	\$ 167,000
Existing Level of Service (acres per 1,000 residents)	B	3.00
Total Cost Per 1,000 capita	$C = A \times B$	\$ 501,000
Cost Per Resident	$D = C / 1,000$	\$ 501

Sources: Tables 5 and 7.

## Use of Fee Revenue

The City plans to use parkland fee revenue to acquire parkland or to rehabilitate parks that serve the subdivisions paying the fee.

## Fee Schedule

In order to calculate fees by land use type, the investment in park facilities is determined on a per resident basis for land acquisition. These investment factors (shown in Table 9) are investment per capita based on the unit cost estimates and facility standards.

**Table 10** shows the parkland dedication in-lieu fee based on the minimum Quimby standard. The City would collect the fee on residential development occurring in subdivisions. The investment per capita is converted to a fee per dwelling unit using the occupancy density factors in Table 2.

The total fee includes an administrative charge to fund costs that include: (1) legal, accounting, and other administrative support and (2) impact fee program administrative costs including revenue collection, revenue and cost accounting, mandated public reporting, and fee justification analyses.

**Table 10: Quimby Act Parkland Dedication In-Lieu Fee Schedule**

Land Use	A	B	C = A x B	D = C x 0.02	E = C + D
	Cost Per Capita	Density	Base Fee	Admin Charge <sup>1</sup>	Total Fee
Single Family	\$ 501	3.84	\$ 1,924	\$ 38	\$ 1,962
Multifamily	501	2.85	1,428	29	1,457
Senior Housing	501	2.00	1,002	20	1,022

<sup>1</sup> Administrative charge of 2.0 percent for (1) legal, accounting, and other administrative support and (2) impact fee program administrative costs including revenue collection, revenue and cost accounting, mandated public reporting, and fee justification analyses.

Sources: Tables 2 and 9.

# 4. Implementation

---

## Quimby Fee Program Adoption Process

Adoption of a land dedication in-lieu fee program requires the City Council to follow certain procedures including holding a public meeting. A fourteen-day mailed public notice is required for those registering for such notification. Data, such as this fee report, must be made available at least 10 days prior to the public meeting. Your legal counsel should inform you of any other procedural requirements as well as advice regarding adoption of an enabling ordinance and/or a resolution. After adoption there is a mandatory 30-day waiting period before the fees go into effect. This procedure must also be followed for fee increases.

## Inflation Adjustment

The City should annually adjust the fees for inflation by determining a new cost per acre to acquire parkland and recalculating the fees. Annual land value can be based on a survey of recently sold land comparisons within the City.

## Fee Accounting

The City should deposit fee revenues into a restricted fee account. Parkland dedication in-lieu fees should only be expended on the acquisition of parkland, or the rehabilitation of parkland that will serve the subdivision that paid the fee.

## Programming Revenues and Projects with the CIP

The City should commit all projected fee revenues and fund balances to specific projects in a Capital Improvements Program. These should represent the types of facilities needed to serve growth and described in this report. The use of the CIP in this manner documents a reasonable relationship between new development and the use of those revenues. The CIP also provides the documentation necessary for the City to hold funds in a project account for longer than five years if necessary to collect sufficient monies to complete a project.

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

RESOLUTION NO. 2017-\_\_\_\_\_

A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF MORENO VALLEY, CALIFORNIA,

WHEREAS, in accordance with the provisions of Government Code Section 66477 (the “Quimby Act”), the City Council of the City of Moreno Valley (“City Council”) adopted Ordinance 581 establishing the authority to require the dedication of land for park and recreation facilities or a payment in-lieu; and

WHEREAS, the City Council has determined that these fees should be established to provide for certain fees in-lieu of dedicating parkland required of certain types of new subdivisions located in or to be located within the City of Moreno Valley ; and

WHEREAS, the Quimby In-Lieu fees to be charged are reasonable and do not exceed the actual cost of parkland acquisition in the City of Moreno Valley ; and

WHEREAS, on October 17, 2017 the City Council conducted a duly noticed public hearing concerning the establishment of the Quimby Fees .

NOW, THEREFORE, THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF MORENO VALLEY, CALIFORNIA, DOES HEREBY RESOLVE AS FOLLOWS:

The Quimby Fee Schedule as set forth as follows shall go into effect on the date that this resolution is approved and adopted.

Single Family	\$1,962
Multifamily	\$1,457
Senior Housing	\$1,022

APPROVED AND ADOPTED this 17th day of October, 2017.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Mayor of the City of Moreno Valley

ATTEST:

---

City Clerk

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

---

City Attorney

DRAFT

**RESOLUTION JURAT**

STATE OF CALIFORNIA        )  
COUNTY OF RIVERSIDE     ) ss.  
CITY OF MORENO VALLEY    )

I, \_\_\_\_\_, City Clerk of the City of Moreno Valley, California, do hereby certify that Resolution No. YYYY- was duly and regularly adopted by the City Council of the City of Moreno Valley at a regular meeting thereof held on the \_\_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_, YYYY by the following vote:

AYES:

NOES:

ABSENT:

ABSTAIN:

(Council Members, Mayor Pro Tem and Mayor)

\_\_\_\_\_  
CITY CLERK

(SEAL)