



Agenda Item C.3
PUBLIC HEARING
Meeting Date: July 21, 2026

TO: Mayor and Councilmembers

SUBMITTED BY: Luz “Nina” Buelna, Public Works Director

SUBJECT: 2026 Development Impact Fee Program Update

RECOMMENDATIONS:

- A. Continue Public Hearing from May 19, 2026; and
- B. Adopt Council Resolution No. 26-___ entitled “A Resolution of the City Council of the City of Goleta, California, Approving the 2026 Development Impact Fee Program Update Report and Updated Development Impact Fees Pursuant to the Mitigation Fee Act and Finding the Resolution to Be Exempt Under the California Environmental Quality Act.”

BACKGROUND

Development Impact Fees (“DIF”) are fees imposed on development projects to offset in whole or in part, the cost of new or additional public facilities caused by the development. Cities have the authority to charge DIFs by way of the Mitigation Fee Act (Government Code sections 66000-66025). Under the Mitigation Fee Act, cities must ensure that there is a nexus between the development project’s impacts and the imposed fee amounts. In order to have a DIF program, cities must adopt an ordinance or resolution to approve and establish the types of fees and a nexus study to analyze the impacts of types of development (e.g.: residential, commercial, industrial) and their proportionate impacts on public facilities.

Goleta has operated a DIF program since its incorporation, originally relying on ordinances and nexus studies conducted by the County of Santa Barbara before its incorporation. The City adopted the County’s impact fee amounts for the Goleta Planning Area when the City incorporated in 2002. In 2019, the City prepared its own Nexus Study Development Impact Fee Study, which provided the supporting analysis for a new ordinance. The ordinance, referred to as the “DIF Ordinance” (Ordinance 19-04), consolidated previous existing DIF regulations into one regulation in the Zoning Ordinance. The Development Impact Fees listed in Ordinance 19-04, codified in Goleta Municipal Code Chapter 17.70, are:

1. Public Administration Facilities Fee

2. Fire Facilities Fee
3. Library Facilities Fee
4. Parks and Recreation Facilities Fee
5. Storm Drain Facilities Fee
6. Transportation Facilities Fee
7. Bicycle and Pedestrian Facilities Fee

DISCUSSION

The City provided notice of a public hearing for the Development Impact Fee (DIF) Nexus Study ("Study") and proposed DIF update scheduled for May 19, 2026. Prior to the hearing, the City received comments regarding the proposed Study and DIF. The City continued the public hearing to July 21, 2026, to allow additional time to review the issues raised and further refine the Study. The revised Study was published in accordance with the Mitigation Fee Act. The City also published notice of the continued public hearing in the Santa Barbara Independent on June 18, 2026, and June 25, 2026.

The updated Study includes a project-specific Capital Improvement Program (CIP) that identifies the facilities proposed for funding through DIF allocations. The Study updates the City's facility inventory to reflect capital improvements completed since the City's 2019 Nexus Study and incorporates updated information from the City's existing records and databases. The Study was revised to account for existing fund balances and previously planned, but unconstructed, facilities. The proposed 5 percent administrative fee was also reviewed and confirmed to reflect the City's costs of administering the DIF Program. The administrative fee is collected separately and does not reduce the funds available for eligible capital improvements.

Under the Mitigation Fee Act, local agencies are required to complete annual reporting and, every five to eight years, make findings that the purpose of the DIFs still exists, the funds are still needed, and the fees continue to have a reasonable relationship to the impacts of new development. In considering an update to the existing DIF rates and to comply with these requirements, the City completed an updated Study to evaluate the relationship between new development, the public facilities needed to serve that growth, and the appropriate fee amounts. On August 20, 2024, the City Council approved consultant agreements with Urban Economics, DKS Associates (DKS), and MNS Engineers (MNS) to prepare and support the DIF update. DKS updated the City of Goleta Travel Demand Model and analyzed the transportation impacts associated with projected future growth. MNS prepared project cost estimates for the transportation improvements identified through the DKS analysis.

All proposed impact fees except the transportation fee reflect existing levels of service (facility standards) and the cost of maintaining those standards as growth occurs. All fees except the transportation fee are based on an existing capital asset facility standard that equals the ratio of the City's existing (2025) capital assets to the existing population served by those facilities. This approach is based solely on available data (existing capital asset inventory and service population estimates). The facility standard is not based on adopted policies, such as those contained in the City's General Plan or state statutes.

The existing capital asset facility standard provides a reasonable relationship between new development and the need for additional public facilities. The resulting impact fee funds the expansion of public facilities at a rate sufficient to maintain the existing ratio of facilities to service population as growth occurs.

Consistent with Assembly Bill 602, the updated DIF Program is supported by a nexus study and a CIP that identify the public facilities needed to accommodate new development and demonstrate the reasonable relationship between those improvements and the proposed fees. The City of Goleta annually adopts a five-year CIP to identify and prioritize capital projects and anticipated funding sources. For purposes of the DIF Program, the five-year CIP serves as a market-based revenue projection identifying the capital facilities the City expects to fund with projected DIF revenues during the planning period. The projected five-year DIF revenue is based on recent development trends within the City and assumes approximately 10 percent of the City's ultimate build-out will occur during the five-year planning horizon. This 10-percent growth assumption was applied to the total build-out fee revenue projection to estimate the amount of DIF revenue anticipated to be collected over the next five years.

The transportation fee was updated using a similar approach to that used to establish the existing fee. Planning for transportation improvements uses a travel demand model. The Goleta Travel Model (Travel Model) developed for the Goleta General Plan was updated in 2025 for this nexus analysis. The Travel Model analyzed the impacts of the City's buildout growth scenario and surrounding regional growth on the City's transportation system. The results update the list of improvements described in the Transportation Element of the 2006 Goleta General Plan.

The Travel Model used facility standards to determine where transportation improvements are needed within the City to (1) identify and separate out the facilities and costs needed to correct existing deficiencies, and (2) address future facilities needed to mitigate the demands caused by the estimated new development. Facility standards for transportation analysis are based on policies in the Transportation Element of the City's General Plan. The City's primary policy for roadways and intersections is to maintain a level of service (LOS) "C" or better, which represents restricted traffic flow that remains stable but does not cause significant delay. In this instance, LOS is a commonly used measure of congestion and delay based on the ratio of the number of vehicles on a roadway to its capacity (vehicle-to-capacity ratio). The LOS policy for intersections is similar, though the type of analysis varies. The results of the Travel Model and related transportation impact analysis identified 32 CIP projects to address existing deficiencies and the projects needed for future development to mitigate the demands on the City's transportation system.

The fair-share analysis was conducted to ensure the impact fee funds only the portion of those improvements associated with growth within the City. The analysis uses model output to quantify the number of trips using each improvement and the origin and destination of those trips. Cost estimates for each improvement were developed. Combining the fair-share analysis with the improvement cost estimates resulted in a total

cost to accommodate the impacts of new development within the City on its transportation system.

Public Works presented a draft of the 2026 DIF Update Plan to the City Council on February 17, 2026. Based on input from the Council at the meeting, further input from City Staff, Urban Economics, and DKS, the recommended maximum fees have been refined based on the following:

- Finalization of the traffic model and resulting refinement to the deficiency analysis for the transportation projects. This resulted in a reduction in the number of transportation projects from 35 to 32 and some modifications to the deficiency percentages for certain projects. These changes reduced the Maximum Justified Transportation Fee from the amount presented at the February 17, 2026, City Council meeting.
- Use of average intersection control costs for applicable Transportation DIF projects. Of the 32 transportation projects identified to address future growth, 12 include conceptual intersection control improvements that may ultimately function as roundabouts, traffic signals, or other operational improvements such as additional channelization. At this stage, the City has not completed the preliminary engineering, operational analysis, environmental review, or community engagement necessary to determine the appropriate intersection control type for each location. To maintain consistency between the level of analysis supporting the nexus study and future project-level decisions, the study used the average cost of roundabout and signalized intersection improvements for applicable projects. This approach maintains flexibility for future project development, supports consistency between the nexus study assumptions and future implementation decisions, and reduces the Maximum Justified Transportation Fee compared to the fee presented at the February 17, 2026, Council meeting.
- An update of the library population and resulting standards to reflect the Goleta Valley Library contractual service area, which extends beyond City limits. This update lowered the existing facility standards and, in turn, reduced the Maximum Justified Library Fee compared to the Fee presented at the February 17, 2026, Council meeting.
- Updated bicycle and pedestrian facilities inventory to avoid any potential overlap with transportation improvement projects. This updated inventory decreased the Maximum Justified Bicycle/Pedestrian Fee compared to the Fee presented at the February 17, 2026, Council meeting.
- Split the cost of the Goleta Freeway Crossing transportation project (project # R-05) between the Transportation Fee and the Bicycle/Pedestrian Fee.

Based on the Nexus Study, including the changes identified above, the updated fees compared to the existing fees are summarized below:

Table E.1: Existing and Maximum Justified Fee Schedule

		Adopted Fee (2019 Nexus Study)	Existing Fee (FY 2025-26)	Maximum Justified Fee	Difference (Justified vs. Existing)	
Land Use Category	Units				Amount	Percent
<u>Public Administration</u>						
Single Family Detached ¹	per DU	\$3,086	\$4,132	\$10,540	\$ 6,408	155%
All Other Residential	per DU	2,238	2,999	7,396	4,397	147%
Retail & Commercial	per KSF	487	656	1,665	1,009	154%
Office & Medical	per KSF	655	880	2,237	1,357	154%
Industrial	per KSF	243	329	829	500	152%
<u>Library</u>						
Single Family Detached ¹	per DU	\$959	\$1,287	\$ 873	\$ (414)	(32%)
All Other Residential	per DU	696	934	613	(321)	(34%)
Retail & Commercial	per KSF	151	206	138	(68)	(33%)
Office & Medical	per KSF	203	275	185	(90)	(33%)
Industrial	per KSF	75	105	69	(36)	(35%)
<u>Parks & Recreation</u>						
Residential Subdivisions (Quimby Act)						
Single Family Detached ¹	per DU	\$14,998	\$20,084	\$36,913	\$16,829	84%
All Other Residential	per DU	10,880	14,572	25,902	11,330	78%
All Other Development (Mitigation Fee Act)						
Single Family Detached ¹	per DU	\$11,900	\$15,928	\$32,895	\$16,967	107%
All Other Residential	per DU	7,947	13,175	23,083	9,908	75%
Retail & Commercial	per KSF	1,880	2,519	5,196	2,677	106%
Office & Medical	per KSF	2,525	3,382	6,981	3,599	106%
Industrial	per KSF	936	1,257	2,587	1,330	106%
<u>Storm Drain</u>						
Single Family Detached ¹	per DU	\$ 3,596	\$ 4,817	\$10,845	\$ 6,028	125%
All Other Residential	per DU	2,609	3,494	3,904	410	12%
Retail & Commercial	per KSF	1,988	2,665	6,290	3,625	136%
Office & Medical	per KSF	2,671	3,578	4,338	760	21%
Industrial	per KSF	990	1,329	5,097	3,768	284%
<u>Transportation</u>						
	per PM Peak Hour Trip					
All Land Uses		\$ 12,450	\$16,665	\$ 21,866	\$ 5,201	31%
<u>Sample of Land Uses</u>						
Single Family Detached ¹	per DU	\$ 12,077	\$15,165	\$ 19,725	\$ 4,560	30%
Apartment	per DU	7,487	8,166	11,029	2,863	35%
Hotel	per room	7,171	9,499	9,866	367	4%
Supermarket	per KSF	70,816	89,491	115,321	25,830	29%
General Office	per KSF	17,808	22,998	24,770	1,772	8%
General Light Industrial	per KSF	11,835	10,666	10,500	(166)	(2%)

Table E.3: Existing and Maximum Justified Fee Schedule (continued)

Land Use Category	Units	Adopted Fee (2019 Nexus Study)	Existing Fee (FY 2025-26)	Maximum Justified Fee	Difference (Justified vs. Existing)	
					Amount	Percent
<u>Bicycle & Pedestrian</u>						
Single Family Detached ¹	per DU	\$3,092	\$4,142	\$ 13,812	\$ 9,670	233%
All Other Residential	per DU	2,243	3,006	9,692	6,686	222%
Retail & Commercial	per KSF	488	657	2,182	1,525	232%
Office & Medical	per KSF	656	881	2,931	2,050	233%
Industrial	per KSF	243	329	1,086	757	230%
<u>All Updated Fees</u>						
Single Family Detached ¹	per DU	\$ 34,710	\$45,471	\$ 88,690	\$43,219	95%
All Other Residential ²	per DU	23,220	31,774	55,717	23,943	75%
Retail & Commercial ³	per KSF	75,810	96,194	130,792	34,598	36%
Office & Medical ⁴	per KSF	24,518	31,994	41,442	9,448	30%
Industrial ⁵	per KSF	14,322	14,015	20,168	6,153	44%

Notes: "DU" = dwelling unit; "KSF" = thousand building square feet. Residential fees are calculated per square foot of living space in this nexus study update, though residential fees are shown per average sized DU in this table for the purpose of comparison to current fee schedule.

The City also charges impact fees for fire and affordable housing that are not included in this update.

¹ Includes detached and attached accessory dwelling units (ADU). Fees for ADUs can only be charged on ADUs greater than 750 square feet and are charged proportionally based on the square footage of the ADU to the square footage of the primary unit.

² Parks and transportation fees based on "Apartment" category.

³ For transportation fee, based on supermarket category.

⁴ For transportation fee, based on general office category.

⁵ For transportation fee, based on general light industrial category.

Sources: City of Goleta Fee Schedule, FY 2025-26; Tables 3.3, 4.3, 5.4, 6.1, 6.2, 6.4, 7.3, and 8.2.

Changes in total revenue and fee amounts by land use category under the proposed fee schedule are explained as follows:

- **Public Administration fee:** Nexus analysis updated based on the current City facility standard. Total fee revenue to build out is projected to be \$34.7 million. Change in fee amounts is driven by the increased cost of land and buildings.
- **Library fee:** Fees are decreasing compared to existing fees to reflect the lower existing standard once accounting for non-City service areas. Projected fee revenue to build out decreases to \$2.9 million, down from \$4.3 million under the existing fee schedule.
- **Parks and Recreation fee:** Impact updated based on current City park standards. Total fee revenue to buildout increases to about \$108.5 million. Change in fee amounts driven by increased land acquisition and park improvement costs.
- **Storm drain fee:** Nexus analysis updated based on the current City facility standard. Total fee revenue to buildout increases to about \$40.4 million. Change in fee amounts is driven by more comprehensive identification of the City's existing facility standards and increased replacement costs of facilities.

- **Transportation fee:** The fee will fund \$185 million of costs identified as needed to serve new development in the City through the traffic modeling analysis.
- **Bicycle and Pedestrian fee:** Nexus analysis updated based on the current City facility standard. Total fee revenue to buildout increases to about \$45.6 million. Change in fee amounts driven by more comprehensive identification of the City's existing facility standards and increased replacement cost of facilities.

The Maximum Justified Fees represent the highest fee amounts supported by the Nexus Study. The City Council may adopt the Maximum Justified Fees or adopt lower fees as a policy decision.

Under the City's Municipal Code, Section 17.70.070 permits the City to establish, by resolution, categories of "beneficial projects" that are eligible for DIF reductions or waivers. Section 17.70.080(A) allows a developer of any development project to apply to the City Council seeking a reduction, adjustment, or waiver of one or more applicable Development Impact Fees.

The City Council previously adopted Resolution No. 22-68, included as Attachment 3, which lists the types of beneficial project categories eligible for DIF reductions or waivers. The City Council may consider whether to direct a re-evaluation of that set of categories, or otherwise redefine or revise what constitutes a beneficial project eligible to receive DIF reductions or waivers from the City. Resolution No. 22-68 provides Development Impact Fee reductions or waivers for nonprofits, child care facilities, special care homes, mobile homes, and accessory dwelling units. Council may want to consider modifying the percentage reductions in certain categories or adding more categories that are eligible for reduction or complete waiver of DIFs. Since the adoption of Resolution No. 22-68, Development Impact Fee reductions or waivers have been applied to qualifying nonprofit organizations, affordable housing projects, medical and special care facilities, religious organizations, child care facilities, and qualifying accessory dwelling units.

If the City Council chooses to reduce any of the Maximum Justified Fees, staff recommends adopting the Transportation Fee as presented in the Nexus Study. The Transportation Fee has already been refined through updates to the travel demand model, revisions to the deficiency analysis, and the use of average intersection improvement costs where the final intersection design has not yet been determined. The fee reflects the transportation improvements attributable to future development identified in the Nexus Study. Staff also recommends adopting the Library Fee presented in the Nexus Study, as it is lower than the current adopted Library Fee.

ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW

The adoption of new development impact fees, and related nexus study is exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and the regulations promulgated thereunder (14 Cal. Code of Regulations, §§ 15000, et seq., "CEQA Guidelines") because this action does not constitute a "project" pursuant to the CEQA Guidelines, § 15061(b)(3), this action constitutes a creation of governing funding mechanism, who do

not involve any commitment to a specific project which may result in a potentially significant physical impact on the environment CEQA Guidelines, § 15378(b)(4), and the action constitutes an organization and administrative activity of government that will not result in direct or indirect physical changes in the environment CEQA Guidelines, § 15378(b)(5). In addition, obtaining funds (fees) for capital projects for services in existing service areas are statutorily exempt under CEQA Guidelines, § 15273(a)(4).

FISCAL IMPACTS:

2026 DIF Program Update

DIF adjustments will be effective 60 days after adoption. City staff will be able to implement and collect the proposed fees as part of the current development process. The actual fee revenues generated by the adjusted DIFs will depend on the number of development projects subject to DIF payment during the time the fees are in effect, as development activity occurs. All DIF revenues are restricted to payment of identified projects and expenditures and are not discretionary to the City. The DIF amounts will be automatically adjusted on July 1st of each fiscal year by the construction cost index (CCI) specific to California or the nearest region, as published by Engineering News-Record or its successor publication, for the preceding 12-month period, when available.

The DIF revenue estimates will be revised with each annual budget process, along with the related project costs funded by these fees.

Any decision to adopt fees below the maximum justified amounts established by the Nexus Study, approve a project-specific fee reduction or waiver, or expand the categories of projects eligible for reductions or waivers would result in foregone revenue in the affected DIF category without reducing the infrastructure need or cost attributable to the development. Unless the corresponding capital improvement is reduced, deferred, or eliminated, the City will need to identify an alternative funding source, which could include available General Fund resources, other unrestricted revenues, grants, or other eligible financing sources, subject to future City Council appropriation. The availability of such alternative funding is not guaranteed.

ALTERNATIVES:

The City Council may elect not to adopt the 2026 Development Impact Fee Program Update, in which case the existing Development Impact Fees would remain in effect.

The City Council may also adopt the updated 2026 Development Impact Fee Program, including the Nexus Study, while establishing Development Impact Fees below the maximum justified amounts identified in the Study. Any reduction in the adopted fees may affect the amount of revenue available to fund eligible capital improvements, as discussed in the Fiscal Impacts section of this report.

LEGAL REVIEW BY: Isaac Rosen, City Attorney

APPROVED BY: Robert Nisbet, City Manager

ATTACHMENTS:

1. Resolution No. 26-___ entitled "A Resolution of the City Council of the City of Goleta, California, Approving the 2026 Development Impact Fee Program Update Report and Updated Development Impact Fees Pursuant to the Mitigation Fee Act and Finding the Resolution to be Exempt Under the California Environmental Quality Act."

Exhibit A – 2026 Development Impact Fee Program Update Report

Exhibit B – Updated Development Impact Fees

2. Presentation 2026 Development Impact Fee Program Update
3. Resolution No. 22-68, entitled "A Resolution of the City Council of the City of Goleta, California, Amending the Development Impact Fee Reduction Program for Beneficial Projects"

ATTACHMENT 1

Resolution No. 26-____entitled “A Resolution of the City Council of the City of Goleta, California, Approving the 2026 Development Impact Fee Program Update Report and Updated Development Impact Fees Pursuant to the Mitigation Fee Act and Finding the Resolution to be Exempt Under the California Environmental Quality Act.”

RESOLUTION NO. 26-_____

A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF GOLETA, CALIFORNIA, APPROVING THE 2026 DEVELOPMENT IMPACT FEE PROGRAM UPDATE REPORT AND UPDATED DEVELOPMENT IMPACT FEES PURSUANT TO THE MITIGATION FEE ACT AND FINDING THE RESOLUTION TO BE EXEMPT UNDER THE CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT

WHEREAS, the State of California, through the enactment of Government Code sections 66001 through 66025 (also known as the "Mitigation Fee Act") has, among other things, authorized the legislative body of a city to, by ordinance or resolution, impose impact fees on development projects for the purpose of defraying all or a portion of the cost of public facilities related to the development project, provided that a nexus is established in the enactment of development impact fees between the development project's impacts and the imposed fee amounts; and

WHEREAS, the imposition of development impact fees is one of the preferred methods of ensuring that new development bears a proportionate share of the estimated reasonable cost of providing public facilities and service improvements necessary to accommodate such development; and

WHEREAS, the City has operated a development impact fee program since incorporation, initially relying on ordinances and nexus studies conducted by the County of Santa Barbara before incorporation; and

WHEREAS, in 2019, the City Council adopted Resolution No. 19-04, which approved new development impact fees and a Development Impact Fee Study pursuant to the Mitigation Fee Act, establishing seven impact fees for public administration facilities, library facilities, parks and recreation facilities, transportation facilities, bicycle and pedestrian facilities, storm drain facilities, and fire facilities; and

WHEREAS, pursuant to Resolution No. 19-04, the amount of the development impact fees has been automatically modified annually by a percentage equal to the appropriate Construction Cost Index ("CCI") as published by Engineering News Record for the preceding 12 months; and

WHEREAS, under the Mitigation Fee Act and AB 602 (which amended the Mitigation Fee Act in 2021), cities must ensure that there is a nexus between the development project's impacts and the imposed fee amounts, and must update their nexus study at least every eight years beginning January 1, 2022; and

WHEREAS, the City contracted with Urban Economics and DKS to prepare a new nexus study updating six of the City's development impact fees; and

WHEREAS, in June 2026, Urban Economics completed the 2026 Development Impact Fee Program Update for the City of Goleta, California (the "2026 Report"), which provides updated analyses and recommends updated maximum justified fees for: (1) the public administration facilities impact fee; (2) the library facilities impact fee; (3) the parks and recreation facilities impact fee and park dedication in-lieu (Quimby) fee; (4) the transportation facilities impact fee; (5) the bicycle and pedestrian facilities impact fee; and (6) the storm drain facilities impact fee; and

WHEREAS, the 2026 Report does not include the fire facilities fee, as that fee is the responsibility of the County of Santa Barbara, which provides facilities and services through the County's Fire Department, nor does it include the affordable housing fee, which was recently adopted in 2021 and first imposed on development in 2022; and

WHEREAS, this update does not create any new impact fees, but rather updates the nexus analyses and maximum justified fee amounts for the six existing fees described above, consistent with current capital facilities costs, updated facility inventories, and changes required by AB 602; and

WHEREAS, pursuant to AB 602, fees for residential development are now calculated per square foot of living space rather than as a flat rate per dwelling unit type; and

WHEREAS, the 2026 Report has been made available for public review and comment pursuant to the Mitigation Fee Act; and

WHEREAS, the City Council retains discretion, as a policy matter, to adopt development impact fees below the maximum justified amounts identified in the Nexus Study; and should the City Council elect to do so, the resulting reduction in project Development Impact Fee revenue may require future appropriations based on alternative funding sources; and

WHEREAS, the City Council opened the duly noticed public hearing on May 19, 2026, and continued the public hearing to July 21, 2026 to allow additional time to consider the proposed updated development impact fees and the 2026 Report, and at this time the City Council has heard testimony from all interested persons wishing to be heard; and

WHEREAS, the City Council now desires to approve the 2026 Report and adopt updated development impact fees in accordance with the nexus calculations and recommendations in the 2026 Report.

NOW, THEREFORE, THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF GOLETA HEREBY RESOLVES AS FOLLOWS:

SECTION 1: FINDINGS. The City Council finds and determines that the foregoing recitals are true and correct and are incorporated herein by this reference and the 2026 Report, attached as Exhibit A and incorporated

herein by reference, complies with California Government Code Section 66001 by establishing the basis for the imposition of updated fees on new development. This finding is based on the fact that the 2026 Report:

- A. Identifies the purpose of each fee;
- B. Identifies the use to which each fee will be put;
- C. Demonstrates a reasonable relationship between the use of the fee and the type of development project on which the fee is imposed;
- D. Demonstrates a reasonable relationship between the need for the public facilities and the type of development projects on which the fee is imposed; and
- E. Demonstrates a reasonable relationship between the amount of the fee and the cost of the public facilities or portion of the public facilities attributable to the development on which the fee is imposed.

SECTION 2: FEES FOR USES CONSISTENT WITH THE 2026 DEVELOPMENT IMPACT FEE PROGRAM UPDATE REPORT. The fees collected pursuant to this Resolution shall be used to finance the public facilities described or identified in the 2026 Report, attached as Exhibit A and incorporated herein by reference, or such other public facility master plans as may from time to time be adopted by the City Council.

SECTION 3: APPROVAL OF ITEMS IN 2026 DEVELOPMENT IMPACT FEE PROGRAM UPDATE REPORT. The City Council has considered the specific project descriptions and cost estimates identified in the 2026 Report, attached as Exhibit A and incorporated herein by reference, and hereby approves such project descriptions and cost estimates and finds them reasonable as the basis for calculating and imposing the updated development impact fees.

SECTION 4: CONSISTENCY WITH GENERAL PLAN. The City Council finds that the projects and fee methodology identified in the 2026 Report attached as Exhibit A and incorporated herein by reference are consistent with the City's General Plan.

SECTION 5: CEQA FINDING. The adoption of new development impact fees (Exhibit B) and related nexus study (Exhibit A) is exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and the regulations promulgated thereunder (14 Cal. Code of Regulations, §§ 15000, et seq., "CEQA Guidelines") because this action does not constitute a "project" pursuant to the CEQA Guidelines, § 15061(b)(3), this action constitutes a creation of governing funding mechanism, who do not involve any commitment to a specific project which may result in a potentially significant physical impact on the environment (CEQA Guidelines, § 15378(b)(4)), and the action constitutes an organization and administrative activity of government that will not result in direct or indirect physical changes in the

environment (CEQA Guidelines, § 15378(b)(5)). In addition, obtaining funds (fees) for capital projects for services in existing service areas are statutorily exempt under CEQA Guidelines, § 15273(a)(4).

SECTION 6: ADOPTION OF 2026 DEVELOPMENT IMPACT FEE PROGRAM UPDATE REPORT. The City Council hereby adopts the 2026 Report, dated June 2026, prepared by Urban Economics, attached hereto as Exhibit A and incorporated herein by reference.

SECTION 7: RETENTION OF FIRE FACILITIES FEE AND AFFORDABLE HOUSING FEE. The fire facilities impact fee adopted pursuant to Resolution No. 19-04 and the Fire Impact Fee Nexus Study dated September 2014, prepared by the Santa Barbara Fire Protection District, shall remain in effect and is not modified by this Resolution. The affordable housing impact fee adopted in 2021 shall likewise remain in effect and is not modified by this Resolution.

SECTION 8: ADOPTION OF UPDATED FEES. The City Council hereby approves and adopts the updated development impact fees as set forth in Exhibit B to this Resolution, attached hereto and incorporated herein by this reference. Fees for residential development shall be calculated per square foot of living space in accordance with AB 602 and as set forth in the 2026 Report and Exhibit B. The amount of the development impact fees shall be automatically increased annually effective July 1, 2027 and each July 1 thereafter by the percentage increase equal to the appropriate Construction Cost Index ("CCI") as published by Engineering News Record, or its successor publication, for the preceding 12 months for which the CCI is available, and such CCI shall be specific to California or the nearest region. The City Manager, or designee, is authorized to administratively adjust the development impact fees without future action of the City Council or need for future public hearings, until such time as a new impact fee nexus study and fees are adopted, or this authorization is revoked by the City Council.

SECTION 9: AUTHORIZATION. The City Manager, or designee, is hereby authorized and directed to update the development impact fee schedule and to collect such fees on new development projects and to take all action necessary to effectuate the purpose of this Resolution.

SECTION 10: SUPERSESSON OF PRIOR FEES. Upon the effective date of this Resolution, the updated development impact fees hereby approved and adopted shall supersede the corresponding fees previously adopted pursuant to Resolution No. 19-04. For the avoidance of doubt, this Resolution does not supersede the fire facilities impact fee or the affordable housing impact fee.

SECTION 11: SEVERABILITY. If any action, subsection, sentence, clause or phrase of this Resolution or the imposition of a development impact fee for any project described in the 2026 Report or the application thereof to

any person or circumstance shall be held invalid or unconstitutional by a court of competent jurisdiction, such invalidity shall not affect the validity of the remaining portions of this Resolution and other fees levied by this Resolution that can be given effect without the invalid provisions or application of fees.

SECTION 12: EFFECTIVE DATE. This Resolution becomes effective upon its adoption. The updated development impact fees adopted herein shall become effective sixty (60) days after adoption of this Resolution, in accordance with Government Code section 66017.

SECTION 13. CERTIFICATION

The City Clerk shall certify to the passage and adoption of this Resolution and enter it into the book of original resolutions.

PASSED, APPROVED AND ADOPTED this 21st day of July 2026.

PAULA PEROTTE
MAYOR

ATTEST:

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

DEBORAH S. LOPEZ
CITY CLERK

ISAAC ROSEN
CITY ATTORNEY

STATE OF CALIFORNIA)
COUNTY OF SANTA BARBARA) SS.
CITY OF GOLETA)

I, DEBORAH S. LOPEZ, City Clerk of the City of Goleta, California, DO
HEREBY CERTIFY that the foregoing Resolution No. 26-____ was duly adopted
by the City Council of the City of Goleta at a Public Hearing held on July 21st,
2026, by the following roll call vote of the Council members:

AYES:

NOES:

ABSENT:

ABSTAIN:

(SEAL)

DEBORAH S. LOPEZ
CITY CLERK

2026 DEVELOPMENT IMPACT FEE PROGRAM UPDATE PUBLIC REVIEW DRAFT

Prepared For:

City of Goleta

Preparation Date: June 2026

Prepared By:

Robert D. Spencer, Urban Economics

With Assistance From:

Jim Damkowitch, DKS & Gerald Comati, COM3 Consulting



TABLE OF CONTENTS

Executive Summary	iv
1. Introduction	10
Background	10
Study Objectives.....	11
Assumptions and Limitations.....	11
Fee Waivers.....	12
Nexus Analysis Approach.....	12
Existing Fund Balances.....	13
Factors Driving Changes to Maximum Justified Fees.....	14
2. Growth Forecast.....	16
Growth Forecast	16
New Development and Facilities Demand.....	20
Service Population	21
3. Public Administration Facilities.....	23
Facility Standards	23
Fee Schedule.....	25
Use of Fee Revenue	25
4. Library Facilities	29
Facility Standards	29
Fee Schedule.....	31
Use of Fee Revenue	31
5. Park & Recreation Facilities.....	33
Facility Standards	33
Fee Schedule.....	38
Use of Fee Revenue	39
6. Transportation Facilities	41
Transportation Demand Modeling.....	41
Local Transportation Deficiency Criteria	41
Facility Standards	43

Capital Improvements and Fair Share Analysis	43
Fee Schedule.....	48
Use of Fee Revenue	55
7. Bicycle & Pedestrian Facilities.....	57
Facility Standards	57
Fee Schedule.....	58
Use of Fee Revenue	59
8. Storm Drain Facilities Fee.....	61
Storm Drain Demand	61
Facility Standards	62
Fee Schedule.....	64
Use of Fee Revenue	64
9. Capital Improvement Program.....	66
Revenue Projections	66
Capital Improvement Program	66
Appendix A: Traffic Needs Analysis.....	[separate cover]
Appendix B: Transportation Improvement Project Cost Estimates..	[separate cover]

LIST OF TABLES

Table E.1: Goleta Growth Forecast, 2025-Buildout.....	vi
Table E.2: Existing Facility Standard Costs.....	vi
Table E.3: Existing and Maximum Justified Fee Schedule	viii
Table 1.1 Impact Fee Fund Balances	14
Table 1.2: Factors Driving Changes to Maximum Justified Fee Schedule	15
Table 2.1: Growth Forecast (dwelling units & building space).....	18
Table 2.2: Occupant Density.....	19
Table 2.3: Growth Forecast (residents & workers).....	20
Table 2.4: Service Population	22
Table 3.1: Existing Public Administration Facilities	26

Table 3.2: Public Administration Facility Standard and Costs	28
Table 3.3: Public Administration Facilities Impact Fee	28
Table 4.1: Existing Library Facilities	29
Table 4.2: Library Facility Standards and Costs	30
Table 4.3: Library Facilities Impact Fee Schedule	31
Table 5.1: Park Inventory (acres).....	34
Table 5.2: Park Facility Standards	36
Table 5.3: Existing Capital Asset Park Facility Standards	38
Table 5.4: Park & Recreation Facilities Impact and Park Dedication In-lieu Fees	39
Table 6.1: Transportation Improvements and Costs	45
Table 6.2: Vehicle Trip Rates	50
Table 6.3: New Development Vehicle Trip Generation.....	52
Table 6.4: Transportation Fee Cost per Trip.....	53
Table 6.5: Transportation Impact Fee Schedule (sample)	55
Table 7.1: Bicycle & Pedestrian Facilities Standard.....	57
Table 7.2: Bicycle & Pedestrian Facilities Costs	58
Table 7.3: Bicycle and Pedestrian Facilities Impact Fee.....	59
Table 8.1: Equivalent Dwelling Units	61
Table 8.2: Land Use Scenario and EDUs	62
Table 8.3: Existing Storm Drain Facilities & Standards	63
Table 8.4: Storm Drain Facilities Cost Standard	63
Table 8.5: Storm Drain Facilities Impact Fee Schedule.....	64
Table 9.1: Five-Year DIF Revenue Projection	67
Table 9.2: Five-Year Public Administration Facilities DIF CIP	68
Table 9.3: Five-Year Public Library Facilities DIF CIP	69
Table 9.4: Five-Year Park Facilities DIF CIP	70
Table 9.5: Five-Year Transportation Facilities DIF CIP	71
Table 9.6: Five-Year Bicycle and Pedestrian Facilities DIF CIP	72
Table 9.7: Five-Year Storm Drain Facilities DIF CIP	74

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Development impact fees provide a mechanism for new development projects to contribute financially to the one-time cost of improving and expanding the infrastructure and facilities needed to accommodate those projects. The City of Goleta (City) adopted the County of Santa Barbara's impact fees for the Goleta Planning Area when the City incorporated in 2002. The City completed a major update to the program and associated ordinance (Ordinance 19-04) in 2019. The ordinance identified seven fees. This report provides a second major update to the program based on the most current data available at the time the report was prepared. Since 2019 the City has adjusted fees annually for inflation.

This report provides the supporting analysis for the City to update six existing impact fees:

- ♦ Public administration facilities impact fee (update existing fee)
- ♦ Library facilities impact fee (update existing fee)
- ♦ Parks and recreation facilities impact fee and park dedication in-lieu (Quimby) fee (update existing fees)
- ♦ Transportation facilities impact fee (update existing fee)
- ♦ Bicycle and pedestrian facilities impact fee (update existing fee)
- ♦ Storm drain facilities impact fee (update existing fee)

Purpose

The City is updating the aforementioned impact fees and the analysis documented in 2019 so that the fees will accurately reflect new development's fair share of capital facility costs through buildout. Per statute, the City must update its nexus study at least every eight years, but can choose to update the fees more frequently if desired. To this end, the City is updating its development impact fee nexus analysis prior to the eight year update requirement for several reasons:

- ♦ To reflect current capital facilities costs, which have increased significantly since the prior update.
- ♦ To reflect changes existing facility inventories, and resulting facility standards and level of service.
- ♦ To reflect design changes for transportation facilities.

Fees Not Included in this Analysis

This report does not include the fire facilities fee because, although the City collects the fee, the fee is the responsibility of the County of Santa Barbara that provides facilities and services through the County's Fire Department. This report also does not include the affordable housing fee because this fee was recently adopted in 2021 and first imposed on development in 2022.

Changes to Fee Structure

The only structural change to the fee program, is to charge residential fees per square foot, as opposed to a flat rate per type of dwelling unit. This change has been made to comply with the provisions of Assembly Bill (AB) 602, which went into effect in 2022. For the purpose of comparing the maximum justified fees to the current fees, the maximum justified fees are expressed per average sized dwelling unit. Fees will vary based on the square footage size of each residential development project. Note that the change to charging residential fees per square foot is not the driving factor to the increases in the fee schedules, rather the changes are driven by the facility standards, planned facilities and cost estimates.

Facility Standards and Growth Assumptions

Impact fees reflect existing levels of service (facility standards) and the cost of maintaining those standards as growth occurs. Levels of existing development and forecast growth used in this study are summarized **Table E.1**, and described in detail in Chapter 2.

The cost per resident and per worker to maintain existing facility standards as growth occurs are shown in **Table E.2**. Parks represent the highest per capita cost for residential development and transportation is the highest cost for non-residential development.

Table E.1: Goleta Growth Forecast, 2025-Buildout

Land Use	Existing (2025)	Buildout	Growth (% Buildout)	
<u>Residential</u>				
Residents	32,417	40,169	7,752	19%
Dwelling Units				
Single Family Detached	5,533	6,511	978	15%
All Other Residential	<u>7,622</u>	<u>9,973</u>	<u>2,351</u>	<u>24%</u>
Total Dwelling Units	13,155	16,484	3,329	20%
<u>Non-residential</u>				
Workers	25,540	35,380	9,840	28%
Bldg. Sq. Ft. (1,000s)				
Retail / Commercial	3,353	4,621	1,268	27%
Office & Medical	3,187	5,058	1,871	37%
Industrial	<u>6,684</u>	<u>7,572</u>	<u>888</u>	<u>12%</u>
Total Bldg. Sq. Ft. (1,000s)	13,224	17,251	4,027	23%

Sources: Tables 2.1 and 2.3.

Table E.2: Existing Facility Standard Costs

Facility	Cost to Maintain Existing Facility Standard	
	Per Resident	Per Worker
Public Administration	\$ 3,573	\$ 715
Library	\$ 296	\$ 59
Parks	\$11,151	\$ 2,230
Transportation	\$ 4,965	\$ 7,914
Bicycle & Pedestrian	\$ 4,682	\$ 936
Storm Drain	n/a	n/a

Notes: Transportation costs based on "all other residential" (all but detached single family) and "general office" land use categories. Storm drain fees calculated based on impervious surface, not per capita. Cost per equivalent dwelling unit of impervious surface to maintain standard is \$10,303.

Sources: Tables 2.2, 2.4, 3.2, 4.2, 5.3, 6.1, 6.2, 6.4, and 7.2.

Maximum Justified Fee Schedules

The updated fee schedules based on the per capita costs from **Table E.2** are shown below in **Table E.3**. The table also includes a comparison with the City's existing fee schedule. Fees for residential development calculated in this nexus study will be charged per square foot of living space. However, to provide a comparison to the fees currently charged by the City, Table E.3 displays the maximum justified fees for the average sized single family detached unit (1,791 square feet), and for the average sized 'all other'

residential unit (927 square feet). Fees for a given unit will be different than the maximum justified fees shown here to the extent that the square footage of the unit varies from that of an average sized unit.

Fees for Accessory Dwelling Units

The California State Legislature has provided requirements for how local agencies can impose development impact fees on accessory dwelling units (ADU). California Government Code §66311.5(c)(1) stipulates that local agencies may not impose any impact fees on ADUs 750 square feet or less. ADUs greater than 750 square feet can be charged impact fees in proportion to the size of the primary dwelling unit. Charging impact fees per square foot for ADUs larger than 750 square feet meets the proportionality requirement.

Table E.3: Existing and Maximum Justified Fee Schedule

		Adopted Fee (2019 Nexus Study)	Existing Fee (FY 2025-26)	Maximum Justified Fee	Difference (Justified vs. Existing)	
Land Use Category	Units				Amount	Percent
<u>Public Administration</u>						
Single Family Detached ¹	per DU	\$3,086	\$4,132	\$10,540	\$ 6,408	155%
All Other Residential	per DU	2,238	2,999	7,396	4,397	147%
Retail & Commercial	per KSF	487	656	1,665	1,009	154%
Office & Medical	per KSF	655	880	2,237	1,357	154%
Industrial	per KSF	243	329	829	500	152%
<u>Library</u>						
Single Family Detached ¹	per DU	\$959	\$1,287	\$ 873	\$ (414)	(32%)
All Other Residential	per DU	696	934	613	(321)	(34%)
Retail & Commercial	per KSF	151	206	138	(68)	(33%)
Office & Medical	per KSF	203	275	185	(90)	(33%)
Industrial	per KSF	75	105	69	(36)	(35%)
<u>Parks & Recreation</u>						
Residential Subdivisions (Quimby Act)						
Single Family Detached ¹	per DU	\$14,998	\$20,084	\$36,913	\$16,829	84%
All Other Residential	per DU	10,880	14,572	25,902	11,330	78%
All Other Development (Mitigation Fee Act)						
Single Family Detached ¹	per DU	\$11,900	\$15,928	\$32,895	\$16,967	107%
All Other Residential	per DU	7,947	13,175	23,083	9,908	75%
Retail & Commercial	per KSF	1,880	2,519	5,196	2,677	106%
Office & Medical	per KSF	2,525	3,382	6,981	3,599	106%
Industrial	per KSF	936	1,257	2,587	1,330	106%
<u>Storm Drain</u>						
Single Family Detached ¹	per DU	\$ 3,596	\$ 4,817	\$10,845	\$ 6,028	125%
All Other Residential	per DU	2,609	3,494	3,904	410	12%
Retail & Commercial	per KSF	1,988	2,665	6,290	3,625	136%
Office & Medical	per KSF	2,671	3,578	4,338	760	21%
Industrial	per KSF	990	1,329	5,097	3,768	284%

Table E.3: Existing and Maximum Justified Fee Schedule (continued)

		Adopted Fee (2019 Nexus Study)	Existing Fee (FY 2025-26)	Maximum Justified Fee	Difference (Justified vs. Existing)	
Land Use Category	Units				Amount	Percent
<u>Transportation</u>						
All Land Uses	per PM Peak Hour Trip	\$ 12,450	\$16,665	\$ 21,866	\$ 5,201	31%
<u>Sample of Land Uses</u>						
Single Family Detached ¹	per DU	\$ 12,077	\$15,165	\$ 19,725	\$ 4,560	30%
Apartment	per DU	7,487	8,166	11,029	2,863	35%
Hotel	per room	7,171	9,499	9,866	367	4%
Supermarket	per KSF	70,816	89,491	115,321	25,830	29%
General Office	per KSF	17,808	22,998	24,770	1,772	8%
General Light Industrial	per KSF	11,835	10,666	10,500	(166)	(2%)
<u>Bicycle & Pedestrian</u>						
Single Family Detached ¹	per DU	\$3,092	\$4,142	\$ 13,812	\$ 9,670	233%
All Other Residential	per DU	2,243	3,006	9,692	6,686	222%
Retail & Commercial	per KSF	488	657	2,182	1,525	232%
Office & Medical	per KSF	656	881	2,931	2,050	233%
Industrial	per KSF	243	329	1,086	757	230%
<u>All Updated Fees</u>						
Single Family Detached ¹	per DU	\$ 34,710	\$45,471	\$ 88,690	\$43,219	95%
All Other Residential ²	per DU	23,220	31,774	55,717	23,943	75%
Retail & Commercial ³	per KSF	75,810	96,194	130,792	34,598	36%
Office & Medical ⁴	per KSF	24,518	31,994	41,442	9,448	30%
Industrial ⁵	per KSF	14,322	14,015	20,168	6,153	44%

Notes: "DU" = dwelling unit; "KSF" = thousand building square feet. Residential fees are calculated per square foot of living space in this nexus study update, though residential fees are shown per average sized DU in this table for the purpose of comparison to current fee schedule.

The City also charges impact fees for fire and affordable housing that are not included in this update.

¹ Includes detached and attached accessory dwelling units (ADU). Fees for ADUs can only be charged on ADUs greater than 750 square feet, and are charged proportionally based on the square footage of the ADU to the square footage of the primary unit.

² Parks and transportation fees based on "Apartment" category.

³ For transportation fee, based on supermarket category.

⁴ For transportation fee, based on general office category.

⁵ For transportation fee, based on general light industrial category.

Sources: City of Goleta Fee Schedule, FY 2025-26; Tables 3.3, 4.3, 5.4, 6.1, 6.2, 6.4, 7.3, and 8.2.

1. INTRODUCTION

Background

Development impact fees provide a mechanism for new development projects to contribute financially to the one-time cost of improving and expanding the infrastructure and facilities needed to accommodate that development. Impact fees are commonly used by local agencies throughout California and in many other states as one of many funding sources for capital improvement programs. Fees are a one-time, non-recurring revenue source paid at the time of development impact, typically at issuance of certificate of occupancy.¹

The City adopted the County of Santa Barbara's impact fees for the Goleta Planning Area when the City incorporated in 2002. The City completed a major update to the program in 2019. This report provides a second major update to the program based on the most current data available at the time the report was prepared. The City adjusts fees annually for inflation between major program updates.

This report provides the supporting analysis for the City to update six existing impact fees:

- ◆ Public administration facilities impact fee (update existing fee)
- ◆ Library facilities impact fee (update existing fee)
- ◆ Parks and recreation facilities impact fee and park dedication in-lieu (Quimby) fee (update existing fees)
- ◆ Transportation facilities impact fee (update existing fee)
- ◆ Bicycle and pedestrian facilities impact fee (update existing fee)
- ◆ Storm drain facilities impact fee (update existing fee)

This report does not include the fire facilities fee because, although the City collects the fee, the fee is the responsibility of the County of Santa Barbara that provides facilities and services through the County's Fire Department. This report also does not include the affordable housing fee because this fee was recently adopted in 2021 and first imposed on development in 2022. Per AB 602, a nexus study must be updated at least every eight years, from

¹ If there is no certificate of occupancy, such as change of use that does not require a building permit, the fee would be paid prior to the land use permit. Quimby fees are due at the time of map recordation according to the Quimby Act.

the period beginning January 1, 2022. Further, to comply with AB 602, fees for residential development are calculated per square foot of living space.

Study Objectives

California local agencies may adopt impact fees under authority granted by the Mitigation Fee Act (the Act), contained in Sections 66000 et seq. of the *California Government Code*. The primary purpose of this report is to substantiate the findings required by the Act for adopting or increasing an impact fee.

The Act requires the following key findings to be made before a local agency adopts or increases a fee imposed on a development project:

1. **Impact:** Reasonable relationship between new development and need for public facilities.² This finding demonstrates the impacts of new development on the demand for public facilities.
2. **Benefit:** Reasonable relationship between new development and the use of fee revenue for public facilities to accommodate that development.³ This finding demonstrates how the use of fee revenues for public facilities benefits new development.
3. **Proportionality:** Reasonable relationship between the amount of the fee and the proportionate cost of public facilities attributable to new development.⁴ This finding demonstrates how the fee on a development project is proportionate to the development project's impacts that create demand for the public facility.

Together these three key findings define the nexus among the impact of development, the amount of the fee, and the use of fee revenues.

Assumptions and Limitations

This nexus study relies on data from a variety of sources, including publicly available, third-party sources (California Department of Finance; US Census Bureau), the City's own data (General Plan, facility inventories, certain replacement cost data), and data developed by consultants specifically for this effort (Goleta Travel Demand model, transportation cost estimates). Care has been taken to use reasonable and justifiable

² Government Code, section 66001(a)(3).

³ Government Code, section 66001(a)(4).

⁴ Government Code, section 66001(b).

assumptions throughout this report, and to conservatively estimate the allocation of future facility costs to new development where appropriate. The City should consider updating this analysis periodically to ensure the assumptions are reasonable. Per state law, a nexus study must be updated at least every eight years.

Fee Waivers

The nexus analysis is based on the estimated cost of the facilities needed to serve all new development, and does not exclude any development that may be exempted from paying impact fees, such as affordable housing units. If the analysis excluded development that is exempted from paying fees, then the burden would be shifted to other land uses, which is not permissible under the Mitigation Fee Act. As such, any fee reductions, waivers or exemptions for development projects are effectively subsidized by the City's General Fund.

Nexus Analysis Approach

The approach taken by this nexus analysis for all impact fees except the transportation impact fee includes the following steps:

1. Determine the population served by the facilities (service population).
2. Identify the existing facility standard to document the impact of new development on the need for additional facilities (finding #1, above).
3. Describe the types of facilities eligible for funding with fee revenue (finding #2, above).
4. Calculate the fee schedule necessary to maintain the facility standard (finding #3, above).

The basis for the service population are estimates of existing and buildout population and employment in the city and are provided in Chapter 2. Chapters 3 through 9 provide for each impact fee and analysis necessary to substantiate the findings described above.

For the transportation fee, a slightly different approach was employed with the use of travel demand modeling:

1. Use the same citywide growth forecast as the other five fees put in the context of a region-wide forecast.
2. Use the regional growth forecast in a regional travel demand model to identify the capital improvements necessary to maintain level of service

on the city's roadways based on measures of vehicle congestion (finding #1, above).

3. Estimate the cost of needed capital improvements, and the share associated with growth within the city versus growth elsewhere in the region (finding #2, above).
4. Calculate the fee schedule necessary to fund the city's cost share (finding #3, above).

Each fee chapter includes a schedule of maximum justified fees by land use category. The City may adopt any fee up to the amount shown in each fee schedule for each land use category. Any fee below the maximum justified amount need not be consistent in absolute or percentage terms across land use categories for any given fee. However, the City cannot increase fees above the maximum justified amount on other land uses to compensate for adopting lower fees for a particular use.

Finally, the Act also requires findings regarding (1) the purpose of the fee, and (2) a description of the public facilities to be funded by the fee.⁵ The purpose of each impact fee is to accommodate the impacts of new development by funding the expansion of the City's existing facilities. The types of facilities funded by each fee are described in the respective chapter of this report and more detail is provided in Chapter 9. The transportation fee is based on a comprehensive long-range list of specific improvements that is included in Chapter 6.

Existing Fund Balances

Table 1.1 displays the City's current impact fee fund balances for all impact fee funds, including those not being updated in this nexus study. The fund balances are not used in the fee analysis for those fees calculated using the existing facility standard (public administration, library, parks and recreation, storm drain and bicycle and pedestrian facilities). The existing fund balances for these categories represents facilities that the City has not yet constructed or acquired. To be conservative the fund balances are excluded from the calculation of the existing facility standards.

The fund balance is used in the calculation of the transportation facilities fee, since that fee is calculated based on a defined project list and allocation to new development. In that case the fund balance is subtracted from the costs allocated to new development prior to calculating the cost per PM peak hour trip.

⁵ *Ibid.*, sections 66001(a)(1) and 66001(a)(2).

Table 1.1 Impact Fee Fund Balances

Fee	FY24/25 Fund Balance (\$1,000s)
Public Administration	683
Library	283
Parks and Recreation - Quimby	6,400
Parks and Recreation - Non-Quimby	2,320
Affordable Housing Development	7
Storm Drain	565
Transportation	1,296
Bicycle and Pedestrian	291
Fire	4,100
Source: City of Goleta.	

Factors Driving Changes to Maximum Justified Fees

The maximum justified fees in this report are in some cases considerably higher than the fees justified by the City's 2019 Nexus Study. There are many factors that drive changes to the maximum justified fee schedule. The following discussion summarizes the predominant factors driving changes to fee levels in this nexus study update compared to the 2019 study:

- ◆ Increased unit costs (replacement costs for buildings, bike, pedestrian, storm drainage infrastructure and land acquisition). Unit costs have been updated based on cost experience provided by the City, and Urban Economics' experience in other jurisdictions in Southern California. Construction costs have escalated significantly since COVID, and this analysis seeks to capture changes in the cost of future facilities needed to serve new development. For example, the Engineering News Record's Construction Cost Index has increased by over 25% since 2019.
- ◆ Updated inventories of existing facilities (public administration facilities, parks and open space, bike and pedestrian infrastructure, storm drain infrastructure) that more accurately reflect the City's existing level of service and investment in facilities and infrastructure compared to the information that was available in 2019. More detailed inventories demonstrate that the City provides a higher level of service than was previously assumed, which means that the corresponding fees to maintain the existing level of service are higher than in the prior nexus study.
- ◆ Library fees have been updated to assume a larger service population, including demand from unincorporated areas within the Goleta Valley Library's service area, per the FY 2025-2026 Agreement for Operation

of a Countywide Library System. This results in a lower facility standard per person, and consequently lower impact fees.

- ♦ Revised traffic model analysis and cost estimates. The City's traffic consultant, DKS, updated the travel demand model to reflect current conditions, and recalculated the existing deficiencies and allocation of responsibility to new development. Projects that had been completed, or no longer deficient since the prior update have been removed from the analysis, and new projects have been added.

Table 1.2 summarizes the factors driving the changes to the maximum justified amounts, by fee category.

Table 1.2: Factors Driving Changes to Maximum Justified Fee Schedule

Fee Category	Factors Driving Changes to Fee Schedule	Primary Cost Drivers	Key Assumptions
Public Administration	Increased cost of facilities; Increased cost of land acquisition; increased level of service indicated by existing facility inventories	Land Acquisition; Construction Costs	Existing Service Population; Existing level of service (LOS); Unit Cost Assumptions
Libraries	Level of service decreased due to increased population served by roughly the same amount facilities. Costs increased slightly. Fees decreased compared to prior study.	Land Acquisition; Construction Costs	Existing Service Population; Existing LOS; Unit Cost Assumptions
Parks	Existing inventory of parkland indicates an increased level of service; Increased costs to acquire land and improve parks	Land Acquisition; Park improvement costs	Existing Service Population; Existing LOS; Unit Cost Assumptions
Transportation Facilities	Revised traffic model and increased cost estimates	Construction Costs	Travel Demand Model allocation; Growth Projections; Project Costs
Bicycle and Pedestrian Facilities	Updated inventories of existing facilities providing service resulting in higher level of service. Increased unit costs.	Construction Costs	Existing Service Population; Existing LOS; Unit Cost Assumptions
Storm Drains	Updated inventories of existing facilities providing service resulting in higher level of service. Increased unit costs.	Construction Costs	Existing Impervious Surface; Existing LOS; Unit Cost Assumptions

2. GROWTH FORECAST

This chapter describes the growth forecast and related assumptions used as a basis for measuring the impact of development on the need for public facilities, including:

- ♦ Estimates of existing land use in 2025 and for buildout of the City under the current General Plan in terms of dwelling units and nonresidential building square feet. Buildout is not assigned to occur in any particular year, rather, the nexus analysis considers the total growth increment, regardless of when it may occur.
- ♦ Estimates of population and employment from growth based on occupant density assumptions (residents per dwelling unit and workers per thousand square feet) that translate dwelling units and building square feet to residents and workers.
- ♦ Estimates of the need for public facilities to accommodate growth based on growth in the population served (“service population”) by the various public facilities included in this impact fee program update.

The nexus analysis for each fee presented in subsequent chapters uses these estimates to determine facility standards and estimate facility needs and fee revenues.

Growth Forecast

Existing land use and buildout of the City’s current General Plan expressed in terms of housing units and building space are shown in **Table 2.1**. Existing dwelling units by type are based on January 1, 2025 estimates from the California Department of Finance (DOF). Buildout dwelling units and existing and buildout workers by land use type are based on estimates used in the Goleta travel demand model. As shown in **Table 2.1**, the travel demand model uses detailed estimates of nonresidential building space by land use category, including eleven retail/commercial categories, three office/medical categories, and three industrial categories.

The following section describes the updates made to the travel demand model for use in this nexus study.

Updates to Travel Demand Model Baseline Land Use

DKS updated the travel demand model baseline to accurately quantify the current development in the City and surrounding areas. The 2013 baseline data was updated using the sources cited below. All City of Goleta land uses were reviewed and approved by City staff – including land use of neighboring jurisdictions. The County of Santa Barbara, City of Santa Barbara, and University of California, Santa Barbara (UCSB) land use was informed and coordinated with the County and the City. The following summarizes the data sources for each jurisdiction that informed changes to the land use scenario:

City of Goleta:

- ◆ Residential and nonresidential land use permit data (2013-2024)
- ◆ General Plan Update Resolutions
- ◆ 2024 school enrollment
- ◆ Built housing unit summaries 2013-2024

County of Santa Barbara:

- ◆ Residential and nonresidential land use permit data (2013-2024)
- ◆ County General Plan rezones

City of Santa Barbara

- ◆ Residential and nonresidential land use permit data (2013-2024)
- ◆ La Cumbre Plaza General Plan rezones

UCSB:

- ◆ Residential permit data (2013-2024)
- ◆ Student Enrollment (2024)

Table 2.1: Growth Forecast (dwelling units & building space)

Land Use	Existing (2025) ¹	Buildout	Growth (% Buildout)	
<u>Residential (dwelling units)</u>				
Single Family Detached	5,533	6,511	978	15%
All Other Residential	<u>7,622</u>	<u>9,973</u>	<u>2,351</u>	<u>24%</u>
Total Residential	13,155	16,484	3,329	20%
<u>Retail / Commercial (1,000 sq. ft.)</u>				
Auto Services	424	499	75	15%
Banks	23	28	5	18%
Fast Food Restaurants	35	35	-	0%
Hotels ²	410	664	254	38%
Indoor Recreation	254	368	114	31%
Shopping Mall	-	-	-	NA
Neighborhood Commercial	1,225	1,861	636	34%
Regional Commercial	491	528	37	7%
Resort Hotel ³	281	329	48	15%
Restaurants	210	244	34	14%
Theater	<u>-</u>	<u>65</u>	<u>65</u>	<u>NA</u>
Subtotal	3,353	4,621	1,268	27%
<u>Office & Medical (1,000 sq. ft.)</u>				
Hospitals	101	161	60	37%
Medical	150	225	75	33%
Office	<u>2,936</u>	<u>4,672</u>	<u>1,736</u>	<u>37%</u>
Subtotal	3,187	5,058	1,871	37%
<u>Industrial (1,000 sq. ft.)</u>				
Heavy Industrial	274	418	144	34%
Light Industrial	6,410	7,088	678	10%
Research & Development	<u>-</u>	<u>66</u>	<u>66</u>	<u>NA</u>
Subtotal	<u>6,684</u>	<u>7,572</u>	<u>888</u>	<u>12%</u>
Total Non-residential	13,224	17,251	4,027	23%

¹ Residential estimates for 2025 based on California Department of Finance (DOF) data.

Nonresidential estimates for 2025 based on travel demand model data for 2024. The amount of subsequent development would not materially affect the nexus analysis in this report.

² Land use data for hotel rooms (630 existing, 1,022 buildout, and 392 growth) converted to building square feet at 650 square feet per room.

³ Land use data for resort hotel rooms (360 existing, 422 buildout, and 62 growth) converted to building square feet at 780 square feet per room.

Sources: State of California, Department of Finance, Table E-5 Population and Housing Estimates for Cities, Counties and the State — January 1, 2025; Goleta Traffic Model land use scenarios (2025 and General Plan buildout); Jan A. DeRoos, *Planning and Programming a Hotel*, Cornell University, 2011.

The nexus analysis uses occupant density assumptions (residents per dwelling unit and workers per thousand square feet of nonresidential building space) to establish the relationship between development projects and the demand for public facilities and services. Occupant density assumptions vary by land use category to differentiate the impact of

development on the need for public facilities. Differentiating fees by land use assists in supporting a reasonable relationship between the amount of the fee and the proportionate cost of public facilities attributable to new development.

The occupant density assumptions used in this nexus analysis are based on the latest citywide population and housing estimates prepared by the U.S. Census Bureau, and surveys of nonresidential land uses in the Los Angeles metropolitan area. These assumptions are shown in **Table 2.2**.

Table 2.2: Occupant Density

Land Use				
<u><i>Residential</i></u>				
Single Family Detached	2.95	persons / DU		
All Other Residential	2.07	persons / DU		
<u><i>Nonresidential</i></u>				
Retail & Commercial	430	sq. ft. / worker	2.33	worker / KSF
Office & Medical	320	sq. ft. / worker	3.13	worker / KSF
Industrial	861	sq. ft. / worker	1.16	worker / KSF
Notes: "DU" is dwelling units and "KSF" is thousand square feet. All densities rounded to the nearest hundredth.				
Sources: U.S. Census Bureau, 2019-2023 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates, Tables B25033 and B25024; The Natelson Company, <i>Employment Density Survey Summary Report</i> , prepared for Southern California Association of Governments, October 31, 2001; Urban Economics				

Existing land use and buildout of the City's current General Plan expressed in terms of residents and workers is shown in **Table 2.3**. Existing and buildout population by dwelling unit type, and existing and buildout workers by land use type, are based on the occupant density assumptions shown in **Table 2.2**. It is important to quantify the existing and land use scenario in terms of people, because it is people who generate demand for services and the facilities needed to provide those services from the City.

Total existing household population is consistent with January 1, 2025 estimates by the California Department of Finance. Existing residents in single family units are estimated using the existing count of dwelling units, and the calculated occupant density from Table 2.2. The difference between total household population and the calculated residents in single family detached units is the estimated number of existing residents in all other residential units.

The total increase of resident units, by type from Table 2.1 is multiplied by the assumptions of residents per unit, by type from Table 2.2 to estimate the increase in household population between 2025 and buildout. The increase in household population is added to the estimates of existing population to calculate an estimate of total household population, by housing unit type at buildout.

Estimates of nonresidential square footage (in thousands) from Table 2.1 are multiplied by the occupant density assumptions of workers per 1,000 square feet of building space for three general land uses types to estimate workers in the base year, at the planning horizon and those associated with new nonresidential development in the City.

Table 2.3: Growth Forecast (residents & workers)

Land Use	Existing (2025)	Buildout	Growth (% Buildout)	
<u>Residents¹</u>				
Single Family Detached	16,322	19,207	2,885	15%
All Other Residential	16,095	20,962	4,867	23%
Total	32,417	40,169	7,752	19%
<u>Workers</u>				
Retail & Commercial	7,812	10,766	2,954	27%
Office & Medical	9,975	15,831	5,856	37%
Industrial	7,753	8,783	1,030	12%
Total	25,540	35,380	9,840	28%

¹ Excludes group quarters population, e.g. assisted care facilities and dormitories.

Sources: State of California, Department of Finance, *E-5 Population and Housing Estimates for Cities, Counties and the State — January 1, 2025*, Sacramento, California, May 2025; Tables 2.1 and 2.2.

New Development and Facilities Demand

Service population is a measure of the number of users or beneficiaries of a public service and the related public facilities required to deliver that service. Vehicle trip generation is the common measure of demand for transportation facilities. Increases in impervious surface generating runoff drive demand for storm drain facilities. Service population, trip generation and impervious surface are commonly used and reasonable indicators of the impact of new development on the need for new or expanded facilities.

Service population is typically composed of residents plus workers. To equate residents and workers in a single measure of service population, workers are weighted by a factor to reflect the potential demand for public facilities from businesses and their workers relative to demand from residents.

This nexus analysis uses three separate approaches to measure the impacts of growth on public facilities:

1. The types of facilities covered by the public administration, library, parks, and bicycle & pedestrian impact fees have reasonably similar service populations. All of these facilities are generally associated with both residential and some business uses, tend to be used during certain parts of the day, and face lower levels of demand per worker versus per

resident. Therefore, the same service population, which includes residents plus workers, who have been weighted to reflect a lower level of demand for facilities compared to residents, is used for all three of these impact fees.

2. Demand for storm drain facilities is based on impervious surface assumptions applied to residential and non-residential land uses.
3. Demand for transportation facilities is based on trip generation rates applied to residential and non-residential land uses.

The next section describes the approach used in this study to measure service population for the public administration, library, parks, and bicycle & pedestrian facilities. See Chapter 6 for further explanation of how transportation demand is measured for the nexus analysis. See Chapter 8 for a discussion of impervious surface related to demand for storm drain facilities.

Service Population

Household population is used to represent public facility demand for residential land uses. Household population excludes persons living in group quarters. Group quarters include, for example, dormitories, adult care facilities, and detention facilities. The population in group quarters is excluded from the calculation of service population because residents in group quarters are more likely to have access to private facilities such as a university campus, or are inmates prohibited from using public facilities. This nexus analysis uses the employment associated with these non-residential uses to reflect their relative level of public facility demand.

Workers are used to represent service demand from nonresidential land uses. Workers include employees, partners, and owners. The city's existing and buildout resident and worker populations are shown in **Table 2.3**, above.

User surveys by other local government agencies have indicated that service demand from one worker is typically less than demand from one resident. This result is reasonable because nonresidential buildings are typically occupied less intensively (fewer hours of the day) than housing units. Thus, relative to one resident, one worker should be weighted by a factor less than one before adding employment to residents to calculate service population.

This nexus analysis assumes that a worker represents demand for public administration, library, park, and bicycle & pedestrian facilities at a ratio of 0.20 relative to a resident. User surveys, as well as a comparison of demand based on 40 hours per week as a worker versus 128 hours as a resident (168

hours total in a week), would suggest a weighting factor closer to 0.30. However, to reflect that master planning for these facilities typically focuses more on residential demand, a more conservative factor of 0.20 is used in this nexus analysis. For residents that both live and work in the city, the demand for public facilities is reflected at both the residential and non-residential location because both those locations generate facility demand.

The service population used in this impact fee update is shown in **Table 2.4**. New development will comprise 21% ($9,720 / 47,245 = 21\%$) of the calculated service population at buildout.

Table 2.4: Service Population

Land Use	Existing (2025)	Buildout	Growth (% Buildout)
<i><u>Public Administration, Library, Park & Bike/Ped. Facilities</u></i>			
Residents (a)	32,417	40,169	7,752
Workers (b)	25,540	35,380	9,840
Relative Demand/Benefit (c) ¹	<u>0.20</u>	<u>0.20</u>	<u>0.20</u>
Service Population (a + (b x c))	37,525	47,245	9,720 21%

¹ Factors based on available user survey data and estimates from similar impact fee nexus studies.
Sources: Urban Economics; Table 2.3.

3. PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION FACILITIES

This chapter provides the updated nexus analysis, fee schedule, and estimated revenue for the public administration facilities impact fee. Public administration facilities include all facilities owned by the City and not otherwise associated with the nexus analysis for any of the City's other impact fees. Public administration facilities include a range of facilities such as city hall, community centers, corporation yards, and recreation facilities not associated with typical park development costs (see Chapter 5, *Park and Recreation Facilities*).

Police facilities are not included because services are provided through a contract with the Santa Barbara County sheriff's department, and the local substation is in a leased facility. Fire facilities are not included because services are provided by the Santa Barbara County Fire Department and facilities are owned by the County.

Facility Standards

Nexus analyses for impact fees often use an existing capital asset facility standard ("facility standard") that is based on the ratio of a city's existing capital assets to the existing population served by those facilities. This approach is based solely on available data (existing inventory of capital assets and existing service population estimates). The facility standard also commonly referred to as a "level of service" standard is not based on adopted policy such as standards contained in a city's General Plan or state statute, nor is it based on recommendations from the professional literature.

The existing capital asset facility standard provides a reasonable relationship between new development and the need for additional public facilities. The resulting impact fee funds the expansion of public facilities at a rate sufficient to maintain the existing ratio of facilities to service population as growth occurs.

The advantage of using an existing capital asset facility standard is that by definition there is no existing deficiency. An existing deficiency exists when new development is funding, through an impact fee, a facility standard that is higher than the existing capital asset standard. Facility standards based on adopted level of service policies, such as those contained in a general plan, are often higher than existing standards. If an impact is designed to fund new development's share of that higher standard, then the local agency must use other funding sources for the share of improvements

needed to correct the deficiency. If not, the agency risks new development partially funding the deficiency and overpaying for a higher standard that is not achieved. The Mitigation Fee Act specifically prohibits the use of fees to correct existing deficiencies in public facilities.⁶

The use of existing capital assets to determine the facility standard is the approach used in all fees documented in this report except the transportation impact fee (see Chapter 6).

The City's existing capital asset inventory of public administration facilities and associated land is shown in **Table 3.1**. As mentioned above, this inventory includes all facilities not otherwise associated with the nexus analysis for any of the City's other impact fees.

The public administration facility standard and associated costs are shown in **Table 3.2**. Service population is from **Table 2.4**. Replacement costs are based on the average of values used in seven recent (since 2021) development impact fee nexus studies for jurisdictions in California.⁷ These nexus studies were chosen because they included recent replacement costs, and provided sufficient detail to differentiate between administrative buildings and utility buildings. To be conservative, these values were not adjusted for cost inflation since the specific study was conducted. Land costs reflect a conservative estimate of \$2,695,000 per acre for acquisition based on the City's 2018 cost to acquire the Goleta Train Depot. This cost is significantly less than the average cost per acre incurred by the City to acquire right of way recently. The Train Depot acquisition is a reasonable proxy for valuing the City's land inventory, since the parcel is more representative of land suitable to site public facilities, as opposed to right-of-way acquisition. Total costs include a five percent charge for fee program administration based on the City's analysis of staff time spent to administer the fee program.

As shown in the Table 3.2, the City has an existing capital asset facility standard composed of 2.94 and 0.20 square feet per capita for civic and utility buildings, respectively, plus 20.59 square feet of land per capita. Also included in the table is the train depot facility standard. This standard is expressed separately from other types of buildings to reflect the City's recent investment in the facility, and because the cost of the facility was significantly higher than other types of buildings. The total cost for new development to maintain this facility standard is \$3,573 per capita including fee program administration costs.

⁶ Government Code, section 66001(g).

⁷ Local agencies included in sample to estimate building replacement costs: Azusa, Chino Hills, Pismo Beach, Grover Beach, Indian Wells, Temple City, Placer County.

Fee Schedule

The updated public administration facilities impact fee is shown in **Table 3.3**. The fee is based on the cost per capita shown in **Table 3.2** necessary to maintain the City's existing capital asset facility standard.

Fees adopted at this level would allow the City to provide facilities to new development at the same ratio of facilities to service population that currently exists in the City of Goleta today. As a policy decision, the City can adopt any fee lower than the maximum justified amounts. However, should the City elect to adopt fees below the maximum amounts, the lost revenue required to construct the facilities must come from the City's general fund or other unrestricted revenue source. The City cannot impose higher fees on other applicants in the future to make up the lost revenue.

Use of Fee Revenue

Estimated fee revenue over the next five-year planning horizon corresponding with the City's Capital Improvement Program (CIP) through buildout based on a market-based growth forecast is shown in the Capital Improvement Program Chapter, in **Table 9.1**. A five-year growth projection is used to estimate revenues to correspond with the five-year planning horizon of the City's CIP. The planning horizon of the CIP or nexus study does not affect the calculation of the fee schedule, which is based on the existing level of service. **Table 9.2** displays the Nexus Study CIP for public administration facilities, as required by AB 602. Upon adoption of this fee program, the City's CIP will be updated to incorporate projections of future DIF revenues, and program those revenues to eligible projects that benefit new development.

If revenue is used to replace an existing facility without expanding capacity, the project provides a joint benefit to existing and new development. In this case the fee can fund only 21 percent of project costs based on new development as a share of total development at buildout (see **Table 2.4**). However, if the City raises other funds for facility expansion that would accommodate growth, the impact fee revenue that would have been used for expansion projects could be re-programmed to joint benefit projects without adhering to the funding share noted here.

The City must allocate five percent of fee revenue to program administration. Administration costs include costs to collect and account for fee revenue, and costs to comply with the Mitigation Fee Act such as annual and five-year reporting requirements. The City will monitor its actual program administration costs and adjust this charge accordingly when the impact fee is updated in the future.

Table 3.1: Existing Public Administration Facilities

Facility	Address	Use	Building Type	Parcel Area (acres)	Building Area (sq. ft.)
Goleta Valley Community Center				9.84	
Main Bldg. / Goleta Community Center	5679 Hollister Ave.	Community center	Civic		23,860
Boys and Girls Club	5701 Hollister Avenue	Youth services	Civic		14,974
Classroom Bldg - North (site-built)	5689 Hollister Ave.	Youth services	Civic		6,851
Classroom Bldg - South (pre-fabricated)	5717 Hollister Ave.	Youth services	Utility		2,970
Classroom Bldg - West (site-built)	5681 Hollister Ave.	Youth services	Civic		5,376
Subtotal					54,031
Parking Lot	Orange Ave.	Parking lot	NA	0.15	-
City Hall	130 Cremona Drive	Offices	Civic	2.46	40,049
Public Works Corporation Yard	6735 Hollister Ave.		Utility	2.32	4,000
Land For Future Corporation Yard	Hollister/Hwy 217	Future City Facility	Utility	0.49	-
Goleta Train Depot	27 S La Patera Lane	Train Station/Transit Center	Train Depot	2.48	9,000
Rancho La Patera & Stow House				Note 1	
Historic Train Depot	300 North Los Carneros Rd.	Museum, offices	Civic		5,000
Stow House	304 North Los Carneros Rd.	Museum	Civic		7,440
Caretaker's Residence	304 North Los Carneros Rd.	Residence	Civic		680
Garage	304 North Los Carneros Rd.	Visitor center	Civic		1,000
Bunk House	304 North Los Carneros Rd.	Administrative office	Civic		660
Packing Shed	304 North Los Carneros Rd.	Museum	Civic		3,180
Subtotal					17,960
Stow Grove Park				Note 1	
Caretaker's Residence & Garage	580 La Patera Lane		Civic		1,200
Restroom Building	580 La Patera Lane		Civic		200
Storage Shed	580 La Patera Lane		Utility		600
Subtotal					2,000
All Facilities					
Civic Buildings					110,470
Train Depot					9,000
Utility Buildings					7,570
Total				17.74	127,040

¹ Land included in parkland inventory.

Sources: City of Goleta Master Facilities List (City of Goleta GS Facilities Master List 01-2025.xlsx); City of Goleta Owned Land Inventory (City_of_Goleta_Owned_Jan_2023.xlsx).

Table 3.2: Public Administration Facility Standard and Costs

Facility Type	Existing Facilities Inventory (sq. ft.)	Existing Service Population	Existing Facility Standard (sq. ft. per capita)	Average Replacement Cost (per sq. ft.) ¹	Total Cost (per capita)
<i>Formula</i>	<i>a</i>	<i>b</i>	<i>c = a / b</i>	<i>d</i>	<i>e = c x d</i>
Civic Buildings	110,470	37,525	2.94	\$ 500	\$ 1,470
Train Depot	9,000	37,525	0.24	2,444	587
Utility Buildings	7,570	37,525	0.20	300	60
Land ²	772,624	37,525	20.59	62	1,277
Subtotal					\$ 3,394
Program Administration (5% of total)					179
Total					\$ 3,573

Note: Total cost per capita rounded to the nearest dollar.

¹ Building replacement costs based on values used in similar studies for jurisdictions in California. Land cost based on City's recent land acquisition costs.

² Acres from Table 3.1 converted to square feet based on 43,560 square feet per acre.

Sources: Urban Economics; Tables 2.4 and 3.1.

Table 3.3: Public Administration Facilities Impact Fee

Land Use Category	Cost per Capita	Occupant Density (Residents/DU or Workers/KSF)	Relative Demand	Maximum Justified Fee	Fee per Square Foot ¹
<i>Formula</i>	<i>a</i>	<i>b</i>	<i>c</i>	<i>d = a * b * c</i>	<i>e = d / average</i>
<u>Residential</u>					
Single Family Detached ²	\$ 3,573	2.95	1.00	\$ 10,540 per DU	\$5.88
All Other Residential	3,573	2.07	1.00	7,396 per DU	7.98
<u>Nonresidential</u>					
Retail & Commercial	\$ 3,573	2.33	0.20	\$ 1,665 per KSF	\$1.67
Office & Medical	3,573	3.13	0.20	2,237 per KSF	2.24
Industrial	3,573	1.16	0.20	829 per KSF	0.83

Notes: "DU" = dwelling unit; "KSF" = thousand building square feet.

¹ Assumes 1,791 square feet per average sized single family unit and 927 for all other residential units in Goleta based on an analysis of American Housing Survey data from 2023.

² Includes attached and detached accessory dwelling units. Fees for ADUs can only be charged on ADUs greater than 750 square feet in size, and are charged proportionally based on the square footage of the ADU to the square footage of the primary dwelling unit.

Sources: Tables 2.2, 2.4, and 3.2.

4. LIBRARY FACILITIES

This chapter provides the updated nexus analysis, fee schedule, and estimated revenue for the library facilities impact fee. Library facilities include the City's single library, its collection of materials, and a book mobile.

Facility Standards

The library facilities impact fee uses the City's existing capital assets to determine the facility standard and provide a reasonable relationship between new development and the need for additional library facilities. The resulting impact fee would fund the expansion of library facilities at a rate sufficient to maintain the existing ratio of facilities to service population as growth occurs. See the *Facility Standard* section in Chapter 3 for more explanation of this approach.

The City's existing capital asset inventory of library facilities is shown in **Table 4.1**. Note that the inventory only includes owned library facilities, and excludes the temporary GVL Express library at 6500 Hollister Avenue, Suite 105 because it is not owned by the City. The City is currently renovating its main library building at 500 North Fairview Ave.

Table 4.1: Existing Library Facilities

Facility	Address	Building Type	Amount
Building	500 North Fairview Ave.	Civic	15,773 square feet
Materials	500 North Fairview Ave.		81,004 volumes ¹
Land	500 North Fairview Ave.		2.07 acres
Vehicles			1.00 book van

¹ Includes books, audiobooks, DVDs, CDs, and library of things, hotspots, passes, magazines and book club kits.

Sources: City of Goleta Master Facilities List (City of Goleta GS Facilities Master List 01-2025.xlsx); City of Goleta Owned Land Inventory (City_of_Goleta_Owned_Jan_2023.xlsx).

The library facility standard and associated costs are shown in **Table 4.2**. The assumed City service population is from Table 2.4. This figure has been adjusted in Table 4.2 to account for unincorporated service population served by the Goleta Valley Library. Per the FY 2025-26 Agreement for the Operation of a Countywide Library System, and the latest estimate of household population in Goleta from the California Department of Finance, 49.8% of demand for the Goleta Valley Library branch library services is associated with City residents and the remainder is associated with unincorporated residents. Consequently, the City's library service

population is assumed to be 49.8% of the total service population in this for the purpose of calculating the existing facility standards, which results an assumed service population of 75,332, which includes residents and a weighted estimate of workers.

Building and materials replacement costs are based on values used in similar studies for jurisdictions in California consistent with the sources used in the Public Administration fee analysis, and have been increased to reflect upgrades and renovations from the Building Forward Facilities Improvement Program infrastructure project. Assumed land values reflect recent land sales in and around the City. Total costs include a five percent charge for fee program administration.

As shown in the table, the City has an existing capital asset facility standard composed of 0.21 square feet of library space and 1.08 volumes per 1,000 capita, plus 1.20 square feet of land per capita. The total cost for new development to maintain this facility standard is \$296 per capita including fee program administration costs.

Table 4.2: Library Facility Standards and Costs

Facility Type	Existing Facilities Inventory (units)		Existing Service Population	Existing Facility Standard (units per capita)	Average Replacement Cost (per unit) ¹	Total Cost (per capita)
Formula	a		b	c = a / b	d	e = c x d
Building	15,773	sq. ft.	75,332	0.21	\$ 800	\$ 168
Materials	81,004	volumes	75,332	1.08	32	35
Land ²	90,169	sq. ft.	75,332	1.20	62	74
Vehicles	1	book van	75,332	0.000013	300,000	4
Subtotal						\$ 281
Program Administration (5% of total)						15
Total						\$ 296

Note: Total cost per capita rounded to the nearest dollar.

¹ Per Table 2.4 the existing City service population for library facilities is 37,525. This figure has been adjusted in this table to account for unincorporated service population served by the Goleta Valley Library. Per the FY 2025-26 Agreement for the Operation of a Countywide Library System, and the latest estimate of household population in Goleta from the CA Department of Finance, 49.8% of demand for the branch library services is associated with City residents and the remainder is associated with unincorporated residents. The City's library service population is assumed to be 49.8% of the total service population in this table for the purpose of calculating the existing facility standards.

² Building and materials replacement costs based on values used in similar studies for jurisdictions in California. Building replacement cost increased to reflect upgrades and renovation from Building Forward infrastructure project. Land cost based on City's recent land acquisition costs.

³ Acres from Table 4.1 converted to square feet based on 43,560 square feet per acre.

Sources: Table 1, FY 2025-2026 Agreement for Operation of a Countywide Library System; Urban Economics; Tables 2.4 and 4.1.

Fee Schedule

The updated library facilities impact fee is shown in **Table 4.3**. The fee is based on the cost per capita shown in **Table 4.2** necessary to maintain the City's existing capital asset facility standard.

Fees adopted at this level would allow the City to provide facilities to new development at the same ratio of facilities to service population that currently exists in the City of Goleta today. As a policy decision, the City can adopt any fee lower than the maximum justified amounts. However, should the City elect to adopt fees below the maximum amounts, the lost revenue required to construct the facilities must come from the City's general fund or other unrestricted revenue source. The City cannot impose higher fees on other applicants in the future to make up the lost revenue.

Table 4.3: Library Facilities Impact Fee Schedule

Land Use Category	Cost per Capita	Occupant Density (Residents/DU or Workers/KSF)	Relative Demand	Maximum Justified Fee	Fee per Square Foot ¹
<i>Formula</i>	<i>a</i>	<i>b</i>	<i>c</i>	<i>d = a * b * c</i>	<i>e = d / average</i>
<i>Residential</i>					
Single Family Detached ²	\$ 296	2.95	1.00	\$ 873 per DU	\$0.49
All Other Residential	296	2.07	1.00	613 per DU	0.66
<i>Nonresidential</i>					
Retail & Commercial	\$ 296	2.33	0.20	\$ 138 per KSF	\$0.14
Office & Medical	296	3.13	0.20	185 per KSF	0.19
Industrial	296	1.16	0.20	69 per KSF	0.07

¹ Assumes 1,791 square feet per average sized single family unit and 927 for all other residential units in Goleta based on an analysis of American Housing Survey data from 2023.

² Includes attached and detached accessory dwelling units. Fees for ADUs can only be charged on ADUs greater than 750 square feet in size, and are charged proportionally based on the square footage of the ADU to the square footage of the primary dwelling unit.

Sources: Tables 2.2, 2.4, and 4.2.

Use of Fee Revenue

Estimated fee revenue over the next five-year planning horizon corresponding with the City's CIP through buildout based on a market-based growth forecast is shown in the Capital Improvement Program Chapter, in **Table 9.1**. A five-year growth projection is used to estimate revenues to correspond with the five-year planning horizon of the City's CIP. The planning horizon of the CIP or nexus study does not affect the calculation of the fee schedule, which is based on the existing level of service. **Table 9.3** displays the Nexus Study CIP for library facilities, as required by AB 602. Upon adoption of this fee program, the City's CIP will

be updated to incorporate projections of future DIF revenues, and program those revenues to eligible projects that benefit new development.

The City may use library facilities impact fee revenue to fund any capital project, or to purchase equipment or volumes, that expands the capacity of the City's library facilities. Examples include additional collections, a bookmobile or expanded building space.

Capital projects that address changing service demands, such as the reconfiguration of existing library space, as opposed to increasing service demands, benefit both existing and new development. Therefore, impact fee revenue for these types of projects must be combined with other funding sources so that new development only pays for a fair share of total capital costs. City service population from growth is forecast to be 21 percent of total service population at buildout (see **Table 2.4**), so the share of costs for joint benefit projects funded with the impact fee should be limited to 21 percent.

The City must also allocate five percent of fee revenue to program administration. Administration costs include costs to collect and account for fee revenue, and costs to comply with the Mitigation Fee Act such as annual and five-year reporting requirements. The City should monitor its actual program administration costs and adjust this charge accordingly when the impact fee is updated in the future.

5. PARK & RECREATION FACILITIES

This chapter provides the updated nexus analysis, fee schedule, and estimated revenue for the park and recreation facilities impact fee. Park and recreation facilities include the City's developed and undeveloped parks plus the City's open space. The City also has a parkland dedication in-lieu fee that is governed by Government Code section 66477, also known as the Quimby Act. This chapter also explains the relationship between the impact fee and the Quimby in-lieu fee.

Facility Standards

This section explains both the existing capital asset facility standard and the Quimby Act standard for park facilities. These standards are both based on the City's existing inventory of improved parklands, unimproved parklands, and open space as shown in **Table 5.1**.

Existing Capital Asset Standard

The park and recreation facilities impact fee uses the City's existing capital assets to determine the facility standard and provide a reasonable relationship between new development and the need for additional park facilities. The resulting impact fee would fund the expansion of park facilities at a rate sufficient to maintain the existing ratio of facilities to service population as growth occurs. See the *Facility Standard* section in Chapter 3 for more explanation of this approach.

This fee program update calculates three components that combined represent the City's existing parkland standard:

- ♦ Improved parkland per capita
- ♦ Total parkland (improved and unimproved) per capita
- ♦ Open space per capita.

Table 5.1: Park Inventory (acres)

Park	Unimproved	Improved	Total Parkland	Open Space	Total Acres
Andamar	-	2.45	2.45	-	2.45
Armitos Park	-	1.48	1.48	-	1.48
Armstrong	-	0.46	0.46	-	0.46
Bella Vista I & II	-	3.50	3.50	-	3.50
Bella Vista III	0.77	-	0.77	-	0.77
Berkeley Park	-	4.20	4.20	-	4.20
Brandon	2.22	-	2.22	-	2.22
Campus Glen	6.31	-	6.31	-	6.31
Evergreen Acres	-	28.72	28.72	-	28.72
Glen Annie at Del Norte	0.99	-	0.99	-	0.99
Jonny D. Wallis Neighborhood Park	-	3.98	3.98	-	3.98
Koarts Apartments	6.60	-	6.60	-	6.60
La Goleta	6.13	-	6.13	-	6.13
Lake Los Carneros Natural and Historical Preserve (Including Stow House)	-	5.53	5.53	134.46	139.99
Mathilda	-	0.20	0.20	-	0.20
Nectarine	-	0.13	0.13	-	0.13
Oro Verde	7.35	-	7.35	-	7.35
San Jose Creek	4.87	-	4.87	-	4.87
San Miguel	-	2.71	2.71	-	2.71
San Miguel Open Space	3.07	-	3.07	-	3.07
Santa Barbara Shores (Small)	4.83	-	4.83	-	4.83
Santa Barbara Shores Open Space (Small)	1.24	-	1.24	-	1.24
Santa Barbara Shores Park	-	-	-	98.62	98.62
Sperling Preserve	-	-	-	137.65	137.65
Stonebridge	3.41	-	3.41	-	3.41
Stow Grove Park ¹	11.10	-	11.10	-	11.10
Stow Tennis Courts	-	2.68	2.68	-	2.68
University Village	-	3.16	3.16	-	3.16
Winchester I	2.22	1.14	3.36	-	3.36
Winchester II	-	1.20	1.20	-	1.20
Total	61.11	61.54	122.65	370.73	493.38

¹ Stow Grove park is currently improved, however the City is planning to completely rehabilitate the park. Park acres for this park are listed as unimproved to reflect need for rehabilitation.

Sources: Table 3-1, Draft Open Space Element Update; City of Goleta Owned Land Inventory (City of Goleta Owned Jan 2023.xlsx).

Quimby Act Standard

The Quimby Act⁸ allows local agencies to require certain residential projects to dedicate parkland or pay a fee in lieu of dedication. Compared to impact fees adopted pursuant to the Mitigation Fee Act, Quimby Act land dedication and in-lieu fees:

- ♦ Can only apply to residential projects that require a tentative or parcel map (typically any type of subdivision)
- ♦ Cannot be based on a service population that includes workers and therefore Quimby fees cannot apply to nonresidential development
- ♦ Cannot include park development costs
- ♦ Cannot include open space.

The Quimby Act allows a local agency to require dedication of three to five acres of unimproved parkland per 1,000 residents based on the development project's estimated residential population. A local agency may require a minimum of three acres of unimproved parkland per 1,000 residents regardless of the agency's existing parkland standard. This standard is the ratio of existing improved and unimproved neighborhood and community parkland to existing residents as of the last Federal Census and excludes open space.

The agency may require dedication of up to five acres of unimproved parkland per 1,000 residents if the existing parkland standard supports that higher level. The agency may not require dedication at a standard greater than five acres per 1,000 residents regardless of the agency's existing parkland standard.

The local agency may allow payment of a fee in lieu of parkland dedication based on the cost of land acquisition but not the cost of park development. This in-lieu fee is exempt from the Mitigation Fee Act.⁹ The Act contains no language that prohibits an agency from adopting an impact fee to fund park development costs and open space acquisition, in addition to the Quimby dedication requirement or in-lieu fee. Thus, the agency may adopt both approaches to ensure that the combined requirements address all development impacts.

⁸ Government Code, section 66477.

⁹ *Ibid.*, sections 66000(b)

Summary

The parkland standards applicable to the Mitigation Fee Act and the Quimby Act are shown in **Table 5.2**. Service population is from **Table 2.4**. Service population includes residents and workers for the Mitigation Fee Act standard but only residents for the Quimby Act standard.

As shown in the table, the City has an existing parkland standard under the Mitigation Fee Act composed of 1.64 acres of improved parkland, 3.27 acres of total parkland, and 9.88 acres of open space per 1,000 capita.

The Quimby Act standard based only on existing residents as of the last Federal Census and parkland is 3.75 acres per 1,000 residents. The Quimby Act standard is slightly higher than the comparable Mitigation Fee Act standard (3.75 versus 3.27 acres) for total parkland because the former is based on only residents and does not include workers. This approach results in a higher ratio of acres per capita. Because this standard is between the minimum and maximum Quimby Act standards (three to five acres per 1,000 residents), this standard is the maximum amount that the City can require in parkland dedication.

Table 5.2: Park Facility Standards

Facility Type	Existing Facilities Inventory (units)	Existing Service Pop-ulation ¹	Existing Facility Standard
<i>Formula</i>	<i>a</i>	<i>b</i>	<i>c = a / (b / 1,000)</i>
<u>Mitigation Fee Act Park Facilities Standard</u>			
Improved Parkland	61.54 acres	37,525	1.64 acres / 1,000 capita
Total Parkland	122.65 acres	37,525	3.27 acres / 1,000 capita
Open Space	370.73 acres	37,525	9.88 acres / 1,000 capita
<u>Quimby Act Parkland Dedication Standard</u>			
Total Parkland	122.65 acres	32,690	3.75 acres / 1,000 capita

¹ Service population is based on residents and workers for the Mitigation Fee Act standard. Residents as of last Federal Census in 2020 used to calculate Quimby Act standard.
Sources: Tables 2.4 and 5.1.

Park facility costs based on the facility standards in **Table 5.2** are shown in **Table 5.3**. Land costs reflect a conservative estimate of \$2,695,000 per acre for acquisition based on the City's 2018 cost to acquire the Goleta Train Depot. This cost is used to be conservative because it is significantly less than the average cost incurred by the City to acquire right of way recently (\$62 per square foot, compared to the average cost of \$133 per square foot across five recent acquisitions). The assumed park improvement cost per acre is based on the City's budgeted cost to rehabilitate Stow Grove Park

from the City's most recent CIP. Table 5.3 has two sections, depending on whether the project is subject to the Quimby Act:

- ♦ The "All Development Except Residential Subdivisions" section shows costs for development projects that would not be subject to the Quimby Act. Costs components include: (1) improved parkland (park development costs only excluding land acquisition), (2) total parkland (land acquisition costs only), and (3) open space (land acquisition costs only).
- ♦ The "Residential Subdivision" section shows costs for development projects that would be subject to the Quimby Act. Cost components include: (1) a Quimby park dedication in-lieu fee based on parkland acquisition, (2) an impact fee based on park improvements and open space acquisition.
- ♦ All fees include five percent for fee program administration.

Table 5.3: Existing Capital Asset Park Facility Standards

Facility Type	Existing Facility Standard (acres per 1,000 capita)	Average Replacement Cost (per unit)¹	Total Cost (per capita)
<i>Formula</i>	<i>a</i>	<i>b</i>	<i>c = a x b / 1,000</i>
<i>All Development Except Residential Subdivisions</i>			
Park Facilities Impact Fee (Mitigation Fee Act)			
Improved Parkland	1.64	\$ 919,000	\$ 1,507
Total Parkland	3.27	2,695,100	8,813
Open Space	9.88	27,600	273
Subtotal			\$ 10,593
Program Administration (5% of total)			558
Total			\$ 11,151
<i>Residential Subdivisions</i>			
Parkland Dedication In-lieu Fee (Quimby Act)			
Total Parkland	3.75	\$ 2,695,100	\$ 10,107
Program Administration (5% of total)			532
Subtotal			\$ 10,639
Park Facilities Impact Fee (Mitigation Fee Act)			
Improved Parkland	1.64	919,000	1,507
Open Space	9.88	27,600	273
Subtotal			\$ 1,780
Program Administration (5% of total)			94
Subtotal			\$ 1,874
Total			\$ 12,513

Note: Total cost per capita rounded to the nearest dollar.

¹ Land cost based on City's recent land acquisition costs. Park development costs based on cost per acre to renovate Stow Grove Park from the City's current CIP (Project No. 9074).

Sources: City of Goleta CIP; Urban Economics; Table 5.2.

The total cost for new development to maintain the existing parkland standard is \$11,151 per capita if the project is not a residential subdivision subject to the Quimby Act. The total cost is \$12,513 if the project is subject to the Quimby Act. The higher per capita cost for projects subject to the Quimby Act is due to the higher standard for parkland acquisition, as described above.

Fee Schedule

The updated park and recreation facilities impact fee and Quimby Act in-lieu fee are shown in **Table 5.4**. The fees are based on the costs per capita shown in **Table 5.3** necessary to maintain the City's existing park standards.

Fees adopted at this level would allow the City to provide parks to new development at the same ratio of facilities to service population that currently exists in the City of Goleta today. As a policy decision, the City can adopt any fee lower than the maximum justified amounts. However, should the City elect to adopt fees below the maximum amounts, the lost revenue required to construct the facilities must come from the City's general fund or other unrestricted revenue source. The City cannot impose higher fees on other applicants in the future to make up the lost revenue.

Table 5.4: Park & Recreation Facilities Impact and Park Dedication In-lieu Fees

Land Use Category	Cost per Capita	Occupant Density (Residents/DU or Workers/KSF)	Relative Demand	Maximum Justified Fee	Fee per Square Foot ¹
<i>Formula</i>	<i>a</i>	<i>b</i>	<i>c</i>	<i>d = a * b * c</i>	<i>e = d / average</i>
<i>All Development Except Residential Subdivisions (Mitigation Fee Act)</i>					
Residential					
Single Family Detached ²	\$11,151	2.95	1.00	\$ 32,895 per DU	\$ 18.37
All Other Residential	11,151	2.07	1.00	23,083 per DU	24.90
Nonresidential					
Retail & Commercial	\$11,151	2.33	0.20	5,196 per KSF	\$ 5.20
Office & Medical	11,151	3.13	0.20	6,981 per KSF	6.98
Industrial	11,151	1.16	0.20	2,587 per KSF	2.59
<i>Residential Subdivisions</i>					
Parkland Dedication In-Lieu Fee (Quimby Act)					
Single Family Detached ²	\$10,639	2.95	1.00	\$ 31,385 per DU	\$17.52
All Other Residential	10,639	2.07	1.00	22,023 per DU	23.76
Park Development & Open Space Fee (Mitigation Fee Act)					
Single Family Detached ²	\$ 1,874	2.95	1.00	\$ 5,528 per DU	\$ 3.09
All Other Residential	1,874	2.07	1.00	3,879 per DU	4.18
Total Fee					
Single Family Detached	\$12,513	2.95	1.00	\$ 36,913 per DU	\$ 20.61
All Other Residential	12,513	2.07	1.00	25,902 per DU	27.94

Note: "DU" = dwelling unit; "KSF" = thousand building square feet.

¹ Assumes 1,791 square feet per average sized single family unit and 927 for all other residential units in Goleta based on an analysis of American Housing Survey data from 2023.

² Includes attached and detached accessory dwelling units. Fees for ADUs can only be charged on ADUs greater than 750 square feet in size, and are charged proportionally based on the square footage of the ADU to the square footage of the primary dwelling unit.

Sources: Tables 2.2, 2.4, and 5.3.

Use of Fee Revenue

Estimated fee revenue over the next five-year planning horizon corresponding with the City's CIP through buildout based on a market-based growth forecast is shown in the Capital Improvement Program

Chapter, in **Table 9.1**. A five-year growth projection is used to estimate revenues to correspond with the five-year planning horizon of the City's CIP. This estimate assumes that all projects are subject to the Mitigation Fee Act only and would not pay a Quimby in-lieu fee. The planning horizon of the CIP or nexus study does not affect the calculation of the fee schedule, which is based on the existing level of service. **Table 9.4** displays the Nexus Study CIP for parks and recreation facilities, as required by AB 602. Upon adoption of this fee program, the City's CIP will be updated to incorporate projections of future DIF revenues, and program those revenues to eligible projects that benefit new development.

The City may use park and recreation facilities impact fee revenue for any capital project that expands the capacity of the City's park facilities. If revenue is used to replace an existing facility without expanding capacity, the project provides a joint benefit to existing and new development. In this case then the fee can fund only 21 percent of project costs based on new development as a share of total development at buildout (see **Table 2.4**).

The City is largely built out and there are limited opportunities to acquire additional parkland. Therefore, the City anticipates using fee revenue to further develop existing parks with expanded, improved, or enhanced recreational facilities and infrastructure. Refer to the City's adopted Capital Improvement Program for the anticipated use of fee revenue to fund capital projects within the next five years.

The City must also allocate five percent of fee revenue to program administration. Administration costs include costs to collect and account for fee revenue, and costs to comply with the Mitigation Fee Act such as annual and five-year reporting requirements. The Quimby Act does not have analogous reporting requirements, although the fee revenue must be spent appropriately. The City will monitor its actual program administration costs and adjust this charge accordingly when the impact fee is updated in the future.

6. TRANSPORTATION FACILITIES

This chapter provides the updated nexus analysis, fee schedule, and estimated revenue for the transportation impact fee. Transportation facilities include roadways, intersections, and transit infrastructure. Improvements specifically targeted to accommodate increased bicycle and pedestrian travel from new development are addressed in the following chapter.

Determining the impact of development on the need for expanded transportation facilities required a sophisticated technical analysis. That analysis is described in this chapter and supported by attachments to this report.

Transportation Demand Modeling

Planning for transportation improvements is typically addressed with the use of a travel demand modeling coupled with operational determinations. Travel demand models estimate the effect of land use on the generation of vehicle trips and how those trips distribute across the transportation network. The Goleta Travel Model used in the City's prior Public Facilities Impact Fee Program was updated in 2025 for use in this nexus analysis. The model encompasses 192 traffic analysis zones that aggregate the underlying land use based on 28 land use categories. The model covers an area that includes the City and surrounding portions of the Goleta Valley to analyze impacts on the City's transportation system from growth both in and around the City. The model is a single-mode (auto trips only) model and analyzes both morning (a.m.) and evening (p.m.) peak-period travel. Based on the City's General Plan buildout growth scenario described in Chapter 2, along with surrounding regional growth, the Goleta Travel Model is applied to generate future year AM/PM peak hour traffic volumes that are then input into various planning- and/or engineering-based operational tools to determine the operating characteristics of a given roadway or intersection. Based on these analyses, operational deficiencies are identified relative to the City's General Plan standards/thresholds as described below.

Local Transportation Deficiency Criteria

The City of Goleta defines transportation deficiency criteria through the City General Plan Circulation Element. The primary policies of concern for this study are Transportation Element (TE) 4, which defines target level of

service (LOS) standards, TE 5, which defines planned street and road improvements, and TE 13, which defines traffic impacts for new developments. From these policies, the City defines a traffic impact as any project which causes an intersection on a major arterial, minor arterial, or collector roadway to degrade below a LOS C except at the intersection of Storke Road and Hollister Avenue where an LOS D standard will be maintained. Projects are required to evaluate the creation of safety hazards, potential adverse effects on local neighborhood streets, and other substantial transportation concerns.

Projects to be funded by the fee program met at least one of the following criteria. In any event, the use of development impact fee revenue will be used only to (1) refurbish existing facilities in order to maintain existing LOS or (2) achieve an adopted LOS that is consistent with the City's General Plan.

- The project is needed to mitigate a future deficiency, or the worsening of an existing deficiency at a signalized intersection. Due to new development's contribution to a LOS failure, channelization is provided to allow the intersection to operate at an acceptable LOS.
- The project is needed to add capacity to accommodate new development by improving a non-signalized intersection into either a signalized intersection or roundabout. These projects are identified by either a projected decrease in the LOS, or signal warrant conditions.
- The project is needed to mitigate queue spillback caused by additional trips generated by new development. Queue spillback refers to a traffic condition in which a queue of vehicles formed at a congested signalized intersection, extends backwards far enough to block the upstream intersection.
- The project is needed on a major arterial, minor arterial, or collector roadway to add capacity to accommodate new development by providing additional travel lanes, as identified under the Highway Capacity Manual approach, or if the segment exceeds General Plan average daily trip (ADT) thresholds.
- The project is needed to mitigate a future deficiency, or the worsening of an existing deficiency on a State owned and operated freeway facility (i.e., US 101 or SR 217). Due to new development's contribution to a level of service (LOS) failure, additional travel lane (aux-lane, general purpose lane, managed lane) is provided to allow the freeway to operate at an acceptable LOS. Given that these are not City-owned facilities, the City applies an LOS Standard of D

(standard used for applicable Congestion Management Programs statewide).

The results of the deficiency assessment and project identification serve to update the list of improvements described in the City's Development Impact Fee capital improvement list and the Transportation Element of 2006 *Goleta General Plan*.

Facility Standards

The travel model used facility standards to determine where transportation improvements are needed within the city (1) to correct existing deficiencies, and (2) address future deficiencies caused by new development. The cost to correct existing deficiencies cannot be funded with impact fee revenue and is excluded from the fee calculations. Facility standards for transportation analysis are based on policies in the Transportation Element of the City's *General Plan*.¹⁰ The City's primary policy for roadways and intersections is to maintain a level of service (LOS) "C" or better, representing restricted traffic flow that remains stable but without causing significant delay. In this instance LOS is a commonly used measure of congestion and delay based on the ratio of the number of vehicles using a roadway to the capacity of the roadway (vehicle-to-capacity ratio). The LOS policy for intersections is similar though the type of analysis varies. Certain roadways and intersections required more specialized analysis of their operation (operational analysis) to determine if a deficiency exists.

Capital Improvements and Fair Share Analysis

The results of the travel model and related transportation impact analysis generated a list of 32 capital improvement projects to address existing and future deficiencies on the City's transportation system.

Next, a fair share analysis was conducted so that the impact fee will fund only the portion of those improvements that are associated with growth within the City. The analysis uses model output to quantify the number of trips using each improvement and the origin and destination of those trips. The fair share analysis allocated the need for each improvement across three categories that summed to 100 percent:

1. Existing deficiency

¹⁰ City of Goleta, *Goleta General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan*, Transportation Element, September 2006, pp. 7-16 to 7-17.

2. New development outside Goleta
3. New development inside Goleta

Finally, cost estimates for each improvement were developed. The total cost for all 32 projects is \$439.5 million.

Combining the fair share analysis with the improvement cost estimates resulted in a total cost to accommodate the impacts of new development within the City on the City's transportation system. See **Table 6.1** for a summary of these results for each improvement. As shown in the table, new development within the city is responsible for 42.1 percent of total project costs, or \$185 million.

Note that project costs for R-13, I-01, I-12-02, I-12-02 (I4), I-12-05, I-12-06, I-12-07, I-12-10, I-12-11, I-12-12, I-12-35 and I-12-36 represent the average cost between a traffic signal and a roundabout for each location, and are noted as "average" in the *Intersection Control* column of Table 6.1. Average costs are used due to the uncertainty as to which type of intersection control will ultimately be built so that costs are not overstated in this fee analysis. The specific intersection control for each project will be determined during the project's design phase based on operational, safety, and site-specific considerations.

Table 6.1: Transportation Improvements and Costs

		Total Cost (\$1,000s) ¹	Intersection Control	Existing Deficiency		Total Growth ²		Goleta Growth	
Map ID	Project Location			Share	Cost (\$1,000s)	Share	Cost (\$1,000s)	Share	Cost (\$1,000s)
Existing Roadways									
R-02	Hollister Avenue Complete Streets Corridor Plan	10,750	Signal	70%	7,510	30%	3,240	47.52%	1,540
R-10	US 101 NB Aux Lane Between Los Carneros Road and Storke Road	22,650	n/a	90%	20,401	10%	2,249	25.11%	565
R-11	US 101 NB/SB Aux Lanes Between Fairview Avenue and Los Carneros Road	33,500	n/a	0%	-	100%	33,500	61.01%	20,439
R-12	Storke Road Widening: Phelps Road to City Limits	6,000	n/a	65%	3,883	35%	2,117	44.92%	951
R-13	Los Carneros Way Realignment	23,550	Average	0%	-	100%	23,550	73.25%	17,250
R-14	South Fairview Avenue Widening	6,200	n/a	0%	-	100%	6,200	46.72%	2,897
Subtotal		102,650		31%	31,794	69%	70,856	42.51%	43,641
Existing Intersections									
I-01	Fairview Avenue/Calle Real Intersection Improvements	23,875	Average	0%	-	100%	23,875	68.19%	16,280
I-02	Fairview Avenue at US101 SB On-Ramp Improvements	28,800	n/a	71%	20,360	29%	8,440	53.88%	4,547
I-07	Hollister Widening - West of Storke Road	3,620	n/a	0%	-	100%	3,620	62.47%	2,261
I-08	Patterson Avenue at US101 SB Ramp Improvements	44,450	Signal	75%	33,469	25%	10,981	37.16%	4,081
I-10	Hollister Avenue at Patterson Avenue	3,600	n/a	0%	-	100%	3,600	35.40%	1,275

¹ Project costs for projects R-13, I-01, I-12-02, I-12-02 (I4), I-12-05, I-12-06, I-12-07, I-12-10, I-12-11, I-12-12, I-12-35 and I-12-36 represent the average cost between a traffic signal and a roundabout for each location. Average costs are used due to the uncertainty as to which type of intersection control will ultimately be built so that costs are not overstated in this fee analysis.

² Total growth share includes Goleta growth share and excludes existing deficiency share.

Sources: Appendix A and Appendix B.

Table 6.1: Transportation Improvements and Costs Continued

Map ID	Project Location	Total Cost (\$1,000s) ¹	Intersection Control	Existing Deficiency		Total Growth ²		Goleta Growth	
				Share	Cost (\$1,000s)	Share	Cost (\$1,000s)	Share	Cost (\$1,000s)
I-12-02	New Intersection Control - Calle Real / Carlo Drive	4,980	Average	74%	3,665	26%	1,315	67.89%	893
I-12-02 (I4)	New Intersection Control - Cathedral Oaks Road / Hollister Avenue / US 101 NB Ramps	5,640	Average	0%	-	100%	5,640	84.10%	4,743
I-12-05	New Intersection Control - Cathedral Oaks Road / Los Carneros Road	6,555	Average	0%	-	100%	6,555	56.78%	3,722
I-12-06	New Intersection Control - Cathedral Oaks Road / N La Patera Lane	7,205	Average	66%	4,762	34%	2,443	57.22%	1,398
I-12-07	New Intersection Control - Fairview Avenue / Stow Canyon Road	7,015	Average	77%	5,398	23%	1,617	76.55%	1,238
I-12-10	New Intersection Control - Hollister Avenue / Cannon Green Drive	5,925	Average	79%	4,690	21%	1,235	87.80%	1,084
I-12-11	New Intersection Control - Hollister Avenue / Pebble Beach Drive	8,015	Average	0%	-	100%	8,015	87.53%	7,016
I-12-12	New Intersection Control - Hollister Avenue / Sumida Gardens Lane	6,425	Average	0%	-	100%	6,425	25.79%	1,657
I-12-23	New Intersection Control - Carlo Drive / Cathedral Oaks Road	8,050	Roundabout	63%	5,107	37%	2,943	58.12%	1,710
I-12-27	New Intersection Control - Cathedral Oaks / 101 SB-Ramp	34,000	Roundabout	67%	22,842	33%	11,158	81.01%	9,039
I-12-30	New Intersection Control - Hollister Avenue / Palo Alto Drive	10,200	Roundabout	0%	-	100%	10,200	89.08%	9,086

¹ Project costs for projects R-13, I-01, I-12-02, I-12-02 (I4), I-12-05, I-12-06, I-12-07, I-12-10, I-12-11, I-12-12, I-12-35 and I-12-36 represent the average cost between a traffic signal and a roundabout for each location. Average costs are used due to the uncertainty as to which type of intersection control will ultimately be built so that costs are not overstated in this fee analysis.

² Total growth share includes Goleta growth share and excludes existing deficiency share.

Sources: Appendix A and Appendix B.

Table 6.1: Transportation Improvements and Costs Continued

Map ID	Project Location	Total Cost (\$1,000s) ¹	Intersection Control	Existing Deficiency		Total Growth ²		Goleta Growth	
				Share	Cost (\$1,000s)	Share	Cost (\$1,000s)	Share	Cost (\$1,000s)
I-12-31	New Intersection Control - Hollister Avenue / Santa Felicia Drive	2,180	Signal	78%	1,696	22%	484	84.31%	408
I-12-32	New Intersection Control - Storke Avenue / Santa Felicia Drive	270	n/a	78%	211	22%	59	50.15%	30
I-12-33	New Intersection Control - Hollister Avenue / Cathedral Oaks Avenue	9,250	Roundabout	0%	-	100%	9,250	88.52%	8,189
I-12-34	New Intersection Control - Hollister Avenue / Cortona Drive	1,700	Signal	66%	1,115	34%	585	73.87%	432
I-12-35	New Intersection Control - Cathedral Oaks Avenue / Glen Annie Road	5,900	Average	0%	-	100%	5,900	27.23%	1,607
I-12-36	New Intersection Control - Cathedral Oaks Avenue / Alameda Avenue	5,985	Average	0%	-	100%	5,985	30.16%	1,805
I-18	Storke Road at US101 SB Ramps	22,400	Signal	81%	18,140	19%	4,260	50.09%	2,134
I-22	Hollister Avenue / Fairview Avenue Intersection Improvements	15,850	Roundabout	0%	-	100%	15,850	52.91%	8,386
Subtotal		271,890		45%	121,454	55%	150,436	34.21%	93,020
New Roadways									
R-05	Goleta US 101 Bike/Ped Overcrossing ³	46,150	n/a	0%	-	100%	46,150	85.05%	39,252
R-09	Phelps Road Extension	18,800	n/a	0%	-	100%	18,800	48.41%	9,100
Subtotal		64,950		0%	-	100%	64,950	74.45%	48,352
Total		439,490		35%	153,249	65%	286,241	42.10%	185,014

¹ Project costs for projects R-13, I-01, I-12-02, I-12-02 (I4), I-12-05, I-12-06, I-12-07, I-12-10, I-12-11, I-12-12, I-12-35 and I-12-36 represent the average cost between a traffic signal and a roundabout for each location. Average costs are used due to the uncertainty as to which type of intersection control will ultimately be built so that costs are not overstated in this fee analysis.

² Total growth share includes Goleta growth share and excludes existing deficiency share.

³ This project relieves congestion necessary to achieve an acceptable LOS for an adjacent intersection. Given that the project is solely dedicated to bicycle and pedestrian uses, and because there is a separate fee for bicycle and pedestrian facilities, half of the project costs are included here, and half of the costs can be funded by the bicycle and pedestrian facilities fee.

Sources: Appendix A and Appendix B.

See **Appendix A: Traffic Needs Analysis** provided under separate cover for more detail on the travel forecast, deficiency assessment, and fair share analysis. See **Appendix B: Transportation Improvement Project Cost Estimates** provided under separate cover for more detail on the cost estimation work conducted for each improvement. Appendix A and B are on file with the City and are incorporated herein by this reference.

Fee Schedule

The transportation impact fee schedule is based on (1) trip generation rates, (2) total trips from new development, and (3) the overall cost per new trip associated with the improvements in **Table 6.1**. The methodology is explained in the sections that follow.

Trip Generation Rates

Demand for traffic facilities is based on vehicle trip generation rates. Trip rates measure the rate at which trips occur, either an origin or a destination (known as a “trip end”), from a specific type of land use. Thus, trip generation rates distribute the impact of growth equally between both ends of a trip.

Vehicle trip rates are based on the evening peak hour because this period generates the greatest demand on the roadway system. The use of evening peak hour trip rates for the fee calculation is consistent with the approach taken by the travel modeling and described above.

The transportation impact fee schedule is based on a “cost per trip” that represents the total improvement cost allocated to new development divided by total trips estimated to be generated by new development. The formula is:

$$\text{Cost per trip} = \frac{\text{Total improvement costs allocated to new development (see Table 6.1)}}{\text{Total trips (across all land use categories)}}$$

The formula for calculating trips from a given land use category is shown below:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Trips for land use category} = \\ \text{Land use category growth (in units)} \times \\ \text{Land use category trip rate (per unit)} \end{aligned}$$

Total trips are calculated by totaling trips generated across all land use categories in the growth forecast.

Growth by land use category is expressed in dwelling units or 1,000 building square feet. Trip rates are expressed per dwelling unit or per 1,000 building square feet.

To calculate the fee on a development project, the appropriate land use category and related trip generation rate are identified from the *Trip Generation* manual published by the Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE). The manual includes estimated trip rates for over 100 land use categories. The cost per trip is multiplied by the trip rate applicable to the development project and by the size of the development project to calculate the fee for that project, or:

$$\begin{aligned} &\text{Development project with land use category fee} = \\ &\text{Cost per trip} \times \text{Trip rate for land use category (per unit)} \times \\ &\quad \text{Project size (in units)} \end{aligned}$$

Note that trip rates by land use category are used both in (1) calculation of total trips used to calculate the cost per trip, and (2) application of the fee to individual development projects. To ensure that the fee program generates total revenue equal to the cost of improvements allocated to new development, both calculations must use a consistent set of trip generation rates.

As shown in Chapter 2 (see **Table 2.1**) the growth forecast for this study and the travel model includes 28 land use categories. To maintain consistency between the calculation of total trips based on the growth forecast, and the ITE rates used to calculate individual project fees, growth in each of the forecast's 28 categories is allocated to the more detailed categories used by ITE. This effort ensures that the calculation of total trips from growth, and therefore the cost per trip used in the fee schedule, is as consistent as possible with the trip rates used to calculate the fee on each development project.

Table 6.2 shows how trip generation rates were developed for each of the growth forecast's land use categories based on ITE rates. For each category, we estimated the amount of growth in land use sub-categories consistent with the ITE rates and calculated a weighted average trip rate for each category.

Table 6.2: Vehicle Trip Rates

Travel Demand Model Land Use Category	ITE Trip Generation Manual			P.M. Peak Hour Trip Rate		
	Code	Land Use	Unit	ITE	Weight ¹	Average
Single Family Detached	210	Single Family Detached	DU	0.93	100%	0.93
All Other Residential	220	Multifamily Housing (Low Rise)	DU	0.52	36%	0.48
	215	Single Family Attached	DU	0.51	53%	
	252	Senior Housing - Multifamily	DU	0.25	5%	
	255	Continuing Care	DU	0.19	5%	
		Weighted Average			100%	
Auto Services	843	Automobile Parts Sales	KSF	4.86	100%	4.86
Banks	911	Walk-In Bank	KSF	12.13	100%	12.13
Fast Food Restaurants		[No growth forecast]				
Hotel	310	Hotel	room	0.47	50%	0.42
	320	Motel	room	0.37	50%	
		Weighted Average			100%	
Indoor Recreation	492	Health / Fitness Club	KSF	3.77	50%	3.58
	493	Athletic Club	KSF	3.38	50%	
		Weighted Average			100%	
Shopping Mall		[No growth forecast]				
Neighborhood Commercial	814	Variety Store	KSF	6.70	6%	7.75
	816	Hardware / Paint Store	KSF	2.98	0%	
	817	Nursery / Garden Center	KSF	6.58	1%	
	850	Supermarket	KSF	8.79	55%	
	861	Sporting Goods Superstore	KSF	2.09	1%	
	863	Electronic Superstore	KSF	4.25	1%	
	875	Department Store	KSF	1.95	0%	
	876	Apparel Store	KSF	5.77	10%	
	880	Pharmacy / Drugstore	KSF	8.51	15%	
	890	Furniture Store	KSF	0.57	3%	
	975	Drinking Place	KSF	6.44	7%	
		Weighted Average			100%	
Regional Commercial	814	Variety Store	KSF	6.70	6%	4.18
	816	Hardware / Paint Store	KSF	2.98	7%	
	817	Nursery / Garden Center	KSF	6.58	1%	
	850	Supermarket	KSF	8.79	15%	
	861	Sporting Goods Superstore	KSF	2.09	3%	
	863	Electronic Superstore	KSF	4.25	6%	
	875	Department Store	KSF	1.95	32%	
	876	Apparel Store	KSF	5.77	12%	
	880	Pharmacy / Drugstore	KSF	8.51	4%	
	890	Furniture Store	KSF	0.57	11%	
	925	Drinking Place	KSF	6.44	2%	
		Weighted Average			100%	

Table 6.2: Vehicle Trip Rates (continued)

Travel Demand Model Land Use Category	ITE Trip Generation Manual			P.M. Peak Hour Trip Rate		
	Code	Land Use	Unit	ITE	Weight ¹	Average
Resort Hotel	330	Resort Hotel	KSF	0.39	100%	0.39
Restaurants	931	Fine Dining Restaurant	KSF	8.10	25%	8.91
	932	High-turnover (sit-down)	KSF	9.18	75%	
		Weighted Average			100%	
Theater	445	Movie Theater	KSF	4.91	100%	4.91
Hospitals	610	Hospital	KSF	0.86	100%	0.86
Medical	630	Clinic	KSF	3.67	50%	3.55
	720	Medical-Dental Office	KSF	3.42	50%	
		Weighted Average			100%	
Office	710	General Office	KSF	1.18	50%	0.99
	770	Business Park	KSF	0.79	50%	
		Weighted Average			100%	
Heavy Industrial	130	Industrial Park	KSF	0.23	100%	0.23
Light Industrial	110	General Light Industrial	KSF	0.49	100%	0.49
Research & Development	760	Research & Development Center	KSF	0.45	100%	0.45

Notes: "DU" = dwelling unit; "KSF" = thousand building square feet.

¹ Weight reflects estimated share of new development by land use category. All Other Residential estimates from Goleta fiscal impact study (see sources). Commercial land use estimates based on Easton and Owen (see sources). Other estimates reflect current land use allocations within the City and input from City staff.

Sources: Institute of Transportation Engineers, *Trip Generation 12th Edition*, 2025; Economics Research Associates, *A Fiscal Impact Analysis of the Proposed General Plan for the City of Goleta*, Sept. 7, 2006, Table II-1; Gregory Easton and John Owen, *Creating Walkable Neighborhood Business Districts*, June 2009, Table 2.

Total Trips from Growth

Total trips from growth are based on the trip generation rates in **Table 6.2** and the growth forecast from **Table 2.1** in Chapter 2. Vehicle trip rates are adjusted to exclude pass-by trips, which differ by land use category. Pass-by trips reflect trip ends that are intermediate stops between an origin and destination and therefore place additional demand on the roadway network. Pass-by rates are based on surveys conducted by the San Diego Association of Governments (SANDAG) and provide sufficient detail by land use category. The SANDAG data is used because it identifies pass-by and trip length assumptions by land use category. The same adjustment to remove pass-by trips from the fee calculation will be used when applying the fee to individual development projects to maintain the necessary consistency discussed above. New development in Goleta is estimated to generate 8,844 P.M. peak hour trips at buildout, as shown in **Table 6.3**.

Table 6.3: New Development Vehicle Trip Generation

Travel Demand Model Land Use Category	Growth (2025-Buildout) ¹		P.M. Peak Hour Trip Rate			Primary P.M. Peak Hour Trips	
	Amount	Units	Total Trips	Pass- by Trip Share	Primary/ Diverted Trip Rate		Share
Single Family Detached	978	DU	0.93	3%	0.90	880	10%
All Other Residential	2,351	DU	0.48	3%	0.47	1,105	12%
Auto Services ¹	75	KSF	4.86	10%	4.37	328	4%
Banks ¹	5	KSF	12.13	25%	9.10	46	1%
Fast Food Restaurants ¹	-	KSF	NA	40%	NA	NA	NA
Hotels	454	rooms	0.42	4%	0.40	182	2%
Indoor Recreation	114	KSF	3.58	9%	3.26	372	4%
Shopping Mall	-	KSF	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Neighborhood Commercial ¹	636	KSF	7.75	40%	4.65	2,957	33%
Regional Commercial ¹	37	KSF	4.18	20%	3.34	124	1%
Resort Hotel	48	KSF	0.39	4%	0.37	18	0%
Restaurants ¹	34	KSF	8.91	20%	7.13	242	3%
Theater	65	KSF	4.91	17%	4.08	265	3%
Hospitals	60	KSF	0.86	2%	0.84	50	1%
Medical	75	KSF	3.55	10%	3.20	240	3%
Office	1,736	KSF	0.99	4%	0.95	1,649	19%
Heavy Industrial	144	KSF	0.23	3%	0.22	32	0%
Light Industrial	678	KSF	0.49	2%	0.48	325	4%
Research & Development	66	KSF	0.45	2%	0.44	29	0%
Total Trips						8,844	100%

Notes: "DU" = dwelling unit; "KSF" = thousand building square feet.

¹ Used specific rates for p.m. peak hour noted in footnote (S) of SANDAG (see sources). For Auto Services used SANDAG rate for Special Retail/Strip Commercial (other) category. For Restaurants used SANDAG rate for Sit Down/High Turnover Restaurant category.

Source: San Diego Association of Governments, (Not So) Brief Guide of Vehicular Trip Generation Rates For The San Diego Region, April 2002; Tables 2.1 and 6.2.

Cost per Trip

The cost per trip used to apply the fee to individual development projects is based on the total costs of capital improvements allocated to growth (\$191.9 million) from **Table 6.1**, and total trips from growth (8,844) shown in **Table 6.3**. Total costs are reduced by the City's existing transportation impact fee fund balance. In addition, five percent is added to the net cost for fee program administration. The total cost per trip is \$21,866 as shown in **Table 6.4**.

Table 6.4: Transportation Fee Cost per Trip

Transportation Improvement Cost: Goleta Growth Share (\$1,000s)	\$185,014
Estimated Impact Fee Fund Balance (June 30, 2025)	1,296
Net Goleta Growth Share	\$183,718
Program Administration (5% of total)	9,669
Total GTIF Program Cost	\$193,387
P.M. Peak Hour Trips from Growth, (2025 to Buildout)	8,844
Proposed Fee per P.M. Peak Hour Trip	\$ 21,866
Sources: Tables 6.1 and 6.3.	

Smart Growth and VMT Efficient Housing Discounts

As described above, the fee for each development project will be calculated by multiplying the cost per trip from **Table 6.4** by the applicable ITE trip generation rate adjusted by the applicable SANDAG pass-by rate. Fees for a sample of land use categories are shown in **Table 6.5**.

Housing development projects that meet certain smart growth or vehicle miles traveled (VMT) efficient criteria must be charged a lower impact fee to reflect lower levels of demand for transportation facilities.¹¹

The Smart Growth criteria are:

1. The housing development is located within a transit priority area and the major transit stop, if planned, is programmed to be completed before or within one year from the scheduled completion and occupancy of the housing development.
2. The housing development is located within one-half mile from three or more of the following:
 - a. A supermarket or grocery store.
 - b. A public park.
 - c. A community center.
 - d. A pharmacy or drugstore.
 - e. A medical clinic or hospital.
 - f. A public library.
 - g. A school that maintains a kindergarten or any of grades 1 to 12, inclusive.
 - h. A licensed childcare facility.
 - i. A restaurant. For purposes of this paragraph, a “restaurant” means a retail food establishment that prepares, serves, and vends food directly to the consumer.

¹¹ Government Code, section 66005.1

3. The housing development provides no more than one onsite parking space for zero- to two-bedroom units, and two onsite parking spaces for three or more bedroom units.

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

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

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

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

Table 6.5: Transportation Impact Fee Schedule (sample)

Sample Land Use Category	Cost per Trip	ITE P.M. Peak Hour Trip Rate	SANDAG Pass-by Trip Share	Transportation Impact Fee		Fee per Square Foot ¹
<i>Formula</i>	<i>a</i>	<i>b</i>	<i>c</i>	<i>d = a x b x (1 - c)</i>		<i>e = d / average sq. ft.</i>
<u>Residential</u>						
Single Family Detached ²	\$ 21,866	0.93	3%	\$19,725	per DU	\$ 11.01
Apartment	21,866	0.52	3%	11,029	per DU	6.16
<u>Nonresidential</u>						
Hotel	\$ 21,866	0.47	4%	\$ 9,866	per room	n/a
Supermarket	21,866	8.79	40%	115,321	per KSF	115.32
General Office	21,866	1.18	4%	24,770	per KSF	24.77
General Light Industrial	21,866	0.49	2%	10,500	per KSF	10.50

Notes: "DU" = dwelling unit; "KSF" = thousand building square feet.

¹ Assumes 1,791 square feet per average sized single family unit and 927 for all other residential units in Goleta based on an analysis of American Housing Survey data from 2023.

² Includes attached and detached accessory dwelling units. Fees for ADUs can only be charged on ADUs greater than 750 square feet in size, and are charged proportionally based on the square footage of the ADU to the square footage of the primary dwelling unit.

Source: San Diego Association of Governments, (Not So) Brief Guide of Vehicular Trip Generation Rates For The San Diego Region (including footnote (s)), April 2002; Tables 6.2, 6.3, and 6.4.

Use of Fee Revenue

The City may use transportation impact fee revenue for any of the capital improvements listed in **Table 6.1**. Estimated fee revenue over the next five-year planning horizon corresponding with the City's CIP through buildout based on a market-based growth forecast is shown in the Capital Improvement Program Chapter, in **Table 9.1**. A five-year growth projection is used to estimate revenues to correspond with the five-year planning horizon of the City's CIP. The planning horizon of the CIP or nexus study does not affect the calculation of the fee schedule, which is based on the existing level of service. **Table 9.5** displays the Nexus Study CIP for transportation facilities, as required by AB 602. Upon adoption of this fee program, the City's CIP will be updated to incorporate projections of future DIF revenues, and program those revenues to eligible projects that benefit new development.

The City need not limit funding from fee revenue for each project to the fair share amounts shown in **Table 6.1**. The City can concentrate fee revenue on some projects in exchange for using alternative funding sources on other projects. Alternative funding sources includes state and federal transportation programs and grants. Through the planning horizon of this program (buildout), the City needs to identify approximately \$254.5 million in alternative funding sources to fully fund all improvements (\$439.5

million - \$261 million). At a minimum the City needs to identify \$153.2 million associated with correcting existing deficiencies noted in **Table 6.1**.

The City must allocate five percent of fee revenue to program administration. Administration costs included costs to collect and account for fee revenue, and costs to comply with the Mitigation Fee Act such as annual and five-year reporting requirements. The City will monitor its actual program administration costs and adjust this charge accordingly when the impact fee is updated in the future.

These projects may include bicycle and pedestrian components that are ancillary to the project and included only because they meet typical transportation improvement design standards. The bicycle and pedestrian facilities fee documented in the next chapter of this report cannot be used to fund the ancillary bicycle and pedestrian components of the projects included in this chapter, with the exception of project R-05, 50% of which can be funded through this fee, and up to 50% of which can be funded by bicycle and pedestrian facilities fee, net of the cost associated with development outside of the City. With the exception of project R-05, the bicycle and pedestrian facilities fee must be used to fund bicycle and pedestrian facilities unrelated to the project list in this chapter.

7. BICYCLE & PEDESTRIAN FACILITIES

This chapter provides a nexus analysis, fee schedule, and estimated revenue for the City's bicycle and pedestrian facilities impact fee. Bicycle and pedestrian facilities include sidewalks and related improvements, and bicycle paths and bike lanes whether within or outside of the City right of way.

Facility Standards

The bicycle and pedestrian facilities impact fee uses the City's existing capital assets to determine the facility standard and provide a reasonable relationship between new development and the need for additional facilities. The impact fee funds the expansion of bicycle and pedestrian facilities at a rate sufficient to maintain the existing ratio of facilities to service population as growth occurs. See the *Facility Standard* section in Chapter 3 for more explanation of this approach.

The City's existing capital asset inventory of bicycle and pedestrian facilities and the associated facility standards is shown in **Table 7.1**. Service population is from **Table 2.4**.

Table 7.1: Bicycle & Pedestrian Facilities Standard

Facility Type	Existing Inventory			Existing Service Pop-ulation	Existing Facility Standard (units per capita)
	Linear Feet	Average Width (ft.)	Total		
<i>Formula</i>	<i>a</i>	<i>b</i>	<i>c = a * b</i>	<i>d</i>	<i>e = c / d</i>
Sidewalks	569,669	6	3,418,016 sq. ft.	37,525	91
Class I Bike Paths	32,250	10	322,500 sq. ft.	37,525	9
Class II Bike Lanes	222,578	NA	222,578 ln. ft.	37,525	6
Class III Bike Boulevards	63,575	NA	63,575 ln. ft.	37,525	2

Note: Existing facility standard rounded to nearest square foot, or linear foot per capita.
 Sources: City of Goleta Infrastructure Inventory Update (2025 Infrastructure Inventory Update_250221_FINAL v1.xlsx); Table 2.4.

The bicycle and pedestrian facilities costs are shown in **Table 7.2**. Replacement costs were provided by the City for use in this analysis. The costs were developed by City transportation and development department staff from the Public Works Department as a part of the infrastructure inventory update process. The total cost for new development to maintain

this facility standard is \$4,682 per capita including fee program administration costs.

Table 7.2: Bicycle & Pedestrian Facilities Costs

Facility Type	Existing Facility Standard (units per capita)	Average Replacement Cost (per unit) ¹	Total Cost (per Capita)
<i>Formula</i>	<i>a</i>	<i>b</i>	<i>c = a * b</i>
Sidewalks	91 sq. ft.	\$ 44.00	\$ 4,004
Class I Bike Paths	9 sq. ft.	36.25	326
Class II Bike Lanes	6 ln. ft.	18.94	114
Class III Bike Boulevards	2 ln. ft.	1.89	4
Subtotal			\$ 4,448
Program Administration (5% of total)			234
Total			\$ 4,682

Note: Total Cost per Capita rounded to the nearest whole dollar.

¹ Average replacement costs identified in City of Goleta 2025 Infrastructure Inventory Update.

Sources: City of Goleta 2025 Infrastructure Inventory Update (2025 Infrastructure Inventory Update_250221_FINAL v1.xlsx), Table 7.1.

Fee Schedule

The bicycle and pedestrian facilities impact fee is shown in **Table 7.3**. The fee is based on the cost per capita shown in **Table 7.2** necessary to maintain the City's existing capital asset facility standard.

Fees adopted at this level would allow the City to provide facilities to new development at the same ratio of facilities to service population that currently exists in the City of Goleta today. As a policy decision, the City can adopt any fee lower than the maximum justified amounts. However, should the City elect to adopt fees below the maximum amounts, the lost revenue required to construct the facilities must come from the City's general fund or other unrestricted revenue source. The City cannot impose higher fees on other applicants in the future to make up the lost revenue.

Table 7.3: Bicycle and Pedestrian Facilities Impact Fee

Land Use Category	Cost per Capita	Occupant Density (Residents/DU or Workers/KSF)	Relative Demand	Maximum Justified Fee	Fee per Square Foot ¹
<i>Formula</i>	<i>a</i>	<i>b</i>	<i>c</i>	<i>d = a x b x c</i>	<i>e = d / average sq. ft.</i>
<u>Residential</u>					
Single Family Detached ²	\$ 4,682	2.95	1.00	\$ 13,812 per DU	\$ 7.71
All Other Residential	4,682	2.07	1.00	9,692 per DU	10.46
<u>Nonresidential</u>					
Retail & Commercial	\$ 4,682	2.33	0.20	\$ 2,182 per KSF	\$ 2.18
Office & Medical	4,682	3.13	0.20	2,931 per KSF	2.93
Industrial	4,682	1.16	0.20	1,086 per KSF	1.09

¹ Assumes 1,791 square feet per average sized single family unit and 927 for all other residential units in Goleta based on an analysis of American Housing Survey data from 2023.

² Includes attached and detached accessory dwelling units. Fees for ADUs can only be charged on ADUs greater than 750 square feet in size, and are charged proportionally based on the square footage of the ADU to the square footage of the primary dwelling unit.

Sources: Tables 2.2, 2.4, and 7.2.

Use of Fee Revenue

Estimated fee revenue over the next five-year planning horizon corresponding with the City's CIP through buildout based on a market-based growth forecast is shown in the Capital Improvement Program Chapter, in **Table 9.1**. A five-year growth projection is used to estimate revenues to correspond with the five-year planning horizon of the City's CIP. The planning horizon of the CIP or nexus study does not affect the calculation of the fee schedule, which is based on the existing level of service. **Table 9.6** displays the Nexus Study CIP for bicycle and pedestrian facilities, as required by AB 602. Upon adoption of this fee program, the City's CIP will be updated to incorporate projections of future DIF revenues, and program those revenues to eligible projects that benefit new development.

Certain transportation facilities projects from Chapter 6 of this report may include bicycle and pedestrian components that are ancillary to the project. The bicycle and pedestrian facilities fee documented in this chapter cannot be used to fund the bicycle and pedestrian components of the transportation facilities fee projects, with the exception of project R-05, up to 50% of which can be funded by bicycle and pedestrian facilities fee. The bicycle and pedestrian facilities fee must be used to fund bicycle and pedestrian facilities unrelated to the project list in the prior chapter, with the exception of project R-05.

If revenue is used to replace an existing facility without expanding capacity, the project provides a joint benefit to existing and new development. In this case then the fee can fund only 21 percent of project costs based on new development as a share of total development at buildout (see **Table 2.4**). However, if the City raises other funds for facility expansion that would accommodate growth, then the impact fee revenue that would have been used for expansion projects could be re-programmed to joint benefit projects without adhering to the funding share noted here.

The City must also allocate five percent of fee revenue to program administration. Administration costs include costs to collect and account for fee revenue, and costs to comply with the Mitigation Fee Act such as annual and five-year reporting requirements. The City will monitor its actual program administration costs and adjust this charge accordingly when the impact fee is updated in the future.

8. STORM DRAIN FACILITIES FEE

This chapter provides a nexus analysis, fee schedule, and estimated revenue for an update to the City's storm drain facilities impact fee. Storm drain facilities include pipes, culverts, catch basins and related facilities used to convey surface storm water.

Storm Drain Demand

New development generates storm water runoff by increasing the amount of land that is impervious to precipitation. The increased stormwater runoff must be controlled through storm drain facilities. **Table 8.1** shows the calculation of equivalent dwelling unit (EDU) demand factors, which relate the amount of impervious surface generated by various land uses to the amount of impervious surface generated by a typical single family dwelling unit. Density assumptions are based on typical densities from the City's General Plan. The average percent impervious factors are derived from California Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) data.

Table 8.1: Equivalent Dwelling Units

Land Use	Density (Units per Acre of KSF/Acre) ¹	Average Percent Impervious	Impervious Surface per DU or KSF	Equivalent Dwelling Unit (EDU) ²
<i>Formula</i>	<i>a</i>	<i>b</i>	<i>c = b * 43,560 / a</i>	<i>d = c / 4,269</i>
<i>Residential</i>				
Single Family Detached	5.00	0.49	4,269	1.00
All Other Residential	20.00	0.70	1,525	0.36
<i>Nonresidential</i>				
Retail & Commercial	15.246	0.86	2,457	0.58
Office & Medical	17.424	0.69	1,725	0.40
Industrial	17.424	0.81	2,025	0.47

¹ Dwelling units for residential and thousand building square feet for non-residential. Density based on typical development densities from the City's General Plan. Density based on R-SF zoning for single family detached, and R-MD zoning for all other residential. Nonresidential densities are based on floor-area-ratios (FAR) of 0.35 for retail/commercial and 0.40 for office/medical and industrial.

² EDUs per dwelling unit for residential development and per thousand square feet for nonresidential development.

Sources: Pages 10 and 15, User's Guide for the California Impervious Surface Coefficients, Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment California Environmental Protection Agency, December 2010; Tables 2-1 and 2-3, Goleta General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan; Urban Economics.

Table 8.2 applies the EDU factors calculated in Table 8.1 to the land use scenario from Table 2.1 to express demand for storm drain facilities in terms of impervious surface EDUs in the base year, at the planning horizon, and for the projected growth increment.

Table 8.2: Land Use Scenario and EDUs

	EDU Factor	Existing (DU/ KSF)	Existing EDUs	Projected Growth (DU/KSF)	Growth in EDUs	Buildout (DU/ KSF)	Build- out EDUs
<i><u>Residential</u></i>							
Single Family Detached	1.00	5,533	5,533	978	978	6,511	6,511
All Other Residential	0.36	<u>7,622</u>	<u>2,744</u>	<u>2,351</u>	<u>846</u>	<u>9,973</u>	<u>3,590</u>
Subtotal		13,155	8,277	3,329	1,824	16,484	10,101
<i><u>Nonresidential</u></i>							
Retail & Commercial	0.58	3,353	1,945	1,268	735	4,621	2,680
Office & Medical	0.40	3,187	1,275	1,871	748	5,058	2,023
Industrial	0.47	<u>6,684</u>	<u>3,141</u>	<u>888</u>	<u>417</u>	<u>7,572</u>	<u>3,559</u>
Subtotal		13,224	6,361	4,027	1,901	17,251	8,262
Total			14,638		3,726		18,364
Percent of Total			80%		20%		100%

Sources: Tables 8.1 and 2.1.

Facility Standards

The storm drain facilities impact fee uses the City's existing capital assets to determine the facility standard and provide a reasonable relationship between new development and the need for additional facilities. The impact fee would fund the expansion of storm drain facilities at a rate sufficient to maintain the existing ratio of facilities to impervious surface as growth occurs. See the *Facility Standard* section in Chapter 3 for more explanation of this approach.

The City's existing inventory of storm drain facilities and associated replacement costs are shown in **Table 8.3**. Existing storm drain EDUs are identified in **Table 8.2**. Dividing the existing quantities of facilities by existing EDUs results in the existing storm drain infrastructure standards, expressed per EDU.

Table 8.3: Existing Storm Drain Facilities & Standards

Facility Type	Quantity	Units	Existing EDUs	Existing Facility Standard (units per EDU)
Underground Drainage	129,433	Linear Feet	14,638	8.84
Inlets	823	Each	14,638	0.06
Outlets	336	Each	14,638	0.02
Maintenance Holes	587	Each	14,638	0.04
Surface Drainage (Channel)	21,175	Cubic Yards	14,638	1.45

Sources: City of Goleta Infrastructure Inventory Update, 2026; Table 8.2.

The existing storm drain facilities cost standard in **Table 8.4**. The infrastructure standards from Table 8.3 are multiplied by the average replacement cost for each facility type to determine the existing cost standard per EDU. Unit replacement costs were provided by City for use in this analysis based on recent project bid results and Caltrans contract cost data, and were adjusted for inflation into 2025 dollars. The cost for new development to maintain the existing storm drain infrastructure facility standards is \$10,845 per EDU including fee program administration costs.

Table 8.4: Storm Drain Facilities Cost Standard

Facility Type	Existing Facility Standard (units per EDU)	Average Replacement Cost (per unit) ¹	Total Cost (per EDU)
<i>Formula</i>	<i>a</i>	<i>b</i>	<i>c = a * b</i>
Underground Drainage	8.84 In. ft.	\$ 559	\$ 4,943
Inlets	0.06 each	12,326	693
Outlets	0.02 each	9,440	217
Maintenance Holes	0.04 each	22,600	906
Surface Drainage (Channel)	1.45 c.y.	2,450	3,544
Subtotal			\$ 10,303
Program Administration (5% of total)			542
Total			\$ 10,845

Note: Total Cost per EDU rounded to the nearest whole dollar.

¹ Average replacement costs identified in City of Goleta 2026 Infrastructure Inventory Update.

Replacement costs provided by City for use in this analysis based on recent project bid results and Caltrans data, adjusted for inflation into current dollars. Cost per linear foot is the weighted average cost across all types of materials for a given diameter.

Sources: City of Goleta 2026 Infrastructure Inventory Update, Table 8.3

Fee Schedule

The storm drain facilities impact fee is shown in **Table 8.5**. The fee is based on the cost per EDU shown in Table 8.4 necessary to maintain the City's existing capital asset facility standard.

Fees adopted at this level would allow the City to provide facilities to new development at the same ratio of facilities to impervious surface that currently exists in the City of Goleta today. As a policy decision, the City can adopt any fee lower than the maximum justified amounts. However, should the City elect to adopt fees below the maximum amounts, the lost revenue required to construct the facilities must come from the City's general fund or other unrestricted revenue source. The City cannot impose higher fees on other applicants in the future to make up the lost revenue.

Table 8.5: Storm Drain Facilities Impact Fee Schedule

Land Use Category	Cost per EDU	EDU Factor	Maximum Justified Fee	Fee per Square Foot ¹
<i>Formula</i>	<i>a</i>	<i>b</i>	<i>c = a * b</i>	<i>d = c / average sq. ft.</i>
<u>Residential</u>				
Single Family Detached ²	\$10,845	1.00	\$10,845 per DU	\$6.06
All Other Residential	10,845	0.36	3,904 per DU	4.21
<u>Nonresidential</u>				
Retail & Commercial	\$10,845	0.58	\$ 6,290 per KSF	\$6.29
Office & Medical	10,845	0.40	4,338 per KSF	4.34
Industrial	10,845	0.47	5,097 per KSF	5.10

¹ Assumes 1,791 square feet per average sized single family unit and 927 for all other residential units in Goleta based on an analysis of American Housing Survey data from 2023.

² Includes attached and detached accessory dwelling units. Fees for ADUs can only be charged on ADUs greater than 750 square feet in size, and are charged proportionally based on the square footage of the ADU to the square footage of the primary dwelling unit.

Sources: Tables 2.2, 2.4, and 8.2.

Use of Fee Revenue

Estimated fee revenue over the next five-year planning horizon corresponding with the City's CIP through buildout based on a market-based growth forecast is shown in the Capital Improvement Program Chapter, in **Table 9.1**. A five-year growth projection is used to estimate revenues to correspond with the five-year planning horizon of the City's CIP. The planning horizon of the CIP or nexus study does not affect the calculation of the fee schedule, which is based on the existing level of service. **Table 9.7** displays the Nexus Study CIP for storm drain facilities, as required by AB 602. Upon adoption of this fee program, the City's CIP

will be updated to incorporate projections of future DIF revenues, and program those revenues to eligible projects that benefit new development.

If revenue is used to replace an existing facility without expanding capacity, the project provides a joint benefit to existing and new development. In this case then the fee can fund only 20 percent of project costs based on new development as a share of total development at buildout (see **Table 8.2**).

The City must allocate five percent of fee revenue to program administration. Administration costs include costs to collect and account for fee revenue, and costs to comply with the Mitigation Fee Act such as annual and five-year reporting requirements. The City will monitor its actual program administration costs and adjust this charge accordingly when the impact fee is updated in the future.

9. CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM

As a requirement of AB 602, a large jurisdiction must adopt a capital improvement plan (CIP) as part of the nexus study. Large jurisdictions are defined as counties with 250,000 or more residents, or any city within those counties. Goleta meets the definition of a large jurisdiction. The City of Goleta annually adopts a CIP to plan for capital needs over a five-year window. Accordingly, this study uses a market-based revenue projection to correspond with the capital facilities that the City plans on funding with projected impact fee revenues collected during that timeframe.

Revenue Projections

Historical dwelling unit production in Goleta, as reported by the California Department of Finance was used, to estimate potential impact fee revenues within the next five-year capital improvement program planning horizon. During the past five years, the City produced 101 single family units and 237 multifamily units. Based on the projected buildout of Goleta's general plan, this represents approximately 10-percent of future potential development. The analysis assumes that nonresidential development will occur at a similar rate, so 10-percent of projected nonresidential development to buildout is assumed to occur within the next five years. **Table 9.1** displays an estimate of potential impact fee revenue over the next five years. The maximum justified fees summarized in **Table E.3**, are multiplied by projected quantities of residential and nonresidential development to determine the projected fee revenue within the five-year CIP planning horizon.

Capital Improvement Program

Tables 9.2 through 9.7 display the City's five-year CIP for this Nexus Study. All projects identified in the tables below include either capacity expanding improvements to existing facilities or new facilities as needed to mitigate the impacts of new development. The City intends to fund these projects, to the extent possible, with impact fee revenues collected over the next five years. The tables document the estimated cost, and the approximate size, location, and time of delivery of the proposed facilities. The tables also include the estimated share to be funded with impact fee revenues for each project.

Table 9.1: Five-Year DIF Revenue Projection

Land Use	5 Year Growth Assumptions (DU or KSF)	Public Administration	Library	Transportation	Parks	Storm Drain	Bicycle & Pedestrian	Total - Five Year
Single Family Detached	101	\$ 1,064,540	\$ 88,173	\$ 1,992,257	\$ 3,322,395	\$ 1,095,345	\$ 1,395,012	\$ 8,957,722
All Other Residential	237	1,752,852	145,281	2,613,923	5,470,671	925,295	2,297,004	13,205,026
Retail & Commercial	126.80	211,122	17,498	14,622,739	658,853	797,585	276,678	16,584,474
Office & Medical	187.10	418,543	34,614	4,634,430	1,306,145	811,640	548,390	7,753,762
Industrial	88.80	73,610	6,098	932,405	229,728	452,627	96,437	1,790,904
Total Projected Fee Revenue		\$ 3,520,667	\$ 291,664	\$ 24,795,754	\$ 10,987,792	\$ 4,082,492	\$ 4,613,521	\$ 48,291,889

Sources: Table E.3; California Department of Finance, Table E-5; Urban Economics.

Table 9.2: Five-Year Public Administration Facilities DIF CIP

No.	Facility Description	General Location	Approximate Size of Facility	Estimated Time of Availability	Estimated Cost	Percentage Funded w/ DIF	Costs Allocated to DIF
1	TBD-02 City Hall Elevator	130 Cremona Drive	1 Elevator	2035	\$ 1,960,000	100%	\$1,960,000
2	TBD-02 City Hall ADA, Expansion and Tenant Improvements	130 Cremona Drive	40,049 Sq. Ft.	2035	2,750,000	21%	577,500
3	9127 - Goleta Community Center Campus Renovation and Capacity Expansion	Goleta Community Center - 5679 Hollister Ave	36,087 Sq. Ft.	2033	1,500,000	21%	315,000
4	9136-Portable Replacement and Expansion Project	Goleta Community Center - 5679 Hollister Ave	2,970 Sq. Ft.	2030	4,000,000	50%	2,000,000
Total					\$ 10,210,000		\$4,852,500
Less Existing Fund Balance							683,000
Less Five-Year Projected Fee Revenue							<u>3,520,667</u>
To Be Funded with Other Sources							\$ 648,833
Source: City of Goleta							

Justification:

1. City Hall currently does not have an elevator. Adding a new elevator would provide new capacity to facilitate the vertical circulation and movement of the anticipated additional staff required as the City expands due to new development.
2. The tenant and ADA improvements project expands operational capacity at City Hall. Since this project is modifying an existing facility, 21% of cost of improvements is allocated to new development, which corresponds with new development's share of demand for facilities at the planning horizon, as identified in Table 2.4
3. The Goleta Community Center project will reconfigure and expand the facility to add capacity. The project will include electrical upgrades that will increase the operational capacity of the entire campus including the ability to add a cooling center. Since this project is modifying an existing facility, 21% of cost of improvements is allocated to new development, which corresponds with new development's share of demand for facilities at the planning horizon, as identified in Table 2.4.
4. The portable buildings at the Community Center will be replaced. The new portables will double the square footage compared to the existing square footage. The impact fees will fund the share of the project that is expanding the size of the portable buildings, which corresponds with 50% of the total project cost.

Table 9.3: Five-Year Public Library Facilities DIF CIP

Item No.	Facility Description	General Location	Approximate Size of Facility	Estimated Time of Availability	Estimated Cost	% Funded w/ DIF	Costs Allocated to DIF
1	Electric Book Van	Citywide	Various	2029	\$ 375,000	100%	\$ 375,000
2	Expand Book Collection	Citywide	6,250 items over 5 years	2030	200,000	100%	200,000
Total					\$ 575,000		\$ 575,000
Less Existing Fund Balance							283,000
Less Five-Year Projected Fee Revenue							291,664
To Be Funded with Other Sources							\$ 336
Source: City of Goleta							

Justification:

1. An additional electric book van is a new facility that represents an increase in library capacity, so the impact fees will fund 100% of the project.
2. Expanding library collections represent an increase in library capacity, so the impact fees will fund 100% of the project.

Table 9.4: Five-Year Park Facilities DIF CIP

Item No.	Facility Description	General Location	Approximate Size of Facility	Estimated Time of Availability	Estimated Cost	Percentage Funded w/ DIF	Costs Allocated to DIF
1	9063-Evergreen Park Recreation Expansion Project	Evergreen Park (Evergreen Park & Brandon Dr)	22 Acres	2040	\$20,000,000	80%	\$16,000,000
2	TBD-Stow Grove Park Development Phase 2 & 3	Stow Grove Park (Cathedral Oaks Rd & N La Patera Ln)	11 Acres	2036	10,200,000	80%	8,160,000
Total					\$30,200,000		\$ 24,160,000
Less Existing Fund Balance							2,320,000
Less Five-Year Projected Fee Revenue							<u>10,987,792</u>
To Be Funded with Other Sources							\$ 10,852,208
Source: City of Goleta							

1. The planned improvements at Evergreen Park will partially rehabilitate the facility, and also add new amenities and enhance the capacity of the park to serve new development throughout the entire City. The projected cost of rehabilitation activities at the park is approximately \$4,000,000 while the cost of new amenities that currently do not exist is approximately \$16,000,000, resulting in an allocation of 80% to new development. Accordingly, 80% of the costs which represent capacity expansion and new amenities are allocated to the impact fees and the remainder will be funded by other sources. Capacity expanding improvements include: pickleball court expansion, additional restrooms, additional playgrounds, multi-use field improvements, new trails, disc golf expansion, new parking facilities, new gathering areas and passive recreation areas.
2. The planned improvements at Stow Grove Park will partially rehabilitate the facility, while also adding new amenities and enhancing the capacity of the park to serve new development throughout the entire City. The projected cost of rehabilitation activities at the park is approximately \$2,040,000 while the cost of new amenities that currently do not exist is approximately \$8,160,000, resulting in an allocation of 80% to new development. Accordingly, 80% of the costs which represent capacity expansion and new amenities are allocated to the impact fees and the remainder will be funded by other sources. Capacity expanding improvements include: new restrooms, multi-use field improvements, perimeter walking paths around the full length of the park, fitness equipment stations, passive recreation paths, observation areas, new picnic area, new horseshoe area, new outdoor games area, new adventure playground, pollinator garden, enhanced pedestrian connectivity and additional seating areas throughout the park.

Table 9.5: Five-Year Transportation Facilities DIF CIP

Item No.	Facility Description	General Location	Approximate Size of Facility	Estimated Time of Availability	Estimated Cost	% Funded w/ DIF	Costs Allocated to DIF
1	I-12-10-New Intersection Control - Hollister Avenue / Cannon Green Drive	Intersection of Hollister Avenue and Cannon Green Drive	New intersection control	2032	\$ 5,925,000	18%	\$ 1,084,240
2	I-12-12-New Intersection Control - Hollister Avenue / La Sumida Gardens Lane	Intersection of Hollister Avenue and La Sumida Gardens Ln	New intersection control	2035	6,500,000	25%	1,657,128
3	9143-Goleta US 101 Bike/Ped Overcrossing	Western Goleta, From San Rossano Dr along Calle Real to Ellwood Station Rd	Approx. 2,100 LF of Bike/Ped Overcrossing	2046	46,150,000	85%	39,250,575
4	9001-R-02-Hollister Avenue Complete Streets Corridor	Hollister Avenue, from Fairview Avenue to S Kellogg Avenue	Approx. 3,100 LF of Road, Median, Curb & Gutter, Sidewalk, Hardscape and Landscaping Improvements	2036	10,750,000	14%	1,539,793
Total							\$43,531,736
Less Existing Fund Balance							1,296,000
Less Five-Year Projected Fee Revenue							<u>24,795,754</u>
To Be Funded with Other Sources							<u>\$17,439,982</u>
Source: City of Goleta							

The justification for the projects, costs and percentage funded by new development within Goleta is documented in Chapter 6 of this report, and Appendices A and B. Note that the “% funded by DIF” column corresponds with new development in Goleta’s total allocated share of costs, as opposed to Goleta’s share of costs allocated to growth, which is shown in Table 6.1.

Table 9.6: Five-Year Bicycle and Pedestrian Facilities DIF CIP

Item No.	Facility Description	General Location	Approximate Size of Facility	Estimated Time of Availability	Estimated Cost	% Funded w/ DIF	Costs Allocated to DIF
1	9109-Ward Drive Sidewalk	849 Ward Dr (gap along west side of Ward Dr between Ekwil St and Obern Trail)	Approx. 230 LF of Sidewalk	2033	\$1,680,000	100%	\$ 1,680,000
2	9143-Goleta US 101 Bike/Ped Overcrossing	Western Goleta, From San Rossano Dr along Calle Real to Ellwood Station Rd	Approx. 2,100 LF of Bike/Ped Overcrossing	2046	46,150,000	85%	39,250,575
3	FY2025/26 TBD-08 South La Patera Sidewalk and Bike Lane Improvements	S La Patera, between Hollister Ave and Train Depot (Goleta Station)	3,200 LF of Class IV Bike Lanes, 600 LF of new sidewalk, 2,100 LF of ADA upgrades to existing sidewalk	2030	2,500,000	64%	1,600,000
4	Bike Ped Master Plan Update	N/A	N/A	2030	500,000	21%	105,000
Total							\$ 42,635,575
Less Existing Fund Balance							291,000
Less Five-Year Projected Fee Revenue							4,613,521
To Be Funded with Other Sources							\$ 37,731,055
Source: City of Goleta							

Justification:

1. This project will complete 230 feet of sidewalk that currently does not exist, which will add to the capacity of the Citywide sidewalk network. 100% of these costs are allocated to the impact fee because it is a new facility.
2. The 101 bicycle/pedestrian overcrossing will help the City address future LOS deficiencies caused by new development. Consistent with the half of the project that is included in the transportation impact fee, approximately 85% of this project can be allocated to new development in Goleta, with the remainder being allocated to new development outside of the City.
3. The improvements on South La Patera Lane will partially complete sidewalk segments that currently do not exist, and will partially rehabilitate existing sidewalks. Approximately 64% of the cost identified are needed for new sidewalks, and class IV bike lanes with the remainder of the costs associated with ADA upgrades to existing sidewalks. Accordingly, 64% of the costs will be funded with impact fee revenue.
4. The update to the City's Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan will identify future facilities needed to serve existing and new development. Since this project is needed to serve both existing and new development, 21% of cost of improvements is allocated to new development, which corresponds with new development's share of demand for facilities at the planning horizon, as identified in Table 2.4.

Table 9.7: Five-Year Storm Drain Facilities DIF CIP

Item No.	Facility Description	General Location	Approximate Size of Facility	Estimated Time of Availability	Estimated Cost	% Funded w/ DIF	Costs Allocated to DIF
1	9085-Goleta Storm Drain Master Plan	Various Citywide Locations	Master Plan	2028	\$600,000	20%	\$120,000
2	9107-Old Town South Fairview Avenue, High Flow Trash Capture Devices	Old Town (Drainage Upgrades Capacity Increasing for portions of Fairview, Hollister, Pine and Tecolote Aves)	Approx. 4,800 LF of storm drain pipe, 24 Drop Inlets, and 4 Outfalls	2030	4,754,000	100%	4,754,000
3	9119-Ellwood Beach Drive Drainage	50' South of 447 Ellwood Beach Drive at the end of Ellwood Beach Drive	300' of 36" Reinforced Concrete pipe	2030	2,000,000	100%	2,000,000
4	TBD- Federal Emergency Management Agency Letter of Map Revisions	San Jose Creek from Calle Real/US Highway 101 to State Route 217	Approx. 2,600 LF of San Jose Creek from Calle Real/US Highway 101 to State Route 217	2030	500,000	100%	500,000
Total							\$7,374,000
Less Existing Fund Balance							565,000
Less Five-Year Projected Fee Revenue							<u>4,082,492</u>
To Be Funded with Other Sources							\$2,726,508
Source: City of Goleta							

Justification:

1. The City's Storm Drain Master Plan will identify future facilities needed to serve existing and new development. Since this project is needed to serve both existing and new development, 20% of cost of improvements is allocated to new development, which corresponds with new development's share of demand for facilities at the planning horizon, as identified in Table 8.2.

2. There are currently no trash capture devices on this segment. Since this project is a new facility that does not currently exist, 100% of the costs are funded through the impact fees.
3. This project will provide a storm drain along Ellwood Beach Drive that currently does not exist. Since it is a new facility 100% of the project is allocated to new development.
4. This project will allow development to occur in areas that are currently not developable, so 100% of the project costs are allocated to new development.