

City of Hayward

Residential Only Park Impact Fee Calculations

DISCUSSION DRAFT

April 19, 2019

GROWTH ESTIMATES

Impact fees are meant to have “growth pay for growth” so the first step in developing an impact fee is to quantify future growth in the City of Hayward. Growth estimates have been prepared for the City of Hayward’s population through the year 2040 in order to match the horizon year of the City’s General Plan.

Exhibit 1 lists Hayward’s population and growth rates from 2010 to 2018 and projections to the year 2040.

| Exhibit 1. Population | | |
|-----------------------------|---------------|---------------------|
| | Population | CAGR ⁽¹⁾ |
| 2010 | 144,186 | |
| 2011 | 146,357 | 1.5% |
| 2012 | 149,965 | 2.5% |
| 2013 | 152,491 | 1.7% |
| 2014 | 154,641 | 1.4% |
| 2015 | 157,409 | 1.8% |
| 2016 | 159,465 | 1.3% |
| 2017 | 161,455 | 1.2% |
| 2018 | 162,030 | 0.4% |
| 2040 | 183,533 | 0.6% |
| Growth⁽²⁾ | 22,078 | 0.6% |

(1) CAGR = Compound Annual Growth Rate.

(2) Growth = 2040 Population – 2018 Population.

Source for population:

- for years 2010 to 2018: California Department of Finance Population Estimates for Cities, Counties, and State; and
- for 2040: City of Hayward General Plan.

It is clear from Exhibit 1 that Hayward expects growth of population in the future, so there is a rational basis for park impact fees that would have future growth pay for parks that are needed to provide appropriate levels of service to new development. The total population for the base year (2018) is 162,030, for the horizon year (2040) is 183,533, therefore growth between 2018 and 2040 is 22,078.

PARK IMPACT FEES

Overview

Impact fees for Hayward's parks use an inventory of the City's existing acreage and population to determine the current level of service ratio for parks. The current level of service ratio is multiplied by the projected population growth to estimate the acres of parks needed to serve growth at the current level of service. The number of acres needed to serve growth is reduced by the number of acres of parks that are already held in reserve for growth. The cost of park acquisition and development per acre is multiplied by the number of acres needed to serve growth at the current level of service to arrive at the investment in parks needed to serve growth. The investment needed for growth is then adjusted by the value of the remaining park in-lieu fee fund balance and estimated program administration costs to arrive at the investment to be paid by growth. The investment to be paid by growth is divided by the growth in population to arrive at the growth cost per person. The amount of the maximum allowable park impact fee is determined by multiplying the growth cost per person by the persons per unit for each type of development.

These steps are described below in the formulas, descriptions of variables, exhibits and explanations of calculations for parks impact fees.

Formula 1: Parks Level of Service Ratio

The current level of service ratio is calculated by dividing the existing acreage of Hayward Area Recreation and Park District (HARD) parks in Hayward by the total current population in Hayward.

$$(1) \frac{\text{Existing Acres of Parks}}{\text{Current Population}} = \text{Current Level of Service Ratio}$$

The current population was described above. There is one new variable that requires explanation: (A) Existing Acres of Parks.

Variable (A): Existing Acres of Parks

The acreage of each park in Hayward, managed by HARD, is listed in Appendix A. The total existing parks acreage includes all existing parks and facilities in the following categories: Local Parks; Community Parks; Special Use Facilities; School Recreation Sites; and Linear Parks, Greenways and Trails. Appendix A additionally includes the total acreage in Hayward and the subtotal by category from the HARD Parks and Recreation Master Plan.

The total existing inventory of parks in the City of Hayward is 1,052.6 acres of parks. Exhibit 2 lists the total existing inventory of parks by category.

Exhibit 2. HARD Park Inventory in Hayward by Park Type, Acres, 2018

| Type | Inventory |
|------------------------------------|----------------|
| Local Parks | 133.2 |
| Community Parks | 63.6 |
| Special Use Facilities | 232.4 |
| School Recreation Sites | 20.0 |
| Linear Parks, Greenways and Trails | 603.4 |
| Total | 1,052.6 |

Exhibit 3 lists the total existing inventory of parks and divides it by the current population of 162,030 (from Exhibit 1), divided by 1,000 to calculate the current level of service ratio of 6.50 acres of parks per 1,000 population.

Exhibit 3. Level of Service Ratio

| Inventory | Current Population | Level of Service Ratio |
|-----------------|--------------------|----------------------------|
| 1,052.6 acres ÷ | 162,030 | = 6.50 acres per 1,000 pop |

Formula 2: Total Park Acres to Serve Growth

Impact fees must be related to the needs of growth. The first step in determining growth's needs is to calculate the total number of acres needed to serve growth with the same level of service ratio that benefits the current population. The acres of parks needed for growth are calculated by multiplying the level of service ratio by the population growth from 2018 to 2040 (divided by 1,000).

$$(2) \frac{\text{Current Level of Service Ratio}}{\text{Service Ratio}} \times \frac{\text{Growth of Population}}{\text{Population}} = \frac{\text{Park Acres to Serve Growth}}{\text{to Serve Growth}}$$

There are no new variables used in Formula 2. Both variables were developed in previous formulas and exhibits.

Exhibit 4 shows the calculation of the total acres of parks needed for growth. The current level of service ratio is calculated in Exhibit 3. The growth in population is calculated in Exhibit 1. The result is that Hayward needs to add 143.4 acres of parks in order to serve the growth of 22,078 additional people who are expected to be added to the City's existing population.

Exhibit 4. Total Park Acres Needed for Growth

| Level of Service Ratio | 2018-2040 Growth | Total Park Acres Needed for Growth |
|----------------------------|------------------|------------------------------------|
| 6.50 acres per 1,000 pop x | 22,078 | = 143.4 |

Formula 3: Park Acres Needed for Growth

The park acres needed for growth is calculated by subtracting any existing reserve capacity from the total park acres needed to serve growth.

$$(3) \frac{\text{Total Park Acres Needed for Growth}}{\text{Needed for Growth}} - \frac{\text{Reserve Capacity}}{\text{Capacity}} = \frac{\text{Park Acres Needed for Growth}}{\text{for Growth}}$$

Total Park Acres Needed for Growth was described in Formula 2. There is one new variable that requires explanation: (B) Reserve Capacity.

Variable (B): Reserve Capacity

Existing reserve capacity includes any park acres that HARD has acquired in the City of Hayward and is holding in reserve to serve the needs of growth. HARD and the City of Hayward have acquired 54.9 acres for the future La Vista Park, which will serve the needs of growth through 2040.

Exhibit 5 shows the calculation of the acres of parks that are needed for growth. The total acres of parks needed for growth (from Exhibit 4) is reduced by the value of existing reserve capacity, 54.9 acres, and the result shows that 88.5 acres of additional parks are needed to serve future growth.

Exhibit 5. Park Acres Needed for Growth

| Total Park Acres Needed for Growth | | Reserve Capacity | | Park Acres Needed for Growth |
|------------------------------------|---|------------------|---|------------------------------|
| 143.4 | - | 54.9 | = | 88.5 |

Formula 4: Investment Needed for Growth

The second step in determining growth's needs is to calculate the total investment in parks needed for growth, or the total cost of parks land acquisition and development to serve growth with the same level of service ratio that benefits the current population. The investment needed for growth is calculated by multiplying the park cost per acre by the number of acres needed to serve growth.

$$(4) \frac{\text{Park Cost per Acre}}{\text{per Acre}} \times \frac{\text{Park Acres Needed for Growth}}{\text{Needed for Growth}} = \frac{\text{Investment Needed for Growth}}{\text{for Growth}}$$

There is one new variable used in Formula 4 that requires explanation: (C) Park Cost per Acre.

Variable (C): Park Cost per Acre

The park impact fees are based on costs per acre for land acquisition and development that will be provided by the Hayward Area Parks and Recreation District. The calculations for the weighted average cost per acre

for land acquisition and development are shown in Appendix B. Park acquisition costs are based on recent purchases for property appropriate for park development by category in the HARD service area. Park development costs are based on recent cost estimates for park development by category provided by HARD. Exhibit 6 details the weighted average cost per acre for park land acquisition and development.

Exhibit 6. Park Acquisition and Development Cost per Acre

| | Cost per Acre |
|------------------|----------------------|
| Land Acquisition | \$690,098 |
| Park Development | \$1,370,832 |
| Total | \$2,060,930 |

Exhibit 7 shows the calculations for the investment needed for growth. The total park cost per acre for land acquisition and development (from Exhibit 6) is multiplied by the additional acres of parks needed for growth (from Exhibit 5) resulting in the investment needed for growth. The result is that the City, in coordination with the Hayward Area Recreation and Park District, will need to invest more than \$182.4. million in impact fee eligible parks acquisition and development to serve growth through 2040.

Exhibit 7. Investment Needed for Growth

| Park Cost per Acre | | Park Acres Needed for Growth | | Investment Needed for Growth |
|---------------------------|---|-------------------------------------|---|-------------------------------------|
| \$2,060,930 | x | 88.5 | = | \$182,445,732 |

Formula 5: Investment to be Paid by Growth

The future investment in parks that needs to be paid by growth may be reduced if the City has other revenues that it can invest in its parks and may include an adjustment for the administration costs of the park impact fee program. Additionally, the investment in parks that needs to be paid by growth must be reduced by the current park in-lieu fee fund balance that will be used to pay for the capital costs of parks facilities to serve growth.

The City of Hayward and the Hayward Area Recreation and Parks District have indicated that there are no other sources of funding available to pay for the eligible costs for park acquisition and development to serve growth. The investment to be paid by growth is calculated by adding the investment needed for growth, the total park in-lieu fee fund balance and program administration costs together to arrive at the investment to be paid by growth.

$$\begin{array}{rclcl}
 \text{Investment} & & \text{Park In – Lieu} & & \text{Park Impact} & & \text{Investment} \\
 (5) \text{ Needed} & + & \text{Fee Fund} & + & \text{Fee Program} & = & \text{to by Paid} \\
 \text{for Growth} & & \text{Balance} & & \text{Administration} & & \text{by Growth}
 \end{array}$$

There are two new variables in Formula 5 that require explanation: (D) Park In-Lieu Fee Fund Balance and (E) Park Impact Fee Program Administration.

Variable (D): Park In-Lieu Fee Fund Balance

The City of Hayward has a remaining fund balance in each of their five existing park in-lieu fee accounts. These existing funds will be used to pay for the park capital facilities to serve new development in Hayward. The total balance across all funds as reported by the City of Hayward is \$8,664,918. The investment needed for growth must be reduced by the available park in-lieu fee fund balance.

Variable (E): Park Impact Fee Program Administration

Park impact fee program administration costs are estimated at 2% of total park costs for the administration of the park impact fee program, consistent with administration cost estimates used in many other California jurisdictions. Program administration costs are estimated by multiplying the investment needed for growth from Exhibit 7 by the 2% estimated for program administration, resulting in estimated program administration costs of more than \$3.6 million.

Exhibit 8 shows the calculation for the investment to be paid by growth. The investment needed for growth (from Exhibit 7), existing park in-lieu fee fund balance and program administration costs are summed together to arrive at the investment to be paid by growth of \$177,429,729.

| Exhibit 8. Investment to be Paid by Growth | |
|---|------------------------|
| | Park Investment |
| Investment Needed for Growth | \$182,445,732 |
| Park Fund Balance | |
| Zone A | (\$2,064,920) |
| Zone B | (\$2,335,758) |
| Zone C | (\$2,681,902) |
| Zone D | (\$1,229,738) |
| Zone E | (\$352,599) |
| <i>Total Available Park In-Lieu Fee Funds</i> | <i>(\$8,664,918)</i> |
| Park Impact Fee Program Administration | \$3,648,914.64 |
| Investment to be Paid by Growth | \$177,429,729 |

Formula 6: Growth Cost per Person

The growth cost per person is calculated by dividing the investment in parks that is to be paid by growth by the amount of population growth.

$$(6) \frac{\text{Investment to be Paid by Growth}}{\text{Growth of Population}} = \frac{\text{Growth Cost per Person}}$$

There are no new variables used in Formula 6. Both variables were developed in previous formulas.

Exhibit 9 shows the calculation of the cost per person for parks that needs to be paid by growth. The investment in parks to be paid by growth (from Exhibit 8) is divided by the growth in population (from Exhibit 4). The result shows the cost for parks to be paid by growth is \$8,036.49 per person.

| Exhibit 9. Growth Cost per Person | | | | |
|--|---|-------------------------|---|-------------------------------|
| Investment to be Paid by Growth | | 2018-2040 Growth | | Growth Cost per Person |
| \$177,429,729 | ÷ | 22,078 | = | \$8,036.49 |

Formula 7: Maximum Allowable Impact Fee per Unit of Development

The maximum allowable amount to be paid by each new development unit depends on the persons per dwelling unit by type. The cost per unit of development is calculated by multiplying the growth cost per person by the persons per dwelling unit for each type of development.

There is one new variable used in Formula 7 that requires explanation: (F) persons per dwelling unit.

Variable (F): Persons per Dwelling Unit

The number of persons per dwelling unit is the factor used to convert the growth cost per person into impact fees per unit of development. The growth cost per person (from Exhibit 9) is multiplied by the average number of persons per dwelling unit to calculate the impact fee per dwelling unit for parks.

The number of persons per dwelling unit in the City of Hayward are 3.55 persons per single-family dwelling unit, 2.90 persons per multifamily unit and 2.35 persons per mobile home or other type of unit. The number of persons per dwelling unit are calculated using the number of occupied dwelling units by unit type and estimated population by unit type from the 2013-2017 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates for Hayward, California. Tables from the American Community Survey used in the analysis include Selected Housing Characteristics and Tenure by Household Size by Units in Structure.

Exhibit 10 shows the calculation of the maximum allowable parks impact fee per unit of development. The growth cost per person of \$8,036.49 from Exhibit 9 is multiplied by the average persons per dwelling unit to calculate the impact fee per unit of development for parks.

Exhibit 10. Maximum Allowable Park Impact Fee per Unit of Development

| Type of Development | Growth Cost per Person | | Persons per Dwelling Unit | Park Impact Fee per Unit |
|-----------------------|---------------------------|---|------------------------------|-----------------------------|
| Single-Family | \$8,036.49 | x | 3.55 dwelling unit = | \$28,504.07 |
| Multifamily | \$8,036.49 | x | 2.90 dwelling unit = | \$23,328.78 |
| Mobile Home and Other | \$8,036.49 | x | 2.35 dwelling unit = | \$18,873.82 |

APPENDIX A. INVENTORY OF EXISTING PARKS

The 2019 Hayward Area Recreation and Park District Parks Master Plan provides a detailed inventory of existing acres throughout the HARD service area, including a detailed inventory of parks in the City of Hayward as of 2018. The parks system in Hayward currently consists of 1,052.6 acres of parks in total. This includes 133.2 acres of Local Parks, 63.6 acres of Community Parks, 232.4 acres of Special Use Facilities, 20.0 acres of School Recreation Sites and 603.4 acres of Linear Parks, Greenways and Trails.

Exhibit A1. HARD Local Parks Inventory in the City of Hayward, 2018

| Park Name | Acres |
|-----------------------------------|--------------|
| Sorensdale Park | 12.7 |
| J.A. Lewis Park | 12.6 |
| Centennial Park | 11.6 |
| Bidwell Park | 10.5 |
| Cannery Park | 8.9 |
| Birchfield Park | 5.8 |
| Gordon E. Oliver Eden Shores Park | 5.6 |
| Old Highlands Park | 5.6 |
| Canyon View Park | 5.4 |
| Rancho Arroyo Park | 4.8 |
| Palma Ceia Park | 4.5 |
| Christian Penke Park | 4.2 |
| Ruus Park | 4.1 |
| College Heights Park | 3.9 |
| Greenwood Park | 3.5 |
| Eldridge Park | 3.4 |
| Silver Star Veterans Park | 3.3 |
| Jalquin Vista Park | 3.2 |
| Gansberger Park | 2.9 |
| Longwood Park | 2.9 |
| Fairway Greens Park | 2.5 |
| Spring Grove Park | 2.3 |
| Stonybrook Park | 2.3 |
| Twin Bridges Park | 2.1 |
| Stratford Village Park | 1.9 |
| Schafer Park | 1.3 |
| Bechtel Mini Park | 0.8 |
| Haymont Mini Park | 0.4 |
| La Placita Park | 0.2 |
| Subtotal Local Parks | 133.2 |

Detailed parks inventory from Table 3-1 of the Draft HARD Parks and Recreation Master Plan.

**Exhibit A2. HARD Community Parks, Special Use Facilities, School
Recreation Sites and Linear Parks, Greenways and Trails Inventory in the
City of Hayward, 2018**

| Park Name | Acres |
|--|----------------|
| Kennedy Park | 14.5 |
| Memorial Park | 2.9 |
| Mt. Eden Park | 14.1 |
| Southgate Park | 8.8 |
| Tennyson Park | 9.6 |
| Weekes Park | 13.7 |
| Subtotal Community Parks | 63.6 |
| Alden E. Oliver Sports Park | 25.6 |
| Children's Park at Giuliana Plaza | 0.2 |
| Douglas Morrison Theater | 0.5 |
| HARD District Office | 3.6 |
| Hayward Area Senior Center | 0.2 |
| Hayward Community Gardens | 4.8 |
| Hayward Plunge | 1.2 |
| Japanese Gardens | 3.6 |
| Mission Hills of Hayward Golf Course | 57.8 |
| Shoreline Interpretive Center | 0.4 |
| Skywest Golf Course | 126.5 |
| Southgate Community Center | 0.3 |
| Sunset Park/Swim Center | 6.7 |
| Weekes Park Community Center | 1.0 |
| Subtotal Special Use Facilities | 232.4 |
| Stonebrae Elementary School | 9.1 |
| Bret Harte Play Field | 5.0 |
| El Rancho Verde Park | 3.3 |
| Brenkwitz High School | 2.6 |
| Subtotal School Recreation Sites | 20.0 |
| Eden Greenway | 36.1 |
| Greenbelt Riding & Hiking Trail | 148.0 |
| Hayward Plunge Greenway Trail | 30.4 |
| Hayward Shoreline Open Space and Trails | 349.0 |
| Nuestro Parquecito | 2.3 |
| Taper Park | 37.6 |
| Subtotal Linear Parks, Greenways and Trails | 603.4 |
| Total | 1,052.6 |

Detailed parks inventory from Table 3-1 of the Draft HARD Parks and Recreation Master Plan.

APPENDIX B. PARKS LAND ACQUISITION AND DEVELOPMENT COST PER ACRE

Park impact fees are based on a total cost of parks that are needed to serve growth with the same level of service ratio that benefits the current population. In order to provide a defensible and accurate estimate for the cost of park land acquisition and park development cost per acre, the Hayward Area Recreation and Park District provided information on recent land purchases, as well as recent cost estimates for park development, by park category, detailed in Exhibits B1 and B2. All acquisition and development costs for previous years are adjusted to reflect 2019 dollars using a 3% inflation rate, as provided by HARD staff.

Local Parks, Community Parks, Special use Facilities and School Recreation Sites are combined into a single category for the costs of land acquisition. HARD staff provided feedback that the types of land required for these three categories are of parks are similar. Linear Parks, Greenways and Trails have very different acquisition costs, as demonstrated by the acquisition cost for the Valley View property.

Exhibit B1. Parks Land Acquisition Cost per Acre

| Property | City | Acquisition Cost ⁽¹⁾ | Acreage | Cost per Acre ⁽²⁾ |
|---|---------------|---------------------------------|---------|------------------------------|
| Local Parks, Community Parks, Special Use Facilities and School Recreation Sites | | | | |
| Bidwell School Property | Hayward | \$6,300,000 | 5.3 | \$1,188,679 |
| Mateo Properties | San Leandro | \$2,700,000 | 1.4 | \$1,888,112 |
| Via Toledo | San Lorenzo | \$2,262,271 | 2.0 | \$1,148,361 |
| Boston Road Property | Hayward | \$788,075 | 1.0 | \$788,075 |
| Average Cost per Acre | | | | \$1,253,307 |
| Linear Parks, Greenways and Trails | | | | |
| Valley View (EMBUD property) | Castro Valley | \$6,499,632 | 24.0 | \$270,818 |

(1) Data on purchase price provided by HARD staff. This reflects the purchase price for each property inflated to 2019 dollars based on a 3% inflation rate provided by HARD staff.

(2) Cost per acre = Acquisition Cost ÷ Acreage.

Exhibit B2. Parks Development Cost per Acre

| Park | City | Acreage | Cost per Acre (1) |
|--|---------------|---------|----------------------|
| Local Parks | | | |
| Via Toledo Park (2) | San Lorenzo | 2.0 | \$2,100,000 |
| West Evergreen (3) | San Jose | 1.0 | \$1,223,000 |
| Stojanovich Family Park (3) | Campbell | 1.1 | \$1,033,094 |
| Commodor (3) | San Jose | 2.5 | \$1,012,186 |
| N Rengstorff (3) | Mountain View | 1.0 | \$1,008,000 |
| 31 St & Alum Rock (3) | San Jose | 1.7 | \$834,300 |
| Porto Park (3) | Elk Grove | 1.3 | \$546,364 |
| Average Cost per Acre | | | \$1,108,135 |
| Community Parks | | | |
| Memorial Park (Design & Construction) (4) | Hayward | 2.9 | \$1,738,943 |
| Del Monte (3) | San Jose | 4.2 | \$1,123,323 |
| San Lorenzo Community Park Renovation (5) | San Lorenzo | 30.9 | \$1,118,719 |
| Weekes Community Park Renovation (6) | Hayward | 13.7 | \$990,633 |
| Creekside Sports Park (3) | Los Gatos | 3.0 | \$785,686 |
| McClatchy Park (3) | Sacramento | 3.8 | \$732,661 |
| Vista Montana (3) | San Jose | 5.0 | \$668,669 |
| Springlake N3 (3) | Santa Rosa | 7.0 | \$484,078 |
| La Vista Park (6) | Hayward | 54.9 | \$390,715 |
| Cordelia Park - Phase 3 (3) | Fairfield | 8.5 | \$398,845 |
| Corderos Park (3) | Vacaville | 7.2 | \$227,287 |
| Valley Oak Park (3) | Sacramento | 9.3 | \$232,319 |
| Average Cost per Acre | | | \$740,990 |
| Special Use Facilities | | | |
| Hayward Area Senior Center Renovation (7) | Hayward | 0.26 | \$15,480,845 |
| Hayward Community Gardens - Phase 1 (2) | Hayward | 2.0 | \$619,756 |
| Kennedy Park (2) | Hayward | 13.3 | \$1,353,383 |
| Average Cost per Acre | | | \$5,817,995 |
| School Recreation Site | | | |
| Canyon Middle School Sports Complex (8) | Castro Valley | | \$764,909 |
| Creekside Middle School Sports Complex (8) | Castro Valley | | \$764,909 |
| El Rancho Verde Park (6) | Hayward | 3.3 | \$1,655,647 |
| Average Cost per Acre | | | \$1,061,822 |
| Trails (9) | | | |
| Pen Creek - Reach 1 (3) | | 0.3 | \$3,132,899 |
| Iron Horse Trail (3) | | 0.4 | \$3,928,709 |
| San Tomas Spur (3) | | 1.1 | \$3,388,770 |
| Cross Alameda Trail (10) | | 0.5 | \$6,490,440 |
| Wavecrest Trail (10) | | 0.3 | \$1,615,935 |
| Average Cost per Acre | | | \$3,711,351 |

(1) Cost per Acre provided by HARD staff. Details for each specific project are noted below. All development costs are converted to 2019 dollars from the year of development assuming a

- 3% inflation rate provided by HARD staff.
- (2) Data provided by HARD staff.
 - (3) Data provided by HARD staff, sourced from Callander Associates Landscape Architecture.
 - (4) Data sourced from the adopted 2017-2020 CIP, inflated to 2019 dollars. This includes only the portion of the project focused on design and construction of new improvements and does not include the costs for a renovation master plan.
 - (5) Data sourced from the adopted 2017-2020 CIP, inflated to 2019 dollars. This includes only the portion of the project focused on design and construction of new improvements as outlined in Phase 1 and Phase 2.
 - (6) Data sourced from the adopted 2017-2020 CIP, inflated to 2019 dollars. This includes only the portion of the project focused on design and construction of new improvements.
 - (7) Data provided by HARD staff. Costs were provided per square foot, which were converted to acres for consistency.
 - (8) Cost per acre estimates provided by HARD staff. The costs provided were used to develop the overall cost estimates in the 2017-2020 adopted CIP, inflated to 2019 dollars using an assumed 3% inflation rate provided by HARD staff.
 - (9) Cost for trails provided in cost per linear foot. Linear feet were converted to acres assuming an average trail width of six feet.
 - (10) Data provided by HARD staff, sourced from PlaceWorks Inc.

The average cost per acre for parks acquisition and development by category are weighted by current acres by type in order to arrive at a development cost reflective of the cost for parks acquisition and development to serve growth at the same level of service as the existing population. Exhibits B3 and B4 demonstrate the calculations to arrive at a weighted average cost per acre for parks acquisition and development.

Exhibit B3. Weighted Average Park Acquisition Cost per Acre

| Park Type | Current Acres (1) | % Total (2) | Average Acquisition Cost per Acre (3) | Weighted Average Acquisition Cost per Acre (4) |
|--|----------------------|---------------|---|--|
| Local Parks, Community Parks, Special use Facilities and School Recreation Sites | 449.2 | 42.7% | \$1,253,307 | \$534,852 |
| Linear Parks, Greenways and Trails | 603.4 | 57.3% | \$270,818 | \$155,246 |
| Total | 1,052.6 | 100.0% | | \$690,098 |

- (1) Current Acres are from Exhibit 2.
- (2) Percent Total = Current Acres by Category ÷ Total Acres.
- (3) Average Acquisition Cost per Acre from Exhibit B1.
- (4) Weighted Average Acquisition Cost per Acre = % Total x Average Acquisition Cost per Acre.
Total Weighted Average Acquisition Cost per Acre is the sum of Weighted Average Cost per Acre by category.

Exhibit B4. Weighted Average Park Development Cost per Acre

| Park Type | Current Acres (1) | % Total (2) | Average Development Cost per Acre (3) | Weighted Average Development Cost per Acre (4) |
|-------------------------|----------------------|---------------|--|--|
| Local Parks | 133.2 | 12.7% | \$1,108,135 | \$140,228 |
| Community Parks | 63.6 | 6.0% | \$740,990 | \$44,772 |
| Special Use Facilities | 232.4 | 22.1% | \$5,817,995 | \$1,284,535 |
| School Recreation Sites | 20.0 | 1.9% | \$1,061,822 | \$20,175 |
| Trails (5) | 6.1 | 0.6% | \$3,711,351 | \$21,350 |
| Open Space (6) | 597.3 | 56.7% | \$0 | \$0 |
| Total | 1,052.6 | 100.0% | | \$1,370,832 |

(1) Current Acres from Exhibit 2.

(2) Percent Total = Current Acres by Category ÷ Total Acres.

(3) Average Development Cost per Acre from Exhibit B2.

(4) Weighted Average Development Cost per Acre = % Total x Average Development Cost per Acre. Total Weighted Average Acquisition Cost per Acre is the sum of Weighted Average Cost per Acre by category.

(5) Trails represent the portion of the Linear Parks, Greenways and Trails category that are developed as trails. Estimates are based on the miles of trails for each park within the category, converted to acres based on an assumed average trail width of six feet.

(6) Open Space represents the remaining undeveloped portion of the Linear Parks, Greenways and Trails category. Development costs are assumed at \$0 per acre.