



Yorba Linda Transportation Impact Fees

NEXUS STUDY



Prepared By: Scott Thorpe | scott@revenuecost.com

Table of Contents

CHAPTER 1 BACKGROUND AND INTRODUCTION TO DEVELOPMENT IMPACT FEES AND YORBA LINDA	
TRANSPORTATION IMPACT FEES	1
<i>The Importance of Capital Infrastructure.....</i>	<i>2</i>
REQUIRED NOLLAN/DOLAN LEGAL STANDARDS.....	2
<i>Traffic Impact Fee Structure.....</i>	<i>5</i>
CALCULATION OF TRAFFIC IMPACT FEES.....	5
OTHER ASSUMPTIONS OF THE REPORT.....	6
<i>Condition of Approval Projects Omitted.....</i>	<i>6</i>
<i>"Normal" Subdivision Improvements Omitted.....</i>	<i>7</i>
<i>Land Acquisition Costs.....</i>	<i>7</i>
CHAPTER ORGANIZATION	7
<i>Distribution of Any Unobligated Existing Traffic Impact Fee Fund Balance.....</i>	<i>8</i>
<i>Use of Textual Acronyms.....</i>	<i>8</i>
CHAPTER 2 DEMOGRAPHICS AND FINDINGS	10
LAND USE ASSUMPTIONS.....	10
<i>TIF Land-use Types Definitions.....</i>	<i>11</i>
<i>Definitions of TIF Application Categories Status.....</i>	<i>13</i>
SUMMARY OF FINDINGS	13
<i>TIFs for the City's General Plan Area.....</i>	<i>14</i>
FORMAT OF THIS REPORT	15
CHAPTER 3 TRANSPORTATION (STREETS, SIGNALS, BRIDGES, ITS AND PLANNING DOCUMENTS) SYSTEM.....	16
<i>The Existing System.....</i>	<i>16</i>
GENERAL CITY TIF SCHEDULE	19
<i>Demand Upon Infrastructure Created by the Development of Undeveloped Parcels.....</i>	<i>19</i>
TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM COST DISTRIBUTION BY AVERAGE LAND-USE TRIP FREQUENCY/DISTANCE	26
<i>Recommended Transportation System TIF Schedule.....</i>	<i>32</i>
<i>Construction Responsibility vs. TIF Payment.....</i>	<i>32</i>
RECAP OF RECOMMENDED TIFS.....	32

Appendices

APPENDIX A - SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS

APPENDIX B - EXPANDED LAND-USE DATABASE

APPENDIX C - CALCULATION OF AVERAGE RESIDENTIAL DWELLING SIZES

APPENDIX D - ACCESSORY DWELLING UNITS COST CALCULATION EXPLANATION

List of Tables

TABLE 2-1 CITY OF YORBA LINDA LAND USE INVENTORY	11
TABLE 2-2 TOTAL CITY-WIDE GENERAL PLAN BUILD-OUT CAPITAL REQUIREMENTS	14
TABLE 2-3 SUMMARY OF MAXIMUM POTENTIAL TRANSPORTATION IMPACT FEES FOR THE CITY'S GENERAL PLAN AREA	14
TABLE 3-1 CITY OF YORBA LINDA'S GENERAL PLAN AREA MINIMUM NEEDS-BASED TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT IMPACT COSTS BY TIF LAND-USE TYPE.....	29
TABLE 3-2 SUMMARY OF AVERAGE RESIDENTIAL DWELLING SQUARE FEET.....	29
TABLE 3-3 AVERAGE RESIDENTIAL DWELLING TIF COST PER SQUARE FEET	30
TABLE 3-4 EXISTING TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM COMMUNITY FINANCIAL COMMITMENT COMPARISON DATA	31

List of Abbreviated Terms

COAs	Conditions of Approval
DIFs	Development Impact Fees (in general)
FARs	Floor Area Ratios
LUDB	Land-use Database
LOS	Level of Service
ROW	Rights-of-way
TIF	Traffic Impact Fee (specific to Yorba Linda)

Chapter 1

Background and Introduction to Development Impact Fees and Yorba Linda Transportation Impact Fees

The City of Yorba Linda recently determined it needed to undertake a comprehensive updated calculation of the future transportation-related development impact costs for the City. This document will serve as the update of the previous 1993 calculation. City staff contacted staff at Urban Crossroads who then put together a team that included Revenue and Cost Specialists, LLC (henceforth referred to as RCS). The development impact cost calculation is intended to identify the cost of additional transportation-based infrastructure necessary to accommodate continued development within the City's existing limits. The intent is to prevent the natural decrease in the transportation Level of Service (henceforth referred to as the LOS) currently enjoyed by the City's existing residents and businesses that would occur by increasing demands from new development. This transportation development impact cost calculation can now be formalized as the Transportation Impact Fee (TIF) schedule by the City Council. Government Code §66000 et. seq. refers to such impositions as *development impact* fees. However, for consistency purposes, the City prefers to continue its current nomenclature of *Traffic Impact Fees*, or TIFs for its transportation system needs. The term Development Impact Fee will be reserved to any reference to Government Code §66000 et. seq. while *Transportation Impact Fee* (TIF) will refer to the City's specific transportation-based impact fee schedule and will henceforth will be referred to as TIFs.

A review and adjustment of the City's TIFs is appropriate and warranted in order to continue to ensure that the City collects sufficient monies to construct the additional transportation-based infrastructure needed to accommodate the anticipated traffic demands of new residents and businesses expected to be developed in the City. Continuous inflation, older project cost estimates, General Plan amendments and changing development are major factors in creating the need to update of this important fee schedule. This section also requires public agencies to quantify and defend the development costs. Such has been completed with the submission of this *Traffic Impact Fee Calculation and Nexus Report*.

This *TIF Calculation and Nexus Report* effort is consistent with the requirements contained within §66000, et, seq. of the Government Code. This document includes a complete list of the projects potentially financed by the TIF schedules as well as an investment comparison with the existing financial commitment of the existing community. TIF proceeds are limited for use only on the projects highlighted in this report and conversely cannot be used on any other project not listed.

The Importance of Capital Infrastructure. The LOS of any single City infrastructure is based upon (and limited by) the capacity of the cumulative improvements within that infrastructure to support the users, both residents and businesses. The design of any municipal project has a finite capacity, such as a four-lane roadway or a 30" storm drainage pipe. Each can only meet the needs of a defined number of users. For example, a four-lane collector street segment can only support so many vehicles per hour, especially at a speed that makes it worth using for driving over longer distances similarly as a storm drainage pipe that is 30" cannot handle storm flows twice that capacity.

However, the amount of and complexity of any infrastructure defines (in part or all) of the LOS. This makes the one-time TIF financing of any City's infrastructure that much more important. It takes a balance to accommodate development with the proper amount of major street lane-miles within the desired street segment. It will take additional lane miles, traffic signals, bridges, intelligent transportation systems and planning documents to maintain the existing LOS. The importance of having a properly calculated and documented TIF schedule necessary to accommodate development-related demands cannot be overstated. Of course, the City's TIFs can only be used for the capital acquisitions, the short- and long-term maintenance costs will need to come from other sources.

REQUIRED NOLLAN/DOLAN LEGAL STANDARDS

Impact Fees in California must meet three nexus requirements:

1. The Federal Nollan Decision,
2. The Federal Dolan Decision; and
3. The five findings referred to in the State of California Government Code §66000 et. seq.

The Nollan/Dolan Standards require a public entity to show that a fee bears an "essential nexus" and "rough proportionality" directly related to the impact of the development being charged the fee. The standard or test is derived from two separate court cases, and most recently reaffirmed and clarified in the 2024 Sheetz v. County of El Dorado U.S. Supreme Court decision.

The first case was Nollan v. California Coastal Commission in 1986. This established the "essential nexus," or the first part of the Standard. In this particular case, the Nollan's wanted to tear down their dilapidated bungalow and build a larger new home. The California Coastal Commission stated that since the larger house would block the public's view of the ocean, the Nollan's would need to dedicate a strip of their land along the beach to allow the public to pass along the beach for 20 years. The United States Supreme Court ruled in favor of the Nollan's and found no clear relationship or "nexus" between the public's view of the ocean and the Coastal Commission's requirement that the Nollan's dedicate a part of their land for public access. In this Report, the TIF is limited to transportation improvement projects based upon a Daily trip-mile basis.

The second case was Dolan v. City of Tigard in 1993. This case established the “rough proportionality,” the second part of the Standard. In the case, Dolan owned a plumbing supply store and wanted to expand the store and parking lot. The City of Tigard’s planning commission granted conditional approval of the expansion, dependent on Dolan dedicating 10% of her land to a public greenway along an adjacent creek and constructing a bicycle and pedestrian pathway. The case went to the Supreme Court, which ruled in favor of Dolan. The Court found that although an “essential nexus” (in this case, increased runoff due to impervious surfaces) was established, there was no clear proportionality between the expansion of Dolan’s store and the city’s requirement for a public greenway and bike path. Therefore, the condition was found to be an unconstitutional exaction.

These cases combined resulted in the Nollan/Dolan Standards. The first part of the Standard is the “essential nexus.” When applied to Impact Fees, this means that each fee must have a nexus directly related to that development’s impact on a city’s infrastructure. For example, it would make sense to have development contribute to increasing the capacity of the water conveyance system in the city, since all new developments increase water demand. However, it would not make sense for all developments to contribute to a reverse osmosis plant that only benefits a few industrial uses.

The second part of the Standard is “rough proportionality.” This means that the fee charged to new development must be proportional to the impact that development will have on the city’s infrastructure. For example, a single-family home should not bear the cost of an entire new water treatment plant, but rather contribute based on its relative demand, such as gallons per day (or in a proportional manner).

PROPORTIONAL ANALYSIS

The infrastructure needs that are required to accommodate continued development of the City as compared to the existing infrastructure has been generated through years of taxes and other contributions and currently serves the existing community. This proportional analysis is intended to recognize and reconcile the difference between the City’s desired LOS required of new development, per statements in the various General Plan elements, with that of the *de-facto* or actual LOS provided to the existing community. The City’s current transportation inventory of transportation assets generated by the existing community is nearly five times greater than will be asked of the development community through the new TIFs. The inclusion of this proportional analysis will assist the City Council in adopting a TIF structure that recognizes long term equity and assist the Council in making the difficult policy decisions regarding the required capital additions needed to accommodate new development by increasing the lay-person’s understanding of *fairness*.

The proportional analysis is important as a test for long term community equity, i.e., fairness in the infrastructure investment that has been made by existing residents and businesses with those of new residents and businesses that wish to use the existing transportation system infrastructure. For example, new development may be required to expand the number of arterial and collector lane miles in the City but that same new development gains an immediate benefit from the use of the existing transportation improvements constructed over many decades. In short, previous

generations of businesses and residents have contributed to the massive development of the City's existing infrastructure inventory and this fact should be recognized by future residents and businesses by contributing a similar (or lesser) amount of capacity towards completing the various infrastructure systems.

It is one thing to identify the many public improvement projects needed through build-out. It is an entirely different thing to assume that all of the identified improvements are required to meet the demands of the new development. Some projects will be *replacements* of the existing infrastructure while others will be *capacity increasing* projects. Within the category of the latter, they may also be further classified into two categories;

1. Existing Needs, i.e., projects that are required regardless of whether there is additional development or not. An example could be a traffic intersection currently controlled by an aging traffic signal that simply needs to be replaced or updated. This is not caused by new development. An additional example would be adding a 2" cap on any existing roadway. That improvement does not increase the capacity of that roadway to carry additional traffic.
2. Public improvement projects required as a result of the need to accommodate future development. An example of this would be a stop-controlled intersection but because of anticipated development will ultimately need to be signalized.

The U.S. Supreme Court, in *Sheetz v. County of El Dorado*, further clarified and reinforced the application of the Nollan/Dolan Standards, particularly in the context of monetary impact fees. In that case, the Court held that development impact fees imposed on an individual basis must also meet the "essential nexus" and "rough proportionality" standards, even if such fees are part of a legislatively adopted fee schedule rather than an ad hoc, project-specific condition.

Mr. Sheetz had challenged El Dorado County's traffic impact fee, which was uniformly imposed on all new residential development under a county ordinance. The Court ruled that constitutional protections against takings under the Fifth and Fourteenth Amendments apply equally to fees imposed through legislation as they do to fees imposed on a case-by-case basis. This decision rejects the idea that legislative enactments are immune from individualized scrutiny when they demand concessions from property owners in exchange for building permits.

The ruling in *Sheetz* emphasizes that all exactions—monetary or otherwise—must be justified with a clear, individualized connection to the specific development's impacts. Cities and public agencies must be able to demonstrate that a fee relates to a public need caused by the development and that the amount charged is reasonably proportional to the development's actual impact.

This Report provides the documentation of the City's costs serves as the basis for calculating the City's TIF schedule. The updated Schedules and related information can be found in [Chapter 3](#) and Appendices [A](#) through [D](#) of this Report.

Urban Crossroads and RCS staff has worked with the Finance, Public Works and Community Development staff to generate and review the supporting data which forms the recalculation of the City's TIF schedule. The results of this review can be found on the schedules located at the end of [Chapter 3](#).

Traffic Impact Fee Structure. The General Plan provides a range of potential densities for residential development, as such, the DIFs for residential uses need to be calculated on a more accurate per dwelling unit basis to reflect the impacts from a specific development. For example, a property zoned for detached dwelling residential development may contain from two to six units per acre. If fees are calculated on an acreage basis, the developer proposing three units per acre would pay the same amount as a developer constructing six units per acre. Similarly, fees are calculated on a square footage basis for business (retail/service, office and industrial, etc.) parcels to reflect the impacts of different building intensities for these types of development.

A second reason for the proposed TIF fee structure recommended in this Report involves the issue of building expansion or intensification of retail, office and industrial areas. For example, if a property owner of commercial or industrial property proposes an expansion to his building, the question exists about how to charge this proposed expansion for its impact on the City's transportation system. A TIF calculated on a building square footage (with an Average Floor Area Ratio, or **FAR**) for business uses basis simplifies this calculation.

CALCULATION OF TRAFFIC IMPACT FEES

In California, State legislation sets certain legal and procedural parameters for the charging of these fees. This legislation was passed as AB1600 by the California Legislature and is now codified as California Government Code Sections 66000 through 66009. This State law went into effect on January 1, 1989. Additional requirements and clarifications from the more recent AB602 are also chaptered in this section.

Government Code §66000 requires documentation of projects to be financed by Development Impact Fees prior to their levy and collection, and that the monies collected actually be *committed* within five years to a project of direct benefit to the development which paid the fees. It is important to note that the term *committed* does not equate with *expended*. The portion of this Report identifying the list and description of the projects act suffices as the commitment of collection of the fees. Government Code §66000 requires the following nexus process commonly referred to as the five findings. They are:

1. Delineation of the purpose of the fee.
2. Determination of the use of the fee.
3. Determination of the relationship between the use of the fee and the type of development paying the fee.
4. Determination of the relationship between the need for the facility and the type of development project.

5. Determination of the relationship between the amount of the fee and the cost of the portion of the facility attributed to the specific development project.

This Report, with some additions, utilizes the basic methodology consistent with the above requirements of Government Code §66000. Briefly, the following steps were undertaken in the calculation of TIFs for the City:

1. Define the LOS desired within the General Plan area for each project or acquisition identified as necessary. In some areas, certain statistical measures are commonly used to measure or define an acceptable LOS for a category of infrastructure. Street intersections, for instance, are commonly rated based on a LOS scale of "A" to "F" developed by transportation engineers. Most agencies adopt a LOS of "C".
2. Review the Land-use map and determine the existing mix of land-uses and amount of undeveloped/developed land. The magnitude of ROW costs and its impacts can thus be determined by considering this land-use data when planning needed infrastructure. This inventory can be found in [Table 2-1](#) and the more detailed [Appendix B](#).
3. Identify all additions to the transportation capital facilities necessary to maintain the existing LOS within the City and then determine the cost of those additions. This is accomplished in the [Chapter 3](#) project descriptions and [Schedule 3.1](#) in this Report.
4. Identify a level of responsibility, identifying, as termed in this Report, the relative need or as referred to in [Schedule 3.1](#) as "Percent Need" for the facility necessary to accommodate future additional transportation demands as defined, and as opposed to current transportation requirements.
5. Distribute the identified project costs based on their relative use, or *nexus*, of the capital system. For example, future street costs were distributed to each land use based on their trip generation characteristics.

OTHER ASSUMPTIONS OF THE REPORT

In addition to the land use assumptions contained in the next Chapter of this Report, other important assumptions of this study include the following:

Condition of Approval Projects Omitted. *Condition of Approval* projects (henceforth referred to as COA's) are required for and typically benefit limited private development and thus do not benefit the greater City at large. COA projects are identified in development documents approved by Council. The best example of a COA would be a mid-block traffic signal providing access in and out of a shopping center. But for that shopping center, that signal would probably not be needed and for that reason it is left out of the City-wide TIF calculation. An additional COA example would be the curb, gutter and sidewalk improvements adjacent to any City arterial or collector road segment. These projects are identified as specifically called-out as COA's of the private development project that is generating 100% of the need for that public infrastructure

improvement. To do otherwise would require other developers in the City to unfairly subsidize those particular developers by requiring them to construct those very specific public improvements.

"Normal" Subdivision Improvements Omitted. "Local" public improvements generally associated with and identified as being the sole responsibility of the developer through the subdivision or development review process are not included in either of the project lists or consequent calculations. This type of "on site" and immediately adjacent improvement would include all such capital construction within the boundaries of any development, such as street lights, curb, gutter, sidewalks, neighborhood streets and all local utility pipes. These improvements would continue to be the direct responsibility of the developer, with or without the addition of DIFs. These COA projects are only required to meet specific local needs of the residential dwellings and business needs within that specific private development. No other development within the City benefits from those local improvements so they should not be put in a position of having to subsidize that developer in paying for them. They benefit only that one development.

Land Acquisition Costs. Land acquisition cost estimates have been developed based upon recent ROW acquisitions, the nature or value of the contiguous land-use or information about parcels similar to what is needed by the City. Arguments for higher or lower costs can be made; however, the herein contained per acre amounts appear to be the most appropriate current figure for the purposes of this study. However, City engineering staff should be vigilant in looking for marked swings that can occur to land acquisition costs that would affect the City's TIF schedule.

CHAPTER ORGANIZATION

Within the Transportation System Chapter there will be three fee/cost comparison tables. They are:

[Schedule 3.1](#), *Allocation of Project Cost Estimates* - The first schedule is the *Allocation of Project Cost Estimates* identifies the project titles, their costs and the relationship, in an allocation percentage, to future development. This list of the projects identifies projects proposed to maintain the City's transportation system LOS.

[Schedule 3.2](#), *Minimum Needs-based Impact Fee* – This schedule calculates the TIF schedule that would need to be adopted to meet the capital needs identified in [Schedule 3.1](#) as necessary to maintain the City's existing LOS, as best as possible. Strictly speaking, this schedule is a calculation of the development impact **costs**, suitable to be adopted as a TIF schedule, by the legislative body determining City policy, in this case the Yorba Linda City Council.

With adoption of this level of TIFs, one could claim that new development is occurring without creating any additional cost to the existing residents and businesses. You could not, however, necessarily claim that new development is paying its fair share.

[Schedule 3.3](#), *Existing Community Financial Commitment Comparison* - [Schedule 3.3](#), while not an impact fee calculation, serves as the test for long term equity (or fairness) by identifying the

cost (at current nominal replacement dollar value) of the City significant existing infrastructure, including land and physical transportation-based capital improvements. This significant figure is then divided by the existing peak-hour trip-end demands from the existing community. The distribution of this replacement value equity total distributed over the existing developed community calculates the average amount that has been invested over the many years by the current community of residents and businesses and is a good indication, or comparison, with what could be imposed upon new development. This financial commitment will be expressed in terms of the cost to acquire the ROW assets and construct the public transportation improvements at current replacement costs. Significant differences between this schedule and the [Schedule 3.2](#), General Plan Minimal Needs-based TIF rate schedule would certainly be worth additional analysis and explanation.

If the average equity (for a detached dwelling for example) on this *Existing Commitment Financial Commitment Comparison* Table is greater than the average cost on the previous *Minimum Needs-based* Table, then that infrastructure system is front-ended with more of the system, say 80% of it has been constructed while only at 50% of General Plan build-out has occurred and it likely has excess capacity at that point in time. The excess capacity is the result of earlier residents and businesses of the community having put more of the transportation system into place than will be necessary by the remaining un-built portions of the community. In Yorba Linda's case, the existing community has advanced money to build capacity into the infrastructure system to meet the needs of residents and businesses not yet there. This table is intended to be the required test for the required proportionality.

Distribution of Any Unobligated Existing Traffic Impact Fee Fund Balance. There is an existing Traffic Impact Fund Balance but it has been appropriated to projects within the 2025-26 budget thus there is no unobligated amount.

Use of Textual Acronyms. The following acronyms may be used through-out the Report. They are:

- **Conditions of Approval** may be referred to as COAs.
- **Development Impact Fees** will often be referred to as DIFs but only when discussing Government Code §66000 in general.
- **Floor Area Ratios** may be referred to as FARs.
- **Land-use Database** may be referred to as the LUDB.
- **Level-of-Service** will be referred to as the LOS.
- **Right-of-way** may be referred to a ROW.
- The City's specific **Transportation Impact Fees** will be referred to as TIFs.
- **Transportation System** will refer to the City's inventory of major collector and arterial streets, traffic signals, bridges, intelligent transportation system improvements and planning documents.

As a reminder, Section §66000 of the Government Code (often referred to as the Mitigation Fee Act) refers to the payment of an impact mitigation fee as condition of a development approval as *Development Impact Fees* (or DIFs) while the City refers to its State enabled transportation-oriented development impact fee as the *Transportation Impact Fee (or TIF)*. This is merely a difference in nomenclature as the City's TIF is under the auspices of Section §66000. To avoid confusion within this Report, the use of the term *Development Impact Fees* or *DIFs* has been

limited to any discussion relating to the generic discussion of impact fees and the law as stated in Government Code §66000, et. seq. The term *Transportation Impact Fees* or *TIFs*, will be used in reference to the City's current TIF schedule.

END OF CHAPTER ONE TEXT

Chapter 2

Demographics and Findings

This Chapter represents the beginning and end of the TIF calculation process. It begins with an inventory of fully developed, undeveloped and under-developed units and acreage within the City and concludes with a summary of the recommended TIF schedule with detailed infrastructure explanations in the following chapters of this Report.

LAND USE ASSUMPTIONS

This Report's calculations are based upon an inventory of fully developed, undeveloped and underdeveloped land within the City limits of Yorba Linda and is based upon the City's most recent General Plan update as well as City staff adjustments based upon vacant land opportunities. The Report refers to as the Land Use Database or the LUDB. The *Undeveloped* and the *Underdeveloped* land use inventory, identified as *Potential Development*, combine to form the base for the distribution of the estimated costs of the service-expanding transportation system capital projects necessary to accommodate that same anticipated development. Without the expansion projects, the City would have difficulty absorbing/accommodating new development without some form of impact on the City's transportation-based LOS. The *developed* land inventory creates the denominator basis for distributing the replacement cost of the existing infrastructure over the LUDB representing the existing community. This action provides the basis for comparison with the proposed TIF schedules and for the *de facto* identification of the many existing LOS currently provided by the City's major transportation-based infrastructure which is conservatively valued at about \$2.25 billion (See [Schedule 3.3](#)).

[Table 2-1](#), is the inventory of all private land-uses contained within the current City limits in what is referred to as the **General City** area and new development in the City's Sphere of influence that will be dependent upon the City of Yorba Linda's combined transportation system. The LUDB has been based on the General Plan's land use inventory along with a planning staff analysis of privately held residential parcels. [Table 2-1](#) is a summary of the LUDB

[Appendix B, Total - Land-use Database, Sum of A, B, C, & D Below.](#) This block of information identifies the total amount of developed and undeveloped land in terms of acres and development units for the City's transportation demands. This is the total of: *A. Land-use Database within the General Core City Limits, B. SAVI Ranch, C. Esperanza Development via County Planning and D. Cielo Vista Development via County Planning.* [A](#), [B](#), [C](#), & [D](#) are detailed below the summary on [Appendix B](#) which includes potential redevelopment of approximately 6.56 acres in the Savi Ranch area.

[Appendix B](#) and its summary in [Table 2-1](#) identify new transportation demands from two potential developments that appear to be exempt from the imposition of General Area TIFs but will be fully dependent upon the City's transportation system for access/egress to their developments. Both of these projects have some specific transportation projects they will have to contribute to. The two projects, governed Pre-Annexation Agreements, include a maximum of 340 detached dwellings in the Esperanza Development and a maximum 80 detached dwellings within the Cielo Vista Development, both of which developments were submitted to and approved by the County. The roughly combined 420 detached dwellings from the two County approved developments need to be included in the Land-use Database as they will add to the City's new traffic demands because they have no alternative routes other than in or out of the Yorba Linda Transportation System. To ignore their traffic demands would require those developments within the City boundaries to unfairly subsidize that non-City demand. The City has annexed the 80 detached dwelling-unit Cielo Vista Development but has no current plans to annex the Esperanza Development of 340 detached dwellings.

Table 2-1
City of Yorba Linda
Land Use Inventory

Total - Land-use	Existing Development		Potential Development		Total G. P. Build-out	
	Acres	# of Units	Acres	# of Units	Acres	# of Units
Detached Dwelling Units	5,700.17	19,049	164.73	631	5,864.90	19,680
Attached Dwelling Units	406.91	5,534	45.01	1,536	451.92	7,070
Mobile Homes Dwelling Units	35.24	212	0.10	1	35.34	213
Senior Only Apartment Units	30.00	600	5.06	40	35.06	640
Commercial Lodging Units	12.03	229	-4.00	-122	8.03	107
Commercial Uses (SF)	124.98	1,924,369	11.89	38,244	136.87	1,962,613
Office Uses (SF)	72.35	1,095,674	0.94	16,876	73.29	1,112,550
Ind./Manufacturing Uses (SF)	42.53	2,529,271	25.41	1,807,891	67.94	4,337,162
Private Institutional Uses (SF)	580.57	3,793,444	5.00	43,560	585.57	3,837,004
Total - Land-use Database	7,004.78		254.14		7,258.92	
Residential Dwelling Units	6,172.32	25,395	214.90	2,208	6,387.22	27,603
Commercial Lodging Units	12.03	229	-4.00	-122	8.03	107
Business Use Square Feet	820.43	9,342,758	43.24	1,906,571	863.67	11,249,329
Total - Land-use Database	7,004.78		254.14		7,258.92	

TIF Land-use Types Definitions. This Report classifies private development within the City's more numerous Land Uses into one of four residential TIF *Land-use Types* or one of five different business-based TIF *Land-use Types*. For purposes of the Report, the term TIF *Land-use Type* will refer to one of the nine broad types under which the City's specifically defined zoning code *land-uses* will fall into. These TIF *Land-use Types* are defined as the following:

Residential Land-uses:

- **Detached Dwelling Units** - This TIF Land-use Type is generally defined as a detached unit and corresponds to an allowable use within the City's land-use designations of:

Residential Low (R-L), 1.0 dwelling units/acre

Residential Medium-Low, (R-ML) 1.8 dwelling units/acre

Residential Medium (R-M), 3.0 dwelling units/acre

Residential Medium-High, (R-MH) 4.0 dwelling units/acre

Residential High (R-H), 4 – 30 dwelling units/acre, for those dwelling units deemed as similar to a detached dwelling.

This category would include the construction of the unusual detached condominium or townhome and a manufactured unit on an individual lot.

- **Attached Dwelling Units** - This larger category consists of apartments, townhomes, condominiums or any other living unit that is attached to any other living unit. It generally corresponds to an allowable land-use designation of *Residential High (R-H)* [4 to 30 dwelling units/acre] when the units are attached dwelling units and *Residential Very High (R-VH)* [40-60 dwelling units/acre].

- **Mobile Home Dwelling Residential Units** - This TIF Land-use Type encompasses portions of any land use consistent with the typical 10 to 15 mobile homes per acre land-use designation in the Zoning Code. No applications for this type is anticipated, but given the number of existing mobile unit pads (212), the calculation was included for purposes of the proportional analysis.

It is important to note that the removal of one existing manufactured unit (or existing mobile home dwelling) and the replacement with a similar dwelling does not constitute a TIF imposition event, it is merely a replacement of existing demand. The construction of a mobile unit pad is the TIF imposition event, not the placement of a mobile or modular residential dwelling.

- **Senior Only Apartment Dwelling Units** - This category consists of apartments, townhomes, condominiums or any other living unit that is attached to any other unit and has a minimum age requirement (typically at 55+). It generally corresponds to an allowable land-use designation of Residential High (R-H) 4 – 30 dwelling unit/acre and Residential Very High (R-VH) 40-60 dwelling unit/acre.

Business/Commerce Land-uses:

- **Commercial Lodging (keyed) Units** - This TIF *Land-use Type* may be approved in *Commercial General (C-G)* zones. The extended Land-use Database indicates an anticipated decrease in commercial lodging uses.

- **Commercial Uses** - As utilized in this Report, commercial uses include the general type of retail services and thus includes outlets ranging from restaurants to auto repair shops to shopping centers. This category includes the *Commercial General (C-G)* and *Commercial Neighborhood (C-N)* zones.
- **Office Uses** - As utilized in this Report, office uses is largely limited to general office, professional and medical buildings. This category includes the *Commercial Office (C-O)* zone.
- **Industrial/Manufacturing Uses** - This TIF *Land-use Type* contains all businesses engaged in heavy to light manufacturing or industrial development. This category consists of the *Industrial Manufacturing (I-M)* zone.
- **Private Institutional Uses** - This TIF *Land-use Type*, based upon the specific use, may be approved in just about any of the City's previously mentioned zones. It consists of private schools, private meeting places, places of worship and similar private facilities and could be located within many of the City's land use categories.

Definitions of TIF Application Categories Status. For each of the TIF land-use categories detailed on [Table 2-1](#), acreage is categorized as either *Existing Development* or *Potential Development*. Definitions regarding the status of each land use are as follows:

Existing Development - Acres/Units - This column title reference identifies land in the City which is developed or land which has received a building permit but may not yet be constructed. Acreage in this category may include non-conforming use areas of the City which contain extensive development prior to an annexation or before any changes to the General Plan.

Potential Development - Acres/Units - Refers to all non-public vacant acreage located within the City and some outside of the City's limits that is highly dependent upon Yorba Linda's transportation system for local trips. This category includes any fully vacant parcel and those that can be upsized in the future if it contains some remaining development potential on it.

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

The combined efforts of City and Urban Crossroads staff have identified over \$78.2 million in needed and Master Planned capital improvement projects required through the City's General Plan build-out including both projects related to existing deficiencies and those needed solely to support future demands. Roughly 44.9% of the total project list can be financed with TIF receipts imposed upon new development. The proposed impact fees will generate just over \$35.1 million. The remaining 55.1% (or \$43.1 million) will need to be financed via other measure like grants and or contributions for other agencies. [Table 2-2](#) indicates the development fee-related capital project costs by area.

Table 2-2
Total City-wide General Plan Build-out Capital Requirements
 (per [Schedule 3.1](#) in the following chapter)

Infrastructure Type	Total – All Capital Projects
Development-related Projects (all or partial)	\$35,139,055
Non-Development Generated Projects	\$43,062,202
Future Transportation System Project Costs	\$78,201,257

TIFs for the City's General Plan Area. Based on these costs and the schedules found at the end of [Chapter 3](#) of this Report, costs attributable to future development were derived on a per-dwelling unit basis for residential land-uses and on a per square foot of pad basis for business land-uses. Schedule 2.1, found at the end of this Chapter, provides a summary of the recommended TIF schedules for each type of infrastructure and land use category. The total recommended maximum TIFs for each of the nine TIF Land-use Types within General City area are summarized following in [Table 2-3](#).

Table 2-3
Summary of Maximum Potential Transportation Impact Fees
For the City's General Plan Area
 (See [Schedule 3.2](#) at conclusion of text)

TIF Land Use Type	Maximum Development Impact Fees
Detached Dwelling Units	\$8,886/Unit
Attached Dwelling Units	\$4,799/Unit
Mobile Home Dwelling Units	\$5,156/Unit
Senior Only Apartment Units	\$822/Unit
Commercial Lodging (keyed) Units	\$978/Unit
Commercial Uses	\$40.167/Unit
Office Uses	\$20.478/S.F.
Ind./Manufacturing Uses	\$10.751/S.F.
Private Institutional Uses	\$29.404/S.F.

FORMAT OF THIS REPORT

The following chapter of this Report contains the detailed information relative to the calculation of the Transportation (Streets, Signals, Bridges, Intelligent Transportation System and Planning Studies) TIFs recommended by RCS for the City. There is an appropriate textual nexus explanation contained in that specific chapter along with the five required findings per §66000 of the California Government Code. The transportation infrastructure chapter is listed along with four appendices, one of which contains a summary of TIF recommendations.

[CHAPTER 3](#) - Transportation (Streets, Signals, Bridges, Intelligent Transportation System and Planning Documents) Facilities

[APPENDIX A](#) - Summary of Maximum Adoptable Fees.

[APPENDIX B](#) - Expanded Land-use Database (LUDB)

[APPENDIX C](#) - Findings in Support of Continuation of City Policy to Impose Residential Transportation Impact Fees on a per Unit Basis

[APPENDIX D](#) - Accessory Dwelling Unit Cost Calculation Explanation

NOTE REGARDING TEXTUAL MATHEMATICS: It is important to note that the use of a computer provides for calculations to a large number extending over a large number of decimal points. Such data, when included in text and supporting textual tables, has often been rounded to usually no more than two or three decimals for clarity and thus may not be replicated to the necessary degree of accuracy as the spreadsheet schedules at the end of each chapter. If questions arise between the tables and schedules, the schedules at the end of each chapter will prevail as the more accurate. The schedules at the end of the Chapter are instructive to the recommendation. The tables within the chapters are text summaries of the schedules at the end of the chapter and are illustrative.

END OF CHAPTER TWO TEXT

Chapter 3

Transportation (Streets, Signals, Bridges, ITS And Planning Documents) System

The following Chapter will discuss the Transportation System capital improvements consisting of major street segments, traffic signals, bridges, intelligent transportation system (henceforth ITS) and planning documents required for the City through build-out of the existing City General Plan as identified in the Land Use Database Table in [Chapter 2](#). Initially, RCS recommends continuation of the current calculation of a comprehensive TIF schedule covering all components of the transportation system within the City's General Plan area. The reasons are practical in that combining these infrastructure components will provide greater flexibility in establishing priorities in what is essentially a singular transportation issue with a common nexus, a combination of peak-hour trip-end⁽¹⁾ generation with average trip distance.

The Existing System. The City currently has and maintains an extensive system of roadways available for transportation of goods and services, as well as for other purposes. Streets that fall under the jurisdiction of the City of Yorba Linda are classified as one of the following major roadways for the purposes of this Report and are defined in the Yorba Linda General Plan Circulation Element. The following is an excerpt of that Element and generally comprises of pages CR-2 through CR-5 of the General Plan, Circulation Element.

City of Yorba Linda Functional Roadway Classification System

The City of Yorba Linda's transportation network serves two distinct and equally important functions: it provides access to adjacent land uses, and it facilitates the movement of persons and goods to and from, within and through the City. The design and operation of each street is determined by the importance placed on each of these functions. Streets that have a mobility and/or regional access function will typically have more lanes, higher speed limits and fewer driveways. Where direct access to properties is required, streets will generally have fewer lanes, lower speeds, on-street parking, and more frequent driveways to serve abutting properties. To define the intended uses of roadways, many jurisdictions, including the City of Yorba Linda, use a functional roadway classification system. The system provides a framework for the design and operation of the roadway system and helps identify preferred characteristics of each street. In the General Plan, the City of Yorba Linda's Circulation Element employs a functional classification system consistent with classification systems used throughout Orange County. It includes the following street classifications. It states:

¹ A *trip* is defined as a series of one or more trip-ends. A trip-end is a single stop in a trip. As an example, a drive from home to work is a trip. Each individual stop along the way along the way to drop children off at a school, buy gas, get a lunch, drop off laundry and the ultimate arrival at work or home is a trip-end. The term *trip* has no effect on the calculation and only means a *drive*.

- Smart Street
- Major
- Primary
- Secondary
- Collector

Typical cross sections for roadways in the City are presented in *Exhibit CR-1: Typical Roadway Cross-Sections*. The existing functional classifications for the arterial roadways in the City of Yorba Linda are presented on *Exhibit CR-2: Existing Roadway Functional Classification*.

Smart Street

Smart Streets are arterials with enhanced traffic-carrying capacity. Increases in capacity are achieved by a variety of measures, including, but not limited to:

- Preferential and acceptably maintained traffic signal timing and synchronization;
- Prohibition of on-street parking;
- Intersection grade separations of critical through and/or turn movements;
- Addition of at-grade through or turn lanes at intersections;
- Access limitation to right turns only, or no access (street and/or driveways);
- Access consolidation;
- Frontage roads;
- Pedestrian grade separations; and
- Other elements that may be documented to be useful.

The intent of these measures is to minimize conflicts with cross traffic. These measures improve traffic carrying capacity and facilitate improved traffic flow along an arterial. This designation is intended to represent a roadway of a Primary, Major, or a Principal arterial classification.

In the City of Yorba Linda, Imperial Highway is a Smart Street with six-lanes from the west City limit to Yorba Linda Boulevard, and four-lanes from Yorba Linda Boulevard to the south City limit.

Major Arterial

A Major Arterial is a six-lane divided roadway, with 84 to 106 feet of curb-to-curb width within 100 to 120 feet of ROW. The optimal ROW width for a six-lane Major arterial would be 120 feet, but where full ROW is not available; the six-lane cross section could be accommodated within less ROW (Modified Major). A minimum ROW of 100 feet is considered appropriate where it is not feasible to obtain the desired ROW width of 120 feet. Major arterials are designated with Yorba Linda

General Plan Page CR-4 Adopted Oct 2016 emphasis for automobile, goods movement, and/or transit, and may carry a component of regional through traffic not handled by the freeway system.

A Major arterial would typically consist of three through lanes in each direction, with one or two left- turn lanes and a dedicated right-turn lane at intersections. Major arterials in the City of Yorba Linda consist of:

- Yorba Linda Boulevard: from Rose Drive to Fairmont Boulevard
- Fairmont Boulevard: from Village Center Drive South to Esperanza Road
- Esperanza Road from City limit to Fairmont Boulevard
- Yorba Linda Boulevard: from State Route 91 north to the City boundary

Primary Arterial

A Primary Arterial is a four-lane divided roadway, with 64 to 84 feet of curb-to-curb width within 80 to 100 feet of ROW. The ROW width for a Primary arterial would be 100 feet, but where necessary, the four-lane cross section could be accommodated within less ROW (Modified Primary). A minimum ROW of 80 feet is considered appropriate where it is not feasible to obtain the desired ROW width of 100 feet. Primary arterials are designated with emphasis for automobile, goods movement, transit and bicycle, and may function similarly to Major arterials, with the primary difference being vehicle capacity. Typically, Major arterials are expected to carry more vehicles than Primary arterials.

Primary arterial would typically consist of two through lanes in each direction, with a left-turn lane, and may include a dedicated right-turn lane at intersections. Primary arterials in the City of Yorba Linda consist of:

- Yorba Linda Boulevard: from Fairmont Boulevard to Esperanza Road
- Lakeview Avenue: from Yorba Linda Boulevard to south of southern City limit
- Fairmont Boulevard: from Village Center Drive N to Village Center Drive S
- Bastanchury Road from City limit to Fairmont Boulevard
- Rose Drive from north City limit to Imperial Highway
- Esperanza Road from Fairmont Boulevard to Yorba Linda Boulevard
- La Palma Boulevard from Yorba Linda Boulevard to Gypsum Canyon Road
- Savi Ranch Parkway from Yorba Linda Boulevard to Old Canal Road

Secondary Arterial

A Secondary Arterial is a four-lane undivided roadway, with 64 feet of curb-to-curb width within 80 feet of ROW. Secondary arterials are designated with emphasis for automobiles and bicycles, and often provide a collector function, distributing traffic between local streets and Major and Primary arterials. Although some Secondary arterials may also serve as through routes, most provide more direct access to surrounding land uses.

A Secondary Arterial would typically consist of two travel lanes in each direction, with a left-turn lane at intersections. Secondary arterials in the City of Yorba Linda consist of:

- Buena Vista Avenue: from western City limit to Lakeview Avenue
- Valley View Avenue: from Yorba Linda Boulevard to Valleyview Circle
- Richfield Road: from Yorba Linda Boulevard to southern City limit
- Lakeview Avenue: from Yorba Linda Boulevard to Valleyview Avenue
- Kellogg Drive: from Yorba Linda Boulevard to Imperial Highway
- Village Center Drive: from Fairmont Boulevard N to Fairmont Boulevard S
- Yorba Ranch Road: from Yorba Linda Boulevard to Esperanza Road
- Paseo de las Palomas: from Fairmont Blvd. to Yorba Linda Blvd.

Collector Arterial

A Collector is a two-lane undivided roadway, with 40 feet of curb-to-curb width within 60 feet of ROW. Collector streets would typically consist of one avenue lane in each direction and a parking lane or bike lane on each side. Collectors carry traffic from the neighborhoods to the higher classification street system. An Enhanced Collector would serve the same function as a Collector but would also have a center median.

The last category of street segments within the City are referred to as *local streets*. In general, construction of *local streets* would be the responsibility of the developer who then dedicates the completed street to the City. The City will accept these local street improvements and the responsibility to maintain them in perpetuity assuming they meet City's requirements. For these reasons and the fact that local streets do not exhibit City-wide benefits to all transportation system users, the cost of all *local streets* are not included in the Transportation System financial commitment calculation or the proportionality test.

GENERAL CITY TIF SCHEDULE

Demand Upon Infrastructure Created by the Development of Undeveloped Parcels. Undeveloped parcels create few trip-ends beyond an occasional visit to the site for weed abatement purposes, planning purposes or to consider a sale or development of the vacant parcel. None of these trip-ends are on a routine basis. However, a developed parcel will generate a statistically predictable amount of trip-ends and peak-hour trip-miles, depending upon the specific land use of the

development. Thus it can be stated that a vacant parcel, when developed into a specific use, i.e., residential or business, will generate more traffic than it did when it was vacant. Similarly, a change in the use of the property may increase or decrease the number of trip-ends, i.e., the demolition of a low trip-generating insurance office into reconstruction as a new a high trip generating fast-food restaurant.

All new development contributes to cumulative traffic impacts, which are difficult to measure and mitigate on a project-by-project basis but which have significant and widespread cumulative impacts on the City's existing road system. Factors that will increase the competition for existing major street segment lane miles existing in the City include the following:

- The construction of just over 1.9 million square feet of private business uses on under or undeveloped acres will generate 8,240 additional daily peak-hour trip-miles at General Plan build-out. This figure could vary significantly depending upon the type of commercial uses constructed and possible zoning changes or conditional use permits issued.
- An increase in demand from residential construction of approximately 1,788 additional dwelling units within the City's limits contributing approximately 3,386 new daily peak-hour trip-miles.
- The combined 420 anticipated detached dwellings within the City's transportation system dependent sphere of influence areas will generate about 1,361 daily peak-hour trip-miles. These two developments have no alternative routes available and thus these residents are dependent upon the City's street system.
- A reduction of about 122 commercial lodging units is anticipated by General Plan build-out that will reduce traffic demands by about 174 daily peak-hour trip-miles daily. This reduction will be offset by whatever land-use replaces the commercial lodging units. The developer that replaces the demolished commercial lodging business will receive a credit for those reduced peak-hour trip-miles due to the elimination of the existing lodging units. In short the developer transitioning from the commercial lodging units to whatever use is to come would have TIFs imposed on only the delta between the new TIF and the credit identified in this Report for the removed or demolished units. A potential credit against any new fees would be the case for any demolished building replaced with a new one. No TIF refunds can be made regardless of decreased demands from changing from one land-use to another.

When all (or most) of the available vacant land within the City's sphere is developed, the City can expect an additional 12,812 daily peak-hour trip-miles. For perspective, the City currently experiences an estimated 159,304 daily peak-hour trip-miles from/to the existing residences and businesses for a total at General Plan build-out demand of 172,116 annual peak-hour trip-miles.

Finding #1, Delineation of the Purpose of the Fee. - In the City, most of the planned arterials and collectors exist in some form, perhaps not yet fully widened to allow for the maximum number of lane miles. Stated another way, there are few opportunities to construct any completely new

arterial/collector lane miles. Thus the collection of Transportation System TIF receipts becomes imperative as a revenue source to finish off any existing, but limited or incomplete, or not yet maximized roads. Additionally, the fees would be used to complete the system of signals that insures the smooth movement of vehicles through intersections. Efficient signalization (i.e. turn pockets and fully actuated left-turn signals) are also important to keep vehicular traffic moving at the optimum efficiency through major intersections. Included are the transportation projects needed to alter existing arterials, connectors or collectors that currently exist to create additional capacity, but due to additional peak-hour trip-ends are becoming less effective at moving goods, services and residents in a timely manner.

The importance of traffic signals is two-fold. First, the City can build only so many major collector/arterial streets and there are limits as to how many extra lanes they will have. Second, north-south collectors will, by definition, intersect with east-west collectors assuring that *someone* will have to stop, either at a stop sign or a traffic signal. The traffic carrying capacity of each collector can only be maximized by assuring the orderly flow of traffic by signaling those intersecting arterials and collectors. There are several traffic signal improvement projects and ITS signal interconnect projects included in the City's TIF calculation that will maximize traffic flows through intersections.

The collection of Transportation System Impact Fees is not intended to eliminate the existing practice of the developer constructing the full width roadway and being reimbursed for the portion of costs greater than would otherwise be required of the developer in the calculated simple impact fee amount. This impact fee calculation and resulting fee collection would simply improve the City's capability for such reimbursements.

Finding #2, Determination of the Use of the Fee. The collection of TIF schedule receipts would be used to construct the projects (or portions of projects) identified in [Schedule 3.1](#) at the conclusion of this Chapter's text. The collected fees will be used to create traffic signals, major street segment additions, and roadway reconfigurations with which to accommodate the additional daily peak-hour trip-miles expected from further development near (or through) the City.

ST-001, Arroyo Cajon Drive – Kellogg Drive to Foxfield Lane. Construct sidewalks and wheelchair access/egress ramps along Arroyo Cajon Drive. There is no possibility of adding lanes along this street segment however the existing lane carrying capacity can be maximized with these minor improvements.

ST-002, Avocado Avenue N/S – Avocado E/W to Yorba Linda Boulevard. Construct sidewalks and wheelchair ramps and access/egress median islands along Avocado Avenue. There is no possibility of adding lanes along this street segment, however the existing lane carrying capacity can be maximized with these minor improvements.

ST-003, Bastanchury Road – Fairmont Boulevard to Village Center Drive. Construct improvements to widen the street segment to its ultimate width. Reconstruct the median to accommodate restriping from two to four lanes. Project includes some right-of-way costs.

ST-004, Buena Vista Avenue – Imperial Highway to Grandview Avenue. Widen the traffic lanes within this segment. Proposed sidewalk improvements will allow for pedestrians to be located outside of travel way thereby improving vehicular passage for LOS improvement. The project will require approximately 5,725 square foot of ROW, assuming a 60' ROW.

ST-005, Buena Vista Avenue – Richfield Road to Imperial Highway. Construct full improvements necessary from two to four lanes and installation of sidewalk. The project estimate includes the acquisition of approximately 42,240 square foot of ROW needed at an 80' ROW.

ST-006, Casa Loma Avenue – Richfield Road to La Entrada Dr. Improvements for this street segment includes minor pavement additions and sidewalk gap closures that will allow for pedestrians to be located outside of travel way thereby improving vehicular passage for LOS improvement.

ST-007, El Cajon Avenue – Prospect Avenue to Valley View Avenue. Project improvements consist of minor pavement additions and sidewalk gap closures that will allow for pedestrians to be located outside of travel way thereby improving vehicular passage for LOS improvement.

ST-008, Esperanza Road – West City Limits to Fairmont Boulevard. Construct improvements for these four to six lane segments. Sidewalk improvements will be limited to the north side of the street segment.

ST-009, Eureka Avenue – Bastanchury Road to Yorba Linda Boulevard Construct east-side sidewalk and pavement improvements from Bastanchury to Mark Lane and west-side sidewalk and pavement improvements between La Entrada and Oak Leaf. Proposed sidewalk improvements will allow for pedestrians to be located outside of travel way thereby improving vehicular passage for LOS improvement. ROW acquisition is not included nor required. Improvements vary along this area.

ST-010, Highland Avenue – Buena Visa Avenue to Mariposa Avenue. Improvements consist of pavement widening on west side and sidewalks on both the east and west side. Proposed sidewalk improvements will allow for pedestrians to be located outside of travel way thereby improving vehicular passage for LOS improvement. Costs include relocation of the power poles along east side. ROW acquisition is not included nor required.

ST-011, La Palma Avenue – Lomas De Yorba to Corbit Place. Construct sidewalk along north side of La Palma. Proposed sidewalk improvements will allow for pedestrians to be located outside of travel way thereby improving vehicular passage for LOS improvement. No ROW is required.

ST-012, Lakeview Avenue – Lemon Drive to Oriente Drive. Project includes widening of this street segment to its ultimate width per the Circulation Element. It includes removal or relocation of the existing power poles as well as construction of curb, gutter, sidewalks, and driveways and roadway striping.

ST-013, Ohio Street – J & J Lane to Yorba Linda Boulevard. Project is limited to the roadway widening per transportation element, striping, sidewalk, ADA ramps, and grading. Proposed sidewalk improvements will allow for pedestrians to be located outside of travel way thereby improving vehicular passage for LOS improvement.

ST-014, Ohio Street – Yorba Linda Boulevard to Mountain View Avenue. The project consists of pavement widening, sidewalk improvements and relocation of the power poles on east-side. Proposed sidewalk improvements will allow for pedestrians to be located outside of travel way thereby improving vehicular passage for LOS improvement. There are ROW acquisition needs of 13,280 square feet.

ST-015, Oriente Drive – Lakeview Avenue to Palm Avenue. Lane widening and sidewalk improvements that will also require ROW acquisition. Proposed sidewalk improvements will allow for pedestrians to be located outside of travel way thereby improving vehicular passage for LOS improvement.

ST-016, Palm Avenue – Via Del Cabillo to Yorba Linda Avenue. The project consists of pavement widening and sidewalk improvements with the relocation of power poles on east side. Proposed sidewalk improvements will allow for pedestrians to be located outside of travel way thereby improving vehicular passage for LOS improvement.

ST-017, Plumosa Drive – Bastanchury Road to Cari Lane. The project is limited to construction of sidewalk and wheelchair access/egress ramps on this street segment. Proposed sidewalk improvements will allow for pedestrians to be located outside of travel way thereby improving vehicular passage for LOS improvement.

ST-018, Prospect Avenue – Imperial Highway to Hillcrest Drive. The project consists mainly of sidewalk and wheelchair ramps along Prospect Avenue and elimination of the various sidewalk gaps along this street segment. Proposed sidewalk improvements will allow for pedestrians to be located outside of travel way thereby improving vehicular passage for LOS improvement.

ST-019, Richfield Road – 250 S/O Page Court to Buena Vista Avenue. Project includes roadway widening per Circulation Element, striping, sidewalk, ADA ramps, and grading.

ST-020, Rose Drive – Blake Road to Wabash Avenue. Improvements for two to four lanes from Wabash to Blake Road Sidewalk improvements 200' south of Promenade to 100' south of Wabash on west side of the street. Relocate the power poles along east-side. There is the need for ROW in the amount of 13,350 square feet (northerly segment).

ST-021, Savi Ranch Parkway – Yorba Linda Boulevard to Mirage Street. The project adds a left turn pocket at the Savi Ranch Parkway/Yorba Linda intersection and implements modifications that improve circulation on Savi Ranch Parkway between Yorba Linda Boulevard and Mirage Street.

ST-022, Valley View Avenue – Imperial Highway to Yorba Linda Boulevard. The project is limited to restriping from two lanes to four lanes.

ST-023, Yorba Linda Boulevard – Lakeview Avenue to Imperial Highway. The project consists of major Intersection improvements, left-turn pocket improvements and a right turn pocket at eastbound Imperial to southbound Lakeview Avenue. Project costs include for the acquisition of roughly \$1.6 million in required ROW.

ST-024, Yorba Linda Boulevard – Santa Ana Canyon to La Palma Avenue. The project includes the expansion of the Yorba Linda Bridge over the Santa Ana River to allow for additional lane capacity and pedestrian improvements. Other improvements include capacity increases for turn pockets on Yorba Linda Boulevard. The project also include improvements in the Anaheim city limits along with their funding participation.

ST-025, Traffic Signal – Fairmont at Avenida Del Rey. Construct operational traffic signal improvements to the T intersection of Fairmont Avenue at Avenida Del Rey. The project consists of the construction of a three-way traffic signal and, as necessary, minor intersection modifications. This project has been identified as necessary to maintain the existing LOS at General Plan build-out.

ST-026, Traffic Signal – Imperial Highway at Yorba Linda Boulevard. Construct operational traffic signal modifications/improvements to the intersection of Imperial Highway at Yorba Linda Boulevard including the construction of an additional left turn lane on Yorba Linda Boulevard. This project has been identified as necessary to maintain the existing LOS at General Plan build-out.

ST-027, Traffic Signal – Lakeview Avenue at Buena Vista Drive. All proposed street improvements and right-of-way (ROW) acquisitions are intended to address existing visibility deficiencies specifically those caused by the alignment of Lakeview Avenue and the significant grade differential on Buena Vista Avenue and to support the installation of a traffic control measure, such as a traffic signal or a roundabout. This project has been identified as necessary to maintain the existing LOS at General Plan build-out.

ST-028, Traffic Signal – Lakeview Avenue at Oriente Drive. Construct operational traffic signal improvements to the intersection of Lakeview Avenue at Oriente Drive. The project consists of the construction of a four-way, fully actuated traffic signal, with left turn pockets and, as necessary, minor intersection modifications. This project has been identified as necessary to maintain the existing LOS at General Plan build-out.

ST-029, Traffic Signal – Lakeview Avenue at Yorba Linda Boulevard. Construct operational traffic signal modifications to the intersection of Lakeview Avenue at Yorba Linda Boulevard and construct an additional left hand turn lane on Yorba Linda Boulevard. This project has been identified as necessary to maintain the existing LOS at General Plan build-out.

ST-030, Traffic Signal – Prospect Avenue at Imperial Highway. Construct operational traffic signal modifications to the intersection of Prospect Avenue at Imperial Highway. The project includes construction of a protected left turn phase for Prospect Avenue. This project has been identified as necessary to maintain the existing LOS at General Plan build-out.

Chapter 3 Transportation (Streets, Signals, Bridges, ITS and Documents) Facilities

ST-031, Traffic Signal – Van Buren Street at Buena Vista Avenue. Construct operational traffic signal improvements to the intersection of Van Buren Street at Buena Vista Avenue. The project consists of the construction of a four-way, fully actuated traffic signal, with left turn pockets and, as necessary, minor intersection modifications. This project has been identified as necessary to maintain the existing LOS at General Plan build-out.

ST-032, ITS Bastanchury Road Interconnect. This project along Bastanchury Road consists of electronic interconnect or wireless communication improvements that will allow for real time alteration of signal timing plans in order reduce congestion, handle varying traffic conditions and improve road safety. It will also allow for reliable and redundant communication to traffic signals.

ST-033, Fairmont Boulevard Interconnect. This project along Fairmount Boulevard consists of electronic interconnect or wireless communication improvements that will allow for real time alteration of signal timing plans in order reduce congestion, handle varying traffic conditions and improve road safety. It will also allow for reliable and redundant communication to traffic signals.

ST-034, Kellogg Drive Interconnect. This project along Kellogg Drive consists of electronic interconnect or wireless communication improvements that will allow for real time alteration of signal timing plans in order reduce congestion, handle varying traffic conditions and improve road safety. It will also allow for reliable and redundant communication to traffic signals.

ST-035, La Palma Avenue Interconnect. This project along La Palma Avenue consists of electronic interconnect or wireless communication improvements that will allow for real time alteration of signal timing plans in order reduce congestion, handle varying traffic conditions and improve road safety. It will also allow for reliable and redundant communication to traffic signals.

ST-036, Lakeview Avenue Interconnect. This project along Lakeview Avenue consists of electronic interconnect or wireless communication improvements that will allow for real time alteration of signal timing plans in order reduce congestion, handle varying traffic conditions and improve road safety. It will also allow for reliable and redundant communication to traffic signals.

ST-037, ITS Traffic Management Center Expansion. Construct improvements to the *Intelligent Transportation System Control and Operations Center* that will increase the City's on-site signal timing plans and traffic management plans can be quickly and efficiently implemented in order to reduce congestion, handle varying traffic conditions and improve safety.

ST-038, Orangethorpe/Esperanza RTSSP. The projects consists of traffic signal timing adjustments consistent with the requirements of the *Regional Traffic Signal Synchronization Program (RTSSP)* for the Orangethorpe/Esperanza Street segments though Yorba Linda. These roads have significant importance to numerous contiguous public agencies.

ST-039, Tustin/Rose RTSSP. The project consists of traffic signal timing adjustments consistent with the requirements of the *Regional Traffic Signal Synchronization Program (RTSSP)* for the Tustin/Rose Street segments though Yorba Linda. These roads have significant importance to numerous contiguous public agencies.

Chapter 3 Transportation (Streets, Signals, Bridges, ITS and Documents) Facilities

ST-040, Yorba Linda/Weir Canyon RTSSP. The project consists of traffic signal timing adjustments consistent with the requirements of the *Regional Traffic Signal Synchronization Program (RTSSP)* for the Yorba Linda/Weir Canyon Street segments through Yorba Linda. These segments have significant importance to contiguous public agencies and thus coordination/consistency of the ITS improvements required along this segment must be consistent.

ST-041, ATP Study and Trail Master Plan. Update the City's *Active Transportation Plan* and the *Tails Master Plan*.

ST-042, ITS Master Plan Update. Update the *Intelligent Transportation System Master Plan* of specific improvements with recommendations for optimum timing of segment ITS improvements.

ST-043, TIF Updates. Update the City's TIF Calculation and Nexus reports on a more frequent basis.

ST-044, LRSP Update. Update the City's *Local Road Safety Plan*.

Finding #3 – Determination of the Relationship between the Need for the Fee and the Type of Development Project. Schedule 5.1 identifies the additional traffic to be generated by new development, by type of development. The technical volume, *Trip Generation (Manual)* 11th Edition, produced by the Institute of Traffic Engineers, has been used to identify the *nexus*, or relationship between the type of development and the projected number of trips that development will generate.

Transportation System Cost Distribution by Average Land-use Trip Frequency/Distance

New Trip Adjustment for *Pass-by* or *Diverted* Trips. [Schedule 3.2](#) contains a sub-schedule that identifies adjustments to new total **trip-ends**. As an example, an acre of commercial uses would be expected, on average, to generate about 136.9 peak-hour trip-ends daily. However, approximately 15% of those trip-ends, or about 20.5 peak-hour trip-ends per day, are **pass-by trip-ends**. The **trip-end** is not truly an **end** but is actually one in a series of **ends**, i.e. at various commercial establishments, with a different location such as a residence as the final **trip-end** or destination of the series of **trip-ends**. In order to be considered a pass-by trip, the location of the stop must be contiguous to the **generator** route ⁽²⁾, i.e. the route that would have been used even if the temporary stop had not been made. The Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) indicates that:

Thus when forecasted trips based upon the trip generation rates are distributed to the adjacent streets, some reduction is made to account for those trips already there that will be attracted to the proposed development.⁽³⁾

² An example of a diverted trip-end would be a single trip-end where along the way from work, a motorists evening drive deviates from the normal route taken home at perhaps a preferred grocery store, mail drop, or to pick up a child from a piano lesson before continuing home. Each of these three stops would be considered *diverted* trip-ends.

³ Trip Generation, Institute of Transportation Engineers, 1099 14th Street, Suite 300 West, Washington D.C. 20005-3438. Definition of terms.

A *diverted* trip is similar to a *pass-by* trip-end in that it is an extra stop between, as an example, a motorists' work site and their residence. The *diverted* trip differs slightly from the *pass-by* trip in that it requires a minor deviation from the normal **generator** route and the temporary stop. In short, a *diverted* trip creates a separate side trip using additional (and different) lane miles from that of the normal route from the motorist's place of employment and his or her residence.⁽⁶⁾ Using our example of one acre of general retail/service/office uses, roughly 1,499 of the expected trips would involve a diversion to that basic planned trip. We could expect these trips to increase the traffic volume off of the generator route, but only for brief distances. The ITE states that diverted trips: are produced from traffic volume on roadways within the vicinity of the generator (route) and require a diversion from that roadway to another roadway with access to the site. These roadways could include streets or freeways adjacent to the generator but without access to the generator.⁽⁴⁾

These *diverted* trips will be adjusted (reduced at 50%) from the full trip count for each of the land-uses identified in [Chapter 2](#).

Again, the sub-schedule at the bottom of [Schedule 3.2](#) indicates the total trip-ends and the reduction due to the number pass-by trips (at 100%) and diverted trips (at 100%). The trip pass-by and diversion percentages were generated and are supported by a study conducted by the San Diego Association of Governments (SANDAG) in conjunction with various U.S. and California government agencies ⁽⁵⁾.

Additionally, the same SANDAG data schedule referenced above provides information for a trip distance factor component to the nexus. Based upon that data, a trip to an industrial work-site has the greatest distance at 9.0 miles. A trip to an office average 8.8 miles, residential trips average 7.9 miles, a trip from a hotel or motel (once in residence) average 7.6 miles, and an average trip to a retail/service site is the shortest at 4.3 miles. This indicates that drivers generally appear willing to travel further distances to work and for treatment at medical offices than they are to shop. Both frequency (trip-ends) and distance (average/typical miles per trip) have been combined into the nexus by multiplying the average trip frequency by average trip distance. Trip-mile rates have been calculated for the nine TIF land-use categories. They are demonstrated at the bottom of [Schedule 3.2](#) at the end of the Chapter.

⁴ Institute of Transportation Engineers, 1099 14th Street NW, Suite 300 west, Washington D.C. 2005-3438, Definition of Terms.

⁵ *Traffic Generators*, San Diego Association of Governments, 401 B Street, Suite 800, San Diego, CA 92101. Brief Guide to Traffic Generators Rates. Compiled in conjunction with the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development. U.S. Department of Transportation, The California Department of Transportation and the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, 2002.

Finding #4, Determination of the Relationship Between the Need for the Facility and the Type of Project - Private development will generate additional peak trip-miles based upon the demand of that land use and the number of units in either dwelling units or business square feet. All of the projects identified on [Schedule 3.1](#) (and described within this Chapter) are intended to mitigate the additional transportation needs/demands of that new development. The fee collected will be based on the projected number of trip-ends the proposed development will generate in relationship to the total 151,510 projected peak-hour trip-miles at build-out. Any amount imposed as a Transportation System TIF will be placed in a separate fund (collecting interest) and is to be used only on the projects identified on [Schedule 3.1](#) as development-related. The collected TIF receipts can only be used per [Schedule 3.1](#).

Credits Against a Developers TIFs for Construction of Improvements on [Schedule 3.1](#) as a Condition of Approval. From time to time the City may require an applicant for a private project to construct a street or signal improvement (or portion thereof) that is on the list of required improvements at the end of this Chapter ([Schedule 3.1](#)). This method is often undertaken to expedite the project at the request of the applicant/developer. The developer should receive a credit for any monies expended on any required improvement listed on [Schedule 3.1](#) (as development-generated) against their Transportation System TIF calculation.

Finding #5, Determination of the Relationship Between the Amount of the Fee and the Cost of the Portion of the Facility Attributed to the Specific Development Project - The calculation of the Transportation System TIFs is based upon the recognition that differing types of developments generate differing amounts of peak-hour trip-miles. The fee is based upon the projected number of trip-miles generated by the proposed private development project. TIF receipts will be accumulated until they reach the amount that could construct a meaningful project to alleviate or mitigate the demands of those new developments. [Table 3-1](#) (summarized from [Schedule 3.2](#)) on the following page identifies the Minimum Needs-based Transportation System TIF schedule for the City of Yorba Linda's General Plan area.

**Table 3-1
City of Yorba Linda’s General Plan Area
Minimum Needs-based Transportation System
Development Impact Costs
By TIF Land-use Type**

TIF Land-use Type	Allocation of Development Costs	Development Impact Cost Per Unit or Square Foot
Detached Dwelling Units	\$5,606,065	\$8,886/Unit
Attached Dwelling Units	\$7,372,359	\$4,799/Unit
Mobil Home Dwelling Units	\$5,156	\$5,156/Unit
Senior Only Apartment Units	\$32,912	\$822/Unit
Commercial Lodging (Keyed) Units	-\$477,229	\$978/Unit
Commercial Uses (Square Foot)	\$1,535,908	\$40.167/S.F.
Office Uses (Square Foot)	\$345,579	\$20.478/S.F.
Ind./Manufacturing Uses (Square Foot	\$19,437,466	\$10.751/S.F.
Private Institutional Uses (Square Foot)	\$1,280,838	\$29.404/S.F.

This schedule of proposed TIFs would generate the Minimum Needs amount of revenue necessary to construct the needed street, signal, and roadway reconfiguration projects. These figures then need to be compared to the financial commitment demonstrated by the existing community.

AB-602, Chaptered within the General Mitigation Fee Act requires the City to adopt residential dwelling TIFs on a per-square foot basis, unless certain findings are made. Appendix C outlines the methodology used to determine the residential dwelling unit (detached dwelling unit, attached dwelling unit, and mobile home units) average square footage. They are as follows:

**Table 3-2
Summary of Average Residential Dwelling Square Feet**

Land Use Designation	Average Dwelling Size
Detached Dwelling Units	2,800 S.F.
Attached Dwelling Units	1,000 S.F.
Mobile Home Units	1,300 S.F.

When the residential per-dwelling unit TIFs from [Table 3-1](#) (from [Schedule 3.2](#)) are divided by the average residential dwelling sizes in [Table 3-2](#) previous, the following per-square foot residential TIF costs are derived. They are as follows:

**Table 3-3
Average Residential Dwelling TIF Cost per Square Foot**

Land Use Designation	TIF per Unit	Average Dwelling Size	TIF per Square Foot
Detached Dwelling Units	\$8,886	2,800 S.F.	\$3.17
Attached Dwelling Units	\$4,799	1,000 S.F.	\$4.80
Mobile Home Units	\$5,156	1,300 S.F.	\$3.97

Alternative Business Cost Methodology. A more precise calculation of costs for specific types of land-uses (i.e., banks, hospitals, convalescent residences, etc.) can be determined by multiplying the average cost per daily peak-hour trip-end of \$2,742.69 by the applicable peak-hour daily trip-mile rate. An example of this calculation can be found at the bottom of [Schedule 3.2](#) and applied to [Table 3-2](#). This table lists trip rates and costs for various residential, industrial and commercial developments. A fee system based on a lengthy schedule of trip rates theoretically provides more accuracy and therefore financial commitment in determining specific uses' impact on the City's transportation system, but at the same time may increase the City's costs to administer the fee. A more extensive listing of traffic generators by land use is available in *Trip Generation* as published by the Institute of Transportation Engineers, New York, NY.

[Table 3-2](#) following, (and summarized from [Schedule 3.3](#)) identifies the assets of the City's existing transportation system (at current replacement costs). The total transportation system replacement cost of \$2,256,797,238 consists of the existing 67.07 miles of major transportation plan arterial and collector miles (or 213 lane miles) with \$155,877,150 invested in major roadways, ROW assets totaling \$1,799,989,488, sixty-two traffic signals, interconnections and intersection improvements at \$37,200,000 and major bridge structures investment at \$263,730,600. When these existing assets are distributed over the existing community, using the same nexus factor (e.g. peak-hour trip-miles) used for distribution of future costs, the existing community has contributed the following, on average, by land use:

Table 3-4
Existing Transportation System Community
Financial Commitment
Comparison Data

TIF Land-use Category	Allocation of Development Costs	Development Impact Cost Per Unit or Square Foot
Detached Dwelling Units	\$874,348,847	\$49,925/Unit
Attached Dwelling Units	\$137,203,593	\$24,793/Unit
Mobile Home Dwelling Units	\$5,652,457	\$4,392/Unit
Senior Only Apartment Units	\$2,634,989	\$20,225/Unit
Commercial Lodging (Keyed) Units	\$4,632,481	\$20,225/Unit
Commercial Uses (Square Foot)	\$399,115,833	\$207.406/S.F.
Office Uses (Square Foot)	\$116,109,515	\$105.971/S.F.
Ind./Manufacturing Uses (Square Foot)	\$140,461,913	\$55,535/S.F.
Private Institutional Uses (Square Foot)	\$576.637,591	\$152.009/S.F.

It should be noted that the existing community has contributed, on average, significantly more than would be required of future development to meet the minimum needs for build-out and all users. This is not to imply that each dwelling unit or business square foot has equally contributed this amount, only that on a whole the existing community has done so. While there is likely some excess capacity in the existing transportation system, it is usually the result of the existing community absorbing the initial street construction costs including the costly ROW acquisition, the later part of the community often finances only the smaller segment length widening's and the final traffic signals which maximize the capacity of each street segment.

Recommended Transportation System TIF Schedule. The adoption of [Schedule 3.2](#) at the end of the chapter (and as summarized in [Table 3-1](#)), as the Transportation System Schedule would generate enough capital to construct the facilities needed by the new development. In addition, the City should adopt the application of the *per peak-hour trip-mile fee* from the bottom of [Schedule 3.2](#) and multiplied by the specific use in [Table 3-2](#) or the more extensive listing of traffic generation by land use available in *Trip Generation* as published by the Institute of Transportation Engineers, New York, N.Y.

Construction Responsibility vs. TIF Payment. This TIF calculation assumes that each developer, contiguous to a planned Major Street, would:

- Dedicate needed ROW and would be responsible for last lane of asphalt concrete or PCC;
- Construct the parkway landscaping; and,
- Construct the curb, gutter, sidewalk, striping and street lights.

However, construction of the extra lanes would be financed by the Transportation System TIF, contributed to by all development within the City limits, thereby leveling the playing field between privately held parcels contiguous to a four lane collector as opposed to those privately held parcels contiguous to a two lane minor arterial. A given developer may undertake the actual construction of the *extra* lanes at the same time that they construct the *first* lane, but they would receive a reimbursement for construction of those *extra* lanes. However, it is important to note that if the developer constructs all or a portion of a road, signal or other transportation system improvement, and that project is not listed on Schedule 5.1, that project is assumed to be a condition of approval and not subject to a reimbursement or credit from the City from this TIF Fund. In short, the City cannot give a credit for a project that is not partially financed through this calculation.

The City's TIF adoption ordinance should contain the necessary language for identifying the process for calculating the reimbursement amount for the construction of *extra* lanes.

RECAP OF RECOMMENDED TIFS

- **General City Residential-based TIFs** – The City could adopt [Table 3-3](#), or a portion thereof.
- **General City Business-based TIFs** – The City could adopt [Schedule 3.2](#), or a portion thereof, for most land-uses and the \$2,742.69 per trip-end rate calculated on [Schedule 3.2](#) to be used in conjunction with the most current edition of ITE manual (and the peak-hour trip frequency/length figures (via SANDAG) at the bottom of [Schedule 3.2](#)) as well as [Table 3-2](#) for unusual land-uses.

END OF CHAPTER TEXT

Schedule 3.1

City of Yorba Linda

2025-26 Development Impact Cost Calculation

Allocation of Project Cost Estimates

Transportation (Streets, Signals, Bridges, ITS and Planning Documents) Facilities

Line #	Estimated Cost	Construction Needs Supported by Other Resources or C of A		Infrastructure Needed to Accommodate Increased Development		
		Percent Need	Apportioned Dollar Cost	Percent Need	Apportioned Dollar Cost	
Street/Bridge Capacity Improvements						
ST-001	Arroyo Cajon Dr. - Kellogg Dr. to Foxfield Ln.	\$319,900	0.00%	\$0	100.00%	\$319,900
ST-002	Avocado Ave. N/S - Avocado Ave. E/W to Yorba Linda Blvd.	\$1,505,000	0.00%	\$0	100.00%	\$1,505,000
ST-003	Bastanchury Rd. - Fairmont Blvd. to Village Center Dr.	\$2,200,000	75.00%	\$1,650,000	25.00%	\$550,000
ST-004	Buena Vista Ave. - Imperial Hwy. to Grandview Ave.	\$1,017,800	75.00%	\$763,350	25.00%	\$254,450
ST-005	Buena Vista Ave. - Richfield Rd. to Imperial Hwy.	\$5,404,000	75.00%	\$4,053,000	25.00%	\$1,351,000
ST-006	Casa Loma Ave. - Richfield to La Entrada Dr.	\$56,200	0.00%	\$0	100.00%	\$56,200
ST-007	El Cajon Ave. - Prospect Ave. to Valley View Ave.	\$150,300	0.00%	\$0	100.00%	\$150,300
ST-008	Esperanza Rd. - West City Limits to Fairmont Blvd.	\$372,400	75.00%	\$279,300	25.00%	\$93,100
ST-009	Eureka Ave. - Bastanchury Rd. to Yorba Linda Blvd.	\$278,100	0.00%	\$0	100.00%	\$278,100
ST-010	Highland Ave. - Buena Vista Ave. to Mariposa Ave.	\$1,280,000	0.00%	\$0	100.00%	\$1,280,000
ST-011	La Palma Ave. - Lomas De Yorba E to Corbit Pl.	\$93,600	0.00%	\$0	100.00%	\$93,600
ST-012	Lakeview Ave. - Lemon Dr. to Oriente Dr.	\$1,326,055	75.00%	\$994,541	25.00%	\$331,514
ST-013	Ohio St. - J & J Ln. to Yorba Linda Blvd.	\$1,738,000	0.00%	\$0	100.00%	\$1,738,000
ST-014	Ohio St. - Yorba Linda Blvd. to Mountain View Ave.	\$2,076,400	0.00%	\$0	100.00%	\$2,076,400
ST-015	Oriente Dr. - Lakeview Ave. to Palm Ave.	\$4,505,920	0.00%	\$0	100.00%	\$4,505,920
ST-016	Palm Ave. Via Del Caballo to Yorba Linda Blvd.	\$1,097,000	0.00%	\$0	100.00%	\$1,097,000
ST-017	Plumosa Dr. - Bastanchury Rd. to Cari Ln.	\$74,000	0.00%	\$0	100.00%	\$74,000
ST-018	Prospect Ave. - Imperial Hwy to Hillcrest Cir.	\$243,200	0.00%	\$0	100.00%	\$243,200
ST-019	Richfield Rd. - 250' S/O Page Ct. to Buena Vista Ave.	\$1,488,111	75.00%	\$1,116,083	25.00%	\$372,028
ST-020	Rose Dr. - Blake Rd. to Wabash Ave.	\$1,600,600	75.00%	\$1,200,450	25.00%	\$400,150
ST-021	Savi Ranch Pkwy - Yorba Linda Blvd. to Mirage St.	\$4,280,000	75.00%	\$3,210,000	25.00%	\$1,070,000
ST-022	Valley View Ave. - Imperial Hwy to Yorba Linda Blvd.	\$41,000	0.00%	\$0	100.00%	\$41,000
ST-023	Yorba Linda Blvd. - Lakeview Ave. to Imperial Hwy	\$6,957,171	75.00%	\$5,217,878	25.00%	\$1,739,293
ST-024	Yorba Linda Blvd. - Santa Ana Canyon Rd. to La Palma Ave.	\$26,783,000	75.00%	\$20,087,250	25.00%	\$6,695,750
Traffic Signal/Intersection Improvements						
ST-025	TS - Fairmont Blvd. at Avenida Del Rey	\$400,000	0.00%	\$0	100.00%	\$400,000
ST-026	TS - Imperial Hwy at Yorba Linda Blvd.	\$500,000	75.00%	\$375,000	25.00%	\$125,000
ST-027	TS - Lakeview Ave. at Buena Vista Ave.	\$6,000,000	0.00%	\$0	100.00%	\$6,000,000
ST-028	TS - Lakeview Ave. at Oriente Dr.	\$400,000	75.00%	\$300,000	25.00%	\$100,000
ST-029	TS - Lakeview Ave. at Yorba Linda Blvd.	\$600,000	75.00%	\$450,000	25.00%	\$150,000
ST-030	TS - Prospect Ave. at Imperial Hwy	\$50,000	0.00%	\$0	100.00%	\$50,000
ST-031	TS - Van Buren St. at Buena Vista Ave.	\$500,000	0.00%	\$0	100.00%	\$500,000
Intelligent Transportation System Improvements (ITS)						
ST-032	ITS Bastanchury Rd. Interconnect	\$140,000	75.00%	\$105,000	25.00%	\$35,000
ST-033	ITS Fairmont Blvd. Interconnect	\$977,000	75.00%	\$732,750	25.00%	\$244,250
ST-034	ITS Kellogg Dr. Interconnect	\$158,000	75.00%	\$118,500	25.00%	\$39,500
ST-035	ITS La Palma Interconnect	\$634,000	75.00%	\$475,500	25.00%	\$158,500
ST-036	ITS Lakeview Ave. Interconnect	\$848,000	75.00%	\$636,000	25.00%	\$212,000
ST-037	ITS Traffic Management Center Expansion	\$600,000	75.00%	\$450,000	25.00%	\$150,000
ST-038	Orangethorpe/Esperanza RTSSP	\$70,000	80.00%	\$56,000	20.00%	\$14,000
ST-039	Tustin/Rose RTSSP	\$129,000	80.00%	\$103,200	20.00%	\$25,800
ST-040	Yorba Linda Blvd./Weir Canyon RTSSP	\$860,500	80.00%	\$688,400	20.00%	\$172,100
Master Plans and Other Circulation-based Documents						
ST-041	ATP Study and Trail Master Plan	\$47,000	0.00%	\$0	100.00%	\$47,000
ST-042	ITS Master Plan	\$200,000	0.00%	\$0	100.00%	\$200,000
ST-043	TIF Updates	\$100,000	0.00%	\$0	100.00%	\$100,000
ST-044	LRSP Update	\$100,000	0.00%	\$0	100.00%	\$100,000
Total Infrastructure Master Plan Capital Needs		\$78,201,257	55.07%	\$43,062,202	44.93%	\$35,139,055

Schedule 3.2

City of Yorba Linda
 2025-26 Development Impact Cost Calculation
 General Plan Minimal Needs-based Impact Costs
 Transportation (Streets, Signals, Bridges, ITS and Planning Documents) Facilities

Proposed Land Use	Undeveloped		Peak Trip-end and Length Factor	Total Peak Additional Trip-miles	Percentage of Additional Trip-miles	Allocation of Expansion Costs	Cost Distribution Per Acre	Average Units or Square Feet/Acre	Development Impact Fee per Unit or Square Foot
	Acres	Units							
Detached Dwelling Units	164.73	631	3.24	2,044	15.95%	\$5,606,065	\$34,032	3.83	\$8,886 per Unit
Attached Dwelling Units	45.01	1,536	1.75	2,688	20.98%	\$7,372,359	\$163,794	34.13	\$4,799 per Unit
Mobile Homes Dwelling Units	0.10	1	1.88	2	0.01%	\$5,156	\$51,563	10.00	\$5,156 per Unit
Senior Only Apartment Units	5.06	40	0.31	12	0.09%	\$32,912	\$6,504	7.91	\$822 per Unit
Commercial Lodging Units	(4.00)	(122)	1.43	(174)	-1.36%	-\$477,229	\$119,307	30.50	\$978 per Unit
Commercial Uses (SF)	11.89	38,244	14.64	560	4.37%	\$1,535,908	\$129,176	3,216	\$40,167 per S.F.
Office Uses (SF)	0.94	16,876	7.48	126	0.98%	\$345,579	\$367,638	17,953	\$20,478 per S.F.
Ind./Manufacturing Uses (SF)	25.41	1,807,891	3.92	7,087	55.32%	\$19,437,466	\$764,953	71,149	\$10,751 per S.F.
Private Institutional Uses (SF)	5.00	43,560	10.73	467	3.65%	\$1,280,838	\$256,168	8,712	\$29,404 per S.F.
TOTAL	254.14	--	--	12,812	100.00%	\$35,139,055	Total Infrastructure Master Plan Capital Needs		
ALTERNATIVE FEE METHODOLOGY				12,812		\$35,139,055	\$2,742.69 per Daily Peak-hour Trip-mile		

Trip-ends Adjustment Calculation Land Use Title	Daily Peak Trip-ends	Percent of Diverted Trips	Diverted Trip-end % Adjustment	Diverted Trip-end Percent	Percent of Pass-by Trips	Combined Diverted and Pass-by	Remaining Trip % as Adjustment %	Adjusted Trip Rate, Adjustmen % X Total trips	Average Trip Length	Trip-ends X Length X 50%
Detached Dwelling Units	0.895	11	0.50	5.5	3.0	8.5	91.5%	0.819	7.9	3.24
Attached Dwelling Units	0.484	11	0.50	5.5	3.0	8.5	91.5%	0.443	7.9	1.75
Mobile Homes Dwelling Units	0.520	11	0.50	5.5	3.0	8.5	91.5%	0.476	7.9	1.88
Senior Only Apartment Units	0.085	11	0.50	5.5	3.0	8.5	91.5%	0.078	7.9	0.31
Commercial Lodging Units	0.488	38	0.50	19.0	4.0	23.0	77.0%	0.376	7.6	1.43
Commercial Uses (SF)	10.475	40	0.50	20.0	15.0	35.0	65.0%	6.809	4.3	14.64
Office Uses (SF)	1.966	19	0.50	9.5	4.0	13.5	86.5%	1.701	8.8	7.48
Ind./Manufacturing Uses (SF)	0.983	19	0.50	9.5	2.0	11.5	88.5%	0.870	9.0	3.92
Private Institutional Uses (SF)	2.820	19	0.50	9.5	4.0	13.5	86.5%	2.439	8.8	10.73

Schedule 3.3

City of Yorba Linda

2025-26 Development Impact Cost Calculation

Existing Community Financial Commitment Comparison

Transportation (Streets, Signals, Bridges, ITS and Planning Documents) Facilities

Proposed Land Use	Developed		Peak Trip-end and Length Factor	Total Peak Existing Trip-miles	Percentage of Additional Trip-miles	Allocation of Expansion Costs	Cost Distribution Per Acre	Average Units or Square Feet/Acre	Development Impact Fee per Unit or Square Foot
	Acres	Units							
Detached Dwelling Units	5,700.17	19,049	3.240	61,719	38.74%	\$874,348,847	\$153,390	3.34	\$45,925 per Unit
Attached Dwelling Units	406.91	5,534	1.750	9,685	6.08%	\$137,203,593	\$337,184	13.60	\$24,793 per Unit
Mobile Homes Dwelling Units	35.24	212	1.880	399	0.25%	\$5,652,476	\$160,399	6.02	\$26,644 per Unit
Senior Only Apartment Units	30.00	600	0.310	186	0.12%	\$2,634,989	\$87,833	20.00	\$4,392 per Unit
Commercial Lodging Units	12.03	229	1.430	327	0.21%	\$4,632,481	\$385,077	19.04	\$20,225 per Unit
Commercial Uses (SF)	124.98	1,924,369	14.640	28,173	17.69%	\$399,115,833	\$3,193,438	15,397	\$207,406 per S.F.
Office Uses (SF)	72.35	1,095,674	7.480	8,196	5.14%	\$116,109,515	\$1,604,831	15,144	\$105,971 per S.F.
Ind./Manufacturing Uses (SF)	42.53	2,529,271	3.920	9,915	6.22%	\$140,461,913	\$3,302,655	59,470	\$55,535 per S.F.
Private Institutional Uses (SF)	580.57	3,793,444	10.730	40,704	25.55%	\$576,637,591	\$993,227	6,534	\$152,009 per S.F.
TOTAL	7,004.78	--	--	159,304	100.00%	\$2,256,797,238	Total Infrastructure Master Plan Assets		
						\$155,877,150	Major Circulation System		
						\$1,799,989,488	Arterial Rights of Way		
						\$37,200,000	Traffic Signals and Major Intersections		
						\$263,730,600	in Bridge Improvements		
						\$2,256,797,238	Total Infrastructure Master Plan Assets		

[Appendix A](#)

Summary of Recommendations

SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS

Chapter 3 - Transportation (Streets, Signals, Bridges, ITS and Documents) Facilities

- **General City Residential -based TIFs** – The City could adopt [Table 3-3](#), or a financial portion thereof.
- **General City Business-based TIFs** – The City could adopt [Schedule 3.2](#), or a financial portion thereof, for most land-uses and the \$2,742.69 per trip-end rate calculated on [Schedule 3.2](#) to be used in conjunction with the most current edition of ITE manual (and the peak-hour trip frequency/length figures (via SANDAG) at the bottom of [Schedule 3.2](#)) as well as [Table 3-2](#) for unusual land-uses.

[Appendix B](#)

Expanded Land-use Database

Appendix B
City of Yorba Linda
Circulation (Streets, Signals, Bridges) Facilities Development Impact Fee
Expanded Land-use Database
2024-25 Development Impact Cost Calculation (DRAFT TEXT FEES)

Total - Land-use Database Sum of A, B, C, & D Below	Existing Development		Potential Development		Total G. P. Build-out	
	Acres	# of Units	Acres	# of Units	Acres	# of Units
Detached Dwelling Units	5,700.17	19,049	164.73	631	5,864.90	19,680
Attached Dwelling Units	406.91	5,534	45.01	1,536	451.92	7,070
Mobile Homes Dwelling Units	35.24	212	0.10	1	35.34	213
Senior Only Apartment Units	30.00	600	5.06	40	35.06	640
Commercial Lodging Units	12.03	229	-4.00	-122	8.03	107
Commercial Uses (SF)	124.98	1,924,369	11.89	38,244	136.87	1,962,613
Office Uses (SF)	72.35	1,095,674	0.94	16,876	73.29	1,112,550
Ind./Manufacturing Uses (SF)	42.53	2,529,271	25.41	1,807,891	67.94	4,337,162
Private Institutional Uses (SF)	580.57	3,793,444	5.00	43,560	585.57	3,837,004
Total - Land-use Database	7,004.78		254.14		7,258.92	

Residential Dwelling Units	6,172.32	25,395	214.90	2,208	6,387.22	27,603
Commercial Lodging Units	12.03	229	-4.00	-122	8.03	107
Business Use Square Feet	820.43	9,342,758	43.24	1,906,571	863.67	11,249,329
Total - Land-use Database	7,004.78		254.14		7,258.92	

A. Land-use Database within the General Core City Limits	Existing Development		Potential Development		Total G. P. Build-out	
	Acres	# of Units	Acres	# of Units	Acres	# of Units
Detached Dwelling Units	5,700.17	19,049	39.73	211	5,739.90	19,260
Attached Dwelling Units	400.52	5,410	45.01	1,536	445.53	6,946
Mobile Homes Dwelling Units	35.24	212	0.10	1	35.34	213
Senior Only Apartment Units	30.00	600	5.06	40	35.06	640
Commercial Lodging Units	4.03	1	-	-	4.03	1
Commercial Uses (SF)	47.84	1,414,369	14.45	72,244	62.29	1,486,613
Office Uses (SF)	25.90	485,674	0.94	16,876	26.84	502,550
Ind./Manufacturing Uses (SF)	21.49	1,529,271	25.41	1,807,891	46.90	3,337,162
Private Institutional Uses (SF)	580.57	3,793,444	5.00	43,560	585.57	3,837,004
Sub-total (General City)	6,845.76		135.70		6,981.46	

B. SAVI Ranch Area	Existing Development		Potential Development		Total G. P. Build-out	
	Acres	# of Units	Acres	# of Units	Acres	# of Units
Detached Dwelling Units	-	-	-	-	-	-
Attached Dwelling Units	6.39	124	-	-	6.39	124
Mobile Homes Dwelling Units	-	-	-	-	-	-
Senior Only Apartment Units	-	-	-	-	-	-
Commercial Lodging Units	8.00	228	(4.00)	(122)	4.00	106
Commercial Uses (SF)	77.14	510,000	(2.56)	(34,000)	74.58	476,000
Office Uses (SF)	46.45	610,000	-	-	46.45	610,000
Ind./Manufacturing Uses (SF)	21.04	1,000,000	-	-	21.04	1,000,000
Private Institutional Uses (SF)	-	-	-	-	-	-
SAVI Ranch Development	159.02		(6.56)		152.46	

C. Esperanza Development Via County Planning	Existing Development		Potential Development		Total G. P. Build-out	
	Acres	# of Units	Acres	# of Units	Acres	# of Units
Detached Dwelling Units	-	-	85.00	340	85.00	340
Attached Dwelling Units	-	-	-	-	-	-
Mobile Homes Dwelling Units	-	-	-	-	-	-
Senior Only Apartment Units	-	-	-	-	-	-
Commercial Lodging Units	-	-	-	-	-	-
Commercial Uses (SF)	-	-	-	-	-	-
Office Uses (SF)	-	-	-	-	-	-
Ind./Manufacturing Uses (SF)	-	-	-	-	-	-
Private Institutional Uses (SF)	-	-	-	-	-	-
Esperanza Development	-		85.00		85.00	

D. Cielo Vista Development Via County Planning	Existing Development		Potential Development		Total G. P. Build-out	
	Acres	# of Units	Acres	# of Units	Acres	# of Units
Detached Dwelling Units	-	-	40.00	80	40.00	80
Attached Dwelling Units	-	-	-	-	-	-
Mobile Homes Dwelling Units	-	-	-	-	-	-
Senior Only Apartment Units	-	-	-	-	-	-
Commercial Lodging Units	-	-	-	-	-	-
Commercial Uses (SF)	-	-	-	-	-	-
Office Uses (SF)	-	-	-	-	-	-
Ind./Manufacturing Uses (SF)	-	-	-	-	-	-
Private Institutional Uses (SF)	-	-	-	-	-	-
Cielo Vista Development	-		40.00		40.00	

[Appendix C](#)

Calculation of Average Residential Dwelling Sizes

**Findings in Support of Continuation of City Policy to Impose
Residential Transportation Impact Fees on a per Residential Unit Basis**

AB-602 (Gov't Code, sections 66016.5(a)(5)(A) and (B)) states that if the City adopts a calculation and nexus study after July 1, 2022, it must either "calculate a fee imposed on a housing development project proportionately to the square footage of proposed units of the development" or make the following findings:

- (i) An explanation as to why square footage is not an appropriate metric to calculate fees imposed on housing development projects.
- (ii) An explanation that an alternative basis of calculating the fee bears a reasonable relationship between the fee charged and the burden posed by the development.
- (iii) That other policies in the fee structure support smaller developments or otherwise ensure that smaller developments are not charged disproportionate fees.

However, there is no requirement for the City to have a financial element in the City's General Plan document. Thus, a properly calculated Development Impact Fee Calculation and Nexus Report functions as the de-facto financial plan in support of the City's General Zoning Plan. It identifies the anticipated service demands by infrastructure based upon the empirically based per residential unit-based averages and lays out a fair and reasonable method with which to finance the required capital projects and acquisitions necessary to accommodate those anticipated new service demands.

The City of Yorba Linda has expressed that it may wish to continue to impose residential Transportation Impact Fees (TIFs) based upon the same manner that additional development service demands are calculated, that is, by type of average residential unit. The City may not impose TIFs based on residential development projects proportionate to the square footage of proposed units for completing the City's General Plan. The current set of fees fosters greater accuracy in planning and provides the City with the required level of certainty in needed impact fee collection to assure that the infrastructure needs, also determined by average residential unit demands, will be adequate and sufficient to finance the infrastructure required by that same development.

The California Mitigation Fee Act (Government Code §66000, et seq.), which was first established in 1987, specifies that every public agency that adopts development impact fees must provide the essential calculation and nexus report with fees calculated upon data that is as empirical accurate as possible. AB-602's Proportionate to Square Footage is based upon a presumption (7) that a smaller detached dwelling creates less local government service demands than a larger detached dwelling. AB-602 does not offer any peer reviewed, third-party empirical data that substantiates that a small square footage detached dwelling unit creates less municipal service impacts than a larger square foot detached dwelling.

As such, the City has determined that the best practices for both managing development and obtaining the adequate impact fee financing for the development-generated infrastructure is as identified in the many infrastructure chapters in this Report.

The City's zoning code allows for identification of the use of privately held land and in some cases, primarily business uses, provides for a maximum Floor Area Ratio (FAR) that limits the amount of square feet that can be constructed on an acre of business space. No such limitation is placed upon the construction square foot of a detached dwelling unit (AKA "single family residence"). The detached dwellings can be a size that the developer determines to be a marketable product.

At approximately 15.9 detached dwelling units per acre, this equates to an additional net 631 detached dwellings to be constructed by General Plan build-out within the City's limits. The City does not, however, have any information as to how many square feet any of these 631 detached dwelling units will be, that is, within applicable zoning, determined by the developers of the various parcels. There will be an additional 420 detached dwelling units developed contiguously to the City that will be dependent upon the City's traffic system (Cielo Vista and Esperanza developments).

This Report employs the most defensible empirical sources, appropriate to the demands of that particular infrastructure to determine the *average* demands of an *average* detached dwelling. These sources determine demand by an average detached dwelling but does produce this demand data for various sized detached dwellings. Such data is simply not available.

The amount of and complexity of any City's infrastructure defines the LOS of that infrastructure, not just currently but in perpetuity. This makes the one-time TIF financing of any City's infrastructure that much more important. It takes balance to accommodate development with the police responses within the desired standard. It will take a combination of additional law enforcement station space, response and support vehicles and specialty equipment to support the required officers (non-impact supported). The importance of having a properly calculated and documented TIF schedule in order to accommodate development-related demands cannot be over-stated.

The collection of an impact fee to raise capital revenue for development-based demands is one-time but represents the municipal service needs of that dwelling unit as long as that structure exists. Thus the argument that any new detached dwelling will generate less municipal service demand based on its smaller square footage is separated from the reality that any particular residential dwelling may have different occupants over 50 years (e.g. a home for a family of four to a single resident).

Government Code §66000 charges local governments to determine the most fair method of distributing the costs of infrastructure required to support services to new development. The following paragraphs identify the logic behind using a per unit impact fee schedule over per square foot impact fee schedule by infrastructure. To summarize, each uses best practices information from empirical data, all of which is based upon per unit demand data. To divert to a per square foot fee schedule, any agency would have to divide the more accurate per unit fee schedule by an average square foot figure for detached dwellings, attached dwellings and mobile home dwellings. Since there is no known source for average residential dwellings size particular to the City of Yorba Linda, the resulting figure would be no more than an estimate. As a result, the per square foot impact fee schedule would yield a less accurate result than the City's existing per unit methodology.

If the City were to employ a per residential square foot impact fee schedule one of three result could occur. Initially, the City could collect the exact of impact fee revenue required over the course of permitting over 631 residential units, a very unlikely result. What is more likely is that the City will either under-collect or over-collect the impact fees. If the City were to overstate the average size of a detached dwelling at say 3,250 square foot per detached dwelling and the actual average of the permitted detached homes is 2,500 square feet, the City would seriously under-collect the impact fees and would not be able to finance the required transportation infrastructure. In short the City would only be able to finance 77% of the required infrastructure ($2,500 \text{ SF} \div 3,250$). In the alternative, if the City were to understate the average size of a detached dwelling at say 2,500 square foot per detached dwelling and the actual average of the permitted detached homes is 3,250 square feet, the City would be in a position of over-collecting the impact fees and would be forced to return any excess to the current owners of those parcels that over-paid. The City does cannot afford to under-collect nor does it desire to over-collect either. The responsible method is to employ the per unit impact fee schedule to avoid either of those results.

Transportation Needs - According to the volume of empirical data collected by the highly respected Institute of Traffic Engineering (ITE), an average detached dwelling generates approximately 0.895 trip-ends per day; however the ITE does not offer any distinction between small and large homes, because such data does not exist in their database. There is no demonstrated link or nexus between the square foot sizes of a detached dwelling with its traffic-generation demand rate. GIS data does not include the size of each residential dwelling in the City. To convert the accurate per unit impact fee schedule into a per square foot impact fee schedule would render it as less than the maximum accuracy it could have. There is a dearth of evidence that a "smaller" home generates any less traffic demand than a "larger" detached dwelling regardless as to how intuitive that may appear to some. The City's GIS data does not include the size of each residential dwelling in the City, such information is not available. Per dwelling unit fees, on the other hand, accomplishes that desired accuracy.

Importance of a Static or Average per Unit based Development Impact Fee Schedule.

The City must be able to depend on the collection of sufficient impact fee revenues with which to finance development-generated projects necessary to accommodate new development with adequate and sufficient service levels without decreasing the existing levels of service. This assurance will be greatly diminished should the City choose an arbitrarily determined per residential square foot impact fee schedule. As an example, the City has identified that a number of street segment and traffic signal improvements required for maintenance of the City's Transportation/Traffic LOS (Level of Service) an area with 631 dwelling units. However, if a greater proportion of those 631 residential dwellings are far smaller than the City had anticipated, the City will not have adequate TIF revenue to construct those required units. With a per unit determined fee representing an average demand per unit, the City can have significantly greater confidence in receiving the TIF revenue necessary to construct those required Transportation system improvements.

The City's development practices neither favor nor penalize any one land-use over another. Nor are the City's policies unfair within any one land use based upon available empirical data. For residential units based upon best practices empirically-based averages, all are assessed the same fee; no developer is charged disproportionately as could be the case with an arbitrarily based "average" detached dwelling size estimate. The type of dwelling unit drives the fee, not the square footage. For detached, attached and mobile home residential units, all are assessed the same fee (within those three residential types); none are charged disproportionately. A five unit detached dwelling development would have one tenth the impact fees imposed as would a fifty units detached dwelling unit proposal.

Since the City does not impose per square foot-based impact fees, it also does not apply such fees on any room addition to a residential dwelling.

DIFs for non-residential uses (i.e. the variety of businesses) have always been calculated and imposed on a per square foot basis as empirical data is available for those uses. Additionally, each of those business uses (see Table 2-1) has differing maximum allowable floor area ratio (FAR).

The City is mindful that the state is encouraging construction of smaller detached dwellings and is assuming that these types of residential dwellings create lesser demand merely because they are smaller. However, given the lack of any empirical data supporting such a presumption, the City feels obligated to adopt residential impact fees that are fair to all developers of residential dwellings, regardless of size. In the end, the City has determined to err on the side of fair treatment of all residential development.

Yorba Linda Transportation Impact Fees on a per Average Dwelling Unit Basis.

Should the City prefer to adopt their residential dwellings TIFs by square foot in accordance within the strict definition of residential TIFs within AB-602 the following will assist the City in that effort.

Average Unit Size Derivation of the Three Types of Residential Dwelling Units

Adopted Residential Average Unit Sizes (Summary). The following figures represent the average residential dwelling square foot sizes based upon a sampling of dwellings units currently or actual floor plans available in the City.

**Appendix C - Table 1
Summary of Average Residential Dwelling Square Foot**

Land Use Designation	Average Dwelling Size
Detached Dwelling Units	2,800 S.F.
Attached Dwelling Units	1,000 S.F.
Mobile Home Units	1,300 S.F.

Purpose of this Calculation: Establish defensible, evidence-based average residential unit sizes for Yorba Linda to support downstream capacity and fee calculations. The figures rely on current local data, exclude clear outliers, and reflect the central tendency of typical units.

Method (Evidence-First, Outlier-Trimmed)

- 1) Collect recent, local square-footage evidence by category.
- 2) Screen for correct category (detached vs. attached; apartment floor plans vs. houses; mobile/manufactured only for that category).
- 3) Exclude outliers that would skew the mean (e.g., ultra-large custom S.F.Rs; micro-units not typical locally).
- 4) Document the observed range and then adopt a representative average anchored to the central tendency.
- 5) Maintain a clear trail of sources and sample counts.

A. Detached Dwelling Residential (AKA S.F.R) Evidence Set (Detached Dwelling Listings — Yorba Linda)

Sample size: 10 current/recent detached listings with posted living area square footage.

- 21590 Via Pepita — 2,183 S.F.
- 18751 Turfway Park — 4,598 S.F.
- 3880 Hogan Dr — 4,496 S.F.
- 3836 Jutland Ln — 4,535 S.F.
- 19762 Ridgewood Pl — 1,710 S.F.
- 23080 Foxtail Dr — 1,803 S.F.
- 5130 Webb Pl — 1,841 S.F.
- 20000 Villa Torino — 1,824 S.F.
- 5527 Patricia Way — 1,931 S.F.
- Additional city inventory corroborated by Yorba Linda city listing pages.

Observed Range (Detached Dwellings) Approximately 1,700 to 4,600 S.F., with a cluster around 1,800–3,700 S.F.

Adopted Average & Justification (Detached Dwellings) Adopted Average: 2,800 S.F. Centers on the modal band of typical detached homes; avoids upward skew from infrequent ultra-large custom homes.

B. Attached Dwelling Residential (AKA MF), Evidence Set (Published Floor Plans — Yorba Linda) Sample size: multiple plans across two in-city communities that publish square footage. Representative published ranges include 1–2 BR units spanning approximately 795–1,128 S.F. and 1–3 BR units spanning approximately 664–1,040 S.F.

- The Bryant at Yorba Linda — floor plans ~795 to 1,128 S.F. (1–2 BR).
- Oakcrest Heights — floor plans ~664 to 1,040 S.F. (1–3 BR, affordable).
- Arbor Villas — community context only (S.F. not published; excluded from S.F. calculations).

Observed Range (Detached dwellings) Approximately 664 to 1,128 S.F., with most 1–2 BR plans clustering around 800–1,100 S.F.

Adopted Average & Justification (MF) Adopted Average: 1,000 S.F. sites near the center of published plan distributions and reflects typical 1–2-bedroom inventory.

C. Mobile Home Dwelling Units. Evidence Set (Mobile/Manufactured Listings — Yorba Linda)

Sample size: 10+ active/sold listings with posted square footages. Representative examples:

- 16942 Lake Ridge Way — 1,152 S.F.
- 16958 Lake Ridge Way — 1,200 S.F.
- 3708 Lake Crest Dr — 1,536 S.F.
- 3678 Lake Crest Dr #41 — 1,344 S.F.
- 3731 Lake Side Dr — 1,358 S.F.
- 3761 Lake Glen Dr #146 — 1,392 S.F.
- 16927 Lake Ridge Way — 1,440 S.F.
- 16950 Lake Park Way #7 — 1,472 S.F.
- 16942 Lake Park Way — 1,464 S.F.
- 16991 Lake Terrace Way #266A — 1,368 S.F. (sold record).

Observed Range (Mobile Homes)

Approximately 1,152 to 1,536+ S.F., tightly clustered around 1,300–1,500 S.F.

Adopted Average & Justification (Mobile Homes) Adopted Average: 1,300 S.F. Represents the central tendency of double-wide (2 X 800 S.F.) formats in Yorba Linda mobile home parks.

Notes on Defensibility

- Transparency: Each category lists actual examples, shows the observed range, and states a representative average with clear rationale.
- Recency: Sources are current public listings and floor-plan pages.
- Reproducibility: Reviewers can navigate the source pages to verify square footages and repeat the sampling.
- Stability: Averages are inputs to capacity/fee calculations and remain stable across routine market changes.

Source Index (Key References)

- Redfin — Yorba Linda city and ZIP listing pages (detached S.F.R and mobile/manufactured examples).
- The Bryant at Yorba Linda — published floor plans (1–2 BR).
- Oakcrest Heights — published floor plans (1–3 BR).
- Arbor Villas — community context (S.F. not published; excluded from S.F. calculations).

Summary - The following table identifies the TIF cost per residential dwelling unit (from [Schedule 3.2](#)) and divides it by the average square foot of the type of residential dwelling unit for an average TIF cost per square foot.

Appendix C - Table 2

Average Residential Dwelling TIF Cost per Square Foot

Land Use Designation	TIF per Unit	Average Dwelling Size	TIF per Square Foot
Detached Dwelling Units	\$8,886	2,800 S.F.	\$3.17
Attached Dwelling Units	\$4,799	1,000 S.F.	\$4.80
Mobile Home Units	\$5,156	1,300 S.F.	\$3.97

[Appendix D](#)

**Accessory Dwelling Units
Cost Calculation Explanation**

Application of Traffic Transportation Impact Fees on Accessory Dwelling Units

The approach that is recommended for the calculation of TIFs for application to the construction of ADUs is to make it a function of the demand of one detached dwelling unit as is consistent with current State statutes. One can assume that the State identified them as function of a detached dwelling TIF as they more closely resemble detached dwellings, albeit smaller in size, as they are largely located within detached dwelling neighborhoods and will likely function as such.

The application of an ADU TIF as a function of a Detached Dwelling is consistent with the recently Chaptered Government Code, Title 7, Division 1, Chapter 4, Article 2 (attached as Attachments A to E). Section 65852.2, (f) (1).

(3) (A) A local agency, special district, or water corporation shall not impose any impact fee upon the development of an accessory dwelling unit less than 750 square feet. *Any impact fees charged for an accessory dwelling unit of 750 square feet or more shall be charged proportionately in relation to the square footage of the primary dwelling unit.*

The following Table is an example of a proposed 750 square foot accessory dwelling unit to be constructed behind a 3,000 square foot primary dwelling unit. The 750 square feet ADU represents 25.0% of the 3,000 square foot primary unit (750 SQUARE FOOT /3,000 SQUARE FOOT = 25.0%). The City will also receive a spreadsheet application enabling staff to make other such calculations depending upon the facts presented within the ADU application.

Existing Mitigation Fee Act Findings. The five required Government Code §66000 findings within each chapter would apply to the imposition/collection of ADU TIFs. The fees collected would be used to finance the same projects limited for use in that TIF-defined area in each corresponding infrastructure chapter in the *2025-26 Yorba Linda TIF Calculation and Nexus Report*.

Square Foot of Proposed Accessory Dwelling Unit	750
Square Foot of Primary (i.e. "front") Dwelling Unit	3,000
Ratio of ADU S.F. to Primary Unit S.F.	25.0%
Detached Dwelling Unit Traffic Impact Fee	\$8,886
ADU Traffic Impact Fee (rounded)	\$2,221

End of Report