



Pinal County
Development Services
Office of the Assistant County Manager

P.O. Box 2167
31 North Pinal Street, Bldg F
Florence, Arizona 85232

AIR QUALITY ❖ BUILDING SAFETY ❖ ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH ❖ PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT ❖ PUBLIC WORKS

MEMORANDUM

DATE: May 24, 2006

FROM: Ken Buchanan
ACM/DS

TO: Lionel D. Ruiz, Supervisor
District #1
Sandie Smith, Supervisor
District #2
David Snider, Supervisor
District #3

RE: CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM (CIP) FOR
IMPACT FEE AREAS

Definition

Development impact fee (DIFs) are defined as those fees charged to developers to offset the government's costs associated with providing public services and facilities to new development. They have also been defined as scheduled charges applied to new development to generate revenue for the construction and expansion of capital facilities located outside the boundaries of the new development (off-site) that benefit the contributing development. DIFs are sometimes called development fees, impact fees or exactions, although it can be argued the term "exaction" is more descriptive of the improvements or monetary contributions resulting from negotiations between a developer and a municipality, usually through a development agreement.

Philosophical Underpinnings

DIFs are assessed in connection with new development with the idea that current owners and developers in the community have already paid their share of the costs of building or expanding municipal facilities and they should not have to share in the costs of building new or expanding existing public infrastructure necessary by new development. This "fair share" idea is used to assist a county in keeping up with the effects of growth.

Legal Foundations

DIFs are not new but have been enacted by local governments across the country for more than 30 years. In Arizona, mostly municipalities have been expressly authorized by statute to charge DIFs and given broad authority in this area. Until recently, counties in Arizona have been given

limited authority to use DIFs. DIFS have been well litigated through the years in both the federal and state courts. Two fairly recent federal cases of note are *Nollan v. California Coastal Commission* and *Dolan v. City of Tigard*. These cases essentially deal with exaction issues but certainly contain implications for DIFs. The *Nollan* ruling creates a standard of logical connection between the stated purpose for the exaction and the nature of the exaction itself. The *Dolan* ruling added the standard that an exaction be “roughly proportional” to the impact of the development.

In Arizona, *Homebuilders Association of Central Arizona v. City of Scottsdale*, a case involving a water resource DIF, saw the courts upholding DIFs. Interestingly enough, the case was first decided prior to the *Dolan* case, but was remanded to the Court of Appeals by the Arizona Supreme Court for reconsideration in light of *Dolan*. The Appellate Court again upheld the DIFs and ruled *Dolan* does not apply to DIFs (and again, the Arizona Supreme Court concurred). In the case, the Scottsdale water resource DIF was challenged because the city had not begun to implement any of the proposed water resource projects before charging the DIF and the enacting ordinance allowed the city to hold the DIFs for up to ten years before spending or returning them.

DIFs Must Meet Standards

The law which authorizes counties to charge DIFs in Arizona requires several things in order for a DIF to be considered legitimate. Development impact fees.....

- ...are generally paid when building permits are obtained.
- ...must be based on actual anticipated costs for new development.
- ...cannot be issued to fund existing infrastructure deficiencies.
- ...must be assessed in a consistent, “non-discriminatory” manner.

In addition, a county must be able to prove the new development paying for the DIFs get appropriate benefit from the things funded by the DIFs. This “beneficial use” requirement is definitely a judgement call but challenges to the decision in this area have generally been unsuccessful.

Uses for DIFs

DIFs must be used for public services or facilities. The actual statutory standard for the use of DIFs in Arizona is they must be used for the “necessary public services to a development.” DIFs are most commonly applied to residential development, but are also assessed on industrial and commercial development as well. DIFs have been commonly assessed in municipalities for many years to cover the costs of improving municipal water, wastewater and solid waste facilities along with street and road improvements. DIFs are also used to cover the costs of parks and recreation facilities and public safety. Counties are specifically allowed only five (5) Development Impact Fees....

- ...**Public Safety**
- ...**Parks**
- ...**Streets**
- ...**Water**
- ...**Wastewater**

What DIFs Can't be Used for

Development Impact Fees cannot be used....

- ...for repair or maintenance of existing facilities
- ...to correct deficiencies in existing facilities (not attributable to new development)
- ...to fund improvements that disproportionately benefit the large community as opposed to the new development specifically (the “beneficial use” requirement)
- ...to fund operation and maintenance costs and permanent salaries

DIFs...How Much?

It's already been pointed out that the development impact fees can be assessed in a variety of areas. The question of how much any given DIF should be and what process should be used to arrive at a number must be addressed. First, a DIF must have a proportionate relationship to the cost of providing the public facilities for which the DIF is being charged to serve the new development. DIF calculations for residential development are generally based on a formula which compare the facility impact of the new development and the impact of an average residence in the community (usually called “Equivalent Dwelling Unit” [EDU]). DIF formulas for commercial and industrial development will differ from residential development (for example, a high traffic commercial shopping center could be charged a proportionately higher transportation DIF than a residential development). Individuals in like situations must be treated alike, however, when it comes to assessing DIFs.

In developing a formula for DIF charges, solid technical data and analysis must be used to establish cost figures that are legitimate and defensible. The basis for charging the DIF and the calculation is normally included in the enabling ordinance. Though the process of developing DIF formulas can be time consuming, once the cost of service analysis has been done it's just a matter of number crunching.

Developer Credits/Offsets

Every DIF calculation must include consideration of potential credits and offsets. It is common for a city/county to require a developer to do certain things in conjunction with a development such as dedication of right-of-way or setting aside land for a park. These exactions have value and that value must be credited toward any DIF being levied for a related improvement (for example, if a developer is required to dedicate street right-of-way and is also assessed a DIF for construction of the street, the fair market value of the right-of-way land is credited towards the cost of the street DIF). A County must also give credits for payments by the developer to other funding sources being used to fund an improvement (for example, if park construction is being partially funded by property taxes, credit must be given for the property taxes to be paid by the new development). A county must ensure that the total contributions to all sources of funds being paid by a developer and being used to fund a public facility do not exceed the development's appropriate proportionate share of the cost of the facility (for example, using the park construction example above, the sum of the DIF and the portion of the new development's property taxes used to fund the same park construction cannot exceed the new development's proportionate cost of the park).

How to make it Happen

The American Planning Association (APA) suggest a DIF program be carefully designed and documented. Some cities/counties have had success with using a citizen advisory committee to assist in developing a DIF program some sort of public hearing process or other method of securing public input would seem to be essential. The APA says seven issues need to be considered in developing a DIF program....

- ...Linking with comprehensive planning –DIF should support the plan
- ...Defining facility service areas – draw service area boundaries to assign impacts
- ...Assessing impact on existing facilities – analyze real impact of development
- ...Measuring unit impact – quantify impacts and make them specific
- ...Pricing unit impact – avoid overcharging for cost of impacts
- ...Administering revenue – set policy and procedures for fee collection
- ...Administering expenditures – track and monitor expenditure for fees

Statutory procedures and accounting requirements must be followed in the adoption and administration ordinances implementing development impact fees. A 120 day Notice is required before a public hearing can set to discuss the intent. Fourteen (14) days after the public the Board is permitted adopt the ordinance. The ordinances become effective 90 days after the formal adoption of the Impact Fees.

Summary/Recommendation

As can be seen by the above, Pinal County under law is only allowed to consider five (5) elements for impact fees. Public Safety, Streets, Parks, Water and Wastewater elements can only be considered. Pinal County does not provide water service delivery. Nor is Pinal County, statutorily, permitted to provide wastewater services. Public Safety, Parks and Street are the only elements at this time to consider.

Capital Improvement Plans must be developed and adopted for each of the three(3) elements within the seven (7) geographic boundaries of impact. The following is a summary with attachments of the Capital Improvement Programs recommended for adoption for the three elements of Public Safety, Streets and Parks per the seven Impact Fee Areas (IFAs).

Public Safety

The Public Safety Element Capital Improvement Plan is comprised of three areas: public safety buildings; public safety vehicles; and public safety communications equipment. The three areas are for all seven Impact Fee Areas (IFAs). Refer to pages

Parks

The Parks Element Capital Improvement Plan is comprised of three areas: regional parks; trails and Support vehicles and equipment. The three areas are for all seven Impact Fee Areas (IFAs).

Streets

The Streets Capital Improvement Plan is comprised of three areas: Arterial Streets; Support Facilities for Streets; and Support Equipment for Streets. There are separate capital improvement plans for four of the seven Impact Fee Areas. Impact Fee Areas #5, #6 & #7 have been combined due to the commonality of the projects.

Recommendation

It is recommended in accordance and process with A.R.S. §11-1102 the Pinal County Board of Supervisors adopt the three Capital Improvement Plans for the seven Impact Fee Areas being considered for discussion after completion of the 120 Notice of Intent.

Capital Improvement Plan

**Public Safety
Streets
Parks**



Prepared by

**Pinal County
Development Services Department**

**Public Safety Capital
Improvement Plan**



Parks Capital Improvement Plan



**Streets
Capital Improvement Plan**



ARTERIAL STREETS

The *Pinal County Small Area Transportation Study* (hereafter referred to as “SATS”) outlines the arterial streets the County plans to construct in the future. This plan envisions the County constructing 672.3 lane miles of arterial streets throughout the County over the next 10 years (see Figure 3 below). Note this plan does not include any state road projects.

Figure 3: Summary 10 Year Arterial Streets Capital Improvements Program

<i>IFA</i>	<i>Street</i>	<i>Classification</i>	<i>Additional Lane Miles</i>	<i>County Cost</i>	<i>Cost to Other Entities</i>	<i>Total Cost</i>
1	Elliot Rd	Principal Arterial	6.0	\$3,750,000	\$3,750,000	\$7,500,000
1	Germann Rd	Principal Arterial	4.0	\$7,500,000	\$0	\$7,500,000
1	Pima Rd	Principal Arterial	4.0	\$7,500,000	\$0	\$7,500,000
1	Ocotillo Rd	Principal Arterial	2.0	\$7,500,000	\$0	\$7,500,000
1	Combs	Principal Arterial	4.0	\$7,500,000	\$0	\$7,500,000
1	Hunt Hwy	Minor Arterial	4.0	\$10,000,000	\$0	\$10,000,000
1	Ironwood / Ganzel Phase I	Minor Arterial	35.0	\$107,331,648	\$14,700,000	\$122,031,648
1	Combs	Minor Arterial	26.6	\$33,465,000	\$0	\$33,465,000
1	Hunt Hwy	Minor Arterial	4.0	\$10,000,000	\$0	\$10,000,000
1	Ironwood / Ganzel Phase II	Principal Arterial	35.0	\$76,045,620	\$0	\$76,045,620
1	Meridian Parkway	Principal Arterial	26.0	\$50,000,000	\$0	\$50,000,000
1	Arizona Farms	Minor Arterial	5.6	\$12,474,000	\$0	\$12,474,000
1	Arizona Farms	Minor Arterial	4.2	\$7,967,195	\$0	\$7,967,195
2	Maricopa CG Hwy	Minor Arterial	20.0	\$43,312,500	\$0	\$43,312,500
2	Val Vista	Minor Arterial	22.0	\$43,606,013	\$0	\$43,606,013
2	McCartney Rd	Minor Arterial	4.0	\$9,166,667	\$0	\$9,166,667
2	Thorton Rd	Minor Arterial	5.0	\$50,775,000	\$0	\$50,775,000
2	Ralston	Minor Arterial	33.4	\$63,785,000	\$0	\$63,785,000
2	Hunt Hwy	Minor Arterial	4.0	\$10,000,000	\$0	\$10,000,000
2	Miller	Minor Arterial	22.6	\$24,365,000	\$0	\$24,365,000
2	Korsten Rd	Principal Arterial	60.0	\$75,000,000	\$0	\$75,000,000
2	Anderson Rd	Principal Arterial	48.0	\$60,000,000	\$0	\$60,000,000
2	Montgomery	Principal Arterial	16.0	\$20,000,000	\$0	\$20,000,000
2	Arica	Principal Arterial	52.0	\$65,000,000	\$0	\$65,000,000
2	Sunland Gin	Minor Arterial	5.2	\$4,719,071	\$0	\$4,719,071
3	AZ Farms Rd	Minor Arterial	8.0	\$5,000,000	\$0	\$5,000,000
3	Hunt Hwy	Minor Arterial	4.0	\$6,000,000	\$0	\$6,000,000
3	Val Vista	Minor Arterial	8.6	\$17,045,987	\$0	\$17,045,987
3	McCartney Rd	Minor Arterial	14.0	\$32,083,333	\$0	\$32,083,333
3	Florence Kelvin Hwy	Minor Arterial	20.0	\$27,767,606	\$0	\$27,767,606
3	Arizona Farms	Minor Arterial	5.4	\$12,028,500	\$0	\$12,028,500
3	Arizona Farms	Minor Arterial	4.0	\$7,587,805	\$0	\$7,587,805
3	Attaway	Minor Arterial	6.2	\$20,755,000	\$0	\$20,755,000
3	Hunt Hwy	Minor Arterial	28.0	\$32,875,966	\$0	\$32,875,966
3	Selma Hwy	Minor Arterial	25.8	\$28,336,353	\$0	\$28,336,353
4	Florence-Kelvin Hwy	Minor Arterial	18.9	\$23,941,001	\$0	\$23,941,001
5, 6, 7	Park Link Dr	Minor Arterial	18.0	\$28,183,333	\$0	\$28,183,333
5, 6, 7	Selma Hwy	Minor Arterial	27.4	\$30,093,647	\$0	\$30,093,647
5, 6, 7	Sunland Gin	Minor Arterial	31.4	\$28,495,929	\$0	\$28,495,929
TOTAL			672.3	\$1,110,957,174	\$18,450,000	\$1,129,407,174

Source: *Pinal County Small Area Transportation Study*.

IFA 4	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	
Projected Population Unincorporated IFA 4	1,493	1,505	1,517	1,529	1,541	1,553	
Net Population Change During Year	12	12	12	12	12		
Regional Park Acreage Per Person	0.0014	0.0014	0.0014	0.0014	0.0014		
Regional Park Improvements Per Person	0.0005	0.0005	0.0005	0.0005	0.0005		
							<i>5 Year Total</i>
Regional Park Acreage Demanded Residential Development IFA 4	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.08
Regional Park Improvements Demanded Residential Development IFA 4	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.03
Average Cost per Acre*	\$75,000	\$75,000	\$75,000	\$75,000	\$75,000		
Average Cost per Improvements*	\$2,255	\$2,255	\$2,255	\$2,255	\$2,255		
							<i>5 Year Total</i>
Capital Costs Regional Parkland - Residential Development IFA 4	\$1,228	\$1,228	\$1,228	\$1,228	\$1,228	\$6,138	
Capital Costs Regional Park Improvements - Residential Development IFA 4	\$15	\$15	\$15	\$15	\$15	\$73	
TOTAL REGIONAL PARKS CAPITAL COSTS IFA 4	\$1,242	\$1,242	\$1,242	\$1,242	\$1,242	\$6,210	

IFA 5	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	
Projected Population Unincorporated IFA 5	14,262	15,207	16,151	17,096	18,041	18,986	
Net Population Change During Year	945	945	945	945	945		
Regional Park Acreage Per Person	0.0014	0.0014	0.0014	0.0014	0.0014		
Regional Park Improvements Per Person	0.0005	0.0005	0.0005	0.0005	0.0005		
							<i>5 Year Total</i>
Regional Park Acreage Demanded Residential Development IFA 5	1.3	1.3	1.3	1.3	1.3	1.3	6.4
Regional Park Improvements Demanded Residential Development IFA 5	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5	2.5
Average Cost per Acre*	\$75,000	\$75,000	\$75,000	\$75,000	\$75,000		
Average Cost per Improvements*	\$2,255	\$2,255	\$2,255	\$2,255	\$2,255		
							<i>5 Year Total</i>
Capital Costs Regional Parkland - Residential Development IFA 5	\$95,851	\$95,851	\$95,851	\$95,851	\$95,851	\$479,253	
Capital Costs Regional Park Improvements - Residential Development IFA 5	\$1,135	\$1,135	\$1,135	\$1,135	\$1,135	\$5,673	
TOTAL REGIONAL PARKS CAPITAL COSTS IFA 5	\$96,985	\$96,985	\$96,985	\$96,985	\$96,985	\$484,926	

IFA 6	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	
Projected Population Unincorporated IFA 6	1,481	1,555	1,630	1,704	1,778	1,852	
Net Population Change During Year	74	74	74	74	74		
Regional Park Acreage Per Person	0.0014	0.0014	0.0014	0.0014	0.0014		
Regional Park Improvements Per Person	0.0005	0.0005	0.0005	0.0005	0.0005		
							<i>5 Year Total</i>
Regional Park Acreage Demanded Residential Development IFA 6	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.5
Regional Park Improvements Demanded Residential Development IFA 6	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.20
Average Cost per Acre*	\$75,000	\$75,000	\$75,000	\$75,000	\$75,000		
Average Cost per Improvements*	\$2,255	\$2,255	\$2,255	\$2,255	\$2,255		
							<i>5 Year Total</i>
Capital Costs Regional Parkland - Residential Development IFA 6	\$7,537	\$7,537	\$7,537	\$7,537	\$7,537	\$37,686	
Capital Costs Regional Park Improvements - Residential Development IFA 6	\$89	\$89	\$89	\$89	\$89	\$446	
TOTAL REGIONAL PARKS CAPITAL COSTS IFA 6	\$7,626	\$7,626	\$7,626	\$7,626	\$7,626	\$38,132	

Figure 10: 5 Year CIP for Trails by IFA

IFA 1	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
Projected Population Unincorporated IFA 1	78,189	86,415	94,640	102,866	111,092	119,318
Net Population Change During Year	8,226	8,226	8,226	8,226	8,226	
Planned Trail Mileage per Person - Existing Development in 2006	0.0003	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	
Planned Trail Mileage per Person - New Growth	0.0003	0.0003	0.0003	0.0003	0.0003	
						<i>5 Year Total</i>
Planned Trails To Serve Existing Residential Development in 2006 in IFA 1	21	0	0	0	0	21
Planned Trails Demanded New Residential Development IFA 1	2	2	2	2	2	11
Average Cost per Mile	\$51,953	\$51,953	\$51,953	\$51,953	\$51,953	
						<i>5 Year Total</i>
Capital Costs Planned Trails - Existing Residential Development in IFA 1 in 2007	\$1,099,085	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$1,099,085
Capital Costs Planned Trails - New Residential Development IFA 1	\$115,629	\$115,629	\$115,629	\$115,629	\$115,629	\$578,146
TOTAL TRAILS CAPITAL COSTS IFA 1	\$1,214,714	\$115,629	\$115,629	\$115,629	\$115,629	\$1,677,231
IFA 2	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
Projected Population Unincorporated IFA 2	17,005	17,476	17,946	18,416	18,886	19,357
Net Population Change During Year	470	470	470	470	470	
Planned Trail Mileage per Person - Existing Development in 2006	0.0003	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	
Planned Trail Mileage per Person - New Growth	0.0003	0.0003	0.0003	0.0003	0.0003	
						<i>5 Year Total</i>
Planned Trails To Serve Existing Residential Development in 2006 in IFA 2	4.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	4.6
Planned Trails Demanded New Residential Development IFA 2	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.6
Average Cost per Mile	\$51,953	\$51,953	\$51,953	\$51,953	\$51,953	
						<i>5 Year Total</i>
Capital Costs Planned Trails - Existing Residential Development in IFA 2 in 2006	\$239,040	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$239,040
Capital Costs Planned Trails - New Residential Development IFA 2	\$6,611	\$6,611	\$6,611	\$6,611	\$6,611	\$33,053
TOTAL TRAILS CAPITAL COSTS IFA 2	\$245,650	\$6,611	\$6,611	\$6,611	\$6,611	\$272,092
IFA 3	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
Projected Population Unincorporated IFA 3	7,758	8,216	8,674	9,133	9,591	10,049
Net Population Change During Year	458	458	458	458	458	
Planned Trail Mileage per Person - Existing Development in 2006	0.0003	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	
Planned Trail Mileage per Person - New Growth	0.0003	0.0003	0.0003	0.0003	0.0003	
						<i>5 Year Total</i>
Planned Trails To Serve Existing Residential Development in 2006 in IFA 3	2.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.1
Planned Trails Demanded New Residential Development IFA 3	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.6
Average Cost per Mile	\$51,953	\$51,953	\$51,953	\$51,953	\$51,953	
						<i>5 Year Total</i>
Capital Costs Planned Trails - Existing Residential Development in IFA 3 in 2006	\$109,046	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$109,046
Capital Costs Planned Trails - New Residential Development IFA 3	\$6,443	\$6,443	\$6,443	\$6,443	\$6,443	\$32,216
TOTAL TRAILS CAPITAL COSTS IFA 3	\$115,489	\$6,443	\$6,443	\$6,443	\$6,443	\$141,262

IFA 4	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
Projected Population Unincorporated IFA 4	1,493	1,505	1,517	1,529	1,541	1,553
Net Population Change During Year	12	12	12	12	12	
Planned Trail Mileage per Person - Existing Development in 2006	0.0003	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	
Planned Trail Mileage per Person - New Growth	0.0003	0.0003	0.0003	0.0003	0.0003	
						<i>5 Year Total</i>
Planned Trails To Serve Existing Residential Development in 2006 in IFA 4	0.40	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.40
Planned Trails Demanded New Residential Development IFA 4	0.003	0.003	0.003	0.003	0.003	0.02
Average Cost per Mile	\$51,953	\$51,953	\$51,953	\$51,953	\$51,953	
						<i>5 Year Total</i>
Capital Costs Planned Trails - Existing Residential Development in IFA 4 in 2006	\$20,981	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$20,981
Capital Costs Planned Trails - New Residential Development IFA 4	\$170	\$170	\$170	\$170	\$170	\$850
TOTAL TRAILS CAPITAL COSTS IFA 4	\$21,151	\$170	\$170	\$170	\$170	\$21,832
IFA 5	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
Projected Population Unincorporated IFA 5	14,262	15,207	16,151	17,096	18,041	18,986
Net Population Change During Year	945	945	945	945	945	
Planned Trail Mileage per Person - Existing Development in 2006	0.0003	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	
Planned Trail Mileage per Person - New Growth	0.0003	0.0003	0.0003	0.0003	0.0003	
						<i>5 Year Total</i>
Planned Trails To Serve Existing Residential Development in 2006 in IFA 5	3.9	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.9
Planned Trails Demanded New Residential Development IFA 5	0.3	0.3	0.3	0.3	0.3	1.3
Average Cost per Mile	\$51,953	\$51,953	\$51,953	\$51,953	\$51,953	
						<i>5 Year Total</i>
Capital Costs Planned Trails - Existing Residential Development in IFA 5 in 2006	\$200,480	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$200,480
Capital Costs Planned Trails - New Residential Development IFA 5	\$13,279	\$13,279	\$13,279	\$13,279	\$13,279	\$66,396
TOTAL TRAILS CAPITAL COSTS IFA 5	\$213,760	\$13,279	\$13,279	\$13,279	\$13,279	\$266,876
IFA 6	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
Projected Population Unincorporated IFA 6	1,481	1,555	1,630	1,704	1,778	1,852
Net Population Change During Year	74	74	74	74	74	
Planned Trail Mileage per Person - Existing Development in 2006	0.0003	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	
Planned Trail Mileage per Person - New Growth	0.0003	0.0003	0.0003	0.0003	0.0003	
						<i>5 Year Total</i>
Planned Trails To Serve Existing Residential Development in 2006 in IFA 6	0.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.4
Planned Trails Demanded New Residential Development IFA 6	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.10
Average Cost per Mile	\$51,953	\$51,953	\$51,953	\$51,953	\$51,953	
						<i>5 Year Total</i>
Capital Costs Planned Trails - Existing Residential Development in IFA 6 in 2006	\$20,818	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$20,818
Capital Costs Planned Trails - New Residential Development IFA 6	\$1,044	\$1,044	\$1,044	\$1,044	\$1,044	\$5,221
TOTAL TRAILS CAPITAL COSTS IFA 6	\$21,862	\$1,044	\$1,044	\$1,044	\$1,044	\$26,039
IFA 7	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
Projected Population Unincorporated IFA 7	9,170	10,072	10,974	11,876	12,778	13,680
Net Population Change During Year	902	902	902	902	902	
Planned Trail Mileage per Person - Existing Development in 2006	0.0003	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	
Planned Trail Mileage per Person - New Growth	0.0003	0.0003	0.0003	0.0003	0.0003	
						<i>5 Year Total</i>
Planned Trails To Serve Existing Residential Development in 2006 in IFA 7	2.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.5
Planned Trails Demanded New Residential Development IFA 7	0.24	0.24	0.24	0.24	0.24	1.22
Average Cost per Mile	\$51,953	\$51,953	\$51,953	\$51,953	\$51,953	
						<i>5 Year Total</i>
Capital Costs Planned Trails - Existing Residential Development in IFA 7 in 2006	\$128,895	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$128,895
Capital Costs Planned Trails - New Residential Development IFA 7	\$12,681	\$12,681	\$12,681	\$12,681	\$12,681	\$63,407
TOTAL TRAILS CAPITAL COSTS IFA 7	\$141,577	\$12,681	\$12,681	\$12,681	\$12,681	\$192,302

IFA 4	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	
Projected Population Unincorporated IFA 4	1,493	1,505	1,517	1,529	1,541	1,553	
Net Population Change During Year	12	12	12	12	12		
Park Support Vehicles/Equip Per Person	0.0002	0.0002	0.0002	0.0002	0.0002		<i>5 Year Total</i>
Park Support Vehicles/Equip Demanded Residential Development IFA 4	0.003	0.003	0.003	0.003	0.003		0.01
Average Cost per Vehicle/Piece of Equipment	\$21,639	\$21,639	\$21,639	\$21,639	\$21,639		
Capital Costs Support Vehicles & Equipment - Residential Development IFA 4	\$62	\$62	\$62	\$62	\$62		<i>5 Year Total</i>
TOTAL SUPPORT VEHICLES & EQUIPMENT CAPITAL COSTS IFA 4	\$62	\$62	\$62	\$62	\$62		\$310

IFA 5	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	
Projected Population Unincorporated IFA 5	14,262	15,207	16,151	17,096	18,041	18,986	
Net Population Change During Year	945	945	945	945	945		
Park Support Vehicles/Equip Per Person	0.0002	0.0002	0.0002	0.0002	0.0002		<i>5 Year Total</i>
Park Support Vehicles/Equip Demanded Residential Development IFA 5	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2		1.1
Average Cost per Vehicle/Piece of Equipment	\$21,639	\$21,639	\$21,639	\$21,639	\$21,639		
Capital Costs Support Vehicles & Equipment - Residential Development IFA 5	\$4,840	\$4,840	\$4,840	\$4,840	\$4,840		<i>5 Year Total</i>
TOTAL SUPPORT VEHICLES & EQUIPMENT CAPITAL COSTS IFA 5	\$4,840	\$4,840	\$4,840	\$4,840	\$4,840		\$24,198

IFA 6	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	
Projected Population Unincorporated IFA 6	1,481	1,555	1,630	1,704	1,778	1,852	
Net Population Change During Year	74	74	74	74	74		
Park Support Vehicles/Equip Per Person	0.0002	0.0002	0.0002	0.0002	0.0002		<i>5 Year Total</i>
Park Support Vehicles/Equip Demanded Residential Development IFA 6	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.02		0.1
Average Cost per Vehicle/Piece of Equipment	\$21,639	\$21,639	\$21,639	\$21,639	\$21,639		
Capital Costs Support Vehicles & Equipment - Residential Development IFA 6	\$381	\$381	\$381	\$381	\$381		<i>5 Year Total</i>
TOTAL SUPPORT VEHICLES & EQUIPMENT CAPITAL COSTS IFA 6	\$381	\$381	\$381	\$381	\$381		\$1,903

IFA 7	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	
Projected Population Unincorporated IFA 7	9,170	10,072	10,974	11,876	12,778	13,680	
Net Population Change During Year	902	902	902	902	902		
Regional Park Acreage Per Person	0.0002	0.0002	0.0002	0.0002	0.0002		<i>5 Year Total</i>
Regional Park Acreage Demanded Residential Development IFA 7	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2		1.1
Average Cost per Acre*	\$21,639	\$21,639	\$21,639	\$21,639	\$21,639		
Capital Costs Regional Parkland - Residential Development IFA 7	\$4,622	\$4,622	\$4,622	\$4,622	\$4,622		<i>5 Year Total</i>
TOTAL REGIONAL PARKS CAPITAL COSTS IFA 7	\$4,622	\$4,622	\$4,622	\$4,622	\$4,622		\$23,109

IFA 7	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
Projected Population Unincorporated IFA 7	9,170	10,072	10,974	11,876	12,778	13,680
Projected Nonresidential Vehicle Trips Unincorporated IFA 7	5,878	6,264	6,649	7,035	7,420	7,806
Net Population Change During Year	902	902	902	902	902	
Net Nonresidential Vehicle Trips Change During Year	386	386	386	386	386	
Building Square Feet Per Person	0.93	0.93	0.93	0.93	0.93	
Building Square Feet Per Nonresidential Vehicle Trip	0.13	0.13	0.13	0.13	0.13	
Building Square Footage Demanded Residential Development IFA 7	837	837	837	837	837	
Building Square Footage Demanded Nonresidential Development IFA 7	52	52	52	52	52	5 Year Total
TOTAL SHERIFF AND JUSTICE COURT SQUARE FOOTAGE IFA 7	888	888	888	888	888	4,442
Average Cost per Square Foot	\$150	\$150	\$150	\$150	\$150	
Capital Costs - Residential Development IFA 7	\$125,482	\$125,482	\$125,482	\$125,482	\$125,482	
Capital Costs - Nonresidential Development IFA 7	\$7,763	\$7,763	\$7,763	\$7,763	\$7,763	5 Year Total
TOTAL SHERIFF AND JUSTICE COURT BUILDINGS CAPITAL COSTS IFA 7	\$133,245	\$133,245	\$133,245	\$133,245	\$133,245	\$666,227

Figure 9: 5 Year CIP for Detention Center

UNINCORPORATED PINAL COUNTY	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
Projected Population Unincorporated County	129,696	140,469	151,242	162,015	172,788	183,561
Projected Nonresidential Vehicle Trips Unincorporated County	84,861	91,181	97,502	103,822	110,143	116,464
Detention Center Buy-in Square Feet Per Person	0.33					
Detention Center Buy-in Square Feet Per Nonresidential Vehicle Trip	0.02					
Detention Square Footage Utilized Existing Residential Development in 2007	42,273					
Detention Center Square Footage Demanded Existing Nonresidential Development 2007	2,089					5 Year Total
TOTAL SQUARE FOOTAGE UTILIZED BY EXISTING DEVELOPMENT UNINCORPORATED COUNTY	44,362	0	0	0	0	44,362
Net Population Change During Year	10,773	10,773	10,773	10,773	10,773	
Net Nonresidential Vehicle Trips Change During Year	6,321	6,321	6,321	6,321	6,321	
Detention Center Buy-in Square Feet Per Person	0.33	0.33	0.33	0.33	0.33	
Detention Center Buy-in Square Feet Per Nonresidential Vehicle Trip	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.02	
Detention Square Footage Utilized New Residential Development	3,511	3,511	3,511	3,511	3,511	
Detention Center Square Footage Demanded New Nonresidential Development	156	156	156	156	156	5 Year Total
TOTAL SQUARE FOOTAGE UTILIZED BY NEW DEVELOPMENT UNINCORPORATED COUNTY	3,667	3,667	3,667	3,667	3,667	18,334
TOTAL SQUARE FOOTAGE UTILIZED BY UNINCORPORATED COUNTY	48,029	3,667	3,667	3,667	3,667	62,697
Buy-in Cost per Square Foot	\$703	\$703	\$703	\$703	\$703	
Total Planned Buy-in Detention Center Existing Development Unincorporated County	\$31,196,611	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$31,196,611
Total Planned Buy-in Detention Center New Development Unincorporated County	\$2,578,654	\$2,578,654	\$2,578,654	\$2,578,654	\$2,578,654	\$12,893,270
TOTAL PLANNED BUY-IN DETENTION CENTER UNINCORPORATED COUNTY	\$33,775,265	\$2,578,654	\$2,578,654	\$2,578,654	\$2,578,654	\$44,089,881

IFA 7	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
Projected Population Unincorporated IFA 7	9,170	10,072	10,974	11,876	12,778	13,680
Projected Nonresidential Vehicle Trips Unincorporated IFA 7	5,878	6,264	6,649	7,035	7,420	7,806
Net Population Change During Year	902	902	902	902	902	
Net Nonresidential Vehicle Trips Change During Year	386	386	386	386	386	
Public Safety Vehicles Per Person	0.0001	0.0001	0.0001	0.0001	0.0001	
Public Safety Vehicles Per Nonresidential Vehicle Trip	0.000003	0.000003	0.000003	0.000003	0.000003	
Public Safety Vehicles Demanded Residential Development IFA 7	0.09	0.09	0.09	0.09	0.09	
Public Safety Vehicles Demanded Nonresidential Development IFA 7	0.001	0.001	0.001	0.001	0.001	5 Year Total
TOTAL PUBLIC SAFETY VEHICLES IFA 7	0.09	0.09	0.09	0.09	0.09	0.44
Average Cost per Vehicle*	\$26,000	\$26,000	\$26,000	\$26,000	\$26,000	
Capital Costs Public Safety Vehicles - Residential Development IFA 7	\$2,265	\$2,265	\$2,265	\$2,265	\$2,265	
Capital Costs Public Safety Vehicles - Nonresidential Development IFA 7	\$33	\$33	\$33	\$33	\$33	5 Year Total
TOTAL PUBLIC SAFETY VEHICLES CAPITAL COSTS IFA 7	\$2,297	\$2,297	\$2,297	\$2,297	\$2,297	\$11,487

Figure 17: 5 Year CIP for Public Safety Communications by IFA

IFA 1	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
Projected Population Unincorporated IFA 1	78,189	86,415	94,640	102,866	111,092	119,318
Projected Nonresidential Vehicle Trips Unincorporated IFA 1	51,779	57,088	62,398	67,707	73,016	78,325
Net Population Change During Year	8,226	8,226	8,226	8,226	8,226	
Net Nonresidential Vehicle Trips Change During Year	5,309	5,309	5,309	5,309	5,309	
Public Safety Communications Cost Per Person	\$17.25	\$17.25	\$17.25	\$17.25	\$17.25	
Public Safety Communications Cost Per Nonresidential Vehicle Trip	\$1.35	\$1.35	\$1.35	\$1.35	\$1.35	
						5 Year Total
Planned Public Safety Communications Costs in Unincorporated IFA 1 - Existing Development	\$1,418,293	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$1,418,293
Planned Public Safety Communications Costs in Unincorporated IFA 1 - New Development	\$149,025	\$149,025	\$149,025	\$149,025	\$149,025	\$745,124
TOTAL PLANNED PUBLIC SAFETY COMMUNICATIONS COSTS UNINCORPORATED IFA 1	\$1,567,318	\$149,025	\$149,025	\$149,025	\$149,025	\$2,163,417

IFA 2	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
Projected Population Unincorporated IFA 2	17,005	17,476	17,946	18,416	18,886	19,357
Projected Nonresidential Vehicle Trips Unincorporated IFA 2	11,088	11,196	11,304	11,412	11,520	11,628
Net Population Change During Year	470	470	470	470	470	
Net Nonresidential Vehicle Trips Change During Year	108	108	108	108	108	
Public Safety Communications Cost Per Person	\$17.25	\$17.25	\$17.25	\$17.25	\$17.25	
Public Safety Communications Cost Per Nonresidential Vehicle Trip	\$1.35	\$1.35	\$1.35	\$1.35	\$1.35	

						5 Year Total
Planned Public Safety Communications Costs in Unincorporated IFA 2 - Existing Development	\$308,230	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$308,230
Planned Public Safety Communications Costs in Unincorporated IFA 2 - New Development	\$8,256	\$8,256	\$8,256	\$8,256	\$8,256	\$41,282
TOTAL PLANNED PUBLIC SAFETY COMMUNICATIONS COSTS UNINCORPORATED IFA 2	\$316,486	\$8,256	\$8,256	\$8,256	\$8,256	\$349,512

IFA 3	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
Projected Population Unincorporated IFA 3	7,758	8,216	8,674	9,133	9,591	10,049
Projected Nonresidential Vehicle Trips Unincorporated IFA 3	4,997	5,149	5,302	5,454	5,606	5,758
Net Population Change During Year	458	458	458	458	458	
Net Nonresidential Vehicle Trips Change During Year	152	152	152	152	152	
Public Safety Communications Cost Per Person	\$17.25	\$17.25	\$17.25	\$17.25	\$17.25	
Public Safety Communications Cost Per Nonresidential Vehicle Trip	\$1.35	\$1.35	\$1.35	\$1.35	\$1.35	

						5 Year Total
Planned Public Safety Communications Costs in Unincorporated IFA 3 - Existing Development	\$140,527	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$140,527
Planned Public Safety Communications Costs in Unincorporated IFA 3 - New Development	\$8,110	\$8,110	\$8,110	\$8,110	\$8,110	\$40,552
TOTAL PLANNED PUBLIC SAFETY COMMUNICATIONS COSTS UNINCORPORATED IFA 3	\$148,638	\$8,110	\$8,110	\$8,110	\$8,110	\$181,080

IFA 4	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
Projected Population Unincorporated IFA 4	1,493	1,505	1,517	1,529	1,541	1,553
Projected Nonresidential Vehicle Trips Unincorporated IFA 4	984	991	997	1,003	1,009	1,016
Net Population Change During Year	12	12	12	12	12	
Net Nonresidential Vehicle Trips Change During Year	6	6	6	6	6	
Public Safety Communications Cost Per Person	\$17.25	\$17.25	\$17.25	\$17.25	\$17.25	
Public Safety Communications Cost Per Nonresidential Vehicle Trip	\$1.35	\$1.35	\$1.35	\$1.35	\$1.35	

						5 Year Total
Planned Public Safety Communications Costs in Unincorporated IFA 4 - Existing Development	\$27,069	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$27,069
Planned Public Safety Communications Costs in Unincorporated IFA 4 - New Development	\$217	\$217	\$217	\$217	\$217	\$1,086
TOTAL PLANNED PUBLIC SAFETY COMMUNICATIONS COSTS UNINCORPORATED IFA 4	\$27,286	\$217	\$217	\$217	\$217	\$28,155

IFA 5	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
Projected Population Unincorporated IFA 5	14,262	15,207	16,151	17,096	18,041	18,986
Projected Nonresidential Vehicle Trips Unincorporated IFA 5	9,156	9,470	9,784	10,098	10,413	10,727
Net Population Change During Year	945	945	945	945	945	
Net Nonresidential Vehicle Trips Change During Year	314	314	314	314	314	
Public Safety Communications Cost Per Person	\$17.25	\$17.25	\$17.25	\$17.25	\$17.25	
Public Safety Communications Cost Per Nonresidential Vehicle Trip	\$1.35	\$1.35	\$1.35	\$1.35	\$1.35	

	<i>5 Year Total</i>					
Planned Public Safety Communications Costs in Unincorporated IFA 5 - Existing Development	\$258,316	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$258,316
Planned Public Safety Communications Costs in Unincorporated IFA 5 - New Development	\$16,716	\$16,716	\$16,716	\$16,716	\$16,716	\$83,580
TOTAL PLANNED PUBLIC SAFETY COMMUNICATIONS COSTS UNINCORPORATED IFA 5	\$275,032	\$16,716	\$16,716	\$16,716	\$16,716	\$341,897

IFA 6	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
Projected Population Unincorporated IFA 6	1,481	1,555	1,630	1,704	1,778	1,852
Projected Nonresidential Vehicle Trips Unincorporated IFA 6	978	1,023	1,068	1,114	1,159	1,204
Net Population Change During Year	74	74	74	74	74	
Net Nonresidential Vehicle Trips Change During Year	45	45	45	45	45	
Public Safety Communications Cost Per Person	\$17.25	\$17.25	\$17.25	\$17.25	\$17.25	
Public Safety Communications Cost Per Nonresidential Vehicle Trip	\$1.35	\$1.35	\$1.35	\$1.35	\$1.35	

	<i>5 Year Total</i>					
Planned Public Safety Communications Costs in Unincorporated IFA 6 - Existing Development	\$26,860	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$26,860
Planned Public Safety Communications Costs in Unincorporated IFA 6 - New Development	\$1,342	\$1,342	\$1,342	\$1,342	\$1,342	\$6,710
TOTAL PLANNED PUBLIC SAFETY COMMUNICATIONS COSTS UNINCORPORATED IFA 6	\$28,202	\$1,342	\$1,342	\$1,342	\$1,342	\$33,571

IFA 7	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
Projected Population Unincorporated IFA 7	9,170	10,072	10,974	11,876	12,778	13,680
Projected Nonresidential Vehicle Trips Unincorporated IFA 7	5,878	6,264	6,649	7,035	7,420	7,806
Net Population Change During Year	902	902	902	902	902	
Net Nonresidential Vehicle Trips Change During Year	386	386	386	386	386	
Public Safety Communications Cost Per Person	\$17.25	\$17.25	\$17.25	\$17.25	\$17.25	
Public Safety Communications Cost Per Nonresidential Vehicle Trip	\$1.35	\$1.35	\$1.35	\$1.35	\$1.35	

	<i>5 Year Total</i>					
Planned Public Safety Communications Costs in Unincorporated IFA 7 - Existing Development	\$166,069	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$166,069
Planned Public Safety Communications Costs in Unincorporated IFA 7 - New Development	\$16,079	\$16,079	\$16,079	\$16,079	\$16,079	\$80,394
TOTAL PLANNED PUBLIC SAFETY COMMUNICATIONS COSTS UNINCORPORATED IFA 7	\$182,147	\$16,079	\$16,079	\$16,079	\$16,079	\$246,462