

The City of Pasadena Public Works Department reports \$20,236,569 in approved appropriations of Residential Impact Fees for the period beginning December 2, 2005 (adoption of new fee ordinance) through March 31, 2013 (includes FY 13-14 capital improvement plan budgeted appropriations), as reflected in **Table 4**.

Reporting period appropriations of \$20,236,569 exceed the \$19,367,253 RIF collected by \$869,316 but the excess does not create a budgetary deficit. After considering beginning un-appropriated balances and interest earned, total RIF resources of \$22,997,610 exceed appropriations by \$2,761,041.

Table 3
Summary of Funding Generated by RIF from December 5, 2005 to March 31, 2013 (1)
City of Pasadena Park Fee Nexus Study - 2013 Update

	City Park District or Project				Total
	West	Central	East	Arroyo	
Total RIF collected	\$10,691,325	\$4,969,238	\$1,769,703	\$1,936,986	\$19,367,253
Percent funding by District (2)	55%	26%	9%	10%	100%
Un-appropriated Balance at Dec. 2, 2005					\$1,657,095
RIF Collected - Report Period					19,367,253
Interest on Balances, report period					1,973,262
Total RIF Resources Available for Budgeting					\$22,997,610

- (1) Data provided by Mona Tse, Department of Public Works, City of Pasadena, July 2013.
 (2) Excludes interest and beginning balance in calculation.

Sources: City of Pasadena; Brion & Associates.

Table 4
Residential Impact Fees Appropriations - by Fiscal Period
December 2, 2005 - March 31, 2013

Fiscal Year	Funding by District or Source					
	West	Central	East	Arroyo	Interest (1)	Total
FY 2006	\$ 260,296	\$ 183,337	\$ -	\$ 137,023	\$ -	\$ 580,656
FY 2007	267,724	1,145,339	163,345	200,185	311,992	2,088,585
FY 2008	1,410,000	887,807	183,000	507,448	-	2,988,255
FY 2009	2,590,000	1,848,353	806,632	400,000	611,288	6,256,273
FY 2010	1,740,000	730,000	225,000	315,000	-	3,010,000
FY 2011	150,000	75,000	200,000	139,637	423,963	988,600
FY 2012	-	250,000	-	31,828	71,372	353,200
FY 2013	110,000	150,000	-	56,000	50,000	366,000
FY 2014	2,030,000	100,000	450,000	525,000	500,000	3,605,000
Total Appropriations	\$ 8,558,020	\$ 5,369,836	\$ 2,027,977	\$ 2,312,121	\$ 1,968,615	\$ 20,236,569
District Percent of Total	42%	27%	10%	11%	10%	100%

- (1) Appropriations from interest are not assigned to districts, and include citywide projects.
 Sources: City of Pasadena; Brion & Associates.

Residential Impact Fee Fund Balances

The City accounts for and reports financial activity for this fee in its Residential Development Impact capital projects fund (No. 304). The fund reported a positive committed fund balance of \$11.7 million at June 30, 2012, the last full fiscal year for which the comprehensive annual financial report is available. It is normal for accounting balances to be higher than budgetary balances, because the budgetary basis considers the resources to be used when Council grants authority to spend (appropriation) while the accounting methods consider resources to be used only after the actual expenditure occurs.

Existing and Future Demographics and Growth

For purposes of this study, estimates of current population, housing units, households and persons per household have been compiled based on available information from the City and the California Department of Finance (DOF). The City's Planning and Community Department currently estimates that there are 60,478 dwelling units in the City as of 2013 and total household population is estimated at 137,222, with an average persons per household factor of 2.44 (Table 5).

Table 5 also shows expected growth over the next 22 years to the year 2035. Given the City's high land costs, most new development has been and is expected to continue to be, higher density development. Many new higher density projects have been developed in and around the City's Central District where land costs are extremely high.

This analysis uses growth estimates consistent with those that the City Council has directed the Planning Department to use for the updated General Plan. The City expects that there will be an increase of almost 12,900 housing units over the next 22 years. This analysis uses this growth estimate to establish the park and recreation fee.

This level of residential development will generate a total of 24,654 new residents or 11,950 new households, assuming a persons-per-household factor of 2.06. New residential development as a percentage of buildout at 2035 is about 18%. Average household size is expected to decrease, as most new housing will be multi-family developments and condominiums. At 2035, the City is estimated to have about 73,400 residential units, 68,100 households, and a total household population of 161,900.

Table 5
Existing and Projected Residential Development
City of Pasadena Park Fee Nexus Study - 2013 Update

Item	Existing Development 2013	Future Growth 2013 to 2035 General Plan	Total Development at 2035 (1)	New Development as % of 2035
Households	56,124 (2)	11,950 (2)	68,074	17.6%
Housing Units	60,478	12,878	73,356	17.6%
Persons Per Household (3)	2.44	2.06	2.38	na
Household Population	137,222	24,654	161,876	15.2%

(1) Planning Department estimates are based on direction from City Council as to what should be studied in General Plan EIR. The Final General Plan may result in changes to the estimated number of housing units.

(2) Assumes a 7.2% vacancy rate per the CA DOF.

(3) The number of persons per household for existing units is derived from 2010 census tract data. New units are attributed 2.06 persons per household, the average in Central District census tracts, which is where the majority of new development is expected between 2013 and 2035.

Sources: State of California, Department of Finance, E-5 Population and Housing Estimates for Cities, Counties and the State — January 1, 2011- 2013. Sacramento, California, May 2013.; Brion & Associates.

A key measure in nexus studies is the relationship between new and existing development. Under these projections from the City, new population represents 15.2% of total population in 2035.

Currently Pasadena has 4.62 park acres per 1,000 population, as shown in **Table 6**. Of this, 2.73 acres per 1,000 population are developed parks. The majority of this acreage is in citywide parks, at 1.79 acres per 1,000 population. The City has neighborhood and community park standards of .50 and .43 acres per 1,000 population, respectively. The City has 1.89 acres of open space per 1,000 population, which is concentrated at Hahamongna Park, the City's largest park. These existing park standards are applied to estimates of new development⁸ to calculate new required park acreage and the park fee.

⁸ We estimate the need for new park space based on demand from new residential development only based on existing service levels or acres per 1,000 residents. Park fees are typically only levied on residential development because the use of public parks by employees is limited compared to population.

Table 6
Current Park Acreage per 1,000 Population
City of Pasadena Park Fee Nexus Study

Type of Park	Total Park Acreage	Park Acreage Per 1,000 Population (1)
Neighborhood Parks	69.10	0.50
Community Parks	58.70	0.43
Citywide Parks	246.30	1.79
Total Active, Developed Parks	374.10	2.73
Open Space	259.30	1.89
All Parks, with Open Space	633.40	4.62

(1) Based on 2013 population estimates from City of Pasadena; see Table 4.
 Sources: City of Pasadena; Brion & Associates.

4. PARKS AND RECREATION CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM

Table 7 summarizes the City's current Capital Improvement Program (CIP) for parks and recreational facilities for 2014 to 2018. A detailed database of the City's Parks and Recreation CIP is provided in the Appendix in **Table B-1**. As shown, current CIP total costs are approximately \$124.3 million. These costs have been spread between new and existing development based on the nexus factors estimated and discussed previously. For this discussion, the 15.2% population factor associated with the City's forecast is used. Based on this forecast, the City's share of these costs equals \$105.4 million, while new population's share would be \$18.9 million. New population is expected to fund a portion of these costs, as this set of improvements will serve both new and existing development. Existing parks create a network of facilities that will be used by both new and existing residents. Thus, new development is expected to pay its fair share of these costs.

The CIP is also summarized by Park District for informational purposes. The Citywide District has about \$94.0 million, 76% of the total CIP costs, with approximately \$19.2 million in the Western District, 15% of the total CIP Costs. The Eastern District has \$6.8 million, or 5% of the total CIP costs. The Central District has 4.3 million, or 3% of the total CIP costs, as shown in **Table 7**.

Existing allocated funding breaks down slightly differently, with 53% of funding going to the Western District, 26% to Citywide parks, 14% to Central District parks, and 7% to Eastern District parks. Overall, only 20% of the current CIP is funded. This funding comes from a variety of sources, including grants, private funding, and residential impact fees from past development.

Table 7
Summary of Parks and Recreation Capital Improvement Program - FY 2014-18
City of Pasadena Park Fee Nexus Study - 2013 Update

Item	Total		Existing	New	Identified City Funding	
	Estimated Costs	Percent	Development Costs 84.8% (1)	Development Costs 15.2% (1)	\$ Amount	Percent
Totals, All	\$124,292,118		\$105,362,209	\$18,929,909	\$23,775,983	19%
Costs by District						
Western	\$19,215,668	15%	\$16,289,088	\$2,926,580	\$12,660,200	53%
Central	\$4,333,415	3%	\$3,673,428	\$659,987	\$3,398,000	14%
Eastern	\$6,792,773	5%	\$5,758,222	\$1,034,551	\$1,564,623	7%
Citywide	<u>\$93,950,262</u>	<u>76%</u>	<u>\$79,641,472</u>	<u>\$14,308,790</u>	<u>\$6,153,160</u>	<u>26%</u>
Total	\$124,292,118	100%	\$105,362,209	\$18,929,909	\$23,775,983	100%

(1) Based on forecast from Table 3 and General Plan development capacity.

(2) Represents miscellaneous improvements at a variety of parks that have been funded already.

Sources: City of Pasadena; Brion & Associates.

5. POTENTIAL NEW PARK IMPACT FEES

Table 8 estimates the new park and recreation impact fee based on the data and analysis presented above. This analysis follows the nexus study principles discussed in Chapter 2 and is calculated according to the existing service standard -- in this case, park acreage per 1,000 population. Projected population growth and current park standards are shown at the top of **Table 8**. The analysis assumes 2.73 park acres per 1,000 population and 1.89 acres of open space per 1,000 population. New development requires an additional 67.2 acres of new parkland and 46.6 acres of open space, based on existing standards. Separate estimates of parkland and open space are made because development costs and land prices vary greatly between developed parks versus open space. As discussed before, new development under the General Plan equals approximately 12,900 units, and represents 15.2% of total population growth at 2035.

Consistent with the City's current Park and Recreation Fee Ordinance, current land values per acre are used for this analysis. In order to obtain this figure, we analyzed a variety of land sales transactions collected by the City Planning and Community Development Department over the last five years (see Appendix, **Table B-2**). These transactions are residential, mixed use, and open space land sales in the City. The weighted average price per acre of these transactions is about \$3.8 million, based on 10 transactions. Most of these sales were for parcels with an average weighted size of 1.25 acres. For comparison purposes, the City's current park fee ordinance assumes an average land value of about \$2.9 million per acre (from the 2004 Nexus Study). For open space, the average land value is \$244,500 per acre, based on 8 comparable transactions (see Appendix, **Table B-3**).

Using these new land prices, new park land and open space costs would total \$266.3 million. This includes the cost for developed parkland and open space combined. An average of \$250,000 per acre is assumed for park development costs, although some parks may cost more or less depending on the type of facilities included at the park and whether the park is active or passive. Open space development costs are estimated at \$15,000 per acre, a figure that would fund amenities like trails, markers and signage. The total cost of park and open space land combined with development costs is \$302.7 million shown in **Table 8**.

Table 8
Future Parks Requirements and New Parks Impact Fee
City of Pasadena Park Fee Nexus Study - 2013 Update

Item	Reference	Amount
<u>Projected future development</u>		
Projected housing unit growth, 2013-2035		12,878
Projected population growth, 2013-2035		24,654
New population as % of current population		15.2%
Current parks standard (acres per 1,000 population) (1)	Table 5	2.73
Current open space standard (acres per 1,000 Population) (1)	Table 5	1.89
Combined parks and open space standard		4.62
New parks acres required, 2013-2035		67.21
New open space required, 2013-2035		46.59
Total parks and open space acres required		113.80
<u>Park Land Costs</u>		
Average parks land cost per acre (2)	Table A-2	\$3,792,288
<u>Open Space Land Costs</u>		
Average open space land cost per acre (3)	Table A-3	\$244,464
<u>Total land costs</u>		\$266,278,837
<u>Improvement costs</u>		
Average parks improvement cost per acre		\$250,000
Average open space improvement cost per acre		\$15,000
Total improvement costs		\$17,501,983
Total land and improvement costs		\$283,780,820
New residents' share of improvement costs at existing parks (4)	Table 6	\$18,929,909
Total parks and recreation costs attributable to new residents		\$302,710,729

- (1) Based on current population and existing parks and open space.
(2) Based on appraisals and comparable sales from City Planning Department (see Table A-2).
(3) Based on appraisals and comparable sales from City Planning Department (see Table A-3).
(4) Based on the assumption that new residents will pay for improvements to existing parks in proportion to their share of City population. These improvement costs are itemized in Table A-1.

Sources: City of Pasadena; Brion & Associates.

New development should also bear a portion of the costs of the current CIP, as this presents significant improvements to the City's park and recreation network and in many cases expands the amenities and facilities to serve new and existing development. However, only a small

portion of these costs – around \$18.9 million -- can be fairly allocated to new development.⁹ Total new park and recreation facilities required to serve new development will cost about \$303 million.

The average new park impact fee on a per unit basis is highlighted at the bottom of **Table 11**. The City of Pasadena is currently assessing a fee by number of bedrooms, not by type of dwelling unit. The current per bedroom rates are shown in **Table 9** and range from \$16,618 for a studio unit to \$30,761 for a 5-bedroom or larger unit.

Table 9
Current Residential Impact Fee (RIF) Rates - 2014
City of Pasadena Park Fee Nexus Study - 2013 Update

Development Type	Bedrooms	Per-unit RIF	Per-unit RIF with Affordable Housing Discount (1)
New Residential	Studio	\$16,618	\$11,633
New Residential	1	\$17,538	\$12,276
New Residential	2	\$19,478	\$13,634
New Residential	3	\$22,399	\$15,679
New Residential	4	\$27,215	\$19,051
New Residential	5 or more	\$30,761	\$21,533
Affordable Housing	Any	\$861	
Student Housing	Any	\$861	
Skilled Nursing Unit	Any	\$861	

(1) Where a developer provides affordable housing units, market-rate units in the same development receive a 30% discount on the Residential Impact Fee.

Source: City of Pasadena FY 14 Schedule of Taxes, Fees, and Charges; Brion & Associates.

Table 10 calculates the Park and Recreation Fee on a per resident basis. Based on population growth and the projected cost of new park land, the per resident cost is calculated at \$12,278 per resident for both parks and open space.

Based on new housing and population growth, the new per bedroom fee is calculated in **Table 11**. Due to changes in the U.S. Census between 2010 and 2000, it was not possible to cross-tabulate the persons per household with the bedrooms per household. Instead, ratios of average bedroom size from the 2000 Census were applied to current (2010) data to create a weighted average, used to calculate the new rates. The new proposed fees are approximately 41.6% higher than the current fees, ranging from \$23,533 for studio units to \$43,562 for 5-bedroom or larger units. The average fee is \$28,486 per unit, based on an average of 2.32 persons per unit.

⁹ This is based on new population between 2013-2035 as a percentage of total population in the City (15.2% of \$18.9 million).

Table 10
Parks and Recreation Costs per Person
City of Pasadena Park Fee Nexus Study - 2013 Update

Item	Amount
Projected population growth from 2013 to 2035	24,654
Projected new parks acreage	67.21
Projected new open space acreage	46.59
Parks cost per acre	\$3,792,288
Open space cost per acre	\$244,464
Projected parks cost	\$254,889,946
Projected open space cost	\$11,388,891
Project Development costs	\$17,501,983
New residents' share of improvement costs at existing parks	\$18,929,909
Projected combined parks and open space cost	\$302,710,729
Projected total cost per new resident	\$12,278

Sources: City of Pasadena; Brion & Associates.

Table 11
Parks and Recreation Fees by Bedrooms per Unit
City of Pasadena Park Fee Nexus Study - 2013 Update

Number of Bedrooms	Persons per Household (1)	Current Fee per Unit (3)	New Fee per Unit (2)	Percent Increase
Studio	1.92	\$16,618	\$23,533	41.6%
1	2.02	\$17,538	\$24,835	41.6%
2	2.25	\$19,478	\$27,583	41.6%
3	2.58	\$22,399	\$31,719	41.6%
4	3.14	\$27,215	\$38,540	41.6%
5 or more	3.55	\$30,761	\$43,562	41.6%
Average	2.32		\$28,486	

(1) Persons per household is updated with 2010 average household size applied to original 2000 numbers. The 2010 Census no longer cross-tabulates persons per household and bedrooms per household though each of these items is available independently. Ratios of average bedroom size from the 2000 data were applied to current 2010 data to get numbers here.

(2) Based on the per person cost factor of \$12,278 as calculated in Table 8.

(3) See Table 9.

Sources: US Census; Brion & Associates.

6. CITY FUNDING REQUIREMENTS

The City's Department of Public Works collects the Park and Recreation RIF for new development. In addition to these funds raised, the City needs to develop a plan for securing the funding required to pay for existing development's share of the park and recreation facilities included in the CIP. This existing funding requirement equals about \$105.4 million (see **Table 7**). Parks and recreation facilities are an integral part of the City's Capital Improvement Program (CIP), and funding will be allocated each fiscal year towards existing development's share of the current CIP. The City continues to pursue the following funding sources:

Funding Mechanisms Currently in Use

- **State and Federal Grants and Other Outside Funding:** The State of California offers potential funding sources for park and recreation facilities, which the City could apply for directly. For example, the City recently received a grant for an improvement to Annandale Park.
- **General Fund Allocation:** Discretionary General Fund revenues will need to be allocated to park and recreation facilities included in the CIP. The City could establish a policy to set aside a certain percentage of Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenues or sales tax revenue for park facilities. Or, the City could decide to increase the TOT rate and use the incremental revenue to fund park and recreation facilities associated with existing development.
- **Community Development Block Grants:** The City receives CDBG revenue each year, which can be used at its discretion for community improvements and projects. Some of this revenue can be applied to the City's existing development CIP requirements.
- **In-kind Contributions:** The City can contribute land or existing facilities towards the development of park and recreation facilities. These in-kind contributions will count towards existing development's requirements.

Potential Funding Mechanism

Some cities use parcel taxes as a means of funding parks and recreation facilities.

- **Parcel Tax:** The City could consider establishing a citywide parcel tax or non-Ad Valorem Property Tax to fund park and recreation facilities. While parcel taxes require a two-thirds vote of the electorate and are difficult to pass, a parcel tax would be an ideal source of funding existing development's share of park and recreation facilities.

7. CONCLUSIONS AND NEXT STEPS

This analysis demonstrates that the City's current impact fee per bedroom is justifiable. It also indicates that this fee is lower than the true cost of providing for new parks and recreation facilities, given the current high cost of land in the City and an increase in cost since the fee was adopted in 2005. Evidence assembled by this study indicates that a park impact fee could be adopted at a rate of \$31,719 for a 3-bedroom unit, which is approximately \$9,300 or 41.6% more than the current fee for a 3-bedroom unit.

The City Council could also consider adopting impact fees that take into account unit type and density. The City does currently charge \$861 for affordable housing units, student housing and skilled nursing facilities. It will provide for a 30% per unit discount for projects that include affordable units on-site. This helps make the fees more reasonable for affordable housing projects, senior projects, and other low-income housing.

The City could also consider offering credits for on-site private open space and recreation facilities. This could help reduce the cost of the impact fee on new development and encourage developers to offer on-site amenities. For instance, if a residential project provides tennis courts, swimming pools, or large park areas with playgrounds, they can receive up to 50% credit on their park fees. The logic is that these private facilities offset demand for public facilities and save the city improvement costs to serve these residents. In the case of San Mateo, the credits that are offered reduce the impact fee considerably.

Next Steps

1. **Publish new fee nexus study and supporting data.**
2. **Present Updated RIF Nexus Study to the Park and Recreation Commission and then to the City Council.**
3. **Prepare and adopt a revised Residential Impact Fee Ordinance and Resolution.** The City Council will direct the City Attorney to prepare these two documents. The Ordinance references this Nexus Study and the resolution will set the final park fee rate at the direction of Council.
4. **Update City Fee Schedule with new RIF rates**

APPENDIX A: ADDITIONAL RECOMMENDATIONS AND POLICIES ON PARKS AND OPEN SPACE

This appendix provides additional details on policies and recommendations on the Green Space, Recreation and Parks Element and Master Plan and the Open Space Conservation Element, from **Chapter 2** of the report. These policies and recommendations relate to the need for a Residential Impact Fee (RIF). The RIF serves as an implementation action of the General Plan goals, policies and recommendations.

Green Space, Recreation and Parks Element and Master Plan

Additional Urban Open Space and Parks

- Pursue acquiring land identified in the Sensitive Lands Survey if it becomes available.
- Encourage the development of publicly accessible urban open space areas throughout the city, both public and privately owned.
- Pursue trail and park improvements within and adjacent to the Los Angeles County Flood Control Basin and Southern California Edison Property in eastern Pasadena. These potential improvements can become an interconnected series of recreational amenities that will tie into existing park facilities and form a recreational corridor.

Acquisition of Open Space

- Pursue leases and enhancement of Los Angeles County Flood Control property in eastern Pasadena.

Additional accessible playgrounds

- Continue to implement existing City policy for upgrading play equipment for increased accessibility.
- Continue to implement existing City policy for incorporation of accessible components in new facilities.

Passive vs. Active Use of Facilities

- Pursue additional recreational facilities to meet identified sports field deficits and relieve pressure on field use.

Park and Recreation Amenities Provided by Park Type

- Implement existing park and facility master plans such as the Arroyo Seco Master Plans.
- Utilize a standard palette of amenities for planning park improvements.

- Ensure that amenities within Neighborhood Parks are responsive to specific location and function of the park.
- Ideally, all Neighborhood Parks shall contain the following amenities:
 - Play Equipment – Separate structures for 3 to 5 year olds and 5 to 12 year olds will be required.
 - Drinking Fountain(s)- ADA compliant
 - Picnic tables, barbeques, benches and waste containers
 - Open turf areas for casual play
 - Trees
 - Security Lighting
 - ADA compliant concrete walkways that connect all of the amenities in the park.

Open Space and Conservation Element

Preserve, Acquire and Create Open Space

- Preserve currently zoned open spaces, natural open spaces, hillsides, view sheds, watersheds and recreational areas.
- Develop criteria, prioritize and plan to acquire additional open space.
- Create additional open spaces through reclamation and restoration.
- Participate in regional, state and federal programs designed to preserve, maintain and acquire open space.
- Direct organized recreation to existing parks, fields, and school facilities and away from natural open spaces.

Develop Access & Connectivity for Wildlife and People

- Develop open space and wildlife corridors and establish easement and acquisition programs.
- Acknowledge, restore and maintain Pasadena's connections with trails in the Angeles National Forest and regional trail systems.

- Ensure that all Pasadena residents have access to information about where open spaces are located and the transportation opportunities and options for getting to them.

Preserve, Restore and Maintain the Eaton Canyon Corridor & the Arroyo Seco

- Preserve, restore and maintain the natural character of the Eaton Canyon Corridor and the Arroyo Seco as self-sustaining healthy ecosystems of plants and animals.
- Its natural character will continue to inspire people, as it has throughout time.
- Promote responsible human interfaces with these unique natural environments in open space planning.

Welcome and Value the Importance of Citizen Participation

- Citizen participation shall play a major role in all phases of open space planning.
- The City shall provide the public with timely information regarding open space planning and decision making.

Define and Recognize the Benefits Derived from Open Space

- The opportunity to experience open space is vital to the physical and psychological well-being of Pasadena's residents.
- Account for impacts to "nature's services" and associated value when making decisions about open space. Open space is important for the health of the ecosystem and provides direct and indirect economic benefit to the City.
- Preserve, restore and maintain Pasadena's natural amenities and recreation options which provide unique value to Pasadena's character and desirability as a place to live, visit, and conduct business.

**APPENDIX B:
DETAILED SUPPORTING DATA**

Table B-1: Park Improvement Capital Cost Database

Table B-2: Recent Urban Comps - Sales Transactions

Table B-3: Recent Open Space Comps - Sales Transactions

Table B-1
 FY 2014 - 2018 Capital Improvement Program
 Parks and Landscaping - Park Projects
 Pasadena Residential Impact Fee Update - 2013

Park District	Park	CIP No.	Improvement Description	Total Estimated Costs	Existing Funding Collected - Appropriated through 2014	Total Unfunded or Not Appropriated by 2014	Existing Development	New Development
Parks and Landscaping - Park Projects								
C	Villa-Parke	78901	Replacement or installation of Security Lights	\$404,915	\$0	\$404,915	\$343,246	\$61,669
C	Jefferson	78901	Replacement or installation of Security Lights	\$290,500	\$0	\$290,500	\$246,256	\$44,244
E	Victory	78901	Replacement or installation of Security Lights	\$672,203	\$0	\$672,203	\$569,825	\$102,378
E	Gwinn	78901	Replacement or installation of Security Lights	\$15,300	\$0	\$15,300	\$12,970	\$2,330
E	Sunnyslope	78901	Replacement or installation of Security Lights	\$213,647	\$0	\$213,647	\$181,108	\$32,539
W	San Rafael	78901	Replacement or installation of Security Lights	\$198,835	\$0	\$198,835	\$168,552	\$30,283
W	La Pintoresca	78901	Replacement or installation of Security Lights	\$300,000	\$300,000	\$0	\$254,309	\$45,691
W	Brenner	78901	Replacement or installation of Security Lights	\$260,000	\$260,000	\$0	\$220,402	\$39,598
C	McDonald	78901	Replacement or installation of Security Lights	\$280,000	\$280,000	\$0	\$237,356	\$42,644
E	Eaton-Blanche	78901	Replacement or installation of Security Lights	\$200,000	\$200,000	\$0	\$169,540	\$30,460
C	Washington	78901	Replacement or installation of Security Lights	\$500,000	\$500,000	\$0	\$423,849	\$76,151
W	Defenders	78901	Replacement or installation of Security Lights	\$229,600	\$229,600	\$0	\$194,632	\$34,968
W	Central Park	78461	Central Park - Implement Master Plan	\$3,150,000	\$2,745,600	\$404,400	\$2,670,249	\$479,751
C	78038		Restroom Buildings (Replace or Construct)	\$2,368,000	\$2,368,000	\$0	\$2,007,349	\$360,651
W	78038		Restroom Buildings (Replace or Construct)	\$1,115,000	\$1,115,000	\$0	\$945,184	\$169,816
E	78038		Restroom Buildings (Replace or Construct)	\$2,691,623	\$1,186,623	\$1,505,000	\$2,281,684	\$409,939
W	78055		Soccer Field - Muir High School	\$1,500,000	\$200,000	\$1,300,000	\$1,271,547	\$28,453
C	McDonald	78044	Sports Fields Improvements	\$90,000	\$0	\$90,000	\$76,293	\$13,707
C	Jefferson	78044	Sports Fields Improvements	\$150,000	\$0	\$150,000	\$127,155	\$22,845
E	Victory	78044	Sports Fields Improvements	\$400,000	\$0	\$400,000	\$339,079	\$60,921
C	Villa-Parke	78045	Sports Fields Improvements	\$200,000	\$200,000	\$0	\$169,540	\$30,460
W	Brenner	78046	Sports Fields Improvements	\$50,000	\$50,000	\$0	\$42,385	\$7,615
C	Washington	78047	Sports Fields Improvements	\$50,000	\$50,000	\$0	\$42,385	\$7,615
W	Annandale Canyon	78240	Annandale Canyon Open Space Trail Access and Trail Improvements	\$500,000	\$300,000	\$200,000	\$423,849	\$76,151
W	Robinson Park	78043	Robinson Park - Implement Master Plan Phase II	\$8,300,000	\$7,300,000	\$1,000,000	\$7,035,895	\$1,264,105
E	Hamilton Park	78907	Hamilton Park - Installation of Skateboard Park	\$360,000	\$153,000	\$207,000	\$305,171	\$54,829
E	Eaton Canyon & Vina Vieja (Eaton Wash)	78066	Eaton Canyon and Eaton Wash Park Improvement Plan	\$500,000	\$25,000	\$475,000	\$423,849	\$76,151
CW	78056		Synthetic Turf Soccer Field	\$5,000,000	\$500,000	\$4,500,000	\$4,238,491	\$761,509
W	Desiderio Park	78054	Desiderio Park - Development of New Park	\$2,410,000	\$160,000	\$2,250,000	\$2,042,953	\$367,047
W	Memorial Park	N/A	Memorial Park - Implement Master Plan - Phase II	\$1,202,233	\$0	\$1,202,233	\$1,019,131	\$183,102
E	Hamilton Park	N/A	Hamilton Park - Various Projects Phase II	\$680,000	\$0	\$680,000	\$576,435	\$103,565
E	Victory Park	N/A	Victory Park Athletic Field Lighting Replacement	\$1,060,000	\$0	\$1,060,000	\$898,560	\$161,440
CW	Washington Park	N/A	Washington Park - Implement Master Plan - Phase II	\$1,123,456	\$0	\$1,123,456	\$952,352	\$171,104
Totals				\$36,465,312	\$18,122,823	\$18,342,489	\$30,911,581	\$5,553,731

Sources: City of Pasadena; Brion & Associates.

Table B-1
FY 2014 - 2018 Capital Improvement Program
Parks and Landscaping - Park Projects
Pasadena Residential Impact Fee Update - 2013

Park District	Park	CIP No.	Improvement Description	Total Estimated Costs Priority Description	Existing Funding Collected - Appropriated through 2014	Total Unfunded or Not Appropriated by 2014	Existing Development		New Development
							84.8%	15.2%	
Continued									
CW	Hahamongna	77509	Implement Master Plan - Hahamongna Watershed Park - Berkshire Creek Area Improvements	\$1,593,010	\$778,410	\$814,600	\$1,350,392	\$242,618	
CW	Hahamongna	77508	Implement Master Plan - Hahamongna Watershed Park - Habitat Restoration	\$520,000	\$420,000	\$100,000	\$440,803	\$79,197	
CW	Hahamongna	77901	Pasadena Equestrian Center Improvements	\$950,000	\$650,000	\$300,000	\$805,313	\$144,687	
CW	Hahamongna	77511	Environmental Educational Center at Hahamongna	\$1,300,000	\$100,000	\$1,200,000	\$1,102,008	\$197,992	
CW	Hahamongna	N/A	Hahamongna Watershed Park - Implement Master Plan - Future Unfunded	\$32,851,563	\$0	\$32,851,563	\$27,848,212	\$5,003,351	
CW	Hahamongna	N/A	Park Roadway Rehabilitation	\$1,550,000	\$0	\$1,550,000	\$1,313,932	\$236,068	
				\$38,764,573	\$1,948,410	\$36,816,163	\$32,860,660	\$5,903,913	
CW	Central Arroyo	77371	Trail and Rubble Wall Restoration - Central Arroyo	\$1,094,660	\$543,848	\$550,812	\$927,941	\$166,719	
CW	Brookside Park	77562	Brookside Park - Jackie Robinson Baseball Stadium Improvements	\$830,000	\$241,123	\$588,877	\$703,590	\$126,410	
CW	Central Arroyo	77377	East Arroyo Neighborhood Connector Trail Improvements	\$186,000	\$56,000	\$130,000	\$157,672	\$28,328	
CW	Brookside Park	77369	Brookside Park - Upgrade of Athletic Field Lighting and Reconfiguration of Diamond 2	\$1,000,000	\$0	\$1,000,000	\$847,698	\$152,302	
CW	Central Arroyo	N/A	Central Arroyo - Implement Master Plan - Future Unfunded	\$31,397,786	\$180,000	\$31,217,786	\$26,615,848	\$4,781,938	
CW	Brookside Park	N/A	Brookside Park - Renovation of Security Lighting	\$625,000	\$0	\$625,000	\$529,811	\$95,189	
CW	Central Arroyo	N/A	Habitat Restoration in the Central Arroyo Seco Phase II	\$376,375	\$0	\$376,375	\$319,052	\$57,323	
CW	Central Arroyo	N/A	Parking Control Along West Drive - Central Arroyo	\$607,500	\$0	\$607,500	\$514,977	\$92,523	
CW	Central Arroyo	N/A	Central Arroyo - Trail Installation - West Side of Arroyo Blvd. from Westgate St. to Rosemont Ave.	\$90,000	\$0	\$90,000	\$76,293	\$13,707	
CW	Central Arroyo	N/A	Replacement of Area H Restrooms and Concession Stand	\$2,000,000	\$0	\$2,000,000	\$1,695,396	\$304,604	
CW	Brookside Park	N/A	Brookside Park - New Maintenance Office and Materials Storage Yard	\$450,000	\$0	\$450,000	\$381,464	\$68,536	
			Totals	\$38,657,321	\$1,020,971	\$37,636,350	\$32,769,743	\$5,887,578	
CW	Lower Arroyo Park	77409	Bird Sanctuary Improvements	\$350,000	\$225,000	\$125,000	\$296,694	\$53,306	
CW	Lower Arroyo Park	77414	Lower Arroyo - Implement Master Plan - Signage	\$316,734	\$179,200	\$137,534	\$268,495	\$48,239	
CW	Lower Arroyo Park	77406	Lower Arroyo - Implement Master Plan - Trail Restoration Improvements	\$850,000	\$487,500	\$362,500	\$720,544	\$129,456	
CW	Lower Arroyo Park	77422	Lower Arroyo - Implement Master Plan - Habitat Restoration	\$841,460	\$541,175	\$300,285	\$713,304	\$128,156	
CW	Lower Arroyo Park	77407	Lower Arroyo - Implement Master Plan - Main Entrance Improvements	\$1,300,000	\$200,000	\$1,100,000	\$1,102,008	\$197,992	
CW	Lower Arroyo Park	77460	Renovation of La Casita del Arroyo	\$500,000	\$375,000	\$125,000	\$423,849	\$76,151	
CW	Lower Arroyo Park	N/A	Lower Arroyo Seco - Master Plan Implementation - Future Unfunded	\$5,328,718	\$675,904	\$4,652,814	\$4,517,145	\$811,573	
CW	Lower Arroyo Park	N/A	Lower Arroyo - Implement Master Plan - Rebuild Rowing Archers Clubhouse with Storage Area	\$300,000	\$0	\$300,000	\$254,309	\$45,691	
CW	Lower Arroyo Park	N/A	Lower Arroyo - Implement Master Plan - La Casita del Arroyo Slope Protection	\$618,000	\$0	\$618,000	\$523,878	\$94,122	
			Totals	\$10,404,912	\$2,683,779	\$7,721,133	\$8,820,226	\$1,584,686	
			Grand Total	\$124,292,118	\$23,775,983	\$100,816,135	\$105,362,209	\$18,929,909	

Sources: City of Pasadena; Brion & Associates.

Table B-2
Recent Urban Comps - Sales Transactions
Pasadena Residential Impact Fee Update - 2013

No.	Assessor Parcel Number	Address	City	Sale Date	Price	Size of lot (sf)	Size of lot (acres)	\$/sf	\$/acre
1	5747-014-035	30 S. Berkeley Ave	Pasadena	11/2011	\$800,000	20,038	0.460	\$39.92	\$1,739,130
2	5720-012-001	100 E. California Blvd.	Pasadena	6/2012	\$1,721,000	23,392	0.537	\$73.57	\$3,204,803
3	5757-029-051, 053	6570 & 3572 E. Foothill Blvd.	Pasadena	3/2010	\$3,850,000	108,900	2.500	\$35.35	\$1,540,000
4	5746-008-044	27 N. Grand Oaks Ave.	Pasadena	6/2012	\$1,600,000	27,007	0.620	\$59.24	\$2,580,645
5	5723-017-912	191 N. Los Robles Ave.	Pasadena	1/2012	\$7,000,000	52,708	1.210	\$132.81	\$5,785,080
6	5735-034-065, 066, 067, 047	The Commons Shopping Ctr	Pasadena	11/2011	\$21,000,000	171,191	3.930	\$122.67	\$5,343,511
7	5735-009-037	36 S. Michigan Ave.	Pasadena	4/2010	\$775,000	11,400	0.262	\$67.98	\$2,961,316
8	5746-008-069	2132 E. Walnut St.	Pasadena	3/2013	\$729,000	10,890	0.250	\$66.94	\$2,916,000
9	5720-008-905	870 Raymond Ave.	Pasadena	2/2012	\$6,150,000	105,189	2.415	\$58.47	\$2,546,787
10	5720-017-030	1030 S. Arroyo Parkway	Pasadena	1/2012	\$3,775,000	13,744	0.316	\$274.67	\$11,964,421
Totals					\$47,400,000	544,459	12.499		
Averages					\$4,740,000	54,446	1.250	\$87.06	\$3,792,288

(1) Data provided by Kelley Kitasato, Real Property Manager, City of Pasadena; July 2013.

Sources: City of Pasadena; Brion & Associates.

Table B-3
Recent Open Space Comps - Sales Transactions
Pasadena Residential Impact Fee Update - 2013

No.	Assessor Parcel Number	Address	City	Sale Date	Price	Size of Lot (sf)	Size of lot (acres)	\$/sf	\$/acre
1	5707-016-912 (24)	1410 Wierfield Dr.	Pasadena	8/2009	\$150,000	31,000	0.712	\$4.84	\$210,774
2	5704-001-045	1918 Linda Vista Ave.	Pasadena	7/2011	\$78,500	13,700	0.315	\$5.73	\$249,596
3	5480-029-005	1318 Wildwood Dr.	Pasadena	7/2011	\$60,000	11,570	0.266	\$5.19	\$225,895
4	5480-026-011	1349 Wildwood Dr.	Pasadena	10/2011	\$55,000	10,600	0.243	\$5.19	\$226,019
5	5649-007-013	3049 Edgewick Rd.	Pasadena	10/2011	\$103,500	10,770	0.247	\$9.61	\$418,613
6	5707-018-023	1336 Wierfield Dr.	Pasadena	current listing	\$99,000	18,800	0.432	\$5.27	\$229,385
7	5707-017-022	1380 Wierfield Dr.	Pasadena	9/2012; listing expired	\$78,000	8,340	0.191	\$9.35	\$407,396
8	5707-017-0023	1390 Wierfield Dr.	Pasadena	9/2012; listing expired	\$98,000	23,870	0.548	\$4.11	\$178,839
Totals					\$722,000	128,650	2.953		
Averages					\$90,250	16,081	0.369	\$5.61	\$244,464

(1) Data provided by Kelley Kitasato, Real Property Manager, City of Pasadena; July 2013.

Sources: City of Pasadena; Brion & Associates.