COUNTY OF SAN BERNARDINO

REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION DEVELOPMENT MITIGATION PLAN REPORT

Department of Public Works – Transportation Operations and Community Services

Adopted December 5, 2006
Revised June 26, 2012
Updated July 22, 2014
Updated August 24, 2021
Updated November 5, 2024

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Section 1 - EXECUTIVE SUMMARY **1**

Section 2 - OVERVIEW AND BACKGROUND OF THE PLAN **6**
(a) OVERVIEW 6
(b) REQUIREMENTS OF MEASURE I 2010-2040 6
(c) REQUIREMENTS OF THE CONGESTION MANAGEMENT PROGRAM 6
(d) THE PLAN AND LOCAL AREA TRANSPORTATION FACILITIES PLANS 8
(e) REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT CONTRIBUTIONS NOT COVERED BY THE PLAN 8
(f) CONFORMANCE TO CALIFORNIA GOVERNMENT CODE 8

Section 3 - PLAN SUBAREAS AND BOUNDARIES **10**
(a) PLAN SUBAREAS 10

Section 4 - GROWTH FORECASTS **11**
(a) CONSISTENCY WITH SANBAG NEXUS STUDY GROWTH FORECAST DATA 11
(b) GROWTH FORECAST METHODOLOGY 11
(c) GROWTH FORECAST DATA FOR PLAN SUBAREAS 11
(d) GROWTH RATIO OF NEW DEVELOPMENT FOR MAJOR ARTERIAL ROADS 14
(e) RATIO OF GROWTH OF FREEWAY INTERCHANGES AND GRADE SEPARATIONS 15
(f) REVIEW AND UPDATES OF GROWTH FORECAST DATA 15

Section 5 - REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION FACILITIES PROJECTS **16**
(a) TRANSPORTATION FACILITIES PROJECT SELECTION 16
(1) MAJOR ARTERIAL ROAD PROJECTS 16
(2) TRAFFIC SIGNAL PROJECTS 16
(3) FREEWAY INTERCHANGE PROJECTS 16
(4) RAILROAD GRADE SEPARATION PROJECTS 17
(b) PROJECT LISTS BY PLAN SUBAREA 17
(c) PRIORITIZATION OF PROJECT LISTS 17
(d) INCLUSION IN GENERAL PLAN CIRCULATION ELEMENT 17

Section 6 - PROJECT COST ESTIMATES **18**
(a) TYPES OF COSTS INCLUDED IN PROJECT COST ESTIMATES 18
(b) PROJECT CATEGORIES 18
(c) METHODOLOGY 18
(1) MAJOR ARTERIAL ROADWAY PROJECTS 18
(2) FREEWAY INTERCHANGE AND GRADE SEPARATION PROJECTS 19
(3) TRAFFIC SIGNALIZATION PROJECTS 19
(d) ADMINISTRATIVE OVERHEAD CALCULATION AND APPLICATION 20

Section 7 - FEE CALCULATIONS **21**
(a) PURPOSE OF THE FEE 21
(b) METHODOLOGY OF FEE CALCULATIONS 21
(1) CALCULATE TOTAL PROJECT COST ESTIMATES BY SUBAREA 21
(2) CALCULATE THE FAIR-SHARE CONTRIBUTION OF TOTAL PROJECT COSTS ATTRIBUTABLE TO NEW DEVELOPMENT 22
(3) CALCULATE PLAN SUBAREA GROWTH WITH CONVERSION OF NON-RESIDENTIAL GROWTH FROM NUMBER OF EMPLOYEES TO SQUARE FOOTAGE 24

(4) CALCULATE THE TOTAL VEHICLE TRIP GENERATION IN PASSENGER CAR EQUIVALENTS (PCEs) TRIP ENDS FOR EACH TYPE OF DEVELOPMENT....25
(5) CALCULATE TOTAL PASSENGER CAR EQUIVALENTS (PCEs) VEHICLE MILE TRAVELED FOR EACH TYPE OF DEVELOPMENT....26
(6) CALCULATE A "FEE-PER-TRIP"....27
(7) CALCULATE SUBAREA FEES FOR RESIDENTIAL AND NON-RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT....28
(8) VERIFY FEE LEVELS BY CALCULATING TOTAL REVENUE GENERATION....29
(9) VERIFY PLAN GENERATES DEVELOPMENT CONTRIBUTION AMOUNT....30

Section 8 - NEXUS ANALYSIS....32
(a) REQUIREMENTS OF CALIFORNIA GOVERNMENT CODE....32
(b) RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN FEE'S USE AND TYPE OF DEVELOPMENT....32
(c) RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN NEED FOR TRANSPORTATION FACILITIES AND TYPE OF DEVELOPMENT....32
(d) RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN FEE AND COST OF TRANSPORTATION FACILITIES ATTRIBUTABLE TO DEVELOPMENT....32

Section 9 – PAYMENT OF PLAN FEES....34
(a) FEE PAYMENTS....34
(b) EFFECTIVE DATE OF PLAN FEES....37
(c) FEE PAYMENT FOR LAND USE CATEGORIES NOT IDENTIFIED IN THE PLAN....37
(d) WAIVER OR REDUCTION OF PLAN FEES....36
(e) PROTESTING FEE AMOUNTS IN A PLAN SUBAREA....37
(f) REFUND OF FEES....38
(g) DEVELOPER FEE CREDITS AND REIMBURSEMENT AGREEMENTS....38
(h) EXCLUSION FROM FEE PAYMENT....40

Section 10 - PLAN ADMINISTRATION....42
(a) PLAN ACCOUNTING FUNDS....42
(1) DISTRIBUTION OF FEES....42
(2) INTEREST....43
(b) PLAN REPORTS....43
(1) SANBAG ANNUAL DEVELOPMENT MITIGATION PROGRAM REPORT....43
(2) ANNUAL PLAN REPORTS....44
(3) FIVE YEAR REPORTS....43
(c) REFUND OF SURPLUS FUNDS....45
(d) UPDATES TO THE PLAN....45
(1) REGULAR UPDATES....45
(2) ANNEXATIONS....45
(e) AMENDMENT AND DISSOLUTION OF THE PLAN....45
(f) COMBINED DEVELOPMENT MITIGATION PROGRAMS WITH CITIES....46

APPENDIX 1 - PLAN PROJECT LIST AND COSTS....46

Section 1 - EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

OVERVIEW AND BACKGROUND OF THE PLAN – Section 2

The Regional Transportation Development Mitigation Plan of the County of San Bernardino (hereafter "the PLAN") was developed to satisfy the provisions of the San Bernardino County Congestion Management Program (CMP). Pursuant to Measure I 2010-2040, the County CMP was updated and adopted by the County Congestion Management Agency, San Bernardino Associated Governments (SANBAG), now San Bernardino County Transportation Authority (SBCTA), in November 2, 2005.

Each local jurisdiction, including San Bernardino County, was required to adopt a regional transportation development mitigation program prior to November 2006. Failure to adopt and maintain a program that is compliant with the CMP may result in significant loss to the Countyof State Gas Tax, regional Measure I, and federal/state grant funding necessary for the ongoing maintenance of and improvements to the County Maintained Road System (CMRS).

The SANBAG Development Mitigation Nexus Study (SANBAG Nexus Study) determines the fair-share contributions from new development for each local jurisdiction and was updated on November 6, 2013. The total development fair-share of cost, or "target share amount" for which the County is responsible to generate through the PLAN is $240.05 million. This total is distributed among the PLAN SUBAREAS based upon project lists and growth forecasts.

The PLAN is intended to generate only the development fair-share contribution of project costs as required by the CMP and is not intended to provide 100% funding for or construct all projects listed in the PLAN. Additional regional Measure I and federal/state funds administered by SANBAG are required for full funding of projects listed in the PLAN.

PLAN BOUNDARIES – Section 3

The PLAN contains sixteen (16) PLAN SUBAREAS, twelve (12) of which represent unincorporated areas within the San Bernardino Valley and four (4) of which represent unincorporated areas within the Victor Valley. With two exceptions, the boundaries of these PLAN SUBAREAS correspond to the boundaries of the city spheres of influence as defined by the Local Agency Formation Commission (LAFCO) of San Bernardino County. The two exceptions are urbanized unincorporated areas in the San Bernardino Valley that are not contained in any city's sphere of influence, the Redlands "Donut Hole" and the Devore/Glen Helen areas.

1. Adelanto Sphere of Influence
2. Apple Valley Sphere of Influence
3. Chino Sphere of Influence
4. Colton Sphere of Influence
5. Devore/Glen Helen Unincorporated Areas
6. Fontana Sphere of Influence
7. Hesperia Sphere of Influence
8. Loma Linda Sphere of Influence
9. Montclair Sphere of Influence
10. Redlands "Donut Hole" Unincorporated Area
11. Redlands Sphere of Influence
12. Rialto Sphere of Influence
13. San Bernardino Sphere of Influence
14. Upland Sphere of Influence
15. Victorville Sphere of Influence
16. Yucaipa Sphere of Influence

GROWTH FORECASTS – Section 4

Growth forecast data for the PLAN is based upon the growth forecast data contained in the SANBAG Nexus Study. The PLAN utilizes the same forecast growth data in order to remain consistent with the SANBAG Nexus Study and generate the required "target share amounts". For residential and non-residential development, growth forecast data is projected separately in each PLAN SUBAREA to be used in calculating development impact fees. Regular review of growth forecast data is essential to the success of the PLAN in generating a fair-share contribution of development toward the SANBAG Nexus Study "target share amount". County Department of Public Works will coordinate with SANBAG and the County Land Use Services Department in periodic reviews and adjustment, as necessary, to the growth forecast data.

REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION FACILITY PROJECTS – Section 5

A list of Major Arterial Road projects was developed for each PLAN SUBAREA beginning with all County maintained roads with an existing Master Plan classification of Secondary or greater, as designated in the 1989 General Plan Circulation Element. The list has been evaluated further and certain roads removed that were not necessary or feasible to construct. Although not a requirement of the CMP or the SANBAG Nexus Study, County Department of Public Works also developed a list of traffic signal projects for inclusion in the PLAN. Traffic Signal projects were identified for construction wherever two of the PLAN's major arterial road projects intersect and a signal does not exist currently. The list of freeway interchange projects was compiled by SANBAG as part of its Nexus Study. The list was originally based upon the interchanges submitted by SANBAG and local jurisdictions for the 2004 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) and then modified for the Nexus Study after local jurisdiction input. SANBAG also compiled a list of Railroad Grade Separation projects for inclusion in its Nexus Study. Only freeway interchange and grade separation projects on the SANBAG Nexus Study Network were included in the PLAN.

PROJECT COST ESTIMATES – Section 6

Within each PLAN SUBAREA, specific projects have been identified as regional transportation facilities. The project costs associated with each project identified in the PLAN are for additional traveled roadway only and include engineering, environmental, right-of-way, construction, and administrative overhead costs. Environmental impact mitigation such as purchase of habitat for endangered species is not included. Where another local agency shares jurisdiction with the County for a project, costs are prorated between the jurisdictions based upon actual road miles within each jurisdiction, and only the County's share of the project cost is identified in the PLAN.

County Department of Public Works' staff have field reviewed the projects and prepared planning level cost estimates based upon current unit cost estimates for road improvement projects included in the PLAN. For traffic signal installation projects, costs were calculated based upon historical contracts and unit prices and fiscal year 2010/2011 engineer's estimates for signal installation projects currently in progress but not yet awarded for construction. The PLAN utilized SANBAG Nexus Study costs for Freeway Interchanges and Railroad Grade Separation projects.

An administrative overhead cost was calculated for major arterial and traffic signal projects consistent with the formula used for the County Department of Public Works Measure I administrative overhead rate. Currently, all indirect costs for labor, services, supplies, and overhead are paid initially out of the County Road Fund. The PLAN will reimburse the County Road Fund for the PLAN's share of those indirect costs. This is consistent with existing Department policy concerning reimbursement of the County Road Fund from Measure I revenues through direct labor costs attributable to Measure I projects.

FEE CALCULATIONS – Section 7

The purpose of the fees is to fund the fair-share development contribution of improvement costs for specific transportation facilities as identified in Appendix 1 of the PLAN. Fees are intended to generate only the development fair-share contribution of project costs as required by the CMP and are not intended to provide 100% funding for or construct all projects listed in the PLAN. Additional regional Measure I and federal/state funds administered by SANBAG (SANBAG Public Share) are required for full funding of projects listed in the PLAN. Fees vary between PLAN SUBAREAS due to the unique project lists and growth projections for those unincorporated areas. In all PLAN SUBAREAS, a residential fee is required for each dwelling unit. Non-residential fees are based upon the predominate use of the building or structure and calculated on the total square footage of the building or structure. To calculate fees, the fair share development contribution of total project costs in a PLAN SUBAREA is divided by the projected vehicular trip generation (per Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) rates) attributable to new development in the PLAN SUBAREA. The fair-share fees attributable to new development for PLAN SUBAREA are summarized in the following tables:

PLAN SUBAREA	Fee for Single Family Dwelling Unit	Fee for Multi Family Dwelling Unit	Fee for Commercial per square foot	Fee for Hotel/Motel per room	Fee for Office per square foot	Fee for Industrial per square foot	Fee for High Cube per square foot	Fee for Institutional per square foot	Fee for Truck Storage/Drop Lots Parking per acre
Adelanto	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0
Apple Valley	$2,770	$1,925	$5.97	$1,528	$3.82	$2.11	$0.64	$2.59	$13,334.66
Chino	$7,022	$4,880	$15.14	$3,873	$9.69	$5.35	$1.62	$6.56	$33,249.20
Colton	$4,409	$3,064	$9.51	$2,432	$6.08	$3.36	$1.01	$4.12	$23,062.11
Devore/Glen Helen	$6,413	$4,456	$13.83	$3,537	$8.85	$4.88	$1.48	$5.99	$31,534.16
Fontana	$6,723	$4,671	$14.49	$3,708	$9.28	$5.12	$1.55	$6.28	$31,575.81
Hesperia	$10,060	$6,991	$21.69	$5,549	$13.88	$7.66	$2.32	$9.40	$49,223.75
Loma Linda	$4,617	$3,208	$9.95	$2,546	$6.37	$3.51	$1.06	$4.31	$23,037.90
Montclair	$3,668	$2,549	$7.91	$2,023	$5.06	$2.79	$0.84	$3.43	$17,587.64
Redlands	$7,063	$4,908	$15.23	$3,896	$9.75	$5.38	$1.63	$6.60	$36,806.69
Redlands DonutHole	$3,163	$2,198	$6.82	$1,745	$4.36	$2.41	$0.73	$2.95	$16,296.82
Rialto	$7,895	$5,486	$17.02	$4,355	$10.90	$6.01	$1.82	$7.37	$40,634.05
San Bernardino	$2,489	$1,729	$5.37	$1,373	$3.43	$1.89	$0.57	$2.32	$13,116.06
Upland	$1,155	$802	$2.49	$637	$1.59	$0.88	$0.27	$1.08	$5,479.71
Victorville	$4,554	$3,164	$9.82	$2,512	$6.28	$3.47	$1.05	$4.25	$23,255.19
Yucaipa	$2,284	$1,587	$4.92	$1,260	$3.15	$1.74	$0.53	$2.13	$13,901.54

NEXUS ANALYSIS – Section 8

The unincorporated communities in the urbanized areas of the San Bernardino Valley and the Victor Valley are developing rapidly. The existing County Maintained Road System (CMRS)is marginally able to handle the existing traffic, and future development within these areas will result in traffic volumes exceeding the capacity of the existing regional transportation facilities. Ifthe capacity of the regional transportation facilities is not increased, continuing development will result in substantial traffic congestion and unacceptable levels of service. It can no longer be expected that the regional transportation facilities that will be needed for the urbanized, unincorporated areas of the San Bernardino Valley and Victor Valley can be funded fully from thetraditional revenue sources that constructed the existing highway system and road network, such

as the County's share of State Highway Excise Tax (Gas Tax) and Measure I Local Streets pass-through funds. Supplemental funding sources must be developed if important components of the County's transportation road system are to be constructed.

The transportation development mitigation fees generated by the PLAN represent a potential source of supplemental funds which will be utilized to construct projects that will mitigate the impacts of development. Future development within the described benefit area will benefit from constructing the proposed transportation facilities plan and should pay for them in proportion to projected traffic demand attributed to each.

Revenues generated by the PLAN are not intended to fund fully the cost of the PLAN's transportation facilities projects. Fees levels have been developed to provide for only that portion of project costs attributable directly to new development. Construction of the projects identified in the PLAN are dependent upon receipt of additional regional Measure I funds and federal/state grant funds that are administered by SANBAG.

PAYMENT OF PLAN FEES – Section 9

Residential and non-residential fee categories will be determined based upon the Land Use Classification as defined in the County Code, Title 8: Development Code, Division 2: Land Use Zoning Districts and Allowed Land Uses, Chapter 82.01: Land Use Plan and Land Use Zoning Districts. Fees are calculated based on the land use category identified in the Section 9 (A) table, not the land use zoning. Fees do not cover the immediate local impact of a development on the County road system. A focused traffic study will still be required of a developer, and additional mitigation of immediate local impacts on the County road system may be required. Fees are effective sixty (60) days followingthe adoption of the PLAN Ordinance.

Upon approval of the Director of Public Works, the County may enter into a written Fee Credit agreement whereby the developer may advance money, or considerations may be accepted in-lieu of part or all of the payment of fees, for the design, land acquisition, construction, financing, or purchase of a Plan transportation facility. Improvements to a regional transportation facility by a developer must be a project identified specifically in the Project List of a PLAN SUBAREA. Upon approval of the Director of Public Works, the County may enter into a developer reimbursement agreement for the balance of project costs only after one-hundred percent (100%) of required fees have been credited to a developer.

Because the PLAN fees are calculated based upon total estimated project costs identified in the PLAN's Project List, construction of transportation facilities not identified in the PLAN are ineligible for fee credit or reimbursement from the PLAN funds. Other provisions of the County General Plan or Development Code may apply to reimbursement for construction of transportation projects not on the Plan's Project List.

For Land Use Categories in a PLAN SUBAREA for which a fee is not established by the PLAN, developer contributions toward mitigation of impacts to regional transportation facilities shall follow the San Bernardino County Congestion Management Program Traffic Impact Analysis process (CMP TIA) to determine a developer mitigation amount.

PLAN ADMINISTRATION – Section 10

All fees collected under the PLAN will be deposited into separate accounts to avoid any commingling of the fees with other revenues and funds of the County. Fees will be deposited into funds based upon the PLAN SUBAREA in which the development occurs and prorated among four project category funds within those subareas (Major Arterial, Traffic Signal, Freeway Interchange, and Railroad Grade Separation) based upon total project category project costs. Funds will be expended solely for the purpose for which the fees are collected and specifically for the construction of the transportation facilities projects listed in the PLAN SUBAREAS. Fees will not be used to construct any other transportation facility not expressly identified in the PLAN.

As set forth in Appendix F.8 (Formerly J.8) of the San Bernardino County Congestion Management Program, the County Department of Public Works – Transportation shall submit an annual development mitigation report to SANBAG. The report shall be provided to SANBAG within ninety
(90) days of the end of the fiscal year. Appendix F of the CMP, Section F.3 requires that local jurisdictions must provide for an annual review and adjustment to project cost estimates.Although not required by the CMP, the County's annual review of the PLAN will also include possible addition or removal of projects. If necessary, fees will be recalculated accordingly.

Section 2 - OVERVIEW AND BACKGROUND OF THE PLAN

(a) OVERVIEW

The Regional Transportation Development Mitigation Plan of the County of San Bernardino (hereafter "the PLAN") was adopted by the Board of Supervisors in December 2006 to satisfy the provisions of the San Bernardino County Congestion Management Program (CMP). Pursuant to Measure I 2010-2040, the County CMP was updated and adopted by the County Congestion Management Agency, San Bernardino Associated Governments (SANBAG), in November 2, 2005. In 2017, SANBAG, , combined the four capacities in which it served and became the San Bernardino County Transportation Authority (SBCTA). Each local jurisdiction, including the County of San Bernardino, was required to adopt a regional transportation development mitigation program by November 2006. Failure to adopt and maintain a program that is compliant with the CMP may result in significant loss to the County of State Gas Tax, regional Measure I, and federal/state transportation funding necessary for the ongoing maintenance of and improvements to the County Maintained Road System (CMRS).

(b) REQUIREMENTS OF MEASURE I 2010-2040

In November 2004, San Bernardino County voters approved Measure I 2010-2040, a half-cent transaction and use tax dedicated to countywide transportation improvements. Section VIII of the Measure I Ordinance states, *"No revenue generated from the tax shall be used to replace the fair share contributions required from new development."* To accomplish this, the Ordinance requires that "*each jurisdiction identified in the Development Mitigation Program must adopt a development financing mechanism within 24 months of the voter approval of Measure I*" to ensure that new development contributes its fair share to the construction of regional transportation infrastructure. Included in these transportation facilities are freeway interchanges, major arterial roads, and railroad grade separations.

Further, the Measure I Ordinance requires that the cities and the unincorporated sphere of influence areas in the San Bernardino Valley and Victor Valley must adopt a mechanism to "*require all future development to pay its fair share for needed transportation facilities as a result of new development pursuant to California Government Code 66000 et seq. and as determined by the Congestion Management Agency,*" and to "*comply with the Land Use/Transportation Analysis and Deficiency Plan provisions of the San Bernardino County Congestion Management Program pursuant to California Government Code Section 65089.*" The Land Use/Transportation Analysis and Deficiency Plan provisions are found in Appendix F (Formerly Appendix J) of the CMP.

(c) REQUIREMENTS OF THE CONGESTION MANAGEMENT PROGRAM

Section VIII of Measure I 2010-2040 also requires that the "*Congestion Management Agency shall require fair share mitigation for regional transportation facilities through a Congestion Management Program update to be approved within 12 months of voter approval of Measure I.*"

SANBAG serves as the San Bernardino County Congestion Management Agency, and as such, implements and maintains the Congestion Management Program (CMP) for San Bernardino County. As part of the CMP Update process required by Measure I 2010-2040, SANBAG developed and adopted the SANBAG Development Mitigation Nexus Study (hereafter "SANBAG Nexus Study") on November 2, 2005 (updated on November 7, 2007, November 4, 2009, November 2, 2011, and November 6, 2013). The SANBAG Nexus Study provides a framework for fair-share development contributions to regional transportation improvements.

The SANBAG Nexus Study determines the fair-share contributions from new development for each jurisdiction in the urbanized areas of the County. This includes the subareas identified

in the PLAN, which are limited generally to the unincorporated spheres of influence of the cities in the San Bernardino and Victor Valleys. The County's fair-share contributions are based upon growth projections reviewed and approved by the County Land Use Planning Department and specific transportation projects submitted to SANBAG by the Department of Public Works – Transportation (hereafter "County Department of Public Works"). Projects identified in the PLAN must be included in the SANBAG Nexus Study to be eligible to receive SANBAG public share contributions of regional Measure I funding or allocations of state or federal transportation funds administered by SANBAG.

The SANBAG Nexus Study determined that the total development fair-share of cost that the County is responsible to generate through the PLAN is $240.05 million, 2013 dollars. For each unincorporated city sphere of influence or other unincorporated area within the boundaries of the PLAN (hereafter "PLAN SUBAREA"), the fair share development contribution amounts for which the County of San Bernardino is responsible, as determined by the SANBAG Nexus Study, are as follows:

Table 2.1 – Total SANBAG Nexus Study Fair-Share Costs of New Development

JURISDICTION	Development Share of Total Arterial Cost ($Mill)	Development Share of Interchange Cost ($Mill)	Development Share of RR Grade Sep Cost ($Mill)	Development Share of Total Cost ($Mill)
Adelanto Sphere	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
Apple Valley Sphere	$6.26	$1.53	$0.00	$7.79
Chino Sphere	$10.63	$1.74	$0.00	$12.37
Colton Sphere	$2.56	$0.41	$0.00	$2.97
Devore/Glen Helen	$11.16	$0.00	$8.28	$19.44
Fontana Sphere	$23.48	$48.68	$0.00	$72.16
Hesperia Sphere	$11.47	$4.74	$0.00	$16.20
Loma Linda Sphere	$0.00	$5.94	$0.00	$5.94
Montclair Sphere	$4.50	$3.26	$0.00	$7.75
Redlands Sphere	$7.90	$12.53	$0.00	$20.43
Redlands Donut Hole	$0.93	$15.70	$0.00	$16.63
Rialto Sphere	$15.13	$26.86	$0.00	$42.00
San Bernardino Sphere	$3.12	$5.44	$0.00	$8.55
Upland Sphere	$2.90	$0.00	$0.00	$2.90
Victorville Sphere	$3.95	$0.61	$0.00	$4.56
Yucaipa Sphere	$0.34	$0.00	$0.00	$0.34
Sphere Totals	$104.34	$127.44	$8.28	$240.05

The PLAN generates the above SANBAG Nexus Study totals for Freeway Interchange and Railroad Grade Separation costs. In the development of the PLAN, the total development contribution generated for major arterial costs above were calculated by County Department of Public Works after completion of the Department of Public Works' Planning Level Project Cost Estimate Study and further refinement of the major arterial project list. Minor adjustments have also been made to the growth projections as a result of further coordination between the County Land Use Services Department and County Department of Public Works.

The PLAN is intended to generate only the development fair-share contribution of project costs as required by the CMP and is not intended to provide 100% funding for or construction of all projects listed in the PLAN. Additional regional Measure I and federal/state funds administered by SANBAG are required for full funding of projects listed in the PLAN.

(d) THE PLAN AND LOCAL AREA TRANSPORTATION FACILITIES PLANS

The PLAN is limited to regional transportation facilities, and specifically the requirements of the CMP and the SANBAG Nexus Study. In addition to the PLAN, the County Board of Supervisors has adopted local area transportation facilities plans as funding mechanisms for construction of or improvements to local roads. The local area transportation facilities plans are entirely separate from the PLAN, as the primary intent of those plans is to construct a backbone of north/south and east/west major thoroughfares within the boundaries of an unincorporated community. The PLAN is intended to meet the requirements of the CMP by addressing the need for increased capacity on regional transportation facilities as a result of increased vehicular traffic resulting from new development.

Where the PLAN and local area transportation facilities plan boundaries overlap, separate fees will be required of development for the regional and local plan in the overlapping area. Because the specific projects listed in the PLAN are unique from those found in the local area transportation facilities plans, funds from overlapping plans shall not be intermingled. Planning and programming, updates and revisions to the PLAN may occur in conjunction with that of local transportation facilities plans in order to provide a comprehensive program to meet transportation needs in the unincorporated areas.

(e) REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT CONTRIBUTIONS NOT COVERED BY THE PLAN

Fees required by the PLAN only apply to development occurring within the PLAN boundaries. For areas outside the San Bernardino Valley and Victor Valley PLAN SUBAREAS, the County shall require Congestion Management Program - Traffic Impact Analysis (CMP-TIA) reports for proposed development projects exceeding specified thresholds of trip generations. This is a continuation of a requirement established when the CMP was approved originally by the SANBAG Board of Directors in 1992. CMP-TIA reports must comply with requirements contained in Appendix C of the CMP.

In the San Bernardino Valley and the Victor Valley PLAN SUBAREAS, payment of fees required by the PLAN replaces the TIA requirements of the CMP. Payment of PLAN fees, however, does not absolve a developer from further mitigation of impacts. Additional traffic studies and contributions may be required to mitigate local impacts of a development project. Forexample, local traffic studies may be required to determine a development's impact on the local road system, which may result in conditioning a development project to construct or contribute toward roadway widening, turn lanes, curb, gutter, storm drains, match-up pavement, and/or traffic signals.

(f) CONFORMANCE TO CALIFORNIA GOVERNMENT CODE

Pursuant to Measure I 2010-2040, the subsequent sections of the PLAN are intended to satisfy all the requirements set forth in the California Government Code, Chapter 5, Section 66000 et seq., Fees for Development Projects (also known as California Assembly Bill 1600 (AB 1600) or the Mitigation Fee Act) and Section 66016.5 for impact fees assessed on residential units (also known as California Assembly Bill 602 (AB 602), Chapter 347, Statutes of 2021). Requirements include:

1. Identify the purpose of the fee.
2. Identify the uses which are supportive of the fee and the transportation facilities which will be provided with the fees.
3. Determine that a reasonable relationship exists between the fee's use and the type of development project on which the fee is imposed.

4. Determine that a reasonable relationship exists between the need for the transportation facilities and the type of development project on which the fee is imposed.
5. Determine that a relationship exists between the amount of the fee and the cost of the Transportation Facility, or portion thereof, attributable to the development on which the fee is imposed.
6. Separate capital facilities funds will be created to deposit, invest, account for, and expend the fees.
7. Make specified findings explaining why square footage is not an appropriate metric to calculate residential impact fees, pursuant to Government Code 66016.5 (a)(5)(B).

Section 3 - PLAN SUBAREAS AND BOUNDARIES

(a) PLAN SUBAREAS

The PLAN contains sixteen (16) PLAN SUBAREAS, twelve (12) of which represent unincorporated areas within the San Bernardino Valley and four (4) of which represent unincorporated areas within the Victor Valley. With two exceptions, the boundaries of these PLAN SUBAREAS will correspond exactly to the boundaries of the city spheres of influence as defined at any time by the Local Agency Formation Commission (LAFCO) of San Bernardino County. The two exceptions are areas that are not contained in any city's sphere of influence. These are 1) the "Redlands Donut Hole" which is bounded by the City of Redlands on all sides and located north of Interstate 10 and west of Interstate 210, and 2) the unincorporated areas of Devore and Glen Helen, which are bounded on the south and west by the City of Rialto Sphere of Influence, on the north by the San Bernardino National Forest, and on the east by the City of San Bernardino or its sphere of influence. The PLAN SUBAREAS are:

1. Adelanto Sphere of Influence
2. Apple Valley Sphere of Influence
3. Chino Sphere of Influence
4. Colton Sphere of Influence
5. Devore/Glen Helen Unincorporated Areas
6. Fontana Sphere of Influence
7. Hesperia Sphere of Influence
8. Loma Linda Sphere of Influence
9. Montclair Sphere of Influence
10. Redlands "Donut Hole" Unincorporated Area
11. Redlands Sphere of Influence
12. Rialto Sphere of Influence
13. San Bernardino Sphere of Influence
14. Upland Sphere of Influence
15. Victorville Sphere of Influence
16. Yucaipa Sphere of Influence

Section 4 - GROWTH FORECASTS

(a) CONSISTENCY WITH SANBAG NEXUS STUDY GROWTH FORECAST DATA

The following Growth forecast data for the PLAN is based upon the growth forecast data contained in the SANBAG Nexus Study. The SANBAG Nexus Study requires that local jurisdictions generate fair-share contributions from new development, or "target share amounts", which are based upon growth forecast data reviewed and approved by local jurisdictions. In order to remain consistency with the SANBAG Nexus Study and generate the required "target share amounts", the PLAN utilizes the same forecast growth data.

(b) GROWTH FORECAST METHODOLOGY

The SANBAG Nexus Study describes the methodology for forecasting growth in all San Bernardino County jurisdictions as follows:

"The calculation of fair share development contributions requires an estimate of projected growth for residential and non-residential development. The data set used as the starting point for projection of residential development (single and multi-family dwelling units) and non-residential development (retail and non-retail employment) was the 2030 local input provided as part of the growth forecasting process for the 2004 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP). This iterative process, well-documented in the 2004 RTP of the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG), generates an initial forecast for the entire Southern California region by jurisdiction, which is then given to local jurisdictions for review, comment, and possible modification. The "local input" 2030 data set was used for the Nexus Study because it was developed through the direct involvement of and review by each of the local jurisdictions. Each local jurisdiction signed off on its local input data in late 2002. These forecasts have been reviewed and updated by local jurisdictions in early and mid-2005…. [The County Land Use Services Department reviewed and approved the forecasts as part of this process.]

The year 2004 was used as the base year for the analysis of growth forecasts. The 2004 dwelling unit totals by jurisdiction are based on California Department of Finance data. The 2004 employment data (retail and non-retail) was derived by adding one year of growth to the 2003 employment data reviewed by each of the local jurisdictions. The growth was estimated as 1/27th of the projected growth between 2003 and 2030…."

By way of comparison, an average of approximately 8000 new residential dwelling units were permitted annually by local jurisdictions in San Bernardino County between 1994 and 2010 (California Department of Finance Table I-6). The range in annual housing permits is large, from a high of approximately 18,000 in 2004 to a low of approximately 2000 units in 2010. The projected growth of about 290,000 dwelling units over the next 26-year Nexus Study planning period equates to an average annual rate of about 10,700 units. Thus, the rate of growth contained in the projections for the Nexus Study would appear to be slightly higher than the historic rate, but the total growth would be achieved with additional years of growth beyond 2030."

The underlying Nexus Study methodology is based on the number of primary residential dwelling units forecasted rather than a proportional contribution based on square footage of a structure.

(c) GROWTH FORECAST DATA FOR PLAN SUBAREAS

For residential and non-residential development type, Growth Forecast Data is projected separately in each PLAN SUBAREA to be used in calculating development impact fees. The tables below present the projected growth over the 27-year planning period addressed by the SANBAG Nexus Study by calculating the change between 2004 and 2030 residential dwelling units and non-residential employment.

The growth for each of the residential and non-residential categories was then converted to Passenger Car Equivalents (PCEs) subtotals as a standard factor of vehicular trip generation. A Passenger Car Equivalents Trip is "trip ends" divided by two. Residential trips generation rates used in the SANBAG Nexus Study are based upon the Institute of Transportation Engineers report *Trip Generation*, and non-residential trip generation rates are based upon per-employee rates used by Southern California Associated Governments (SCAG). The following trip generation factors were used:

Single Family Dwelling Unit – 9.57 vehicle trip ends per day

Multi Family Dwelling Unit – 6.63 vehicle trip ends per day

Retail – 19.5 vehicle trip ends per employee per day

Non-retail – 1.85 vehicle trip ends per employee per day

An example calculation of Single Family dwelling units (SFDU) PCE trip growth for the Adelanto Sphere is:

SFDU trip ends divided by 2
9.57 / 2 = 4.79

PCE Trips times 2004-2030 Change in SFDU = PCE Trip Growth for SFDU 2004-2030
4.79 x 83 = 397

Table 4.1 – Single Family Residences (SFR)

JURISDICTION	Single Family Dwelling Units 2004	Single Family Dwelling Units 2030	Growth in Single Family Dwelling Units 2004-2030	PCE Trip Growth for Single Family 2004-2030
Adelanto Sphere	62	145	83	397
Apple Valley Sphere	1,539	4,000	2,461	11,776
Chino Sphere	1,243	1,837	594	2,842
Colton Sphere	674	983	309	1,479
Devore/Glen Helen	1,102	3,635	2,533	12,120
Fontana Sphere	5,634	8,706	3,072	14,700
Hesperia Sphere	1,667	3,019	1,352	6,469
Loma Linda Sphere	245	1,173	928	4,440
Montclair Sphere	1,289	1,949	660	3,158
Redlands Sphere	2,307	3,910	1,603	7,670
Redlands Donut Hole	3	10	7	33
Rialto Sphere	5,805	9,459	3,654	17,484
San Bernardino Sphere	6,838	8,662	1,824	8,728
Upland Sphere	1,144	1,680	536	2,565
Victorville Sphere	3,748	4,356	608	2,909
Yucaipa Sphere	123	204	81	388
Sphere Totals	33,423	53,728	20,305	97,159

Calculations for PCE Trip Growth for Multi Family and non-residential development are based upon the same formula, using the corresponding PCE trip generation rates.

Table 4.2 – Multi Family Residences (MFR)

JURISDICTION	Multi-Family Dwelling Units 2004	Multi-Family Dwelling Units 2030	Growth in MultiFamily Dwelling Units 2004-2030	PCE Trip Growth for Multi Family 2004-2030
Adelanto Sphere	26	50	24	80
Apple Valley Sphere	325	457	132	438
Chino Sphere	357	513	156	517
Colton Sphere	175	299	124	411
Devore/Glen Helen	121	338	217	719
Fontana Sphere	1,922	3,501	1,579	5,234
Hesperia Sphere	372	524	152	504
Loma Linda Sphere	122	281	159	527
Montclair Sphere	830	1,160	330	1,094
Redlands Sphere	735	1,233	498	1,651
Redlands Donut Hole	11	11	-	-
Rialto Sphere	876	1,344	468	1,551
San Bernardino Sphere	2,142	2,853	711	2,357
Upland Sphere	72	105	33	109
Victorville Sphere	392	649	257	852
Yucaipa Sphere	40	63	23	76
Sphere Totals	8,518	13,381	4,863	16,121

Table 4.3 – Retail Employment

JURISDICTION	Retail Employees 2004	Retail Employees 2030	Growth in Retail Employees 2004-2030	PCE Trip Growth for Retail 2004-2030
Adelanto Sphere	2	18	16	156
Apple Valley Sphere	58	120	62	605
Chino Sphere	626	1,078	452	4,407
Colton Sphere	22	51	29	283
Devore/Glen Helen	12	17	5	49
Fontana Sphere	2,792	5,717	2,925	28,519
Hesperia Sphere	99	134	35	341
Loma Linda Sphere	9	27	18	176
Montclair Sphere	670	1,155	485	4,729
Redlands Sphere	30	64	34	332
Redlands Donut Hole	7	1612	1,605	15,649
Rialto Sphere	237	411	174	1,697
San Bernardino Sphere	229	304	75	731
Upland Sphere	1,119	1,934	815	7,946
Victorville Sphere	66	110	44	429
Yucaipa Sphere	0	1	1	10
Sphere Totals	5,978	12,753	6,775	66,056

Table 4.4 – Non-Retail Employment

JURISDICTION	Non-Retail Employees 2004	Non-Retail Employees 2030	Growth in Non-Retail Employees 2004-2030	PCE Trip Growth for Non-Retail 2004-2030
Adelanto Sphere	18	114	96	89
Apple Valley Sphere	709	1,030	321	297
Chino Sphere	694	1,200	506	468
Colton Sphere	518	1,011	493	456
Devore/Glen Helen	1,998	2,738	740	685
Fontana Sphere	6,323	8,960	2637	2,439
Hesperia Sphere	456	648	192	178
Loma Linda Sphere	417	889	472	437
Montclair Sphere	1,010	1,744	734	679
Redlands Sphere	6,253	8,183	1930	1,785
Redlands Donut Hole	399	5,457	5058	4,679
Rialto Sphere	4,579	6,799	2220	2,054
San Bernardino Sphere	5,018	7,171	2153	1,992
Upland Sphere	1,403	2,420	1017	941
Victorville Sphere	716	1,005	289	267
Yucaipa Sphere	165	275	110	102
Sphere Totals	30,676	49,644	18,968	17,545

(d) GROWTH RATIO OF NEW DEVELOPMENT FOR MAJOR ARTERIAL ROADS

The aggregated PCEs from the tables above were grouped by PLAN SUBAREA and a ratio was calculated from the total change in PCEs divided by the total 2030 PCEs.

Table 4.5 – Growth Ratios for Major Arterial and Traffic Signal Projects

JURISDICTION	Total 2004 Trips in PCEs	Total 2030 Trips in PCEs	Total PCE Trip Growth 2004 to 2030	Ratio of Trip Growth to 2030 Trips
Adelanto Sphere	419	1,141	722	63.0%
Apple Valley Sphere	9,663	22,778	13,115	57.2%
Chino Sphere	13,877	22,111	8,234	36.7%
Colton Sphere	4,499	7,127	2,628	37.2%
Devore/Glen Helen	7,639	21,212	13,573	62.2%
Fontana Sphere	66,401	117,293	50,892	41.7%
Hesperia Sphere	10,597	18,089	7,492	41.5%
Loma Linda Sphere	2,050	7,630	5,580	72.3%
Montclair Sphere	16,386	26,046	9,660	36.6%
Redlands Sphere	19,552	30,990	11,438	35.5%
Redlands Donut Hole	488	20,849	20,361	62.0%
Rialto Sphere	37,227	60,013	22,786	37.6%
San Bernardino Sphere	46,695	60,503	13,808	23.1%
Upland Sphere	17,921	29,482	11,561	38.7%
Victorville Sphere	20,539	24,997	4,458	17.8%
Yucaipa Sphere	874	1,449	575	39.5%
Sphere Totals	274,827	471,709	196,882	42%

The Ratio of Trip Growth to 2030 Trips (hereafter “Growth Ratio”) represents the fair-share percentage of Major Arterial and Traffic Signal project costs identified in the PLAN attributable to new development as used in Section 7 – Fee Calculations.

(e) RATIO OF GROWTH OF FREEWAY INTERCHANGES AND GRADE SEPARATIONS

The PLAN utilizes Growth Ratios of new development for Freeway Interchange and Grade Separation projects as determined by the SANBAG Nexus Study.

(f) REVIEW AND UPDATES OF GROWTH FORECAST DATA

Regular review of growth forecast data is essential to the success of the PLAN in generating a fair-share contribution of development toward the SANBAG Nexus Study “target share amount” required for each PLAN SUBAREA. County Department of Public Works will coordinate with SANBAG and the County Land Use Services Department in periodic reviews and adjustment, as necessary, to the growth forecasts.

Section 5 - REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION FACILITIES PROJECTS

(a) TRANSPORTATION FACILITIES PROJECT SELECTION

The SANBAG Nexus Study required the submission and/or review of a project list representing regional roadways within the urbanized areas of the San Bernardino Valley and the Victor Valley. Submission of the project list and inclusion of projects in the SANBAG Nexus Study is essential to availability of future funding administered by SANBAG for all capital improvement projects within the boundaries of the PLAN SUBAREAS. To receive SANBAG Measure I 2010-2040 Valley Interchange and Major Street Funds and Victor Valley Major Local Highway Project Funds or SANBAG allocations of state or federal transportation funds included in the Measure I 2010-2040 Expenditure Plan, projects must be included in the PLAN and the SANBAG Nexus Study; absence of a project on the list would prohibit the County from obtaining any regional funding administered by SANBAG for that project. As a result of this restriction, County Department of Public Works developed the PLAN in response to the funding needs for future regional transportation capital improvement projects resulting from the impacts of new development.

(1) MAJOR ARTERIAL ROAD PROJECTS

For each PLAN SUBAREA, County Department of Public Works initially submitted a list of Major Arterial Road projects in the PLAN SUBAREAS consisting of all County maintained roads with an existing Master Plan classification of Secondary or greater, per the 1989 General Plan Circulation Element.

Revisions have been made to the project list to reflect updates to the SANBAG Nexus Study and to enhance the accuracy of the list. In some PLAN SUBAREAS, following project specific planning studies, some major arterial road projects were removed from the Project List due to annexation, infeasibility of project delivery, listing in a local area transportation facilities plan, or improvements that will be accomplished through developers existing conditions of approval. The Project List may be revised at other times when appropriate, such as after an annexation within a PLAN SUBAREA or as part of the biennial update of the SANBAG Nexus Study.

(2) TRAFFIC SIGNAL PROJECTS

Although not a requirement of the CMP and the SANBAG Nexus Study, County Department of Public Works developed a list of traffic signal projects for inclusion in the PLAN. Traffic Signal projects were identified for construction wherever two of the PLAN's major arterial road projects intersect and a signal does not exist currently. Because the PLAN is intended to mitigate the impacts of development on the County road system, inclusion of traffic signals is a necessary element of mitigating future impacts. Prioritization and construction of a traffic signal projects in the PLAN will be dependent onwhen the traffic signal is warranted.

(3) FREEWAY INTERCHANGE PROJECTS

The list of freeway interchange projects was compiled by SANBAG as part of the SANBAG Nexus Study and most recently updated in November 2013. The list was originally based upon the interchanges submitted by SANBAG and local jurisdictions for the 2004 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) and then modified for the Nexus Study after

local jurisdiction input. The PLAN does not contain any additional freeway interchange projects beyond what is identified in the SANBAG Nexus Study. The SANBAG Nexus Study assigns share-of-costs to local jurisdictions based upon “traffic shed areas” (hereafter “Traffic Sheds”). Traffic Sheds represent the geographic area around the interchange from which most of the traffic using that interchange is likely to be drawn. Traffic sheds often encompass more than one local jurisdiction, and the projected growth within a traffic shed has been divided among those local jurisdictions using SANBAG’s GIS system, overlaying the traffic sheds on the traffic analysis zones containing the socio-economic data.

(4) RAILROAD GRADE SEPARATION PROJECTS

SANBAG also compiled a list of Railroad Grade Separation projects for inclusion in its Nexus Study. Only the grade separation projects on the Nexus Study Network were included. This Plan does not add any additional grade separation projects to the Nexus Study list.

(b) PROJECT LISTS BY PLAN SUBAREA

All projects identified in the PLAN are grouped by PLAN SUBAREA. Specific projects are listed for each PLAN SUBAREA in Appendix 1 - Plan Project List and Cost Estimates. Project Lists are subject to regular review and possible revision, in response to annexations, changes in growth forecasts, refined planning studies, updates and amendments to the County General Plan, or any other factors which may be applied to maintain the integrity of the PLAN and/or compliance with the CMP.

(c) PRIORITIZATION OF PROJECT LISTS

The PLAN does not prioritize projects. For each PLAN SUBAREA, projects will be identified as priorities once sufficient fees are collected to determine short-term revenue projections and availability. Projects will be programmed based upon factors such as generation of funds within PLAN SUBAREAS, participation with other local jurisdiction, accessibility to required additional funding from SANBAG, and actual development patterns within a PLAN SUBAREA. The PLAN is an essential, but limited, funding source available to County Department of Public Works and will be used in conjunction with other funding sources to provide a comprehensive plan to meet the overall transportation needs of the County. As such, projects identified in the PLAN may be programmed, designed, or constructed concurrently with projects funded by other sources to use available funds in the most cost effective and efficient manner possible.

(d) INCLUSION IN GENERAL PLAN CIRCULATION ELEMENT

All projects included in the PLAN are listed in the Circulation Element of the County General Plan at least thirty days prior to the implementation of a fee for such facilities.

Section 6 - PROJECT COST ESTIMATES

(a) TYPES OF COSTS INCLUDED IN PROJECT COST ESTIMATES

Within each PLAN SUBAREA, specific projects have been identified as regional transportation facilities. The project costs associated with each project identified in the PLAN are for additional traveled roadway only and include engineering, environmental, right-of-way, utility relocation, construction, and administrative overhead costs. Environmental impact mitigation such as purchase of habitat for endangered species is not included. Where another local agencyshares jurisdiction with the County for a project, costs are prorated between the jurisdictions based upon actual road miles within each jurisdiction, and only the County's share of the projectcost is identified in the PLAN.

(b) PROJECT CATEGORIES

All projects listed within the PLAN are categorized into one of four Project Categories. The four Project Categories are defined as 1) Major Arterials, 2) Traffic Signals, 3) Freeway Interchanges, and 4) Railroad Grade Separations. Project Categories are utilized in distributing fees equitably toward projects listed in PLAN SUBAREAS to insure that no single project category and its project list receives more than its fair-share of revenues generated by the PLAN. To accomplish this, each fee shall be distributed and deposited among the four category funds of a PLAN SUBAREA based upon a pro-rated share of total project costs by project category. For example, in the Chino sphere PLAN SUBAREA, of a required fee paid for a single family residence, 74% will be deposited into the Major Arterial fund, 16% into the Freeway Interchange fund, and 10% into the Traffic Signal fund. No portion of the fee will be deposited into the Grade Separation fund because this PLAN SUBAREA does not have any grade separation projects within its boundaries. To program projects in the most efficient and cost effective manner, Public Works may loan funds between the Project Categories within a PLAN SUBAREA or between PLAN SUBAREAS.

(c) METHODOLOGY

(1) MAJOR ARTERIAL ROADWAY PROJECTS

Since the PLAN's adoption in 2006, County Department of Public Works' staff has conducted Project Cost Estimate Studies (hereafter "Cost Studies") to develop a planning level cost estimate for all major arterial road improvement projects included in the PLAN. The PLAN is intended to address increasing capacity needs resulting from increased vehicular traffic caused by new development; therefore, other roadway improvements, such as curb, gutter, sidewalks, storm drains, and match-up pavement not related to vehicular traffic increases and improvements will remain the responsibility of the developing property owners adjacent to the roadway or will be funded by other County transportation funds. All estimates include resurfacing existing lanes to the centerline. Assumptions and methodology used in performing the Cost Study are summarized as follows.

For the purpose of calculating a "fair share" fee to be applied to new development under the PLAN, it was necessary to develop planning level estimates of the cost to complete improvements to the County Maintained Road System (CMRS) of Highways and Arterial roads to adequately accommodate future growth. The planning level cost estimates have been established by collecting data for anticipated changes identified by field assessment between existing Highway and Arterial road configurations and the

identified improvements of these same roads at the standards established by the San Bernardino County Master Plan of Highways; improvements that would provide additional capacity needed to mitigate cumulative regional traffic impacts of new development.

As part of the Cost Study, the field Assessment team established a methodology or protocol to quantify data collected so that data may be aggregated by areas or regions but retain the ability to identify the characteristic planning estimate costs for any individual road. The protocol as developed is intended to provide consistency and accuracy in data collection and efficiency in terms of minimizing the length of time staff needed to be in the field.

All roads and road segments in the County Maintained Road System that the County Master Plan of Highways identifies as a Secondary Highway or higher function road were tabulated by area or region. Most of these roads and road segments are not currently constructed to the ultimate configuration. Many of the roads have differential development; some traverse areas where no right-of-way has been perfected. Theexisting road conditions were recorded by a Field Assessment team from the Departmentof Public Works. In establishing costs for the Cost Study, a data matrix has been constructed where the quantified data is applied to costs established by fiscal year 2011/2012 historic contracts and unit prices.

(2) FREEWAY INTERCHANGE AND GRADE SEPARATION PROJECTS

For freeway interchange projects, the PLAN utilizes the SANBAG Nexus Study as updated in 2011. The SANBAG Nexus Study describes the methodology used in establishing project cost estimates for freeway interchanges and grade separation projects:

The SANBAG Nexus Study *"used the most recent Project Programming Request (PPR), Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP) data, Project Study Report (PSR) or other updated costs from local jurisdictions. If necessary, these costs were updated to 2011. In some cases, verified cost estimates for one interchange were used to estimate costs for other interchanges where the improvement needs were expected tobe similar…. The interchange costs were reduced by the amount of federal earmarks, where specifically identified.*

It should be understood that these planning-level estimates are based on the best available information and represent costs for 2011."

For Grade Separation projects, the Nexus Study report states:

"Costs were based on the most recent project development activities by SANBAG and local jurisdictions. Again, costs were reduced based on federal earmarks, where specifically identified. Costs are consistent with the Trade Corridors Improvement Fund Project Programming Requests (PPRs) submitted to the California Transportation Committee."

(3) TRAFFIC SIGNALIZATION PROJECTS

For traffic signal installation projects, costs were calculated based upon historical contracts and unit prices and fiscal year 2011/2012 engineer's estimates for signal installation projects currently in progress but not yet awarded for construction. The average cost for the ten FY 2011/2012 projects, based upon the engineer's estimate, was calculated to be approximately $600,000. This amount was applied to all traffic signal projects in the plan, except where project field investigations indicated costs may be

substantially higher. Project costs were reduced where the project involved other agency participation.

(d) ADMINISTRATIVE OVERHEAD CALCULATION AND APPLICATION

For the purpose of estimating project costs and calculating fees for the PLAN, the formula used for the Measure I Local Street Funds administrative overhead was applied to the PLAN projects. Currently, all indirect costs for labor, services, supplies, and overhead are paid initially out of the County Road Fund. The PLAN will reimburse the County Road Fund for the PLAN's share of those indirect costs. This is consistent with existing Department policy concerning reimbursement of the County Road Fund from Measure I revenues through direct labor costs attributable to Measure I projects. Applying an overhead administrative reimbursement rate against the PLAN's direct labor costs will place an equal burden for indirect overhead costs on revenues generated by the PLAN and reduce negative impacts to the funding necessary for routine maintenance needs of the County Maintained Road System.

The methodology for calculating the administrative overhead rate was a two-step process. The first step entailed analysis of actual project costs for the period of Fiscal Years 2006/2007 through 2010/2011 to determine the percentage of direct labor costs for similar projects. The type of projects analyzed was limited to capital improvement projects such as newroad construction, road widening, pavement rehabilitation, construction of left turn lanes, and traffic signal installation. Roadway resurfacing, routine maintenance such as roadway grading and pothole repair, erosion control, and drainage improvements were excluded. Direct Labor Costs included all engineering, technical, and force account job functions. The analysis determined that 15.39% of the total expenditures on these historical projects can be identified asdirect labor costs.

Once the direct labor cost percentage was calculated for each Plan project, the Department of Public Works – Transportation Administrative Overhead Rate was applied to the estimated direct labor cost. This method was discussed with, and approved by, the Auditor/Controller-Recorder's Office prior to the initial calculation of the FY 1992/1993 overhead rate. The "cost driver", or denominator, for the overhead equation is a "Direct Labor Costs" (burdened), taken from the County FAS report, less "Indirect Labor". The "Direct Labor" consists of all engineering, technical, and operations job functions. The "Indirect Labor" consists of all non-project-specific, administrative-type functions. Calculations made from this formula and averaged over the prior five fiscal years showed and average rate of 44.0%.

The administrative overhead rate is then applied to total estimated direct labor costs for each project. Graphically, the calculations can be shown as:

Step 1: (Total Estimated Project Cost) * (.143) = Estimated Direct Labor Costs

Step 2: (Estimated Direct Labor Cost) * (.440) = Total Administrative Overhead Costs

The result of the above calculations produces an Administrative Overhead Rate of6.3%. This rate has then been applied to all major arterial and traffic signal projects identified inthe PLAN.

Section 7 - FEE CALCULATIONS

(a) PURPOSE OF THE FEE

The purpose of the fees is to fund the fair-share new development contribution of improvement costs for specific transportation facilities as identified in *Appendix 1 – Project Lists and Cost Estimates* of the PLAN. Fees vary between PLAN SUBAREAS due to the unique project lists and growth projections for those unincorporated areas. In all PLAN SUBAREAS, a residential fee is required for each dwelling unit. Non-residential fees are based upon the predominate use of the building or structure as identified in the building permit and calculated on the total square footage of the building or structure.

(b) METHODOLOGY OF FEE CALCULATIONS

(1) FOR STANDARD DEVELOPMENT PROCESS

Fees for each PLAN SUBAREA are calculated by dividing the total fair-share of project costs attributable to new development by the total growth in Passenger Car Equivalent (PCE) trip generation (see Section 4 – Growth Forecasts) attributable to new development. This produces a "fee-per-trip" rate which is then multiplied by the trip generation rates associated with residential and non-residential types of development to establish a fee schedule. Each approach is consistent with identifying trip generation pursuant the Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE), Trip Generation Manual. ITE trip generation rates are used in the calculations. Pursuant to Government Code Section 66026.5 (a)(5)(B) and consistent with Section 4 of this PLAN, square footage is not an appropriate metric to calculate fees for residential land uses in most cases since the underlying fee methodology is based on trips. However, pursuant to Section 9(A)(5)(v) of this PLAN, an accessory dwelling unit is assessed a fee as a proportional of square footage as compared to the primary unit when the accessory dwelling unit is 750 square feet or greater. At no time is the ratio to be greater than 1.0

(2) FOR SPECIAL CIRCUMSTANCES

Under certain circumstances, a development may propose a land use that is either (i) not studied and represented by the categories listed in Table 7.7 or (ii) is listed in Table 7.7 but demonstrates unique characteristics that restrain or expand typical land uses identified in the County Development Code.

When a project meets the criteria for either clause (i) or clause (ii) above the project shall either demonstrate conformance to a land use published in the ITE Trip Generation Manual or, at the discretion of, and authorization by, the Department of Public Works-Traffic Division, perform a trip generation study as outlined by STEP 7 of the example calculations in this Section. The proportionality of this process is defined by the scalability of trip generation with the size and intensity of the land use.

In addition, the County Development Code allows project flexibility through either the Planned Development Permit (PDP) or Specific Plan (SP) processes. These development applications recognize unique project characteristics such as infrastructure features and restriction on land uses. The PDP and SP processes also expects a significantly higher quality of development and may self-impose land uses that are not represented in the ITE Trip Generation Manual and/or the Trip Generation Study(ies) published by the Department of Public Works.

When a new development qualifies as either a Planned Development Permit as defined in the Development Code, Chapter 85.10 and/or Chapter 84.18, or a Specific Plan as defined in the Development Code, Chapter 86.14, the project applicant may, at the discretion of the Department of

Public Works-Traffic Division, conduct a specialized study that applies the unique characteristics of their project to the underlying nexus study methodology, even if the proposed land uses are otherwise listed in Table 7.7. The specialized study could analyze project trip lengths, PCE-VMT conversion factors, and any other related information needed to complete the fee calculations, using methodologies similar to those in the Plan for the most comparable land use. The study would then be reviewed and approved by the County Traffic Division.

A step-by-step explanation follows.

(3) CALCULATE TOTAL PROJECT COST ESTIMATES BY SUBAREA

Calculations for total project costs by PLAN SUBAREA are based upon the projects listed in Appendix 1 of the PLAN. For each PLAN SUBAREA, the total estimated project costs by project category are contained in the following table:

Table 7.1 – Total Estimated Project Costs by Project Category

JURISDICTION	Total Major Arterial Project Costs	Total Traffic Signal Costs	Interchanges County Fair-Share Costs	Total Grade Sep Fair-share Costs	TOTAL PROJECT COSTS
Adelanto Sphere	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0
Apple Valley Sphere	$10,350,000	$600,600	$2,840,400	$0	$13,791,000
Chino Sphere	$25,373,193	$3,592,400	$5,324,805	$0	$34,290,398
Colton Sphere	$6,876,513	$0	$1,210,000	$0	$8,086,513
Devore/Glen Helen	$17,943,807	$0	$0	$29,568,000	$47,511,807
Fontana Sphere	$49,584,782	$6,732,000	$106,999,731	$0	$163,316,513
Hesperia Sphere	$27,034,323	$600,600	$8,162,900	$0	$35,797,823
Loma Linda Sphere	$0	$0	$13,079,987	$0	$13,079,987
Montclair Sphere	$11,084,491	$1,198,800	$8,650,125	$0	$20,933,416
Redlands Sphere	$20,168,718	$2,094,400	$35,000,000	$0	$57,263,118
Redlands Donut Hole	$0	$1,496,000	$31,696,266	$0	$33,192,266
Rialto Sphere	$38,152,833	$2,094,400	$69,846,946	$0	$110,094,179
San Bernardino Sphere	$13,501,371	$0	$24,070,930	$0	$37,572,301
Upland Sphere	$6,904,859	$598,400	$0	$0	$7,503,259
Victorville Sphere	$22,168,957	$0	$1,246,400	$0	$23,415,357
Yucaipa Sphere	$568,403	$299,200	$0	$0	$867,603
Sphere Totals	$249,712,249	$19,306,800	$308,128,490	$29,568,000	$606,715,539

(4) CALCULATE THE FAIR-SHARE CONTRIBUTION OF TOTAL PROJECT COSTS ATTRIBUTABLE TO NEW DEVELOPMENT

The Growth Ratio of New Development (see Section 4.d – Table 4.5) is applied to the total estimated costs for Major Arterial and Traffic Signal Costs detailed above in Table 7.1. In addition, the Growth Ratio of New Development as determined by the SANBAG Nexus Study has been applied to the total estimated costs for Interchange and Grade Separation Costs. The combined total amount of fair-share contributions of new development for each PLAN SUBAREA is as follows:

Table 7.2 – Total Contribution from New Development

JURISDICTION	Total Estimated Project Costs	Total Sphere Development Contribution
Adelanto Sphere	$0	$0
Apple Valley Sphere	$13,791,000	$7,791,836
Chino Sphere	$34,290,398	$12,372,586
Colton Sphere	$8,086,513	$2,969,463
Devore/Glen Helen	$47,511,807	$19,437,131
Fontana Sphere	$163,316,513	$72,162,217
Hesperia Sphere	$35,797,823	$16,204,821
Loma Linda Sphere	$13,079,987	$5,941,774
Montclair Sphere	$20,933,416	$7,752,438
Redlands Sphere	$57,263,118	$20,433,407
Redlands Donut Hole	$33,192,266	$16,631,132
Rialto Sphere	$110,094,179	$41,995,989
San Bernardino Sphere	$37,572,301	$8,554,552
Upland Sphere	$7,503,259	$2,903,761
Victorville Sphere	$23,415,357	$4,559,674
Yucaipa Sphere	$867,603	$342,703
Sphere Totals	$606,715,539	$240,053,484

NOTE: The Adelanto sphere does not have any Interchange, Major Arterial, Traffic Signal or Grade Separation projects currently listed in the PLAN; therefore there are no project costs and sphere development contribution amounts. Additions of projects may occur at a future date should updated growth projections be sufficient to support adding projects to the PLAN.

EXAMPLE CALCULATION: For the Redlands Sphere, the total development contribution amount of $20,433,407 equals the Major Arterial & Traffic Signal development contribution amount plus the Freeway Interchange development contribution amount as follows:
<u>Total Major Arterial Road and Traffic Signal portion</u>

1. Total Major Arterial Road/Traffic Signal Project Costs = $22,263,118 (Table 7.1)

2. Growth Ratio of Redlands Sphere = 35.5% (Section 4, Table 4.5)

3. Total Project Costs x Growth Ratio = Development Contribution

$22,263,118 x 35.5% = $7,903,407 Major Arterials/Traffic Signals

Freeway Interchange portion

1. Total Freeway Interchange Project Costs = $40,000,000 (Wabash @I-10)

2. Development Contribution % of project per SANBAG Nexus Study = 35.8%

3. Total Project Cost x Development Contribution % = Development Contribution

   $40,000,000 X 35.8% = $14,320,000 Development contribution

4. County Redlands Sphere Share of Freeway Interchange Development Contribution

   $14,320,000x 87.5% = $12,530,000 Sphere share of Development Contribution

Total Development Contribution amount

Major Arterial/Traffic Signal portion + Freeway Interchange portion = Total Contribution

$7,903,407 + $12,530,000 = $20,433,407 (See Table 7.2, Redlands)

TOTAL DEVELOPMENT SHARE BY PROJECT CATEGORY

The total cost of all projects in the PLAN is estimated to be $$606,715,539. By 2030, the PLAN is anticipated to generate $$240,053,484, or 37%, in fair-share contributions from new development. The total estimated project costs and development contributions for the PLAN, grouped by Project Category, are:

	Total PLAN Costs	Development Share	
Major Arterial Roads:	$249,712,249	$96,371,245	(39% of Total)
Traffic Signals:	$19,306,800	$7,965,499	(41% of Total)
Freeway Interchanges:	$308,128,490	$127,440,657	(41% of Total)
Grade Separations:	$29,568,000	$8,276,083	(28% of Total)
TOTAL COSTS:	$606,715,539	$240,053,484	(37% of Total)

NOTE: For the purpose of examples in this report, all figures are rounded to the nearest dollar or percentage, which accounts for any variance in individual amounts and their sums.

(5) CALCULATE PLAN SUBAREA GROWTH WITH CONVERSION OF NON-RESIDENTIAL GROWTH FROM NUMBER OF EMPLOYEES TO SQUARE FOOTAGE

Growth attributable to new development is compiled from Section 4 – Growth Projections, Tables 4.1 - 4.4

Table 7.3 – Growth in Dwelling Units and Non-Residential Square Footage

JURISDICTION	Growth in Single Family Dwelling Units	Growth in Multi-Family Dwelling Units	Growth in Commercial Square Footage	Growth in Office Square Footage	Growth in Industrial* Square Footage	Growth in Institutional Square Footage
Adelanto Sphere	83	24	13,600	0	57,600	0
Apple Valley Sphere	2,461	132	52,700	0	192,600	0
Chino Sphere	594	156	384,200	0	303,600	0
Colton Sphere	309	124	24,650	0	295,800	0
Devore/Glen Helen	2,533	217	4,250	0	444,000	0
Fontana Sphere	3,072	1,579	2,486,250	0	1,577,471	1,970
Hesperia Sphere	1,352	152	29,750	0	26,401	36,999
Loma Linda Sphere	928	159	15,300	0	283,200	0
Montclair Sphere	660	330	412,250	0	440,400	0
Redlands Sphere	1,603	498	28,900	0	1,158,000	0
Redlands Donut Hole	7	0	1,364,250	0	3,034,800	0
Rialto Sphere	3,654	468	147,900	0	842,648	203,897
San Bernardino Sphere	1,824	711	63,750	37,360	956,342	108,641
Upland Sphere	536	33	692,750	13,269	583,661	0
Victorville Sphere	608	257	37,400	0	39,176	55,927
Yucaipa Sphere	81	23	850	0	0	27,500

* Truck Storage/Drop Lots are associated with “Industrial” growth.

NOTE: Non-residential growth from Tables 4.1 - 4.4 has been converted in the table above from employees to square footage based upon the following conversion factors:

Office: 1 employee per 300 sq ft
Commercial: 1 employee per 850 sq ft
Industrial: 1 employee per 600 sq ft
High cube: 1 employee per 2000 sq ft
Institutional: 1 employee per 250 sq ft

NOTE: High Cube Warehousing or Distribution Centers which, are defined as:
Warehousing/Distribution Centers, which are used primarily for the storage and/or consolidation of manufactured goods (and to a lesser extent, raw materials) prior to their distribution to retail locations or other warehouses. These facilities are commonly constructed utilizing concrete tilt-up techniques, with a minimum ceiling height of 24 feet, are greater than 200,000 SF in size, with a minimum dock-high loading door ratio of 1 door per 10,000 SF, a high level of automation, truck activities frequently outside of the peak hour of the adjacent street system and good freeway access, and shall not be used for manufacturing or labor-intensive purposes, nor exceed the ratio of 25 employees per acre. ITE Land Use: 152 (High-Cube Warehouse) is similar.

EXAMPLE CALCULATION: In the Apple Valley Sphere, conversion from employee to square footage for Commercial development growth is calculated as follows:

1. 62 employees (see Employee Commercial Growth, Section 4, Table 4.3, Apple Valley)

2. 1 Commercial employee equals 850 square feet (from conversion factor above)

3. 62 employees x 850 square feet per Commercial employee = 52,700 square feet

(6) CALCULATE THE TOTAL VEHICLE TRIP GENERATION IN PASSENGER CAR EQUIVALENTS (PCEs) TRIP ENDS FOR EACH TYPE OF DEVELOPMENT

The following ITE trip generation rates were applied to the residential and non-residential growth data for each PLAN SUBAREA in Table 7.3 above to calculate total PCE Trip Growth by type of development.

Single Family per dwelling unit:	9.94 trips
Multi Family per dwelling unit:	6.91 trips
Commercial per 1000 sq ft:	29.45 trips
Office per 1000 sq ft:	11.44 trips
Industrial per 1000 sq ft:	6.31 trips
Institutional per 1000 sq ft:	25.45 trips
High Cube Industrial per 1000 sq ft:	1.91 trips

Table 7.4 – Total PCE Trip Generation by Type of Development

JURISDICTION	PCE Trips Growth Single Family	PCE Trips Growth Multi Family	PCE Trips Growth Commercial	PCE Trips Growth Office	PCE Trips Growth Industrial*	PCE Trips Growth Institutional
Adelanto Sphere	825	166	400	0	363	0
Apple Valley Sphere	24,470	912	1,552	0	1,215	0
Chino Sphere	5,906	1,078	11,313	0	1,916	0
Colton Sphere	3,072	857	726	0	1,866	0
Devore/Glen Helen	25,186	1,499	125	0	2,801	0
Fontana Sphere	30,546	10,910	73,209	0	9,953	50
Hesperia Sphere	13,443	1,050	876	0	167	942
Loma Linda Sphere	9,227	1,099	451	0	1,787	0
Montclair Sphere	6,563	2,280	12,139	0	2,779	0
Redlands Sphere	15,939	3,441	851	0	7,307	0
Redlands Donut Hole	70	0	40,171	0	19,149	0
Rialto Sphere	36,333	3,234	4,355	0	5,317	5,189
San Bernardino Sphere	18,136	4,913	1,877	427	6,034	2,765
Upland Sphere	5,330	228	20,398	152	3,683	0
Victorville Sphere	6,045	1,776	1,101	0	247	1,423
Yucaipa Sphere	805	159	25	0	0	700

* Truck Storage/Drop Lots are associated with “Industrial” growth.

EXAMPLE CALCULATION: In the Devore/Glen Helen Area, PCE Trips Growth for Single Family Dwelling Units is calculated as follows:

1. 2,533 Single Family Dwelling Units Growth 2004-2030 from Table 7.3

2. 9.94323 PCE Trips per Single Family Dwelling Units from above.

3. SFDU Growth 2004-2030 X Trips per SFDU = Total PCE Trips per SFDU

   2,533 SFDU X 9.94323 SFDU PCE Trips = 25,186 SFDU PCE Trips

(7) CALCULATE TOTAL PASSENGER CAR EQUIVALENTS (PCEs) VEHICLE MILE TRAVELED FOR EACH TYPE OF DEVELOPMENT

For each type of development, using the PCE Trips calculated in Step 4, apply the following ITE factors for vehicle miles traveled (half-length trip) to calculate the total Passenger Car Equivalent – Vehicle Miles Traveled (PCE – VMT):

Single Family per dwelling unit:	3.70 miles per trip
Multi Family per dwelling unit:	3.70 miles per trip
Commercial per 1000 sq ft:	2.69 miles per trip
Office per 1000 sq ft:	4.44 miles per trip
Industrial per 1000 sq ft:	4.44 miles per trip
Institutional per 1000 sq ft	4.44 miles per trip
High Cube Industrial per 1000 sq ft:	4.44 miles per trip

Table 7.5 – Total SUBAREA Passenger Car Equivalent Vehicle Miles Traveled

JURISDICTION	Total PCE VMT Single Family	Total PCE VMT Multi Family	Total PCE VMT Commercial	Total PCE VMT Office	Total PCE VMT Industrial*	Total PCE VMT Institutional	Total PCE VMT Growth
Adelanto Sphere	3,053	613	1,079	0	1,613	0	6,358
Apple Valley Sphere	90,521	3,374	4,179	0	5,392	0	103,467
Chino Sphere	21,849	3,987	30,469	0	8,500	0	64,805
Colton Sphere	11,366	3,169	1,955	0	8,282	0	24,772
Devore/Glen Helen	93,170	5,546	337	0	12,431	0	111,484
Fontana Sphere	112,995	40,358	197,172	0	44,167	135	394,828
Hesperia Sphere	49,730	3,885	2,359	0	739	2,536	60,895
Loma Linda Sphere	34,134	4,064	1,213	0	7,929	0	47,340
Montclair Sphere	24,276	8,435	32,694	0	12,331	0	77,735
Redlands Sphere	58,962	12,729	2,292	0	32,422	0	106,405
Redlands Donut Hole	257	0	108,192	0	84,970	0	193,419
Rialto Sphere	134,403	11,962	11,729	0	23,593	13,976	195,663
San Bernardino Sphere	67,091	18,173	5,056	1,896	26,776	7,447	126,439
Upland Sphere	19,715	843	54,939	674	16,342	0	92,513
Victorville Sphere	22,364	6,569	2,966	0	1,097	3,833	36,829
Yucaipa Sphere	2,979	588	67	0	0	1,885	5,520

* Truck Storage/Drop Lots are associated with “Industrial” growth.

EXAMPLE CALCULATION: In the Hesperia Area, Total PCE Vehicle Miles Traveled Growth for Single Family Dwelling Units is calculated as follows:

1. PCE Trips Growth from Table 7.5 Hesperia Sphere X VMT Rate from above:

13,443	Single Family PCE Trips	X 3.7 miles/trip	= 49,730	PCE VMT Growth
1,050	Multi Family PCE Trips	X 3.7 miles/trip	= 3,885	PCE VMT Growth
876	Commercial PCE Trips	X 2.69 miles/trip	= 2,359	PCE VMT Growth
0	Office PCE Trips	X 4.44 miles/trip	= 0	PCE VMT Growth
942	Institutional PCE Trips	X 4.44 miles/trip	= 4,182	PCE VMT Growth
167	Industrial PCE Trips	X 4.44 miles/trip	= 739	PCE VMT Growth

Note: For the purpose of this example miles/trip are rounded to nearest one-hundredth

2. Total all types of development VMT Growth from Step 1 above:
   49,730 + 3,885 + 2,359 + 0 + 739 + 4,182 = 90,895 Total PCE VMT Growth

(8) CALCULATE A "FEE-PER-TRIP"

For each Sphere, the development fair-share contribution (Table 7.2: Total Sphere Development Contribution) is divided by the Total PCE VMT Growth in Table 7.5 to calculate a "Fee-per-Vehicle Mile Traveled" rate:

Table 7.6 – Fee per Trip

JURISDICTION	Total Developer Share Project Costs	Total PCE VMT Growth	Fee Per Vehicle Mile Traveled (Fee per VMT)
Adelanto Sphere	$0	6,358	$0.00
Apple Valley Sphere	$7,791,836	103,467	$75.31
Chino Sphere	$12,372,586	64,805	$190.92
Colton Sphere	$2,969,463	24,772	$119.87
Devore/Glen Helen	$19,437,131	111,484	$174.35
Fontana Sphere	$72,162,217	394,828	$182.77
Hesperia Sphere	$16,204,821	60,895	$266.11
Loma Linda Sphere	$5,941,774	47,340	$125.51
Montclair Sphere	$7,752,438	77,735	$99.73
Redlands Sphere	$20,433,407	106,405	$192.03
Redlands Donut Hole	$16,631,132	193,419	$85.98
Rialto Sphere	$41,995,989	195,663	$214.63
San Bernardino Sphere	$8,554,552	126,439	$67.66
Upland Sphere	$2,903,761	92,513	$31.39
Victorville Sphere	$4,559,674	36,829	$123.81
Yucaipa Sphere	$342,703	5,520	$62.09

EXAMPLE CALCULATION: In the Devore/Glen Helen unincorporated area, Total Sphere Development Contribution amount is divided by Total PCE VMT Growth:

1. $19,437,131 Devore/Glen Helen Development Contribution Amount from Table 7.2

2. 111,484 PCE VMT Growth from Table 7.5.

3. Sphere Development Contribution / PCE VMT Growth = Fee per VMT

   $19,437,131 / 111,484 VMT Growth = $174.35 Fee per VMT

(9) CALCULATE SUBAREA FEES FOR RESIDENTIAL AND NON-RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT

PLAN SUBAREA fees are calculated by multiplying the fee-per-VMT amount in Table 7.6 by the ITE trip Generation rates as defined for each type of development in Step 4 and then multiplied by the Vehicle Miles Traveled factors in Step 5. Non-residential fees are converted from per-thousand-square feet to a square foot amount.

In lieu of an established ITE Trip Generation Manual Land Use, and at the discretion of, and authorization by, the Department of Public Works-Traffic Division, an applicant for a development not identified in the fee plan categories may be allowed to conduct a trip generation study. In the event a trip generation study is authorized in lieu of an established ITE Trip Generation Manual Land Usefor a development not identified in the fee plan, the developer shall hire a third-party contractor to conduct ingoing and outgoing traffic counts from at least three separate existing facilities performing a similar function to the proposed development over a seven-consecutive day period. The third-party contractor shall extrapolate the estimated numberof trips based on the size of the proposed development and the sizes of the three facilities. The estimated number of trips will be explained and justified in a trip generation report submitted to the Department of Public Works-Traffic Division. For the purposes of calculating the PLAN SUBAREA fee for unclassified development, each subarea's cost per trip does not take into consideration a passenger car equivalent for trucks so that a single vehicle regardless of classification is used as the uniform unit in calculating the number of trips.

The Department of Public Works-Traffic Division will review and approve the trip generation report based on consistency with County standards and traffic engineering practices. The calculated number of trips is then multiplied by the cost per trip determined in the Fee Plan for each subarea.

EXAMPLE CALCULATION: A developer in the Fontana PLAN SUBAREA conducts a trip generation study pursuant to the procedure outlined above and determines that the uncategorized development will generate 100 trips. The fee shall be calculated as follows:

($182.77 per VMT) X (4.44 VMT per Trip) = $811.50 per trip

($811.50 per trip) X (100 trips) = $81,150

Table 7.7 – PLAN Fee per SUBAREA

PLAN SUBAREA	Fee for Single Family Dwelling Unit	Fee for Multi Family Dwelling Unit	Fee for Commercial per square foot	Fee for Hotel/Motel per room	Fee for Office per square foot	Fee for Industrial per square foot	Fee for High Cube per square foot	Fee for Institutional per square foot	Fee for Truck Storage/Drop Lots Parking per acre
Adelanto	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0
Apple Valley	$2,770	$1,925	$5.97	$1,528	$3.82	$2.11	$0.64	$2.59	$13,334.66
Chino	$7,022	$4,880	$15.14	$3,873	$9.69	$5.35	$1.62	$6.56	$33,249.20
Colton	$4,409	$3,064	$9.51	$2,432	$6.08	$3.36	$1.01	$4.12	$23,062.11
Devore/Glen Helen	$6,413	$4,456	$13.83	$3,537	$8.85	$4.88	$1.48	$5.99	$31,534.16
Fontana	$6,723	$4,671	$14.49	$3,708	$9.28	$5.12	$1.55	$6.28	$31,575.81
Hesperia	$10,060	$6,991	$21.69	$5,549	$13.88	$7.66	$2.32	$9.40	$49,223.75
Loma Linda	$4,617	$3,208	$9.95	$2,546	$6.37	$3.51	$1.06	$4.31	$23,037.90
Montclair	$3,668	$2,549	$7.91	$2,023	$5.06	$2.79	$0.84	$3.43	$17,587.64
Redlands	$7,063	$4,908	$15.23	$3,896	$9.75	$5.38	$1.63	$6.60	$36,806.69
Redlands DonutHole	$3,163	$2,198	$6.82	$1,745	$4.36	$2.41	$0.73	$2.95	$16,296.82
Rialto	$7,895	$5,486	$17.02	$4,355	$10.90	$6.01	$1.82	$7.37	$40,634.05
San Bernardino	$2,489	$1,729	$5.37	$1,373	$3.43	$1.89	$0.57	$2.32	$13,116.06
Upland	$1,155	$802	$2.49	$637	$1.59	$0.88	$0.27	$1.08	$5,479.71
Victorville	$4,554	$3,164	$9.82	$2,512	$6.28	$3.47	$1.05	$4.25	$23,255.19
Yucaipa	$2,284	$1,587	$4.92	$1,260	$3.15	$1.74	$0.53	$2.13	$13,901.54

EXAMPLE CALCULATION: In the Montclair unincorporated area, the fee for a Multi Family Dwelling Unit (MFDU) is calculated as follows:

1. Fee per trip for Montclair subarea = $99.73 (from Table 7.6)

2. Adjusted ITE trip generation rate for MFDU = 6.91 trips (from Section 7.4 above)

3. Fee per trip x trip generation rate = Fee per trip

   $99.73 x 6.91 = $689.13

4. Fee per trip x trip length (VMT) = Fee per Multi Family Dwelling Unit

   $689.13 x 3.7 VMT = $2,549

   (Compare to Table 7.7, Montclair, Fee for Multi Family Dwelling Unit)

(10) VERIFY FEE LEVELS BY CALCULATING TOTAL REVENUE GENERATION

Sufficient fee levels are verified by calculating the total revenue generated. Total revenues for each type of development are calculated by multiplying fees in Table 7.7 by the projected growth in dwelling units or square footage in Table 7.3. The total summed amount should equal the development contribution amount.

Table 7.8 – Total PLAN Revenues generated by Fee Schedule

JURISDICTION	Single Family Revenue	Multi Family Revenue	Commercial Revenue	Office Revenue	Industrial Revenue	Institutional Revenue	High Cube Revenue	Total Revenue
Apple Valley Sphere	$6,816,928	$254,074	$314,738	$0	$406,095	$0	$0	$7,791,836
Chino Sphere	$4,171,342	$761,244	$5,817,126	$0	$1,622,875	$0	$0	$12,372,586
Colton Sphere	$1,362,437	$379,918	$234,335	$0	$992,773	$0	$0	$2,969,463
Devore/Glen Helen	$16,243,990	$967,001	$58,764	$0	$2,167,377	$0	$0	$19,437,131
Fontana Sphere	$20,652,043	$7,376,216	$36,036,977	$0	$8,072,298	$24,684	$0	$72,162,217
Hesperia Sphere	$13,601,179	$1,062,559	$645,281	$0	$202,173	$693,629	$0	$16,204,821
Loma Linda Sphere	$4,284,213	$510,070	$152,292	$0	$995,200	$0	$0	$5,941,774
Montclair Sphere	$2,421,059	$841,172	$3,260,497	$0	$1,229,710	$0	$0	$7,752,438
Redlands Sphere	$11,322,775	$2,444,322	$440,128	$0	$6,226,182	$0	$0	$20,433,407
Redlands Donut Hole	$22,139	$0	$9,302,886	$0	$7,306,106	$0	$0	$16,631,132
Rialto Sphere	$28,847,504	$2,567,410	$2,517,501	$0	$5,063,838	$2,999,736	$0	$41,995,989
San Bernardino Sphere	$4,539,227	$1,229,522	$342,057	$128,308	$1,811,608	$503,829	$0	$8,554,552
Upland Sphere	$618,820	$26,474	$1,724,400	$21,142	$512,926	$0	$0	$2,903,761
Victorville Sphere	$2,768,789	$813,259	$367,214	$0	$135,801	$474,611	$0	$4,559,674
Yucaipa Sphere	$184,984	$36,499	$4,185	$0	$0	$117,035	$0	$342,703
Plan Totals	$117,857,428	$19,269,742	$61,218,380	$149,450	$36,744,960	$4,813,523	$0	$240,053,484

* Truck Storage/Drop Lots are associated with “Industrial” growth.

EXAMPLE CALCULATION: In the Montclair unincorporated area, verification of fee level for a Single Family Dwelling Unit (SFDU) is as follows:

1. Fee for SFDU = $3,668 per unit (from Table 7.7)
2. Growth in SFDU = 660 units (from Table 7.3)
3. Fee for SFDU x Growth in SF = Total SFDU revenue generated

$3,668 x 660 = $2,421,059 (See Table 7.8, Montclair, SFDW)

(11) VERIFY PLAN GENERATES DEVELOPMENT CONTRIBUTION AMOUNT

The total revenues of $249,341,908 generated by the fees in Table 7.9 equals the total development fair-share contribution of $249,341,908 in Table 7.2.

Table 7.9 – PLAN Development Contribution versus Total PLAN Revenue

JURISDICTION	TOTAL PROJECT COSTS	Total Plan Revenue
Apple Valley Sphere	$7,791,836	$7,791,836
Chino Sphere	$12,372,586	$12,372,586
Colton Sphere	$2,969,463	$2,969,463
Devore/Glen Helen	$19,437,131	$19,437,131
Fontana Sphere	$72,162,217	$72,162,217
Hesperia Sphere	$16,204,821	$16,204,821
Loma Linda Sphere	$5,941,774	$5,941,774
Montclair Sphere	$7,752,438	$7,752,438
Redlands Sphere	$20,433,407	$20,433,407
Redlands Donut Hole	$16,631,132	$16,631,132
Rialto Sphere	$41,995,989	$41,995,989
San Bernardino Sphere	$8,554,552	$8,554,552
Upland Sphere	$2,903,761	$2,903,761
Victorville Sphere	$4,559,674	$4,559,674
Yucaipa Sphere	$342,703	$342,703
TOTAL	$240,053,484	$240,053,484

Section 8 - NEXUS ANALYSIS

(a) REQUIREMENTS OF CALIFORNIA GOVERNMENT CODE

The PLAN has been prepared to satisfy the nexus requirements of California Government Code, Section 66001, which requires the Board of Supervisors to make the following findings:

1. *Determine that a reasonable relationship exists between the fee's use and the type of development project on which the fee is imposed*
2. *Determine that a reasonable relationship exists between the need for the transportation facilities and the type of development project on which the fee is imposed.*
3. *Determine that a relationship exists between the amount of the fee and the cost of the transportation facility, or portion thereof, attributable to the development on which the fee is imposed.*

(b) RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN FEE'S USE AND TYPE OF DEVELOPMENT

It can no longer be expected that the regional transportation facilities that will be needed for the urbanized, unincorporated areas of the San Bernardino Valley and Victor Valley can be funded fully from the traditional revenue sources that constructed the existing highway system and road network. The County's share of State Highway Excise Tax and Measure I Local Streets pass-through revenues are needed predominately for the maintenance of the existing County's maintained road system and are insufficient for major road improvement projects resulting from increased vehicular traffic resulting from development. Supplemental funding sources must be developed if important components of the County's transportation road system are to be constructed.

The transportation development mitigation fees generated by the PLAN represent a potential source of supplemental funds which will be utilized to construct projects that will mitigate the impacts of development. Future development within the described benefit area will benefit from constructing the proposed transportation facilities plan and should pay for them in proportion to projected traffic demand attributed to each.

(c) RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN NEED FOR TRANSPORTATION FACILITIES AND TYPE OF DEVELOPMENT

Future development is anticipated to occur in the unincorporated communities in the urbanized areas of the San Bernardino Valley and the Victor Valley. The existing County Maintained Road System (CMRS) is marginally able to handle the existing traffic, and future development within these areas will result in traffic volumes exceeding the capacity of the existing regional transportation facilities. If the capacity of the regional transportation facilities is not increased, continuing development will result in substantial traffic congestion and unacceptable levels of service throughout the urbanized areas of the County.

(d) RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN FEE AND COST OF TRANSPORTATION FACILITIES ATTRIBUTABLE TO DEVELOPMENT

Revenues generated by the PLAN are not intended to fund fully the cost of the PLAN's transportation facilities projects. Fees levels have been developed to provide for only that portion of project costs attributable directly to new development. Construction of the projects identified in the PLAN are dependent upon receipt of additional regional Measure I funds and federal/state transportation funds that are administered by SANBAG.

The cost of transportation facilities attributable to development is based upon the growth projections (detailed in Section 4 of the PLAN) and the total estimated costs of projects identified in the PLAN.

(e) REQUIREMENTS OF CALIFORNIA GOVERNMENT CODE 66016.5 FOR FINDINGS ON RESIDENTIAL IMPACT FEES

The SANBAG Nexus Study methodology is based on the increase of the number of primary single family and multi-family dwelling units as identified in Section 4 of this Plan. Since the total growth is based on the total number of residential units rather than the total square footage of residential housing, it is not reasonable to calculate or assess the Regional Fee on the square footage of the primary residential square footage. However, if the initial Regional Fee is collected on a primary residence, any accessory dwelling unit can reasonably be assessed as a proportional square footage to that primary residence up to the same fee assessed on the primary residence.

Section 9 – PAYMENT OF PLAN FEES

(A) FEE PAYMENTS

(1) Residential and non-residential fee categories (Plan Fee Category) will be determined based upon the Land Use Classification as defined in the County Code, Title 8: Development Code, Division2: Land Use Zoning Districts and Allowed Land Uses, Chapter 82.01: Land Use Plan and Land Use Zoning Districts. Examples include:

Table 9.1 – PLAN Fee Categories with General Plan Land Uses

PLAN FEE CATEGORY	COUNTY 2007 GENERAL PLAN APPLICABLE LAND USE ZONINGDISTRICT	EXAMPLES	FEE PER
SINGLE FAMILY RESIDENTIAL	Rural Living (RL), SingleResidential (RS)	Single family detached dwellingunits, attached single family dwelling units with individual driveway access	UNIT
MULTI FAMILY RESIDENTIAL	Multiple Residential (RM)	apartments, condominiums, townhomes, manufactured home parks, timeshares, senior/retirement housing, assisted living/care facilities	UNIT
HOTEL/MOTEL	Rural Commercial (CR), Highway Commercial (CH),Gen Commercial (CG)	Hotels, motels, resort hotels	UNIT
COMMERCIAL	Neighborhood Commercial (CN), Rural Commercial (CR), Highway Commercial (CH), General Commercial (CG), Service Commercial (CS)	Auto sales, auto service, auto tire stores, banks, beauty salons, carwash, cemetery, coffee/donut shops, convenience markets, copy/printstores, daycare centers, department stores, drug stores, fast food, furniture stores, gasoline stations with/without markets, lodges/fraternal org, nurseries, restaurants, retail shopping centers, video rentals	SQ FT
OFFICE	Office Commercial (CO)	General office, corporate headquarters, office/businessparks, medical/dental/professional, clinics	SQ FT
INDUSTRIAL	Community Industrial (IC),Regional Industrial (IR)	Industrial, manufacturing, warehouse, utilities	SQ FT
HIGH CUBE INDUSTRIAL	Community Industrial (IC),Regional Industrial (IR)	High cube warehouse as defined in Section 7 - Fee Calculations	SQ FT

INSTITUTIONAL	Institutional (IN)	Military base, schools, prison,hospitals, places of worship	SQ FT
Truck Storage/Drop Lots	Community Industrial (IC), Regional Industrial (IR)	Truck and/or trailer Storage, drop lots, expansion of warehouse functions over 15% of the minimum required parking established in Development Code Section 83.11.	AC RE

(2) Unless otherwise provided by law, whenever a residential or non-residential building permit or manufactured home setdown permit is issued for a property within the boundaries of a PLAN SUBAREA, a fee shall be required to be paid prior to the issuance of a building permit or manufactured home setdown permit.

(3) Expired permits, including cancelled, expired, reissued or renewed permits (as determined by Land Use Services Department), shall be considered new permits and the Plan fee shall be computed in accordance with the Plan fee in effect on the date of application for the new or reissued building permit.

(4) Abandoned or vacant buildings/structures (as determined by Land Use Services Department) shall be considered new permits and the Plan fee shall be computed in accordance with the Plan fee in effect on the date of application for the new or reissued building permit. No fee credits for previous uses or buildings/structures will be applied.

(5) Fees assessed on new residential construction will be assessed on a per dwelling unit basis.

(A) Per County Code § 810.01.060 (vv) – Definitions, a Dwelling Unit is defined as: *"Any building or portion thereof, including a manufactured home or portion thereof, that contains living facilities, including provisions for sleeping, eating, cooking and sanitation as required by the California Building Code, for not more than one family, including domestic employees of the family."*

(i) On a single parcel with an existing single family dwelling unit, each additional single family dwelling unit, permitted as a detached building or manufactured homes, requires payment of the PLAN fee.

(ii) Addition of a kitchen facility to a basement, garage or other rooms of a legally established single family residence already containing kitchen facilities is not subject to PLAN fees, unless addition of kitchen facilities creates a dwelling unit that can be utilized as an independent residence on a single parcel.

(iii) Change of a Temporary Dependent Housing (TDH) to a permanent residential unit requires payment of fee.

(iv) Hotel and motel rooms are considered non-residential units and fees are applied accordingly.

(v) Accessory dwelling units, defined as an attached or a detached residential dwelling unit that provides complete independent living facilities for one or more persons, and includes permanent provisions for living, sleeping, eating, cooking, and sanitation on the same parcel as a single-family or multifamily dwelling is or will be situated, shall be charged a percentage of the single

family residence fee as a proportion of the square footage of the accessory dwelling unit to the square footage of the principal residence. Accessory dwelling units of 749 square feet or less are exempt from the assessment of fees. Accessory dwelling units of 750 square feet or more shall be assessed the prorated fee.

(6) For new non-residential construction, fees shall be assessed on a building and/or structure gross square footage and land use category. Land use zoning may be different from the existing property land use category.

(A) Per County Code § 810.01.210 (hhhh) – Definitions, a Structure is defined as: "Anything constructed, built, or installed by man, an edifice or building of any kind, or any piece of work artificially built up or composed of parts joined together in some definite manner, including, but without limitation; buildings, towers, smokestack, and overhead lines."

(i) Fees are calculated to include unenclosed, unroofed areas and unenclosed, roofed-over areas that are integral to the performance of the principle business of the site.

(ii) Fees for hotel or motel development will be calculated based on units.

(iii) Fees for fuel filling stations will be calculated based on the gross square footage of buildings and the covered/roofed service/pump areas.

(iv) Fees for auto sales dealerships will be calculated based on the gross floor area of buildings and all structures associated with the dealership, including all vehicle sales, parts sales, service areas, parking structures, administrative offices and waiting areas.

(v) Fees for businesses that provide rental storage space will be calculated based on the gross area associated with the rental storage area in addition to buildings and/or structures.

(7) Fees do not cover all impacts of development on the road system. Additional mitigation for development impacts on roads not listed in the PLAN may be required and can be in the form of actual improvements, local transportation fees, and fees resulting from a Congestion Management Program – Transportation Impact Analysis or Local Traffic Impact Study. These may be applied to single family residence, multi-family residence, subdivisions, and all non-residential projects.

(8) Fees will be required when alterations, repairs, expansions or a change in use of a building/structure increases the square footage of the business use area, as defined in Section (9)(a)(5). For example, with the addition of commercial or industrial square footage without a change of use, a fee for the additional square footage will be required.

(9) With the change of use of a structure from one fee category to another as defined in Section 9(a)(1), a fee will be required calculated on the difference between the new use and the existing use of the structure. For example, if a building is converted to commercial from industrial use, a fee will be required based on the difference between the commercial fee and the industrial warehouse fee.

(10) Refunds will not be given for a change of use to a lesser fee level.

(11) Fees are required for any illegally established structure or uses in operation (including manufactured home parks), constructed before or after the adoption of the PLAN.

(B) EFFECTIVE DATE OF PLAN FEES

Unless otherwise provided by law, the Plan fees shall be computed in accordance with the Plan fees in effect as of the date that the building plans are submitted and the building permit is applied for, provided the permit applied for has not expired. In the case of expired permits, including cancelled, expired, reissued or renewed permits, the Plan fee shall be computed in accordance with the Plan fee in effect on the date of application for a new or reissued building permit. In the case of permits that will not involve a building permit, payment of the Plan fees shall be recommended as a condition of permitting to the decision-making body that would approve such permit, and shall have Plan fees computed at the time that such conditions are approved. The Plan fees specified in October 22, 2024 Update are effective November 21, 2024, and are in addition to any fees that may be required by the County Land Use Services Department, or any other applicable fees, with the following exception:

(1) For development projects approved prior to October 22, 2024, and where the Conditions of Approval state the exact dollar amount of the Plan fee to be collected, the Plan fee shall be the amount as stated in the Conditions of Approval. Should the project expire, lapse, be extended, cancelled or renewed, or there is any action that requires revision of the Conditions of Approval, the project shall be considered a new project, and fees shall be computed in accordance with the Plan fee in effect on the date of the revision, renewal or extension.

(C) FEE PAYMENT FOR LAND USE CATEGORIES NOT IDENTIFIED IN THE PLAN

Currently, there are no projects within the Adelanto sphere. For any future projects within the Adelanto sphere, development contributions toward mitigation of impacts to regional transportation facilities shall follow the San Bernardino County Congestion Management Program Traffic Impact Analysis (CMP TIA) process to determine the developer mitigation amount. Additional Local Traffic Impact Studies may also be required to mitigate traffic impacts on new development.

(D) WAIVER OR REDUCTION OF PLAN FEES

To ensure equity in application of the fees among all development within a PLAN Subarea, waiver or reduction of PLAN fees is not allowed under the PLAN, existing County ordinances, the San Bernardino County Congestion Management Program, the SANBAG Nexus Study, or the County General Plan.

(1) Errors or omissions are not grounds for waiver or reduction of PLAN fees or a developer's responsibility to mitigate its impacts.
(2) Financial hardship is not grounds for waiver or reduction of PLAN fees.
(3) Purchase of a property with an undisclosed, illegally established building/structure is not grounds for waiver or reduction of PLAN fees.

(E) PROTESTING FEE AMOUNTS IN A PLAN SUBAREA

A developer may protest the imposition of a PLAN fee, provided that:

1. Developer pays the fee in full or provides satisfactory evidence of arrangements to pay in full when due.
2. Developer serves written notice to the Clerk of the Board, containing:

a. A statement that, under protest, the required payment is paid or will be paid when due, or that any conditions which have been imposed are provided for or satisfied.
b. A statement informing the Board of Supervisors of the factual elements of the challenge and the legal theory forming the basis of the challenge.

3. Satisfaction of Paragraphs 1 and 2, above, shall not be the basis for the County to withhold the approval of any map, plan, permit, zone change, license, or other form of permission or occurrence, whether discretionary, ministerial, or otherwise, incidental to, or necessary for, the development project.

4. Any person may request an audit pursuant to and in accordance with California Government Code section 66023.

5. The protest shall be made in writing and filed with the Clerk of the Board no later than the time provided in Government Code section 66020(d)(1). The Board of Supervisors shall consider the application at the public hearing on the permit application or at a separate hearing held within ninety days after the filing of the protest, whichever occurs first. The decision of the Board will be final but may be challenged in court as provided in Government Code section 66020(d)(2). If an adjustment is granted, any change in use within the project shall invalidate the reduction of the fee.

(F) REFUND OF FEES

(1) PLAN Fees shall be refunded under the following conditions:

(A) Upon notification of cancellation or expiration of a building permit or manufactured home setdown permit prior to the initiation of construction and upon written request of the Department of Public Works by the original permit applicant. No refund for any project will be authorized after construction has been initiated.
(B) Any portion of a fee collected in excess of the required amount in effect on the date of payment of such fees.
(C) Any fee collected in error.
(D) A refund shall not be provided for a change in use of an existing structure to a land use category with a lesser fee.
(E) Refunds are dependent upon availability of PLAN funds. No other County funds shall be made available to refund PLAN fees.

(G) DEVELOPER FEE CREDITS AND REIMBURSEMENT AGREEMENTS

<u>Fee Credits</u>

Upon approval of the Director of Public Works, the County may enter into a written Fee Credit agreement whereby the developer may advance money, or considerations may be accepted in-lieu of part or all of the payment of fees, for the design, land acquisition, construction, financing, or purchase of a Plan transportation facility.

Improvements to a regional transportation facility by a developer must be a project identified specifically in the Project List of a PLAN SUBAREA. Because the PLAN fees are calculated based upon total estimated project costs identified in the PLAN's Project List,

construction of transportation facilities not identified in the PLAN are ineligible for fee credit or reimbursement from the PLAN funds. Other provisions of the County General Plan may apply to reimbursement for construction of transportation projects not on the Plan's Project List.

Written agreements for fee credits may be entered into between a developer and the County, provided that the agreement is entered into prior to the approval of the project and in advance of construction and after the Plan has been adopted by the Board of Supervisors. In order to be eligible for fee credits, the following conditions shall apply:

1. The developer shall submit road improvement plans in accordance with County road standards for acceptance and approval of the Department of Public Works. The Developer will obtain road construction permits and construct the project in accordance with the approved plans and permits and to the satisfaction of the County.

2. Each fee is comprised of four portions based upon the total project costs within the four PROJECT CATEGORIES: Interchanges, Major Arterial Roadways, Traffic Signals, and Grade Separations. Fee credits shall be applied only to the fees attributable to the PROJECT CATEGORY in which the project is identified. For example, fee credit for construction by a developer of a major arterial roadway identified in a PLAN SUBAREA will be limited to the portion of the developer's fees attributable directly to the Major Arterial Roadways Project Category. Fee credit will not be given for the interchange, grade separation, or traffic signal portions of the fee.

3. Fee credits shall be calculated separately for on-site and off-site improvements.
    a. On-Site improvements
    For improvements that "front" or are abutting to a development, the County will offer a fee credit equal to the total proportional project cost estimate as identified in the PLAN SUBAREA Project List, regardless of the actual cost of construction incurred by the developer with the following exception: Because project costs estimates include resurfacing the existing roadway to centerline, on-site improvements shall include resurfacing to the centerline for full credit; otherwise, that portion of the project cost attributable to resurfacing existing lanes shall be deducted from the fee credit amount.
    b. Off-site improvements
    The total amount of a fee credit for off-site improvements shall not exceed either the actual costs of the project or the estimated project cost used to establish the fee as contained in the Plan, whichever is less. Actual cost of the project shall be determined by County Department of Public Works' review and acceptance of developer submitted invoices andaccompanying documentation of expenditures.
    When a developer is conditioned to perform off-site improvements, the following will apply:
        i. An estimated project cost is agreed upon in advance and shall not include interest or other charges. At the time when fees are due, a deposit equal to twenty-percent (20%) of the fee credit amount specified in the agreement shall be paid. Upon completion of the project and approval by the Director of the Department of Public Works, the amount of the actual project costs that exceed eighty-

percent (80%) of the estimated project cost as specified in the agreement shall be refunded from the deposit.

ii. Should the total of actual project costs be less than the estimated project cost identified in the agreement, the developer will pay the difference in fees prior to the issuance of a certificate of occupancy.

iii. Fee credits and reimbursement shall be offered for only new traveled roadway. Construction of curb, gutter, sidewalks, storm drains, and match-up pavement are not eligible costs.

4. In approving such an agreement for in-lieu consideration, the Board of Supervisors shall find that the in-lieu consideration is equal to or greater in value than the required fee.
5. In conjunction with the SANBAG Nexus Study update which occurs every two years, the County will review the PLAN SUBAREA Project List cost estimates and growth projections and may recalculate the PLAN SUBAREA fees to reflect the actual costs of improvements constructed by the developer.

Reimbursement Agreements

Upon approval of the Director of Public Works, the County may enter into a developer reimbursement agreement for the balance of project costs only after one-hundred percent (100%) of required fees have been credited to a developer. The same project eligibility criteria as required for Fee Credits apply to reimbursement agreements.

The sole security to the developer for repayment of money or other consideration advanced shall be money subsequently accruing in the PLAN. The total amount of money reimbursed within a PLAN SUBAREA for one fiscal year shall not exceed twenty-five percent (25%) of the fees collected within such PLAN SUBAREA during the same fiscal year. In the event that no fees are collected in the PLAN SUBAREA in a fiscal year, the County will not be obligated to pay reimbursements for that period. Reimbursable project costs shall come only from the same project category fund within a PLAN SUBAREA. For example, reimbursement for construction of a traffic signal shall be paid only from the traffic signal fund of the PLAN SUBAREA.

When two or more developer agreements are executed for the same PLAN SUBAREA Fund, the total funds available for reimbursement will be shared proportionately among developers based upon original reimbursable amounts as identified in the agreements.

A Developer Reimbursement agreement shall expire twenty (20) years after the date it was entered into, and any subsequent money paid into the fund shall accrue to the fund without obligation to the developer whose agreement has expired.

(H) EXCLUSION FROM FEE PAYMENT

The intent of this section is to exclude from the payment of PLAN fees the replacement of structures or uses with new structures or uses, that generate the same or a lesser amount of vehicular traffic than those being replaced on the same parcel, including:

1. Legally established existing structures that are determined not to be abandoned/vacant and uses in operation (including manufactured home parks) on the effective date of the PLAN. Expansion of such structures for non-residential uses shall be subject to such fees.

2. Replacements of structures or uses for which PLAN fees have been paid pursuant to this Chapter where such replaced structure or use is identified in the same fee category for which the fees were originally paid.

Residential Exclusions

Transportation facilities fees shall not be required for residential building permits or residential manufactured home setdown permits for the following:

1. Alterations, repairs, and construction of garages, carports, accessory storage buildings, patio covers, swimming pools, spas, boundary or decorative fences, amateur radio devices or earth stations or any other residential accessory structures that does not constitute an additional dwelling unit as determined by existence of a kitchen facility.
2. Replacement of a legally established residential dwelling unit, including a unit destroyed or damaged by fire, flood, or other accidents or catastrophe provided that:
   a. The replacement will not result in an increase in the number of residential dwelling units,
   b. The proposed type of residential dwelling unit (i.e., single family, multi family, manufactured home, etc.) is within a fee category, as identified in the PLAN, for which the per-dwelling unit fee amount is less than or equal to the per-dwelling unit amount of the fee category for the dwelling unit to be replaced. If the proposed type of residential dwelling unit is within a fee category for which the fee amount is greater than the amount of the fee category for the dwelling unit being replaced, the amount of the fee required shall be the difference between the two fee categories.

Non-Residential Exclusions

Transportation facilities fees shall not be required for non-residential uses and buildings/structures for the following activities:

1. Alterations, repairs, and changes to the use of the building that do not change the applicable fee category as contained in Section 9(a)(1).

2. Replacement of non-residential structures or uses if:
   a. new or replacement construction will not increase the area or square footage upon which fees are assessed as prescribed in the PLAN
   b. The proposed type of structure and use is within a fee category that has a fee amount that is less than or equal to the amount of the fee category for the structure or use to be replaced. If the proposed type of structure and use is within a fee category that has a fee amount that is greater than the amount of the fee category for the structure and use being replaced, the amount of the fee required shall be the difference between the two fee categories.

Section 10 - PLAN ADMINISTRATION

(a) PLAN ACCOUNTING FUNDS

All fees collected under the PLAN will be deposited into separate accounts to avoid commingling of the fees with other revenues and funds of the County. Fees will be deposited into funds based upon the PLAN SUBAREA in which the development occurs. Funds will be expended solely for the purpose for which the fees are collected and specifically for the construction of the transportation facilities projects listed in the PLAN SUBAREAS. Fees will not be used to construct any other transportation facility not expressly identified in the PLAN.

(1) DISTRIBUTION OF FEES

Four Transportation Facilities Funds have been established for each PLAN SUBAREA in the San Bernardino Valley and Victor Valley:

Adelanto Sphere of Influence
Apple Valley Sphere of Influence
Chino Sphere of Influence
Colton Sphere of Influence
Devore/Glen Helen/Lytle Creek Unincorporated Areas
Fontana Sphere of Influence
Hesperia Sphere of Influence
Loma Linda Sphere of Influence
Montclair Sphere of Influence
Redlands “Donut Hole” Unincorporated Area
Redlands Sphere of Influence
Rialto Sphere of Influence
San Bernardino Sphere of Influence
Upland Sphere of Influence
Victorville Sphere of Influence
Yucaipa Sphere of Influence

Each Plan Subarea also has up to four project category funds, one for each category where projects are listed. Each fee will be pro-rated and deposited among project category funds within a PLAN SUBAREA. The amount deposited into each project category fund will be calculated using the total costs of the projects identified within each project category as listed in a PLAN SUBAREA.

Transportation Facilities Funds have been created within each PLAN SUBAREA for the following project categories:

1. Major Arterial Roads
2. Freeway Interchanges
3. Grade Separations
4. Traffic Signals

Distribution percentages by project category for the established transportation facilities funds are as follows:

PLAN SUBAREA	MAJOR ARTERIALS DISTRIBUTION %	TRAFFIC SIGNALS DISTRIBUTION %	FREEWAY INTERCHANGES DISTRIBUTION %	RR GRADE SEPARATIONS DISTRIBUTION %
Adelanto Sphere	0%	0%	0%	0%
Apple Valley Sphere	75%	4%	21%	0%
Chino Sphere	74%	10%	16%	0%
Colton Sphere	85%	0%	15%	0%
Devore/Glen Helen Area	38%	0%	0%	62%
Fontana Sphere	30%	4%	66%	0%
Hesperia Sphere	76%	2%	23%	0%
Loma Linda Sphere	0%	0%	100%	0%
Montclair Sphere	53%	6%	41%	0%
Redlands Sphere	35%	4%	61%	0%
Redlands "Donut Hole"	0%	5%	95%	0%
Rialto Sphere	35%	2%	63%	0%
San Bernardino Sphere	36%	0%	64%	0%
Upland Sphere	92%	8%	0%	0%
Victorville Sphere	95%	0%	5%	0%
Yucaipa Sphere	66%	34%	0%	0%

Distribution percentages will be recalculated when revisions to the PLAN occur such as annexations, updates to the project lists, and revisions in the growth projections.

(2) INTEREST

Any interest income earned by moneys in a fund shall also be deposited in that fund.

(b) PLAN REPORTS

The following may be provided for as required in combination:

(1) SANBAG ANNUAL DEVELOPMENT MITIGATION PROGRAM REPORT

As set forth in Appendix F.8 of the San Bernardino County Congestion Management Program, the County Department of Public Works – Transportation shall submit an annual development mitigation report to SANBAG. The report is an informational document and does not require approval by the Board of Supervisors.

The report shall be provided to SANBAG within ninety (90) days of the end of the fiscal year. The report will be organized by PLAN SUBAREAS will contain the following information:

(a) Quantity of development for which development contributions were generated by development type.

(b) Total development contributions by development type.

(c) Other types of development-related transportation funds obtained during the year (e.g. grants).

(d) Funds expended on regional transportation projects listed in the County's Regional Transportation Development Mitigation Plan. Funds expended must be listed by individual project and must be reported for the current year and cumulatively for each project.

(2) ANNUAL PLAN REPORTS

As set forth in the California Government Code Section 66006 (b), the Board of Supervisors shall, within 180 days after the last day of each fiscal year, make available to the public the following information for the fiscal year:

(a) A brief description of the type of fee in the account or fund.

(b) The amount of the fee.

(c) The beginning and ending balance of the account or fund.

(d) The amount of the fees collected and the interest earned.

(e) An identification of each public improvement on which fees were expended and the amount of the expenditures on each improvement, including the total percentage of the cost of the public improvement that was funded with fees.

(f) An identification of an approximate date by which the construction of the public improvement will commence if the County determines that sufficient funds have been collected to complete financing on an incomplete public improvement.

(g) A description of each inter-fund transfer or loan made from the account or fund, including the public improvement on which the transferred or loaned fees will be expended. In the case of an inter-fund loan, the date on which the loan will be repaid and the rate of interest that the account or fund will receive on the loan.

(h) The Board of Supervisors will review the report at the next regularly scheduled public meeting not less than 15 days after this information is made available to the public.

(3) FIVE YEAR REPORTS

As set forth in the California Government Code Section 66001 (d), for the fifth year following the first deposit into a Transportation Facilities Fund, and every five years thereafter, the Board of Supervisors shall make all of the following findings:

(a) Identify the purpose to which the fee is to be put.

(b) Demonstrate a reasonable relationship between the fee and the purpose for which it is charged.

(c) Identify all sources and amounts of funding anticipated to complete financing incomplete improvements.

(d) Designate the approximate dates on which the funding is expected to be deposited into the appropriate Transportation Facilities Fund.

(c) REFUND OF SURPLUS FUNDS

Commencing on the fifth year after impositions of a fee and establishment of the PLAN and annually thereafter, the Board shall hold a hearing with respect to any portion of the fee remaining unexpended or uncommitted five or more years, and shall refund to the then owners of lots or units in development projects within PLAN SUBAREAS on a prorate basis any such unexpended or uncommitted fees plus interest accrued thereon, for which the Board is unable to demonstrate a reasonable relationship between the need for the fee and the purpose for which it was charged. Refunds shall be made in accordance with California Government Code Section 66001.

After completion of facilities and the payment of all claims from any Transportation Facilities Fund, the Board shall determine by resolution or other legislative action the amount of the surplus monies, if any, remaining in any of these funds. Any surplus shall be refunded in accordance with California Government Code Section 66001.

(d) UPDATES TO THE PLAN

(1) REGULAR UPDATES

Appendix F of the CMP, Section F.3 requires that local jurisdictions must provide for a bi-annual review and adjustment to project cost estimates. Although not required by the CMP, the County's annual review of the PLAN will also include possible addition or removal of projects. If necessary, fees will be recalculated accordingly.

(2) ANNEXATIONS

Upon receipt of a Certificate of Completion from the Local Agency Formation Commission (LAFCO) for San Bernardino County for an annexation within the boundaries of a PLAN SUBAREA, the applicable PLAN SUBAREA boundaries will be modified, and PLAN SUBAREA projects within the annexed area may be removed from the PLAN SUBAREA project list and fees may be recalculated. The PLAN will be amended by the Board of Supervisors as necessary.

County Department of Public Works will provide to SANBAG a copy of the resolution as notification of a reduction or increase in the amount of the Regional Transportation Development Mitigation Plan's development contribution share for the affected subarea/sphere of influence.

(e) AMENDMENT AND DISSOLUTION OF THE PLAN

(1) Amendments

(A) The PLAN may be amended in order to address changes over time with respect to needed facilities, facilities costs, annexations, changes in growth projections, or to clarify Plan language.

(B) Amendments to the PLAN may include any or all of, but not limited to, the following:

(i) Change in the PLAN subject areas or boundaries and benefit areas

(ii) Additions, deletions, and/or modifications of facilities identified in the PLAN

(iii) Adjustment of the estimated cost of facilities

(iv) Adjustment of growth projections attributable to new development

(v) Addition, deletion, and/or modification of calculation and payment of fees

(2) Dissolution

(A) Upon a finding of the Board of Supervisors that the PLAN has either completed construction of all projects for which the PLAN was intended or that construction of the remaining projects identified in the PLAN is not feasible or cost effective, the PLAN may be dissolved.

(f) COMBINED DEVELOPMENT MITIGATION PROGRAMS WITH CITIES

The County may enter into an agreement with a city to establish a combined development mitigation program for that jurisdiction and its sphere of influence, or PLAN SUBAREA, in which a common project list and fee may be negotiated. Upon execution of the agreement by the city and the County, SANBAG will be notified and the PLAN will be updated.

Appendix 1 – PLAN Project List and Costs

MAJOR ARTERIAL ROADS and TRAFFIC SIGNAL PROJECTS

Road Name	From	To	County Miles	Description	Total Estimated Project Cost	SB County Plan Subarea Development Contribution	SANBAG & Other Jurisdiction Contribution
ADELANTO SPHERE OF INFLUENCE							
NO PROJECTS				TOTAL ADELANTO SPHERE	$0	$0	$0
APPLE VALLEY SPHERE OF INFLUENCE							
ROCK SPRINGS ROAD	.25 MILE EAST OF GLENDALE AVE	KIOWA RD	1.86	WIDEN 1 LANE EACH DIRECTION	$10,350,000	$5,920,200	$4,429,800
BEAR VALLEY CUTOFF	SH 18			INSTALL TRAFFIC SIGNAL	$600,600	$343,543	$257,057
				TOTAL APPLE VALLEY SPHERE	$10,950,600	$6,263,743	$4,686,857
CHINO SPHERE OF INFLUENCE							
EAST END AVENUE	CHINO AVE	.01 MILE SOUTH OF WALNUT AVE	0.86	WIDEN 1 LANE EACH DIRECTION	$3,670,794	$1,347,181	$2,323,613
EAST END AVENUE	.13 MILE SOUTH OF PHILADELPHIA AVE	PHILLIPS BLVD		WIDEN 1 LANE EACH DIRECTION	$2,164,179	$794,254	$1,369,925
FRANCIS AVENUE	.11 MILE WEST OF EAST END	.13 MILE EAST OF TELEPHONE		WIDEN 1 LANE EACH DIRECTION	$4,575,149	$1,679,080	$2,896,069
PHILADELPHIA AVENUE	LOS ANGELES COUNTY LINE	EAST END AVE		WIDEN 1 LANE EACH DIRECTION	$762,104	$279,692	$482,412
PHILADELPHIA AVENUE	EAST END AVE	EAST SIDE OF NORTON AVE		WIDEN 1 LANE EACH DIRECTION	$1,157,211	$424,696	$732,514
PHILADELPHIA AVENUE	.04 MILE EAST OF RAMONA AVE	.13 MILE WEST OF MONTE VISTA		WIDEN 1 LANE EACH DIRECTION	$764,865	$280,705	$484,160
PHILLIPS BOULEVARD	YORBA AVE	BENSON AVE		WIDEN 1 LANE EACH DIRECTION	$3,829,250	$1,405,335	$2,423,915
PIPE LINE AVENUE	CHINO AVE	RIVERSIDE DR		WIDEN 1 LANE EACH DIRECTION	$1,101,269	$404,166	$697,103
PIPE LINE AVENUE	RIVERSIDE DR	.28 MILE SOUTH OF WALNUT (CHINO C/L)		WIDEN 1 LANE EACH DIRECTION	$1,024,595	$376,026	$648,568
PIPE LINE AVENUE	.04MILES SOUTH OF PHILADELPHIA AVE	PHILLIPS BLVD		WIDEN 1 LANE EACH DIRECTION	$3,204,249	$1,175,959	$2,028,290
RAMONA AVENUE	.03 MILES NORTH OF PHILADELPHIA AVE	PHILLIPS BLVD		WIDEN 1 LANE EACH DIRECTION	$2,770,954	$1,016,940	$1,754,014
WALNUT AVENUE	.10 MILE WEST OF ROSWELL AVE	ROSWELL AVE		WIDEN 1 LANE EACH DIRECTION	$348,575	$127,927	$220,648
FRANCIS AVE	EAST END AVE			INSTALL TRAFFIC SIGNAL	$598,400	$219,613	$378,787
FRANCIS AVE	PIPELINE AVE			INSTALL TRAFFIC SIGNAL	$598,400	$219,613	$378,787
PHILADELPHIA AVE	EAST END AVE			INSTALL TRAFFIC SIGNAL	$448,800	$164,710	$284,090
PHILLIPS AVE	EAST END AVE			INSTALL TRAFFIC SIGNAL	$598,400	$219,613	$378,787
PHILLIPS AVE	PIPELINE AVE			INSTALL TRAFFIC SIGNAL	$299,200	$109,806	$189,394
PHILLIPS AVE	RAMONA AVE			INSTALL TRAFFIC SIGNAL	$750,000	$275,250	$474,750
WALNUT AVE	EAST END AVE			INSTALL TRAFFIC SIGNAL	$299,200	$109,806	$189,394
				TOTAL CHINO SPHERE	$28,965,593	$10,630,373	$18,335,220
COLTON SPHERE OF INFLUENCE							
AGUA MANSA ROAD	.80 MILE WEST OF RANCHO AVE	.73 MILE EAST OF RANCHO AVE	0.37	WIDEN 1 LANE EACH DIRECTION	$713,271	$265,337	$447,934
C STREET	.07 MILE WEST OF JACKSON	.07 MILE EAST OF TEJON AVE	0.48	WIDEN 1 LANE EACH DIRECTION	$1,690,669	$628,929	$1,061,740
OLIVE STREET	.07 MILE WEST OF JACKSON	.03 MILE WEST OF RANCHO AVE	0.46	WIDEN 1 LANE EACH DIRECTION	$1,568,723	$583,565	$985,158
RECHE CANYON ROAD	.67 MILE NORTHWEST OF RIVERSIDE CO LINE	COLTON CITY LIMIT	0.13	WIDEN 1 LANE EACH DIRECTION	$518,128	$192,743	$325,384
RECHE CANYON ROAD	1.20 MILES SOUTH OF BARTON RD (COLTON C/L)	.42 MILE SOUTH OF BARTON ROAD	0.72	WIDEN 1 LANE EACH DIRECTION	$2,385,723	$887,489	$1,498,234
				TOTAL COLTON SPHERE	$6,876,513	$2,558,063	$4,318,450

Appendix 1 – PLAN Project List and Costs

DEVORE/GLEN HELEN UNINCORPORATED AREA							
DEVORE ROAD	SH215 NORTHBOUND OFF-RAMP	KENWOOD AVE	0.89	WIDEN 1 LANE EACH DIRECTION	$3,609,299	$2,244,984	$1,364,315
DEVORE ROAD	KENWOOD AVE	FOOTHILL ST	0.16	WIDEN 1 LANE EACH DIRECTION	$653,589	$406,532	$247,056
GLEN HELEN PARKWAY	.15 MILE EAST OF GLEN HELEN RD	CAJON BLVD	3.69	WIDEN 1 LANE EACH DIRECTION	$11,755,548	$7,311,951	$4,443,597
GLEN HELEN ROAD	GLEN HELEN PRKWY	END OF ROAD	0.90	WIDEN 1 LANE EACH DIRECTION	$1,925,371	$1,197,581	$727,790
				TOTAL DEVORE/GLEN HELEN UNINCORPORATED AREA	$17,943,807	$11,161,048	$6,782,759
FONTANA SPHERE OF INFLUENCE							
ALDER AVENUE	.08 MILE SOUTH OF TAYLOR ST	VALLEY BLVD	0.09	WIDEN 1 LANE EACH DIRECTION	$216,627	$90,334	$126,294
ALDER AVENUE	VALLEY BLVD	SAN BERNARDINO AVE	0.25	WIDEN 1 LANE EACH DIRECTION	$406,259	$169,410	$236,849
ARROW ROUTE	HICKORY AVE	ALMERIA AVE TOKAY AVE	3.14	WIDEN 1 LANE EACH DIRECTION	$8,220,052	$3,427,762	$4,792,290
BANANA AVENUE	JURUPA AVE	SLOVER	0.73	WIDEN 1 LANE EACH DIRECTION	$1,582,977	$660,102	$922,876
BEECH AVENUE	VALLEY BLVD	RANDALL	0.75	WIDEN 1 LANE EACH DIRECTION	$1,683,004	$701,813	$981,191
BEECH AVENUE	RANDALL AVE	ARROW ROUTE WHITTRAM AVE	1.03	WIDEN 1 LANE EACH DIRECTION	$2,097,366	$874,602	$1,222,764
BEECH AVENUE	ARROW ROUTE	SH66	0.51	WIDEN 1 LANE EACH DIRECTION	$1,287,057	$536,703	$750,355
CALABASH AVENUE	WHITTRAM AVE	FOOTHILL BLVD (SH66)	0.67	WIDEN 1 LANE EACH DIRECTION	$1,740,470	$725,776	$1,014,694
CHERRY AVENUE	MERRILL AVE	WHITTRAM AVE	0.25	WIDEN BRIDGE 2 LANES	$10,200,000	$4,253,400	$5,946,600
FONTANA AVENUE	VALLEY BLVD	LIME AVE POPLAR AVE	0.44	WIDEN 1 LANE EACH DIRECTION	$903,459	$376,743	$526,717
LIVE OAK AVENUE	VALLEY BLVD	RANDALL AVE	1.00	WIDEN 1 LANE EACH DIRECTION	$1,842,009	$768,118	$1,073,891
LIVE OAK AVENUE	RANDALL AVE	MERRILL AVE	0.51	WIDEN 1 LANE EACH DIRECTION	$810,333	$337,909	$472,424
LIVE OAK AVENUE	ARROW ROUTE	FOOTHLL SH66	0.25	WIDEN 1 LANE EACH DIRECTION	$600,935	$250,590	$350,345
MERRILL AVENUE	CHERRY AVE	CATAWBA AVE	1.71	WIDEN 1 LANE EACH DIRECTION	$4,156,354	$1,733,200	$2,423,154
MULBERRY AVENUE	JURUPA AVE	SLOVER AVE	0.44	WIDEN 1 LANE EACH DIRECTION	$579,612	$241,698	$337,914
MULBERRY AVENUE	VALLEY BLVD	SAN BERNARDINO AVE	0.50	WIDEN 1 LANE EACH DIRECTION	$964,208	$402,075	$562,133
RANDALL AVENUE	CHERRY AVE	.12 MILE EAST OF POPLAR AVE	1.44	WIDEN 1 LANE EACH DIRECTION	$2,789,683	$1,163,298	$1,626,385
RANDALL AVENUE	ALDER AVE	LOCUST AVE	0.25	WIDEN 1 LANE EACH DIRECTION	$529,071	$220,623	$308,449
SAN BERNARDINO AVENUE	ALDER AVE	LAUREL AVE	0.27	WIDEN 1 LANE EACH DIRECTION	$523,625	$218,352	$305,274
SAN BERNARDINO AVENUE	CHERRY AVE	FONTANA CITY LIMIT - NORTH SIDE	1.26	WIDEN 1 LANE EACH DIRECTION	$2,031,000	$846,927	$1,184,073
SAN BERNARDINO AVENUE	CHERRY AVE	FONTANA CITY LIMIT - SOUTH SIDE	1.26	WIDEN 1 LANE EACH DIRECTION	$1,733,087	$722,697	$1,010,390
SANTA ANA AVENUE	MULBERRY AVE	.12 MILE EAST OF REDWOOD ALMOND AVE	0.78	WIDEN 1 LANE EACH DIRECTION	$3,660,206	$1,526,306	$2,133,900
VALLEY BOULEVARD	.40 MILE EAST OF COMMERCE DR	BANANA AVE ALMOND AVE	0.66	WIDEN 1 LANE	$662,086	$276,090	$385,996
VALLEY BOULEVARD	CHERRY AVE	HEMLOCK AVE	0.37	WIDEN 1 LANE	$365,299	$152,330	$212,969
ARROW ROUTE	CALABASH AVE			INSTALL TRAFFIC SIGNAL	$598,400	$249,533	$348,867
ARROW ROUTE	LIVE OAK AVE			INSTALL TRAFFIC SIGNAL	$598,400	$249,533	$348,867
FONTANA AVE	BEECH AVE			INSTALL TRAFFIC SIGNAL	$299,200	$124,766	$174,434
MERRILL AVE	BEECH AVE			INSTALL TRAFFIC SIGNAL	$598,400	$249,533	$348,867
MERRILL AVE	LIVE OAK AVE			INSTALL TRAFFIC SIGNAL	$598,400	$249,533	$348,867
RANDALL AVE	ALDER AVE			INSTALL TRAFFIC SIGNAL	$149,600	$62,383	$87,217
RANDALL AVE	BEECH AVE			INSTALL TRAFFIC SIGNAL	$598,400	$249,533	$348,867
RANDALL AVE	LIVE OAK AVE			INSTALL TRAFFIC SIGNAL	$598,400	$249,533	$348,867
RANDALL AVE	LOCUST AVE			INSTALL TRAFFIC SIGNAL	$299,200	$124,766	$174,434

Fontana sphere cont.

	SAN BERNARDINO AVE	MULBERRY AVE			INSTALL TRAFFIC SIGNAL	$598,400	$249,533	$348,867
	SANTA ANA AVE	BANANA AVE			INSTALL TRAFFIC SIGNAL	$598,400	$249,533	$348,867
	SANTA ANA AVE	CALABASH AVE			INSTALL TRAFFIC SIGNAL	$598,400	$249,533	$348,867
	VALLEY BLVD	MULBERRY AVE			INSTALL TRAFFIC SIGNAL	$598,400	$249,533	$348,867
					TOTAL FONTANA SPHERE	$56,316,782	$23,484,098	$32,832,684
HESPERIA SPHERE OF INFLUENCE								
	RANCHERO STREET	0.3 MILES EAST OF MARIPOSA RD	.94 MILE EAST OF MARIPOSA RD	0.94	WIDEN 1 LANE EACH DIRECTION	$2,462,250	$1,021,834	$1,440,416
	RANCHERO STREET	.94 MILE EAST OF MARIPOSA RD	ESCONDIDO AVE	1.50	WIDEN 1 LANE EACH DIRECTION	$6,207,387	$2,576,066	$3,631,321
	RANCHERO STREET	ESCONDIDO AVE	HESPERIA CITY LIMITS	1.00	WIDEN 1 LANE EACH DIRECTION	$2,630,363	$1,091,601	$1,538,762
	SUMMIT VALLEY ROAD	STATE HIGHWAY 138	1.88 MILES NORTH OF STATE HIGHWAY 138	1.88	WIDEN 1 LANE EACH DIRECTION	$6,450,845	$2,677,101	$3,773,744
	SUMMIT VALLEY ROAD	1.88 MILE NORTH OF STATE HIGHWAY 138	4.06 MILE NORTH OF STATE HIGHWAY 138	2.18	WIDEN 1 LANE EACH DIRECTION	$5,230,770	$2,170,769	$3,060,000
	SUMMIT VALLEY ROAD	4.31 MILE NORTH OF SH138 (HESPERIA CITY LIMITS)	5.51 MILE NORTH OF STATE HIGHWAY 138	1.20	WIDEN 1 LANE EACH DIRECTION	$4,052,708	$1,681,874	$2,370,834
	SUMMIT VALLEY RD	SH 138			INSTALL TRAFFIC SIGNAL	$600,600	$249,249	$351,351
					TOTAL HESPERIA SPHERE	$27,634,923	$11,468,493	$16,166,430
LOMA LINDA SPHERE OF INFLUENCE								
	0	0	0	0.00	0	$0	$0	$0
					TOTAL LOMA LINDA SPHERE	$0	$0	$0
MONTCLAIR SPHERE OF INFLUENCE								
	BENSON AVENUE	.18 MILE NORTH OF HOWARD ST	STATE ST	0.17	WIDEN 1 LANE EACH DIRECTION	$519,365	$190,087	$329,277
	BENSON AVENUE	PHILLIPS BLVD	.06 MILE NORTH OF HOWARD ST	0.16	WIDEN 1 LANE EACH DIRECTION	$576,545	$211,016	$365,530
	EAST END AVENUE	PHILLIPS BLVD	.03 MILE SOUTH OF GRAND AVE	0.13	WIDEN 1 LANE EACH DIRECTION	$309,470	$113,266	$196,204
	MISSION BOULEVARD	LA COUNTY LINE	.26 MILE EAST OF PIPE LINE (MONTCLAIR C/L)	0.19	WIDEN 1 LANE EACH DIRECTION	$1,014,291	$371,230	$643,060
	MISSION BOULEVARD	.07 MILE WEST OF CENTRAL AVE	BENSON AVE	0.53	WIDEN 1 LANE EACH DIRECTION	$1,498,336	$548,391	$949,945
	MONTE VISTA AVENUE	PHILLIPS BLVD	STATE ST	0.20	WIDEN 1 LANE EACH DIRECTION	$836,164	$306,036	$530,128
	PHILLIPS BOULEVARD	LA COUNTY LINE	EAST END AVE	0.01	WIDEN 1 LANE EACH DIRECTION	$100,450	$36,765	$63,686
	PHILLIPS BOULEVARD	EAST END AVE	ROSWELL AVE	0.25	WIDEN 1 LANE EACH DIRECTION	$379,349	$138,842	$240,508
	PHILLIPS BOULEVARD	ROSWELL AVE	YORBA AVE	0.90	WIDEN 1 LANE EACH DIRECTION	$3,026,084	$1,107,547	$1,918,537
	PIPE LINE AVENUE	PHILLIPS BLVD	MISSION BLVD	0.73	WIDEN 1 LANE EACH DIRECTION	$2,824,437	$1,033,744	$1,790,693
	PHILLIPS AVE	BENSON AVE			INSTALL TRAFFIC SIGNAL	$149,600	$54,754	$94,846
	PHILLIPS AVE	MONTE VISTA AVE			INSTALL TRAFFIC SIGNAL	$375,000	$137,250	$237,750
	PHILLIPS AVE	PIPELINE AVE			INSTALL TRAFFIC SIGNAL	$299,200	$109,507	$189,693
	PHILLIPS AVE	RAMONA AVE			INSTALL TRAFFIC SIGNAL	$375,000	$137,250	$237,750
					TOTAL MONTCLAIR SPHERE	$12,283,291	$4,495,684	$7,787,606
REDLANDS SPHERE OF INFLUENCE								
	COLTON AVENUE	WABASH AVE	CRAFTON AVE	1.01	WIDEN 1 LANE EACH DIRECTION	$1,546,457	$548,992	$997,464
	CRAFTON HILLS PKWY	WABASH AVE	OVERCREST/TENNESSEE	0.51	CONSTRUCT 2 LANE ROAD	$6,328,935	$2,246,772	$4,082,163
	FIFTH AVENUE	WABASH AVE	CRAFTON AVE	0.96	WIDEN 1 LANE EACH DIRECTION	$3,021,508	$1,072,635	$1,948,873
	FLORIDA STREET	GREENSPOT RD	GARNET ST	0.71	WIDEN 1 LANE EACH DIRECTION	$3,161,717	$1,122,410	$2,039,308
	GARNET STREET	STATE HIGHWAY 38 (MENTONE BLVD)	.57 MILE SOUTH OF NEWPORT AVE	0.13	WIDEN 1 LANE EACH DIRECTION	$382,591	$135,820	$246,771
	GARNET STREET	.29 MILE SOUTH OF NEWPORT AVE	FLORIDA ST	0.60	WIDEN 1 LANE EACH DIRECTION	$1,835,527	$651,612	$1,183,915

Redlands sphere cont.

GARNET STREET	.08 MILE SOUTH OF MENTONE AVE	MENTONE AVE	0.08	WIDEN 1 LANE EACH DIRECTION	$266,389	$94,568	$171,821
GARNET STREET	MENTONE AVE	STATE HIGHWAY 38 (MENTONE BLVD)	0.12	WIDEN 1 LANE EACH DIRECTION	$429,585	$152,503	$277,082
GREENSPOT ROAD	.19 MILE NORTH OF FLORIDA ST	FLORIDA STREET	0.17	WIDEN 1 LANE EACH DIRECTION	$409,824	$145,487	$264,336
SAN BERNARDINO AVENUE	WABASH AVE	OPAL AVE	0.23	WIDEN 1 LANE EACH DIRECTION	$777,915	$276,160	$501,755
WABASH AVENUE	.30 MILE SOUTH OF SEVENTH ST	.13 MILE NORTH OF 7TH ST	0.33	WIDEN 1 LANE EACH DIRECTION	$1,073,969	$381,259	$692,710
WABASH AVENUE	6TH AVE	5TH AVE	0.12	WIDEN 1 LANE EACH DIRECTION	$349,584	$124,102	$225,481
WABASH AVENUE	STATE HIGHWAY 38 (MENTONE BLVD)	SAN BERNARDINO AVE	0.25	WIDEN 1 LANE EACH DIRECTION	$584,718	$207,575	$377,143
COLTON AVE	WABASH AVE			INSTALL TRAFFIC SIGNAL	$299,200	$106,216	$192,984
CRAFTON HILLS PKWY	WABASH AVE			INSTALL TRAFFIC SIGNAL	$598,400	$212,432	$385,968
FIFTH AVE	WABASH AVE			INSTALL TRAFFIC SIGNAL	$149,600	$53,108	$96,492
FLORIDA ST	GARNET ST			INSTALL TRAFFIC SIGNAL	$598,400	$212,432	$385,968
GARNET ST	SH 38			INSTALL TRAFFIC SIGNAL	$299,200	$106,216	$192,984
SAN BERNARDINO AVE	WABASH AVE			INSTALL TRAFFIC SIGNAL	$149,600	$53,108	$96,492
				TOTAL REDLANDS SPHERE	$22,263,118	$7,903,407	$14,359,711
REDLANDS "DONUT HOLE" UNINCORPORATED AREA							
LUGONIA AVE	NEVADA ST			INSTALL TRAFFIC SIGNAL	$299,200	$185,504	$113,696
PALMETTO AVE	ALABAMA ST			INSTALL TRAFFIC SIGNAL	$598,400	$371,008	$227,392
PALMETTO AVE	NEVADA ST			INSTALL TRAFFIC SIGNAL	$448,800	$278,256	$170,544
PALMETTO AVE	CALIFORNIA ST			INSTALL TRAFFIC SIGNAL	$149,600	$92,752	$56,848
				TOTAL REDLANDS "DONUT HOLE" UNINCORPORATED AREA	$1,496,000	$927,520	$568,480
RIALTO SPHERE OF INFLUENCE							
ALDER AVENUE	JURUPA AVE	.12 MILE NORTH OF JURUPA AVE	0.12	WIDEN 1 LANE EACH DIRECTION	$402,894	$151,488	$251,406
ALDER AVENUE	.12 MILE NORTH OF JURUPA AVE	SLOVER AVE	0.90	WIDEN 1 LANE EACH DIRECTION	$2,583,359	$971,343	$1,612,016
EL RIVINO ROAD	CEDAR AVE	AGUA MANSA RD	0.36	WIDEN 1 LANE EACH DIRECTION	$2,135,847	$803,078	$1,332,768
JURUPA AVENUE	LOCUST AVE	CEDAR AVE	0.66	WIDEN 1 LANE EACH DIRECTION	$2,199,285	$826,931	$1,372,354
JURUPA AVENUE	LILAC AVE	.09 MILE WEST OF WILLOW AVE	0.16	WIDEN 1 LANE EACH DIRECTION	$863,119	$324,533	$538,586
JURUPA AVENUE	TAMARIND AVE	ALDER AVE	0.13	WIDEN 2 LANES EACH DIRECTION	$959,517	$360,778	$598,739
JURUPA AVENUE	CEDAR AVE	LILAC AVE	1.00	WIDEN 1 LANE EACH DIRECTION	$3,952,443	$1,486,119	$2,466,325
LOCUST AVENUE	SEVENTH ST	ELEVENTH ST	0.13	WIDEN 1 LANE EACH DIRECTION	$544,499	$204,731	$339,767
LOCUST AVENUE	JURUPA AVE	SANTA ANA	0.52	WIDEN 1 LANE EACH DIRECTION	$2,056,196	$773,130	$1,283,066
LOCUST AVENUE	SANTA ANA AVE	SLOVER AVE	0.48	WIDEN 1 LANE EACH DIRECTION	$1,648,209	$619,726	$1,028,482
LOCUST AVENUE	SAN BERNARDINO AVE	RANDALL AVE	0.50	WIDEN 1 LANE EACH DIRECTION	$1,706,889	$641,790	$1,065,099
LOCUST AVENUE	VALLEY BLVD	SAN BERNARDINO AVE	0.50	WIDEN 1 LANE EACH DIRECTION	$1,402,953	$527,510	$875,443
RANDALL AVENUE	ALDER AVE LOCUST AVE	CEDAR AVE	0.37	WIDEN 1 LANE EACH DIRECTION	$829,700	$311,967	$517,733
SAN BERNARDINO AVENUE	LAUREL AVE	.07 MILE EAST OF LARCH (RIALTO C/L)	1.31	WIDEN 1 LANE EACH DIRECTION	$3,067,953	$1,153,550	$1,914,403
SANTA ANA AVENUE	LOCUST AVE	CEDAR AVE	0.75	WIDEN 1 LANE EACH DIRECTION	$1,744,369	$655,883	$1,088,486
SANTA ANA AVENUE	CEDAR AVE	.12 MILE EAST OF CACTUS AVE	0.88	WIDEN 1 LANE EACH DIRECTION	$2,268,168	$852,831	$1,415,337
SANTA ANA AVENUE	TAMARIND AVE	LOCUST AVE	0.76	WIDEN 1 LANE EACH DIRECTION	$2,551,434	$959,339	$1,592,095
SLOVER AVENUE	ALDER AVE	LINDEN AVE	1.00	WIDEN 1 LANE EACH DIRECTION	$2,800,000	$1,052,800	$1,747,200
SLOVER AVENUE	TAMARIND AVE & LINDEN AVE	ALDER AVE & CEDAR AVE	0.50	WIDEN 1 LANE EACH DIRECTION	$2,400,000	$902,400	$1,497,600

Rialto sphere cont.

Appendix 1 – PLAN Project List and Costs

SLOVER AVENUE	LARCH AVE	CACTUS AVE	0.50	WIDEN 1 LANE EACH DIRECTION	$2,036,000	$765,536	$1,270,464
JURUPA AVE	ALDER AVE			INSTALL TRAFFIC SIGNAL	$299,200	$112,499	$186,701
JURUPA AVE	LOCUST AVE			INSTALL TRAFFIC SIGNAL	$299,200	$112,499	$186,701
RANDALL AVE	LOCUST AVE			INSTALL TRAFFIC SIGNAL	$299,200	$112,499	$186,701
SANTA ANA AVE	ALDER AVE			INSTALL TRAFFIC SIGNAL	$598,400	$224,998	$373,402
SANTA ANA AVE	LOCUST AVE			INSTALL TRAFFIC SIGNAL	$598,400	$224,998	$373,402
				TOTAL RIALTO SPHERE	$40,247,233	$15,132,959	$25,114,273
SAN BERNARDINO SPHERE OF INFLUENCE							
DEL ROSA AVENUE	DEL ROSA DR	SAN BERNARDINO CITY LIMITS	0.04	WIDEN 1 LANE EACH DIRECTION	$89,980	$20,785	$69,194
FIFTH STREET	WATERMAN AVE	.23 MILE WEST OF PEDLEY RD	0.34	WIDEN 1 LANE EACH DIRECTION	$1,296,175	$299,416	$996,758
FIFTH STREET	.03 MILE WEST OF PEDLEY RD	TIPPECANOE AVE	0.35	WIDEN 1 LANE EACH DIRECTION	$898,763	$207,614	$691,149
KENDALL DRIVE	.19 MILE NORTHWEST OF PALM AVE	CAJON BLVD	1.59	WIDEN 1 LANE EACH DIRECTION	$5,216,453	$1,205,001	$4,011,452
STATE STREET	HIGHLAND AVE/SR-210	CAJON BLVD	1.44	WIDEN 1 LANE EACH DIRECTION	$6,000,000	$1,386,000	$4,614,000
				TOTAL SAN BERNARDINO SPHERE	$13,501,371	$3,118,817	$10,382,554
UPLAND SPHERE OF INFLUENCE							
EUCLID AVENUE	24TH ST	MOUNTAIN AVE	0.96	WIDEN 1 LANE EACH DIRECTION	$2,727,127	$1,055,398	$1,671,729
MOUNTAIN AVENUE	23RD ST	EUCLID AVE	1.03	WIDEN 1 LANE EACH DIRECTION	$3,722,922	$1,440,771	$2,282,151
SAN ANTONIO AVENUE	23RD ST	24TH ST	0.13	WIDEN 1 LANE EACH DIRECTION	$341,771	$132,265	$209,505
SAN ANTONIO CRESCENT E	24TH ST	SAN ANTONIO CRESENT W	0.06	WIDEN 1 LANE EACH DIRECTION	$113,039	$43,746	$69,293
MOUNTAIN AVE	EUCLID AVE			INSTALL TRAFFIC SIGNAL	$598,400	$231,581	$366,819
				TOTAL UPLAND SPHERE	$7,503,259	$2,903,761	$4,599,498
VICTORVILLE SPHERE OF INFLUENCE							
YATES ROAD	.24 MILE NORTH OF CHINQUAPIN DR	.02 MILE SOUTH OF FORTUNA LN	1.23	WIDEN 1 LANE EACH DIRECTION	$5,690,000	$1,012,820	$4,677,180
BALDY MESA ROAD	MESA STREET	DUNCAN ROAD	1.50	WIDEN 1 LANE EACH DIRECTION	$3,583,236	$637,816	$2,945,420
BALDY MESA ROAD	DUNCAN ROAD	STATE HIGHWAY 18	1.25	WIDEN 1 LANE EACH DIRECTION	$3,841,862	$683,851	$3,158,010
DUNCAN ROAD	CAUGHLIN ROAD	BALDY MESA ROAD	2.00	WIDEN 1 LANE EACH DIRECTION	$2,147,080	$382,180	$1,764,900
DUNCAN ROAD	CAUGHLIN ROAD	MONTE VISTA	2.94	WIDEN 1 LANE EACH DIRECTION	$6,906,779	$1,229,407	$5,677,373
				TOTAL VICTORVILLE SPHERE	$22,168,957	$3,946,074	$18,222,883
YUCAIPA SPHERE OF INFLUENCE							
BRYANT STREET	NORTH JUNIPER AVE	STATE HIGHWAY 38	0.15	WIDEN 1 LANE EACH DIRECTION	$568,403	$224,519	$343,884
BRYANT ST	SH 38			INSTALL TRAFFIC SIGNAL	$299,200	$118,184	$181,016
				TOTAL YUCAIPA SPHERE	$867,603	$342,703	$524,900
				PLAN MAJOR ARTERIAL/TRAFFIC SIGNAL TOTALS	$269,019,049	$104,336,744	$164,682,305

Appendix 1 – PLAN Project List and Costs

SB COUNTY SHARE OF FREEWAY INTERCHANGES PROJECTS (per SANBAG Nexus Study)

	Freeway	Interchange Street	Plan Subarea (City Sphere of Influence)	Devel. Contri-butio n %	Plan Subarea Development Contribution %	Total Sphere Share Estimated Project Cost	SB County Plan Subarea Development Contributio n	SANBAG & Other Jurisdictio n Contributio n
1)	SR-60	Ramona	Chino Sphere	31.3%	16.7%	$5,050,080	$1,580,675	$26,576,999
			Montclair Sphere	31.3%	22.0%	$6,652,800	$2,082,326	
2)	SR-60	Central	Chino Sphere	58.8%	0.9%	$274,725	$161,538	$28,364,035
			Montclair Sphere	58.8%	6.7%	$1,997,325	$1,174,427	
3)	I-10	Cherry	Fontana Sphere	35.4%	64.0%	$49,216,000	$17,422,464	$59,477,536
4)	I-10	Beech	Fontana Sphere	50.0%	36.5%	$41,574,595	$20,787,298	$93,115,703
5)	I-10	Citrus	Fontana Sphere	38.4%	0.6%	$351,000	$134,784	$58,365,216
6)	I-10	Alder	Rialto Sphere	50.0%	28.8%	$28,641,600	$14,320,800	$85,129,200
7)	I-10	Cedar	Rialto Sphere	30.0%	68.6%	$35,877,800	$10,763,340	$41,536,660
8)	I-10	Riverside Ph I	Rialto Sphere	27.4%	7.9%	$2,165,982	$550,001	$26,749,999
9)	I-10	Riverside Ph II	Rialto Sphere	27.4%	7.9%	$793,400	$173,913	$9,826,087
10)	I-10	Pepper Ph I	Rialto Sphere	34.0%	1.8%	$180,000	$61,200	$9,864,000
			Colton Sphere	34.0%	2.2%	$220,000	$74,800	
11)	I-10	Pepper Ph II	Rialto Sphere	34.0%	1.8%	$810,000	$275,400	$44,388,000
			Colton Sphere	34.0%	2.2%	$990,000	$336,600	
12)	I-10	Mountain View	Loma Linda Sphere	37.8%	6.1%	$3,104,595	$1,173,537	$49,721,463
13)	I-10	California	Loma Linda Sphere	47.8%	22.4%	$9,975,392	$4,768,237	$34,400,496
			Redlands "Donut Hole"	47.8%	25.2%	$11,222,316	$5,364,267	
14)	I-10	Alabama	Redlands "Donut Hole"	50.5%	65.1%	$20,473,950	$10,339,345	$21,110,655
15)	I-10	Wabash	Redlands Sphere	35.8%	87.5%	$35,000,000	$12,530,000	$27,470,000
16)	I-215	University	Rialto Sphere	15.8%	2.2%	$602,000	$95,116	$25,471,684
			San Bernardino Sphere	15.8%	55.0%	$15,400,000	$2,433,200	
17)	I-215	Palm	San Bernardino Sphere	35.7%	50.0%	$5,464,500	$1,950,827	$8,978,174
18)	SR-210	Del Rosa	San Bernardino Sphere	32.8%	9.0%	$3,206,430	$1,051,709	$34,575,291
19)	I-15	6th/Arrow	Fontana Sphere	50.0%	10.1%	$7,070,000	$3,535,000	$66,465,000
20)	I-15	Duncan Canyon	Fontana Sphere	77.3%	21.0%	$8,610,000	$6,655,530	$34,344,470

Appendix 1 – PLAN Project List and Costs

21)	I-15	Sierra	Fontana Sphere	80.3%	1.4%	$178,136.00	$143,043	$11,957,697
			Rialto Sphere	80.3%	6.1%	$776,164	$623,260	
22)	I-15	Ranchero	Hesperia Sphere	57.5%	5.9%	$4,607,900	$2,649,543	$75,046,290
			Apple Valley Sphere	57.5%	0.9%	$702,900	$404,168	
23)	I-15	Joshua	Hesperia Sphere	58.7%	5.0%	$3,555,000	$2,086,785	$69,013,215
24)	I-15	Mojave	Apple Valley Sphere	55.4%	3.8%	$1,887,500	$1,045,675	$48,954,325
25)	I-15	Bear Valley	Apple Valley Sphere	31.3%	1.0%	$250,000	$78,250	$24,921,750
26)	I-15	La Mesa	Victorville Sphere	50.0%	1.6%	$1,246,400	$613,600	$77,286,400
27)	I-15	High Desert Corridor	Apple Valley Sphere	63.7%	19.1%	$0	$0	$0
					PLAN INTERCHANGE TOTALS	$308,128,490	$127,440,657	$1,093,110,343
						$0		

SB COUNTY SHARE OF GRADE SEPARATION PROJECTS (per SANBAG Nexus Study)

	Grade Separation	Railroad Crossing	Plan Subarea (City Sphere of Influence)	Devel. Contri-bution %	Plan Subarea Contribution %	Total SANBAG Estimated Project Cost	SB County Plan Subarea Development Contribution	SANBAG & Other Jurisdiction Contribution
1)	GLEN HELEN PARKWAY	CAJON LINE	DEVORE/GLEN HELEN SPHERE	33%	100%	$29,568,000	$8,276,083	$21,291,917
					PLAN INTERCHANGE TOTALS	$29,568,000	$8,276,083	$21,291,917
					TOTAL PLAN DEVELOPMENT CONTRIBUTION	**$606,715,539**	**$240,053,484**	**$1,279,084,565**