

CITY OF ANGELS CALIFORNIA

► Proposal
Traffic Mitigation Impact Fee Update



Table of Contents

A. Cover Page2

B. Project Understanding and Approach3

 Project Understanding.....3

 Project Objectives3

 Work Plan.....7

 City Staff Support.....9

 Project Disclaimer9

C. Experience and Similar Work10

 Project Team10

 James Edison, JD, MPP, MA11

 Carlos Villarreal, MPP13

 Firm Profile15

 Experience and Expertise16

 References17

 Similar Studies19

D. Cost21

 Notes21

 Hourly Rates22

E. Project Timeline..... 23

A. Cover Page

July 31, 2025

Ms. Amy Augustine
City Planner
City of Angels
200 Monte Verde Street, Suite B
Angels, CA 95222

Re: Proposal to Conduct a Traffic Mitigation Impact Fee Study for the City of Angels

Dear Ms. Augustine:

Willdan Financial Services ("Willdan") is pleased to present this proposal to the City of Angels ("City") to conduct a Traffic Impact Mitigation Fee Study. Willdan's project approach helps to ensure the preparation of an impact fee study that will withstand technical challenges and public scrutiny. Given Willdan's unmatched impact fee experience, we are particularly well positioned to serve the City and help achieve established long-term goals. Outlined below are the advantages and benefits that Willdan will provide for the City.

Unmatched experience implementing and defending fee programs. Willdan's impact fee staff has assisted more than 100 California government agencies with the development and/or update of all fee types and is fortunate to be in a position that will provide a tremendous benefit to the City. Each project has required defensible documentation and thorough coordination of fee program changes for different agency departments and stakeholders within the business community. In some cases, Willdan has been required to negotiate fees with stakeholders and, on occasion, defend them in meetings and public forums.

In addition to the technical work of preparing the fee, we strive to advise our clients on the advantages and disadvantages of different fee schedule structures (Citywide versus multiple-fee districts/zones; more versus fewer land-use categories; etc.) and methods of fee calculation that are based on the City's and stakeholder priorities. Impact fees also need to be developed in compliance with the *Mitigation Fee Act* (California Government Code Section 66000 et seq., also known as Assembly Bill 1600) so that they are defensible and transparent. We are also current on the changes to fee programs and the adoption of nexus studies resulting from AB 602, which took effect in 2022.

Innovative Methodologies. As Willdan operates nationally, we possess unique experiences in numerous jurisdictions dealing with multiple challenges. Our ability to produce studies that accommodate various options and viewpoints ensures fair-minded and sensible projects. Our methodology and approach to impact fees has proven to be effective for Cities and Counties, the development community, and the public. Utilizing focus groups, with established guidelines, during the study, fully informs the development community and the public of the justification of the impact fees, and their positive effect on community growth.

Best-in-class impact fee team that can work immediately to prepare an impact fee program. The Willdan team begins a project by evaluating the agency's existing fee program, if available, and current capital planning policies and funding programs. Not all capital projects are amenable to funding from impact fee programs, and we identify sources that complement fee revenues to fully fund the capital improvement program. The team's Principal-in-Charge James Edison and Project Manager Carlos Villarreal are well respected by our clients for their skill in proactively organizing a clear, consensus-based project approach.

Successful project completion. Willdan has successfully completed many impact fee studies, including most recently in the **Cities of East Palo Alto, Fremont, Union City, Richmond, Belmont, Napa, Foster City, San Bruno, Petaluma, Morgan Hill, Pismo, Gonzales, and Gilroy, and the Counties of Riverside, Santa Barbara, San Benito, San Luis Obispo, Stanislaus, and Tulare.**

Mr. James Edison will serve as the prime contact if you wish to discuss any aspect of this submittal, please contact him directly at (510) 912-4687 | Email: JEdison@Willdan.com

Sincerely,
Willdan Financial Services



Chris Fisher
Vice President / Director

B. Project Understanding and Approach

This section outlines Willdan Financial Services' ("Willdan") understanding of the City of Angels' ("City") desire to update its Traffic Impact Mitigation Fee, as well as identify the project objectives and discusses the background regarding public facilities financing in California. Also outlined is an overview of our impact fee project approach.

Project Understanding

As part of the larger financial planning effort for the City's future development, the City seeks to understand what the financial impacts of future development will have on the City's transportation facilities, and to identify potential gaps in funding for those necessary improvements. The City desires to update its current impact fees to ensure a fair and reasonable fee structure, while meeting the requirements of the *California Mitigation Fee Act (California Government Code 66000 et seq)*, including the new requirements enacted by Assembly Bill (AB) 602. The resulting fees will fund new development's share of planned facilities, while not overburdening development with unnecessary costs. In response to these objectives, the City has issued an RFP to prepare an update to the fee.

Project Objectives

The objective of this project is to update the traffic impact fee pursuant to State law, and to assist the City in understanding additional infrastructure needs necessitated by future development. To accomplish this objective, this study will:

- Develop a technically defensible fee justification, based on the reasonable relationship and deferential review standards;
- Review facility standards, capital facilities plans and costs, and development and growth assumptions and facilities master plans);
- Provide a schedule of maximum-justified fees by land use category; and
- Provide comprehensive documentation of assumptions, methodologies, and results, including findings required by the *Mitigation Fee Act*.

Public Facilities Financing in California

The changing fiscal landscape in California during the past 40 years has steadily undercut the financial capacity of local governments to fund infrastructure. Four dominant trends stand out:

1. The passage of a string of tax limitation measures starting with Proposition 13 in 1978 and continuing through the passage of Proposition 218 in 1996;
2. Declining popular support for bond measures to finance infrastructure for the next generation of residents and businesses;
3. Steep reductions in Federal and State assistance; and
4. Permanent shifting by the State of local tax resources to the State General Fund to offset deficit spending brought on by recessions.

Faced with these trends, many cities and counties have had to adopt a policy of "growth pays its own way." This policy shifts the burden of funding infrastructure expansion from existing rate and taxpayers onto new development. This funding shift has been accomplished primarily through the imposition of assessments, special taxes, and development impact fees, also known as public facilities fees. Assessments and special taxes require approval of property owners or registered voters and are appropriate when the funded facilities are directly related to the developing property.

Development impact fees, on the other hand, are an appropriate funding source for facilities that benefit development jurisdiction-wide. Development fees need only a majority vote of the legislative body for adoption.

Approach and Methodology

Willdan's methodology for calculating public facilities fees is both simple and flexible. Simplicity is important so that the development community and the public can easily understand the justification for the fee program. At the same time, we use our expertise to reasonably ensure that the program is technically defensible.

Flexibility is important, so we can tailor our approach to the available data, and the agency's policy objectives. Our understanding of the technical standards established by statutes and case law suggests that a range of approaches are technically defensible.

Consequently, we can address policy objectives related to the fee program, such as economic development and affordable housing. Flexibility also enables us to avoid excessive engineering costs associated with detailed facility planning. We calculate the maximum justifiable impact fee and provide flexibility for the agency to adopt fees up to that amount.

Development impact fees are calculated to fund the cost of facilities required to accommodate growth. The four steps followed in an impact fee study include:

- **Estimate existing development and future growth:** Identify a base year for existing development and a growth forecast that reflects increased demand for public facilities;
- **Identify facility standards:** Determine the facility standards used to plan for new and expanded facilities;
- **Determine facilities required to serve new development and their costs:** Estimate the total amount and cost of planned facilities, and identify the share required to accommodate new development; and
- **Calculate fee schedule:** Allocate facilities costs per unit of new development to calculate the public facilities fee schedule.

We discuss key aspects of our approach to each of these steps in the subsections that follow.

Growth Projections

In most cases, we recommend use of long-range market-based projections of new development. By "long-range" we suggest 20 to 30 years to: capture the total demand often associated with major public facility investments; and support analysis of debt financing, if needed. In contrast to build out projections, market-based projections provide a more realistic estimate of development across all land uses. Build out projections typically overestimate commercial and industrial development because of the oversupply of these land uses relative to residential development.

Facility Standards

The key public policy issue in development impact fee studies is the identification of facility standards (second bullet above). Facility standards document a reasonable relationship between new development and the need for new facilities. Standards ensure that new development does not fund deficiencies associated with existing development.

Our approach recognizes three separate components of facility standards:

1. **Demand standards** determine the amount of facilities required to accommodate growth. Examples include park acres per thousand residents, square feet of library space per capita, or gallons of water per day. Demand standards may also reflect a level of service such as the vehicles-to-capacity (V/C) ratio used in traffic planning;
2. **Design standards** determine how a facility should be designed to meet expected demand, for example park improvement requirements and technology infrastructure for office space. Design standards are typically not explicitly evaluated as part of an impact fee analysis but can have a significant impact on the cost of facilities. Our approach incorporates current facility design standards into the fee program to reflect the increasing construction cost of public facilities; and
3. **Cost standards** are an alternate method for determining the amount of facilities required to accommodate growth based on facility costs per unit of demand. Cost standards are useful when demand standards were not explicitly developed for the facility planning process. Cost standards also enable different types of facilities to be analyzed based on a single measure (cost or value), useful when disparate facilities are funded by a single fee program. Examples include facility costs per capita, per vehicle trip, or cost per gallon of water per day.

Identifying New Development Facility Needs and Costs

We can take several different approaches to identify facility needs and costs to serve new development. Typically, this is a two-step process: 1) identify total facility needs; and 2) allocate to new development its fair share of those needs. Total facility needs are often identified through a master facility planning process that typically takes place concurrent with or prior to conducting the fee study. Engineered facility plans are particularly important in the areas of traffic, water, sewer, and storm drain due to the specialized technical analysis required to identify facility needs.

There are three common methods for determining new development's fair share of planned facilities costs: 1) the existing inventory method; 2) the planned facilities method; and 3) the system plan method. Often the method selected depends on the degree to which the community has engaged in comprehensive facility master planning to identify facility needs. Willdan anticipates that the planned facilities method, based on the City's transportation projects list, but will evaluate the best method as part of the work effort.

The formula used by each approach and the advantages and disadvantages of each method is summarized as follows:

Existing Inventory Method

The existing inventory method allocates costs based on the ratio of existing facilities to demand from existing development as follows:

$$\frac{\text{Current Value of Existing Facilities}}{\text{Existing Development Demand}} = \$/\text{unit of demand}$$

Under this method new development funds the expansion of facilities at the same standard currently serving existing development. By definition, the existing inventory method results in no facility deficiencies attributable to existing development. This method is often used when a long-range plan for new facilities is not available. Only the initial facilities to be funded with fees are identified in the fee study. Future facilities to serve growth are identified through an annual Capital Improvement Plan (CIP) and budget process, possibly after completion of a new facility master plan.

Planned Facilities Method

The planned facilities method allocates costs based on the ratio of planned facility costs to demand from new development as follows:

$$\frac{\text{Cost of Planned Facilities}}{\text{New Development Demand}} = \$/\text{unit of demand}$$

This method is appropriate when specific planned facilities can be identified that only benefit new development. Examples include street improvements to avoid deficient levels of service or a sewer trunk line extension to a previously undeveloped area. This method is appropriate when planned facilities would not serve existing development. Under this method new development funds the expansion of facilities at the standards used for the master facility plan.

System Plan Method

This method calculates the fee based on the ratio of the value of existing facilities plus the cost of planned facilities divided by demand from existing plus new development:

$$\frac{\text{Value of Existing Facilities} + \text{Cost of Planned Facilities}}{\text{Existing} + \text{New Development Demand}} = \$/\text{unit of demand}$$

This method is useful when planned facilities need to be analyzed as part of a system that benefits both existing and new development. It is difficult, for example, to allocate a new fire station solely to new development when that station will operate as part of an integrated system of fire stations that work together to achieve the desired level of service. Police substations, civic centers, and regional parks are examples of similar facilities.

The system plan method ensures that new development does not pay for existing deficiencies. Often, facility standards based on policies such as those found in General Plans are higher than existing facility standards. This method enables the calculation of the existing deficiency required to bring existing development up to the policy-based standard. The local agency must secure non-fee funding for that portion of planned facilities, required to correct the deficiency, to ensure that new development receives the level of service funded by the impact fee.

Calculating the Fee Schedule

At its simplest, the fee schedule uses the cost per unit of demand discussed in the last subsection to generate the fee schedule. This unit cost is multiplied by the demand associated with a new development project to calculate the fee for that project. The fee schedule uses different demand measures by land use category to provide a reasonable relationship between the type of development and the amount of the fee. We are familiar with a wide range of methods for identifying appropriate land use categories and demand measures depending on the study.

Related Approach Issues

Funding and Financing Strategies

In our experience, one of the most common problems with impact fee programs and with many CIPs is that the program or plan is not financially constrained to anticipated revenues. The result is a “wish list” of projects that generate community expectations that often cannot be fulfilled. Our approach is to integrate the impact fee program into the local agency’s existing CIPs while encouraging those plans to be financially constrained to available resources. We clearly state the cost of correcting existing deficiencies, if any, to document the relationship between the fee program and the need for additional non-fee funding.

We can also address one of the most significant drawbacks of an impact fee program – the inability to support conventional public debt financing, so projects can be built before all fee revenues have been received. In collaboration with financial advisors and underwriters, we have developed specific underwriting criteria so that fees can be used to pay back borrowing if another source of credit exists. Typically, this approach involves the use of Certificates of Participation or revenue bonds that are calibrated so that they can be fully repaid using impact fee revenues.

Economic Development Concerns

The development community often is concerned that fees and other exactions will become too high for development to be financially feasible under current market conditions. Local agencies have several strategies to address this concern, including:

- Conducting an analysis of the total burden placed on development, by exactions, to see if feasibility may be compromised by the proposed fees;
- Gathering similar data on the total fee burden imposed by neighboring or competing jurisdictions;
- Developing a plan for phasing in the fees over several years to enable the real estate market to adjust;
- Providing options for developers to finance impact fees through assessments and other types of financing districts; and
- Imposing less than the maximum justified fee.

If less than the maximum justified fee is imposed, we will work with staff to identify alternative revenues sources for the CIP. The CIP should remain financially feasible to maintain realistic expectations among developers, policymakers, and the public.

Stakeholder Participation

Stakeholder participation throughout the study supports a successful adoption process. Our approach is to create consensus first, around the need for facilities based on agreed upon facility standards. Second, we seek consensus around a feasible funding strategy for these needs, leading to an appropriate role for impact fees.

Gaining consensus among various groups requires a balanced discussion of both economic development and community service objectives. Often, our approach includes formation of an advisory committee to promote outreach to and input from the development community and other stakeholders. We have extensive experience facilitating meetings to explain the program and gain input.

Program Implementation

Fee programs require a certain level of administrative support for successful implementation. Our final report will include recommendations for appropriate procedures, such as:

- Regularly updating development forecasts;
- Regularly updating fees for capital project cost inflation;
- Regularly updating capital facility needs based on changing demands;
- Developing procedures for developer credits and reimbursements; and
- Including an administrative charge in the fee program.

Work Plan

Willdan will work with the City to update its traffic impact mitigation fee consistent with the Mitigation Fee Act and other relevant laws. We want to ensure that our scope of services is responsive to the City's needs and specific local circumstances. We will work with the City to revise our proposed scope based on input prior to approval of a contract, and as needed during the course of the study.

Task 1: Identify Policy Issues

Objective: Identify and discuss potential policy issues raised by the study. Kick-off meeting with staff to review data needs, policy issues, schedule and discuss potential additional fee categories.

Description: Review agency documents related to existing capital planning policies and funding programs including the existing impact fee. Bring policy issues to City staff's attention, as appropriate, during the project and seek guidance prior to proceeding. Potential policy issues include:

- Prior studies;
- Changes in implementation resulting from AB 602;
- Changes in approach and nexus findings necessary to comply with AB 602;
- Availability of existing public facility master plan and CIP to identify needed facilities;
- Types of facilities to be funded by fee;
- Land use categories for imposition of fee;
- Nexus approach to determining facility standards;
- Nexus approach to allocating cost burden among land uses, including need for separate fee zones;
- Potential alternative funding sources, if needed;
- Funding existing deficiencies, if identified; and
- Implementation concerns and strategies.

Deliverables: (1) Information requests; and (2) revised project scope and schedule (if needed).

Task 2: Identify Existing Development and Future Growth

Objective: Identify estimates of existing levels of development; as well as a projection of future growth consistent with current planning policy.

Description: Identify base year for estimating existing levels of development and for calculating facility standards based on existing facility inventories (see Task 3). Include entitled development that would be exempt from fee program.

Consult with City staff to identify growth projections to a defined long-range planning horizon (10 to 30 years). Projections provide a basis for determining the facilities needed to accommodate growth (see Task 4). Consider projections from the City's General Plan and from regional metropolitan planning agencies.

Develop approach for converting land use data to measure facility demand. For example, identify population and employment density factors to convert population and employment estimates to dwelling units and building square footage. Select appropriate approach for each impact fee based on:

- Available local data on facility demand by land use category;
- Approaches used by other agencies; and
- Support for other agency policy objectives.

Changes to estimates and projections during subsequent tasks could cause unanticipated effort and require an amendment to the scope of services and budget. Willdan will obtain approval of estimates and projections from City staff prior to proceeding.

Task 3: Determine Facility Standards	
Note:	Conduct tasks concurrently because of the effect of facility standards (Task 3), facility needs (Task 4), and alternative funding (Task 5) on the fee calculation.
Objective:	Determine standards to identify facilities required to accommodate growth.
Description:	<p>Identify and evaluate possible facility standards depending upon the facility type, current facility inventory data, and available facility planning documents. Consider use of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Adopted policy standards (e.g. General Plan, master facility plans listed above); Standards derived from existing facility inventories; or Standards derived from a list of planned facility projects. City staff to provide policies, inventories, and project lists.
Task 4: Determine Facilities Needs and Costs	
Objective:	Identify the type, amount and cost of facilities required to accommodate growth and correct deficiencies, if any.
Description:	<p>Quantify total planned facilities based on growth projection from Task 2 and facility standards from Task 3. Express planned facilities in general quantities or as a specific list of capital projects from a master facility plan. Location of planned facilities may or may not be specified.</p> <p>Distinguish between: facilities needed to serve growth (that can be funded by impact fees); and facilities needed to correct existing deficiencies (that cannot be funded by impact fees). Use one of three cost allocation methods (existing inventory, system plan, or planned facilities) to calculate the fee schedule.</p> <p>Where project cost data is not available from planning documents or the CIP, gather planning-level data on new facilities costs based on lump sum project cost estimates, or unit costs and project quantities (acres, building square feet, lane miles, etc.).</p> <p>Consider recent City experience, local market data such as land transactions, and Willdan experience from prior projects. Inflate older cost estimates to base year using appropriate cost indices. This proposal does not include any engineering design or cost estimates, traffic analysis (for level of service analysis or VMT). Such services can be provided at an additional cost.</p>
Task 5: Identify Funding and Financing Alternatives	
Objective:	Determine the extent of alternative (non-fee) funding available for new facilities.
Description:	<p>If impact fees are going to only partially fund a capital project, the <i>Mitigation Fee Act</i> requires the agency report on the anticipated source and timing of the additional funding every five years. There are two types of alternative funding sources that we will identify:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Funding from non-impact fee sources to correct existing deficiencies; and Funding from new development other than impact fees that must be credited against new development's impact fee contributions, possibly including taxes paid to finance facilities. <p>Identify anticipated alternative funding based on information from City staff or note that funds are still to be identified based on a list of probable funding alternatives. If fees will fund debt service include financing costs in the total cost of facilities.</p>
Task 6: Calculate Fees and Prepare Report	
Objective:	Provide technically defensible fee report that comprehensively documents project assumptions, methodologies, and results.
Description:	<p>Generate fee schedule to apportion facility costs to individual development projects. Use facility costs per unit of demand multiplied by demand by land use category based on data developed in prior tasks. Prepare draft report tables for City staff to review that document each step of the analysis, including schedule of maximum justified fees by facility type land use category.</p> <p>Following one round of comments from City staff on the quantitative analysis and fee schedules, prepare administrative draft report. Following one round of comments on the administrative draft, prepare public draft for presentation to interested parties, the public and elected officials.</p>

Prepare final report if necessary, based on one round of comments received on the public draft report. Submit up to ten bound copies of the final report. If requested, post report on our website for public access.

Provide legal counsel with copies of fee resolutions and ordinances used by other jurisdictions.

Meetings: One City Council meeting to present the public draft report for review and comment; and one public hearing to present the report for adoption.

Deliverables: Draft report tables, administrative draft report, public draft report, final report (if needed), and slide presentation (if needed).

Task 7: Meetings

Objective: The project manager or other necessary Willdan staff will attend project meetings. A member of the Impact Fee project team will attend up to three (3) meetings throughout the City's engagement. Phone conferences are not considered meetings for the purposes of this scope.

Optional: Optional stakeholder and Council meetings may be requested by the City.

City Staff Support

To complete our tasks, we will need the cooperation of City staff. We suggest that the City of Angels assign a key individual to represent the City as the project manager who can function as our primary contact. We anticipate that the City's project manager will: 1) Coordinate responses to requests for information; 2) Coordinate review of work products; and 3) Help resolve policy issues.

Willdan will endeavor to minimize the impact on City staff in the completion of this project. We will ask for responses to initial information requests in a timely manner. If there are delays on the part of the City, we will contact the City's project manager to steer the project back on track. We will keep the City's project manager informed of data or feedback we need to keep the project on schedule.

Project Disclaimer

Willdan is a registered municipal advisory firm with the U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission ("SEC"), as such the City of Angels represents, acknowledges, and agrees that Willdan is not acting as a "municipal advisor" (as defined by the SEC), to the City, in any capacity as it relates to the project proposed in this Traffic Impact Mitigation Fee Study RFP.

- (i) The City uses, or may use, the services of one or more municipal advisors registered with the SEC to advise it in connection with municipal financial products and the issuance of municipal securities;
- (ii) The City is not looking to Willdan to provide, and the City shall not otherwise request or require Willdan to provide any advice or recommendations with respect to municipal financial products or the issuance of municipal securities (including any advice or recommendations with respect to the structure, timing, terms, and other similar matters concerning such financial products or issues);
- (iii) The provisions of this proposal and the services to be provided hereunder as outlined in the scope of services are not intended (and shall not be construed) to constitute or include any municipal advisory services within the meaning of Section 15B of the U.S. Securities Exchange Act of 1934, as amended (the "Exchange Act"), and the rules and regulations adopted thereunder;
- (iv) For the avoidance of doubt and without limiting the foregoing, in connection with any revenue projections, cash-flow analyses, feasibility studies and/or other analyses Willdan may provide the City with respect to financial, economic or other matters relating to a prospective, new or existing issuance of municipal securities of the City, (A) any such projections, studies and analyses shall be based upon assumptions, opinions or views (including, without limitation, any assumptions related to revenue growth) established by the City, in conjunction with such of its municipal, financial, legal and other advisers as it deems appropriate; and (B) under no circumstances shall Willdan be asked to provide, nor shall it provide, any advice or recommendations or subjective assumptions, opinions or views with respect to the actual or proposed structure, terms, timing, pricing or other similar matters with respect to any municipal financial products or municipal securities issuances, including any revisions or amendments thereto; and
- (v) Notwithstanding all of the foregoing, the City recognizes that interpretive guidance regarding municipal advisory activities is currently quite limited and is likely to evolve and develop during the term of the potential engagement and, to that end, the City will work with Willdan throughout the term of the potential Agreement to ensure that the Agreement and the services to be provided by Willdan hereunder, is interpreted by the parties, and if necessary amended, in a manner intended to ensure that the City is not asking Willdan to provide, and Willdan is not in fact providing or required to provide, any municipal advisory services.

C. Experience and Similar Work

Project Team

Our management and supervision philosophy for the project team is very simple: staff every position in sufficient numbers with experienced personnel to deliver a superior product and convey results to decision makers in meetings, on time and on budget. With that philosophy in mind, we have selected experienced professionals for the City's engagement. We are confident that our team possesses the depth of experience that will successfully fulfill the desired work performance.

City of Angels Project Team		
Key Team Member	Project Role	Responsibility to the Engagement
James Edison, JD, MPP Managing Principal	Principal-in-Charge	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ensure client satisfaction, flow of communication, and management of the project Technical guidance Project oversight Quality assurance & control, and Meeting and presentation attendance
Carlos Villarreal, MPP Principal Consultant	Project Manager	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Collect, interpret, and disseminate key data Day to day contact Production of key elements of the analysis Model development Report preparation, and Meeting and presentation attendance

Staff Continuity

Mr. Edison has been assigned to serve as the City's principal-in-charge; he has been selected for this role due to his extensive experience, which includes the preparation and supervision of numerous fee studies, as well as his experience presenting to governing bodies, stakeholders, and industry groups.

Resumes

Resumes for Willdan's project team are presented on the following pages.



James Edison, JD, MPP, MA

Principal-in-Charge

Mr. James Edison, Managing Principal, specializes in the nexus between public and private, with expertise in public-private partnerships, and the benefits of economic development to municipalities and state, provincial, regional, and national governments. He possesses deep expertise in land use economics, with a specialty in finance and implementation, including fiscal impact and the public and private financing of infrastructure and development projects, both in the U.S. and internationally. Mr. Edison's public-sector experience includes local and regional economic impact studies; fiscal impact evaluations; new government formation strategies; and the creation of impact fees, assessments, and special taxes to fund infrastructure and public facilities. He has conducted numerous evaluations of the economic and fiscal impact of specific plans and consulted on a wide variety of land use planning topics related to community revitalization and the economic and fiscal impacts of development.

As a former bond attorney, Mr. Edison understands the legal underpinnings and technical requirements of public financing instruments and has advised both public and private clients on the use of individual instruments, and the interaction between those instruments and the needs of developers and project finance.

Related Experience

City of Carpinteria, CA – Development Impact Fee Update: Mr. Edison was the project manager for the City of Carpinteria's Development Impact Fee update study engagement. The study included updates to the following fees: highways and bridges, streets and thoroughfares, traffic control, parking, storm drain, general government, aquatic, park and recreation, and open space. The City has engaged Willdan again to update their impact fees.

City of McFarland, CA – Impact Fee Study Update: Mr. Edison was the principal-in-charge and technical advisor on the update to the City's development impact fee program. The study included the following facility fee categories; general government, law enforcement, park and recreation, fire protection, water, sewer, storm drain, and traffic.

City of Manteca, CA – Fire Impact Fee Update: Mr. Edison served in the capacity of project manager for the update of the City's fire services impact fee program.

City of Fillmore, CA – North Fillmore Specific Plan Nexus Study: Mr. Edison is currently assisting the City with an analysis of development impact fees needed to finance public facilities necessary for the development of the North Fillmore Specific Plan. Public facilities included in this analysis include water, sewer systems, recycled water, and streets.

City of Pismo Beach, CA – Development Impact Fee Update: Mr. Edison served in the role of principal-in-charge of an update to the City's impact fee program. The program included the following facilities: police, fire protection, park and recreation improvements, water system improvements, wastewater, traffic, and general government/administrative facilities. Prior to fee program adoption, a stakeholder meeting was held to inform the public about the project, and to solicit feedback from the development community.

City of Morgan Hill, CA – Development Impact Fee Update: Mr. Edison served as principal-in-charge of an update to the City's existing nexus study, which included general government, fire, police, parks and recreation, library, and storm drain fee categories. The project scope included stakeholder outreach.

City of Fremont, CA – Comprehensive Impact Fee Update: Mr. Edison led the Willdan team in the successful update of the impact fee programs for the City of Fremont. The effort included an update of the City's transportation impact fee program and capital improvement program.

County of San Benito, CA – Comprehensive Impact Fee Study: Mr. Edison served as technical advisor to the County's Impact Fee Study. The study included updates to the following fees: capital improvements, road equipment, fire mitigation, and park and recreation.

Education

*Juris Doctorate,
University of
California, Berkeley,
School of Law*

*Master of Public
Policy, Goldman
School of Public
Policy, University of
California, Berkeley*

*Bachelor of Arts,
magna cum laude,
Harvard University*

Professional Registrations

*Member of State Bar,
California*

Affiliations

*Council of
Development Finance
Agencies*

*CFA Society of
San Francisco*

*Congress for the
New Urbanism*

Urban Land Institute

Seaside Institute

*International Economic
Development Council*

26 Years' Experience

J. Edison

Resume Continued

City of Alameda, CA – Comprehensive Impact Fee Update: Mr. Edison led the Willdan team that updated the City of Alameda's impact fee programs, as well as created a separate impact fee program for Alameda Point, the former Alameda Naval Air Station.

City of Santa Clara, CA – Parks Fee Update: Mr. Edison served as principal-in-charge of the City's park impact fee update. This project included a demographic analysis and estimation of the cost of acquiring and improving public park land.

Stanislaus County Council of Governments, CA – Regional Transportation Fee Update: Mr. Edison worked on an update of the County's transportation impact fee program. Key tasks included a revised capital improvement program and fee model, along with a public participation process that ensures buy-in from the communities of Stanislaus County and the County government itself.

County of Tulare, CA – Countywide Impact Fees: Mr. Edison served as project manager for a study that involved the creation of an impact fee program for the County. The study included a range of facilities such as public protection, library, and parks, as well as a transportation facilities impact fee with different fees calculated for two zones in the County.

County of Riverside, CA – Comprehensive Impact Fee Update: Mr. Edison led the effort to establish a comprehensive fee program for the County, including facilities fees for fire, police, parks, criminal justice, libraries, and traffic. He prepared the technical and analytical documents necessary to calculate the fee and establish the necessary nexus to collect it, as well as presented the fees during public hearings to the County Board of Supervisors. ***Furthermore, Mr. Edison is currently leading an update to the County's development impact fees for 2030.***

City of Moreno Valley, CA – Comprehensive Development Impact Fee Study: Mr. Edison was the principal-in-charge for the City's comprehensive impact update. Fee categories included arterial streets, traffic signals, interchanges, parks, recreation, fire, police, library, corporation yard, maintenance equipment, and animal shelter facilities.

City of Murrieta, CA – Master Facilities Plan and Development Impact Fee Calculation Report Update: Mr. Edison served as the principal-in-charge of the City's study to update their Master Facilities Plan and Development Impact Fee Calculation Report, to ensure that new development pays the capital costs associated with growth. ***Willdan was recently re-selected, through competitive bid, to update the Impact Fees.***

City of Cudahy, CA – Development Impact Fee Study: Mr. Edison led the Willdan team that helped the City analyze impact fees needed to support future development in the City of Cudahy through buildout of the City's General Plan.

City of Indian Wells, CA – Development Impact Fee Study: Mr. Edison served as the principal-in-charge for the City Indian Wells' update to their development impact fees. The fee program was comprised of a variety of fee categories including transportation, public facilities, recreation, park, and storm drain.

City of Fountain Valley, CA – Development Impact Fee Update Study: Mr. Edison served as the project manager for the City of Fountain Valley's update to their development impact fees. Fees included the park impact fee, traffic improvement fee, transportation impact fee, utility infrastructure impact fee and general plan surcharge fee.



Carlos Villarreal, MPP

Project Manager

Mr. Carlos Villarreal, a Financial Consulting Group Principal Consultant, is proposed to serve in the role of project manager due to his experience documenting nexus findings for development impact fees, preparing capital improvement plans, facilitating stakeholder involvement, and analyzing the economic impacts of fee programs. He has supported adoption of fee programs funding a variety of facility types.

Related Experience

Education

Master of Public Policy,
Goldman School of
Public Policy,
University of California,
Berkeley

Bachelor of Arts,
Geography, University
of California, Los
Angeles; Minor in Public
Policy and Urban
Planning

Areas of Expertise

Fiscal Impact Analyses
Development Impact
Fees
Public Facilities
Financing Plans
GIS Analysis

18 Years' Experience

City of Pismo Beach, CA – Development Impact Fee Update: Mr. Villarreal served in the role of project manager for the City's impact fee project. The program included: police, fire protection, park and recreation improvements, water system improvements, wastewater, traffic, and general government/administrative facilities. Prior to fee program adoption, a stakeholder meeting was held to inform the public about the project, and to solicit feedback from the development community.

City of Carpinteria, CA – Development Impact Fee Update: Mr. Villarreal was the lead analyst to update the City of Carpinteria's impact fees, which included highways and bridges, streets and thoroughfares, traffic control, parking, storm drain, general government, aquatic, park and recreation, and open space. ***The City has engaged Willdan again to update their impact fees and Mr. Villarreal is serving in the role of project manager.***

County of San Benito, CA – Comprehensive Impact Fee Study: As project manager, Mr. Villarreal assisted the County with the preparation of an updated and expanded impact fee program. The study included updates to the following fees: capital improvements, road equipment, fire mitigation, and park and recreation.

City of Oroville, CA – Impact Fee Study Update: Mr. Villarreal served as project manager for a study updating the City's development impact fee program, including parks, law enforcement, general government, fire suppression, and traffic facilities. The fee program was adopted by the City Council in 2015. The City engaged Willdan again to update the 2015 study, and Mr. Villarreal served in the role of project manager.

City of McFarland, CA – Development Impact Fee Study Update: Mr. Villarreal served as project manager updating the City's development impact fee program. The study comprehensively updated the City's fee program, incorporating new facility master planning and infrastructure costs necessary to facilitate expected development in the City through 2040. The study included the following facility fee categories; general government, law enforcement, park and recreation, fire protection, water, sewer, storm drain, and traffic. The fees were adopted by the City Council in 2020.

County of Stanislaus, CA – Impact Fee Study Update: Mr. Villarreal served in the role of project manager for a study updating the County's existing impact fee program. The program includes a range of facilities, like public protection, library, and parks. The study also included a transportation facilities impact fee, with different fees calculated for two zones in the County. Considerable stakeholder outreach was an integral component of this project.

City of Soledad, CA – Development Impact Fee Study Update: Mr. Villarreal managed the update of the City's impact fee program, specifically changes in demographics, growth projections, project costs, and facility standards. In particular, the City had to revise its capital facilities needs to accommodate a much lower amount of growth than what was projected before 2007. The resulting fees funded new development's share of planned facilities, while not overburdening development with unnecessary costs.

City of Morgan Hill, CA – Development Impact Fee Update: Mr. Villarreal served as lead analyst assisting with an update to the City's existing nexus study, including general government, fire, police, parks and recreation, library, and storm drain fee categories. The project scope included stakeholder outreach. The City engaged Willdan again to update the study and Mr. Villarreal served in the role of project manager.

C. Villarreal

Resume Continued

City of Murrieta, CA – Master Facilities Plan and Development Impact Fee Calculation Report Update: Mr. Villarreal served as the project manager of the City's study to update their Master Facilities Plan and Development Impact Fee Calculation Report, to ensure that new development pays the capital costs associated with growth. ***Willdan was recently re-selected, through competitive bid, to update the Impact Fees.***

City of Long Beach, CA – Park Impact Fee Update: Willdan assisted with an update to the City's existing park impact fees, with Mr. Villarreal serving in the role of project manager. The project included updating demographic data and facility planning to properly update park facility standards. He used this information to then calculate impact fees for single family and multi-family residential dwelling units and prepare a nexus study documenting the revised fees and the required legal findings under the Mitigation Fee Act.

County of Los Angeles/City of Santa Clarita, CA – Law Enforcement Facilities Fee Study: Mr. Villarreal assisted with the development of an impact fee program to fund law enforcement facilities serving the City of Santa Clarita, and other Antelope Valley jurisdictions within the County of Los Angeles. The analysis involved the comparison of law enforcement facilities serving incorporated and unincorporated areas.

County of Riverside, CA – Comprehensive Impact Fee Update: Mr. Villarreal was the lead analyst in the effort to establish a comprehensive fee program for the County, including facilities fees for fire, police, parks, criminal justice, libraries, and traffic. He assisted in the preparation of the technical and analytical documents necessary to calculate the fees and establish the necessary nexus. ***Mr. Villarreal is once again serving on the project team to update the County's impact fees through 2030.***

City of Moreno Valley, CA – Comprehensive Development Impact Fee Study: Mr. Villarreal served as the project manager for the City's comprehensive impact update. Fee categories included arterial streets, traffic signals, interchanges, parks, recreation, fire, police, library, corporation yard, maintenance equipment, and animal shelter facilities. In 2022 the City added a public arts fee and workforce development facility fee.

Firm Profile

Willdan Financial Services is an operating division within Willdan Group, Inc. (WGI), which was founded in 1964 as an engineering firm working with local governments. Today, WGI is a publicly traded company (WLDN). WGI, through its divisions, provides professional technical and consulting services that ensure the quality, value and security of our nation’s infrastructure, systems, facilities, and environment. The firm has pursued two primary service objectives since its inception—ensuring the success of its clients and enhancing its surrounding communities.

A financially stable company, Willdan has approximately 1,770 employees working in more than a dozen states across the U.S. Our employees include a number of nationally recognized Subject Matter Experts for all areas related to the broadest definition of connected communities—including a team who will be committed to contributing their expertise throughout the duration of the City of Angels’ Traffic Impact Fee Study engagement.

Willdan has solved economic, engineering and energy challenges for local communities and delivered industry-leading solutions that have transformed government and commerce. Today, we are leading our clients into a future accelerated by a change in resources, infrastructure, technology, regulations, and industry trends.

Willdan Financial Services

Established on June 24, 1988, Willdan Financial Services, is a national firm and is one of the largest public sector economic and financial analysis consulting firms in the United States. Since that time, we have helped over 800 public agencies successfully address a broad range of infrastructure challenges.

Our staff of over 80 professionals support our clients by conducting year-round workshops and on-site training to assist them in keeping current with the latest developments in our areas of expertise.

Willdan assists local public agencies by providing the following services:

Willdan Financial Services	
Services	
<ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ User fee studies;▪ Cost allocation studies;▪ Utility rate and cost of service studies;▪ Feasibility studies;▪ Municipal Advisory;▪ Arbitrage and Continuing Disclosure Services;▪ Economic development strategic plans;▪ Debt issuance support	<ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ Development impact fee establishment and analysis;▪ District Administration Services;▪ Real estate economic analysis;▪ Property tax audits;▪ Tax increment finance district formation and amendment;▪ Housing development and implementation strategies; and▪ Long-term financial plans and cash flow modeling.



Experience and Expertise

Willdan has been preparing impact fee nexus studies since the passage of the *Mitigation Fee Act*. Our commitment to public agencies and public solutions has helped us develop the broad finance expertise that will be utilized to support the City's Traffic Impact Fee Study. Willdan has worked on virtually every aspect of municipal finance, including fiscal and economic impact studies related to development and re-organization, the financing of infrastructure and services through special district or supplemental taxes, and even working under contract as a department head of an entire municipality. This experience has provided Willdan team members with deep insight into the sources of municipal revenue and the costs of services.

Managing Principal James A. Edison and his team have worked with public agencies on many community development projects, including the full range of analysis related to feasibility, economic and fiscal impacts, infrastructure finance, and negotiations with private developers. Willdan is thoroughly familiar with both the Act and with the technical and policy issues surrounding impact fees.

In the past five years Willdan has conducted over 125 Impact Fee Studies



Unique Qualifications

Willdan is uniquely qualified to assist the City of Angels with the proposed Traffic Impact Fee Study. The following are specific advantages that we will provide for the proposed engagement.

Project Dedication

Willdan has assembled a project team of subject matter experts within the Financial Consulting Services group, to conduct the City of Angels Traffic Impact Fee Study engagement. This team has coordinated or participated in numerous public stakeholder and staff workshops regarding fees and cost of service-based charges.

Community Investment

Much of our success in developing impactful programs and studies is due to our experiences in meeting with citizen / stakeholder groups and elected officials. Our ability to explain technical information in a concise, understandable manner is a fundamental reason for our high degree of success. Willdan staff takes the time to **include and inform the Community**.

Proven Professionals

The Team's quality is often as important as the consulting firm's reputation. Willdan is known for its personal, customized service. Our team will work with the City's professional staff to provide the long-term service, that is our prime goal.

Project Availability

Willdan's Financial Consulting Services group is composed of a team of over 30 senior-level professional consultants. While each member of the project team currently has work in progress with other clients, the workload is at a manageable level with sufficient capacity to meet the needs of the City specific to the schedule and budget for this engagement.

The team presented within this proposal has worked collectively on numerous projects, such as the one requested by the City of Angels; an established work practice between the team members has been forged, this proven long-standing system has benefited our clients.

References

Provided below are client references for projects completed by Willdan and the project team members proposed herein, which demonstrates our ability to provide the requested services. We are proud of our reputation for customer service and encourage you to contact our past clients regarding our commitment to excellence.

City of East Palo Alto
Development Impact Fee Nexus and Financial Feasibility Study

In 2023, Willdan was selected through a competitive bidding process to conduct a comprehensive Development Impact Fee Nexus and Financial Feasibility Study for the City. The planned growth outlined in the City's 2035 Vista General Plan represented significant changes to the anticipated development of the City, and the City's impact fee program was due for an update pursuant to the Mitigation Fee Act. Additionally, there has been an increasing interest in development within the Ravenswood Business District/4 Corners Transit-Oriented Development Specific Plan area that required modifications to the City's infrastructure and financing plans.

To address these challenges, Willdan carried out a comprehensive Development Impact Fee Nexus Study update to revise the existing fees and conducted a Financial Feasibility Analysis to evaluate the effects of the maximum supportable impact fees on development projects. The impact fees included Water Capacity, Parks and Trails, Public Facilities, Transportation Infrastructure, and Storm Drainage.

For this project, the Willdan team evaluated nine development prototypes, compared impact fees with six similar cities, conducted extensive stakeholder outreach, and collaborated closely with City staff. The project was completed in March 2025.

Client Contact: Hanson Hom, FAICOP, Deputy Manager, Special Projects
1960 Tate Street, East Palo Alto, CA 94303
Tel #: (650) 519-5121 | Email: hhom@cityofepa.org

Project Team: James Edison | Carlos Villarreal

County of Stanislaus, CA
Development Impact Fee Update

Willdan has a long-standing relationship with the County of Stanislaus. In 2016, we assisted the County with an update to the existing impact fee program. The program is made up of a range of fee categories including animal control, behavioral health, criminal justice, detention, emergency services, health, library, park, sheriff patrol and investigation, and countywide information technology facilities. Fees are collected on new development countywide, including incorporated municipalities within the County, which include the Cities of Ceres, Hughson, Modesto, Newman, Oakdale, Patterson, Riverbank, Turlock and Waterford. The study also includes a Regional Transportation Impact Fee (RTIF), which is currently being updated for the County. Considerable stakeholder outreach was an integral component of this project.

Willdan recently revised the Public Facilities Impact Fee Update report to include an accessory dwelling unit land use category.

Client Contact: Keith Boggs, Assistant Executive Officer *(Retired, serving as independent consultant to the County)*
1010 10th Street, Suite 6800, Modesto, CA 95354
Tel #: (209) 652-1514 | Email: boggsk@stancounty.com

Project Team: James Edison | Carlos Villarreal

City of Fremont, CA

Comprehensive Impact Fee Update

Willdan's impact fee staff has a long-standing relationship with the City of Fremont. In 2014/2015, Willdan successfully updated their impact fee programs, which included an update of the City's transportation impact fee program and capital improvement program. The City retained Willdan again in 2020 to update their impact fee program and the project was completed during the second quarter of 2021.

Client Contact: Michelle Silva-Salinas, Public Works Business Manager
3300 Capitol Avenue, Fremont, CA 94538
Tel #: (510) 979-5705 | Email: msilva-salinas@fremont.gov

Project Team: James Edison | Carlos Villarreal

City of Pismo Beach, CA

Development Impact Fee Study

Willdan assisted the City of Pismo Beach with an update to their impact fee program. The program included the following facilities: police, fire protection, park and recreation improvements, water system improvements, wastewater, traffic, and general government/administrative facilities. This project was warranted due to the amount of time that had elapsed since the prior update, coupled with the adoption of new and revised public facility master plans that complemented the updated impact fees. Prior to fee program adoption, Willdan held a stakeholder meeting to inform the public about the project, and to solicit feedback from the development community.

Willdan was re-engaged in 2024 to provide an update to the Development Impact Fee Study.

Client Contact: Nadia Feeser, Administrative Services Director
760 Mattie Road, Pismo Beach, CA 93449
Tel #: (805) 773-7010 | Email: nfeeser@pismobeach.org

Project Team: James Edison | Carlos Villarreal

City of Murrieta, CA

Comprehensive Development Impact Fee Study

Willdan was retained originally in 2013 to conduct a comprehensive update to the City's impact fees. The team was once again retained through competitive bid in 2023 to update the following fees: Law Enforcement, Fire Protection, Streets and Minor Bridges, Traffic Signals, Storm Drainage, General Facilities, Bridge/Freeway/Ramps, Open Space Acquisition, Park Land Facilities, Community Center, and Public Library.

Willdan developed a technically defensible fee justification based on the reasonable relationship and deferential review standards; provided a schedule of maximum-justified fees by land use category; engaged stakeholders to facilitate public support for the impact fee; and provided comprehensive documentation of all assumptions, methodologies, and results, including findings required by the Mitigation Fee Act.

Willdan was re-engaged in 2023 to provide an update to the Development Impact Fee Study.

Client Contact: Javier Carcamo, Finance Manager
1 Town Square, Murrieta, CA 92562
Tel #: (951) 461-6090 | Email: jcarcamo@murrietaca.gov

Project Team: James Edison | Carlos Villarreal

Similar Studies

The following table lists Willdan's impact fee clientele that have utilized our services.

Willdan Financial Services Development Impact Fee Experience	
Partial Client List	
City of Alameda, CA	City of Pacifica, CA
City of Arcadia, CA	City of Patterson, CA
City of Arroyo Grande, CA	City of Parkland, FL
City of Artesia, CA	City of Pismo Beach, CA
City of Atwater	City of Pittsburg, CA
City of Azusa, CA	City of Pleasant Hill, CA
City of Bakersfield, CA	City of Pomona, CA
City of Barstow, CA	City of Rancho Mirage, CA
City of Bell, CA	City of Redwood City, CA
City of Bell Gardens, CA	City of Rialto, CA
City of Bellflower, CA	City of Richmond, CA
City of Brea, CA	City of Rio Rancho, NM
City of Calexico, CA	City of Riverbank, CA
City of Calimesa, CA	City of Rolling Hills Estates, CA
City of Carpinteria, CA	City of Rosemead, CA
City of Chino Hills, CA	City of San Carlos, CA
City of Claremont, CA	City of San Fernando, CA
City of Clovis, CA	City of San Gabriel, CA
City of Coachella, CA	City of San Jacinto, CA
City of Commerce, CA	City of San Marcos, CA
City of Compton, CA	City of Santa Clara, CA
City of Corona, CA	City of Sebastopol, CA
City of Covina, CA	City of Selma, CA
City of Cudahy, CA	City of Sierra Madre, CA
City of Dixon, CA	City of Soledad, CA
City of Dublin, CA	City of South Gate, CA
City of Eastvale, CA	City of South Pasadena, CA
City of El Monte, CA	City of South San Francisco, CA
City of El Segundo, CA	City of St. Helena, CA
City of Emeryville, CA	City of Tehachapi, CA
City of Fillmore, CA	City of Temple City, CA
City of Fontana	City of Thousand Oaks, CA
City of Fountain Valley, CA	City of Tracy, CA
City of Fremont, CA	City of Upland, CA
City of Garden Grove, CA	City of Visalia, CA
City of Gilroy, CA	City of Wasco, CA
City of Gonzales, CA	City of Yucaipa, CA

Willdan Financial Services Development Impact Fee Experience

Partial Client List

City of Goose Creek, SC	Coachella Valley Association of Governments, CA
City of Guadalupe, CA	Contra Costa Fire Protection District, CA
City of Greenfield, CA	County of Clay, FL
City of Grover Beach, CA	County of Kern, CA
City of Hawthorne, CA	County of Kings, CA
City of Healdsburg, CA	County of Los Angeles, CA
City of Hemet, CA	County of Madera, CA
City of Hercules, CA	County of Merced, CA
City of Hollister, CA	County of Placer, CA
City of Huntington Beach, CA	County of Riverside, CA
City of Huntington Park, CA	County of Sacramento, CA
City of Indian Wells, CA	County of San Benito, CA
City of Irwindale, CA	County of San Diego, CA
City of Kingsburg, CA	County of San Joaquin, CA
City of La Mesa, CA	County of San Luis Obispo, CA
City of La Verne, CA	County of Santa Barbara, CA
City of Las Cruces, NM	County of Solano, CA
City of Lake Elsinore, CA	County of Sonoma, CA
City of Lake Forest, CA	County of Stanislaus, CA
City of Lancaster, CA	County of Tulare, CA
City of Lawndale, CA	County of Yolo, CA
City of Livermore, CA	East Contra Costa Fire Protection District, CA
City of Long Beach, CA	Kern Council of Governments, CA
City of McFarland, CA	Nevada County Consolidated Fire District, CA
City of Madera, CA	Rodeo-Hercules Fire Protection District, CA
City of Manteca, CA	San Geronio Memorial Healthcare District, CA
City of Menifee, CA	Stanislaus Council of Governments, CA
City of Moreno Valley, CA	Tehachapi Valley Rec. & Park District, CA
City of Morgan Hill, CA	Town of Apple Valley, CA
City of Mountain View, CA	Town of Mead, CO
City of Murrieta, CA	Town of Windsor, CA
City of Newport Beach, CA	Tulare County Association of Governments, CA
City of Oroville, CA	Village of Taos Ski Valley, NM

D. Cost

Based upon the scope of work identified herein, Willdan proposes a **fixed fee of \$22,500** for the City's Traffic Impact Fee Mitigation Study. The table below provides a breakdown of the proposed fee by task and team member.

City of Angels					
Traffic Impact Fee					
Fee Proposal					
		J. Edison Principal-in- Charge	C. Villarreal Project Manager	<u>Total</u>	
		\$	\$	Hours	Cost
Scope of Services					
Task 1:	Identify Policy Issues	4.0	6.0	10.0	\$ 2,820
Task 2:	Identify Existing Development and Future Growth	4.0	6.0	10.0	2,820
Task 3:	Determine Facility Standards	4.0	8.0	12.0	3,360
Task 4:	Determine Facilities Needs and Costs	4.0	8.0	12.0	3,360
Task 5:	Identify Funding and Financing Alternatives	4.0	6.0	10.0	2,820
Task 6:	Calculate Fees and Prepare Report	4.0	8.0	12.0	3,360
Task 7:	Meetings	6.0	8.0	14.0	3,960
Total – Traffic Impact Fee Study		30.0	50.0	80.0	\$ 22,500

Notes

Please note the following:

- The fee denoted above includes attendance at up to three in-person meetings with City staff, stakeholders, and City Council.
Attendance at more than three meetings and/or presentations will be billed at our current hourly rates, provided below, and actual expenses.
- Comprehensive written responses to resolve conflicts or preparation of more than one set of major revisions to the draft report will be classified as Additional Services and may require additional billing at hourly rates stated in the hourly rate schedule listed below. These additional fees shall only take effect once the fixed fee stated above has been exceeded.
- Our fixed fee includes all direct expenses associated with the project.
- We will invoice the City monthly based on percentage of project completed.
- City shall reimburse Willdan for any costs Willdan incurs, including without limitation, copying costs, digitizing costs, travel expenses, employee time and attorneys' fees, to respond to the legal process of any governmental agency relating to City or relating to the project. Reimbursement shall be at Willdan 's rates in effect at the time of such response.
- Optional/Additional Services beyond the listed Scope of Services may be authorized by the City and will be billed at our then-current hourly overhead consulting rates.
- The fee mentioned above may be lower, should there be fewer additional fees.

Hourly Rates

Provided below is Willdan's hourly rate table identifying current hourly rates for additional or optional services.

Willdan Financial Services Hourly Rate Schedule		
Position	Team Member	Hourly Rate
Vice President / Director		\$310
Managing Principal	James Edison	\$300
Principal Consultant	Carlos Villarreal	\$270
Senior Project Manager		\$250
Project Manager		\$210
Senior Project Analyst		\$150
Senior Analyst		\$135
Analyst II		\$120
Analyst I		\$110

E. Project Timeline

Willdan anticipates time is of the essence for the City to begin this engagement. The proposed schedule can only be met with the cooperation of City staff. Delays in responding to our requests for data and review will result in corresponding delays to the project schedule. If that is the case, we will notify the City immediately of the possible impact on the schedule.

City of Angels Camp Traffic Impact Fee																								
Project Schedule																								
Scope of Services	August				September					October				November				December						
	4	11	18	25	1	8	15	22	29	6	13	20	27	3	10	17	24	1	8	15	22	29		
Task 1: Identify Policy Issues				⌘ 1																				
Task 2: Identify Existing Development and Future Growth							⌘ 2																	
Task 3: Determine Facility Standards																								
Task 4: Determine Facilities Needs and Costs																								
Task 5: Identify Funding and Financing Alternatives																								
Task 6: Calculate Fees and Prepare Report																								
Task 7: Meetings																								

Deliverables:

- ⌘ 1: Information Request, Meeting Agenda, Revised Schedule, Summary of Policy Decisions
- ⌘ 2: Development Growth Projections (table format)
- ⌘ 3: Project List

- ⌘ 4: Cost Estimates for Identified Facilities
- ⌘ 5: Draft Fee Tables & Text
- ⌘ 6: Administrative/Public Draft Report(s), Final Nexus Report, Slide Presentation



27368 Via Industria, Suite 200
Temecula, CA 92590-4856

951.587.3500 | 800.755.6864 | Fax: 951.587.3510

www.willdan.com