
Chapter 6
County Facilities and Services

CHAPTER 6

COUNTY FACILITIES AND SERVICES

6.1 INTRODUCTION

This chapter examines the public facilities needed to provide County services to the population and employment expected in Placer County in the future, according to the growth scenario developed for the *Countywide General Plan* (see Chapter 2). Unlike other analyses presented in this EIR, this analysis does not include sections describing "impacts" or "mitigation measures." Instead, it contains a section at the end describing "facility funding options" that addresses the facility needs and cost estimates for all County facilities and services discussed in this chapter. This discussion of funding options provides information for the County to consider in implementing the *General Plan* to ensure that facility and service objectives are met.

Recht Hausrath & Associates (RHA) has prepared for Placer County a comprehensive analysis of the relationship between growth and the capital facilities needed to serve it. This EIR analysis relies on the RHA report prepared for Placer County, *County Facilities Needed to Serve Growth* (referred to here as the *Facilities Study*), which is expected to be released by late summer 1994. The *Facilities Study* serves as the documentation for a countywide development fee or other mitigation measures to provide funding for required facilities. The *Facilities Study*, along with other facility policy issues, will be considered by the Placer County Board of Supervisors in Summer 1994.

The *Facilities Study* draws from the analysis of current and future County facility needs included in the *Comprehensive Facility Master Plan* (FMP) and the *Criminal Justice Master Plan* (CJMP). These master plans were developed to direct the County's facility planning efforts while the *Facilities Study* seeks to serve as documentation for a facility funding program. Thus, the *Facilities Study* addresses a range of funding issues and policy concerns not discussed in the master plans; these differences in focus are addressed in detail in the *Facilities Study*. Additionally, the FMP and the CJMP use different forecasts of population and employment than those used in the *Facilities Study* and in this EIR. The result of the differences in approach and assumptions is that the facility requirements presented below cannot be directly compared to those in the FMP and CJMP.

The *Facilities Study* documents the county facilities needed to serve growth in Placer County from 1994 through 2010. To maintain consistency with the *Facilities Study*, the time-period for analysis in this chapter of the EIR differs from the time period presented in other chapters. This chapter, therefore, assumes a base year of 1994 (rather than a base year of 1990 used in the *Draft General Plan EIR* and used in other chapters of the *Final EIR*). In addition, to further the linkage with the parallel effort of the *Facilities Study* and related efforts to develop funding sources for those facilities, this EIR chapter presents facility needs associated with growth through the year 2010. For each functional area of County government, the *Facilities Study* documents in considerable detail the following results (which have been adapted for the EIR analysis):

- Relevant service populations with respect to both jurisdiction (i.e. countywide versus unincorporated area) and user population (i.e. residents and/or businesses which are measured by employees)
- Service standards describing the relationship between service population and facility requirements expressed, for example, as square feet of library space per thousand population; and
- Facility cost estimates (in 1994 dollars).

For the EIR analysis, two adjustments have been made to the facility standards documented in the *Facilities Study*. That report recommends that, in order to remedy current facility deficiencies, the Placer County Board of Supervisors adopt service standards for some functional areas that exceed existing standards, based on the FMP or CJMP analysis. Increasing these standards will, however, require a policy and financial commitment by the County. Pending the conclusion of that policy discussion, the facility requirements presented in this EIR analysis do not assume increased standards. The facilities identified in this analysis as necessary to serve new development are based on the *existing standards*, which means that the level of service provided for existing residents would be unchanged. If the County adopts increased standards, facility requirements to serve growth will be higher for some functional areas. The second adjustment to the *Facilities Study* standards is to express standards on a per resident and per employee basis to simplify presentation.

The County's services can be described in two general categories, municipal-like and countywide. Municipal-like services in the unincorporated area include administrative, public protection services, community and neighborhood parks, and building inspection services. The only parks facility included in this analysis is the office space used by the parks departments; the County has other fee and dedication programs intended to provide sufficient neighborhood and community parks for new development. Countywide facilities serve all residents and employees in both the incorporated and unincorporated areas. Such facilities provide county services that have no municipal counterpart in city governments (e.g., property tax collection or welfare services). Finally, some departments provide countywide and municipal-like functions; the appropriate share of facilities of those departments are addressed in both sections.

6.2 MUNICIPAL-LIKE FACILITIES

SETTING

There are three categories of facilities that the county provides to the unincorporated area exclusively: sheriff's patrol and investigation, public works, and general administration.

The Sheriff's Department provides patrol and investigation services and dispatch services in the unincorporated areas of the county and by contract to the City of Loomis. In general, the Sheriff services covered in this section correspond to the activities of a city's police department within city boundaries. The Sheriff's Department also provides countywide public protection services such as fingerprinting and identification services and administers the jail and other detention facilities. Those facilities and services are covered in countywide facilities.

The Department of Public Works (DPW) performs a wide variety of functions including the administration, maintenance, and operation of County roads, transit systems, utilities, solid waste facilities, and the County's automotive fleet. The Public Works Department also provides engineering, surveying, and mapping services for County land acquisition and facilities planning and development. Additionally, the DPW is responsible for engineering and construction inspection for assessment districts within the County. These DPW functions primarily benefit the County's unincorporated areas.

A portion of County general administration functions provide municipal-like services to the unincorporated area. The *Facilities Study* explains the relevant share of these departments that serve the unincorporated area. These include:

- Administrative Services Support
- Clerk of the Board of Supervisors
- Central Services
- Personnel

- County Executive Office
- County Counsel
- Management Information Systems (MIS)
- Communications Office
- Auditor/Controller
- Parks Department (office space only)
- Facility Services
- Tax Collector
- Procurement
- Revenue Services
- Planning

METHODOLOGY/ASSUMPTIONS

Table 6-1 presents the facility standards for each of these departments by specific type of facility. The facility standards are either expressed as physical quantities, square feet of building space per thousand residents or employees, or as investment standards, dollars per thousand residents or employees. The investment standards are based on the current value of the facility. The standards reflect county facility conditions as of 1994, except for vehicles, which are 1992 inventories (vehicle standards based on 1994 inventories are included in the final *Facilities Study*). The *Facilities Study* discusses the relative weighting of employees and residents by functional area.

TABLE 6-1

MUNICIPAL-LIKE FACILITY STANDARDS

Function/Facility Type	Units	Per 1,000 Residents	Per 1,000 Employees
Sheriff's Patrol and Investigation			
Administration/Main Station/Substations	sq ft	264	82
Sheriff Patrol and Investigation Vehicles	\$	\$11,317	\$3,508
Dispatch Equipment	\$	\$11,259	\$3,490
General Administration			
Administrative Office	sq ft	431	103
Parks Administration	sq ft	81	0
Warehouse/Communications Shop	sq ft	27	6
Archive	sq ft	11	3
Telephone	\$	\$9,444	\$2,267
Automation Systems	\$	\$36,045	\$8,651
Vehicles	\$	\$10,302	\$2,472
Public Works			
Office Space	sq ft	209	50
Vehicles	\$	\$2,316	\$556

Note: Costs expressed in 1994 dollars.

Source: Recht Hausrath & Associates, July 1994

IMPLICATIONS OF THE LAND USE DIAGRAM

Required Municipal-Like Facilities

By applying the facility standards in the Table 6-1 to estimated unincorporated population and employment growth, the consultants determined the municipal-like facilities required to serve growth in the unincorporated area from 1994 to 2010. Table 6-2 presents those facility requirements, in terms of square feet of building space or cost of vehicles and equipment.

TABLE 6-2

MUNICIPAL-LIKE REQUIRED FACILITIES

Function/Facility Type	Units	1994 -2010
Sheriff's Patrol and Investigation		
Administration/Main Station/Substations	sq ft	11,800
Sheriff Patrol and Investigation Vehicles	\$	\$504,800
Dispatch Equipment	\$	\$502,300
General Administration		
Administrative Office	sq ft	18,600
Parks Administration	sq ft	3,100
Warehouse/Communications Shop	sq ft	1,100
Archive	sq ft	500
Telephone	\$	\$391,500
Automation Systems	\$	\$1,494,400
Vehicles	\$	\$427,100
Public Works		
Office Space	sq ft	9,000
Vehicles	\$	\$100,100

Note: Costs expressed in 1994 dollars.

Source: Recht Hausrath Associates, July 1994.

Municipal-Like Facility Costs

The *Facilities Study* includes estimates of per unit costs to construct additional facilities. These estimates are based on cost estimates from the *Comprehensive Facility Masterplan (FMP)*, the *Criminal Justice Master Plan (CJMP)*, and data from relevant departments. All cost figures are in 1994 dollars. Costs per square foot include land costs, site preparation, direct and indirect construction costs, parking area, and furniture and fixtures. In total, the municipal-like facilities to serve growth in unincorporated Placer County from 1994 through 2010 are estimated to cost \$17.4 million. Table 6-3 presents the cost of municipal-like facilities associated with growth in the unincorporated area from 1994-2010.

TABLE 6-3
MUNICIPAL-LIKE FACILITIES COSTS

Function/Facility Type	1994-2010
Sheriff's Patrol and Investigation	
Administration/Main Station/Substations ¹	\$2,804,000
Sheriff Patrol and Investigation Vehicles	\$505,000
Dispatch Equipment	\$502,000
Subtotal	\$3,811,000
General Administration	
Administrative Office ¹	\$4,436,000
Parks Administration ¹	\$739,000
Warehouse/Communications Shop ²	\$172,300
Archive ³	\$74,000
Telephone	\$392,000
Automation Systems	\$1,494,000
Vehicles	\$427,000
Subtotal	\$7,735,000
Public Works	
Office Space ¹	\$2,156,000
Vehicles	\$100,000
Subtotal	\$2,256,000
TOTAL	\$13,802,000

¹ Construction cost is \$238 per building square foot in 1994 dollars.

² Construction cost is \$156 per building square foot in 1994 dollars.

³ Construction cost is \$162 per building square foot in 1994 dollars.

Source: Recht Hausrath & Associates, July 1994.

Areas with Current Deficiencies

The *Criminal Justice Master Plan (CJMP)* identifies the need for substantially more sheriff patrol and investigation space than the County currently has. This is one of the areas where the *Facility Study* recommends adopting a standard that addresses the current deficiency. If the County makes the policy decision to increase the standard, then the impact of growth would be higher than calculated here.

Service Level Assessment

As stated above, the facility standards used in this analysis are based on existing standards, across all unincorporated areas of the County. Necessarily, these standards reflect an average of more densely populated areas and rural areas. In the future, the County intends to reflect in facility requirements the nature of development: urban density development will be required to provide a higher level of facilities

than the countywide average. In some cases, suburban density development may also be required to provide more facilities. The specific facility needs of developing areas can be addressed through the community plan and specific plan process.

Sheriff facilities are a likely area where higher, urban-like facility standards may be appropriate in some higher density areas. For example, to provide adequate sheriff's protection in an urban density area distant from existing substations may require a sheriff substation to be located in the community. This substation may well be larger than the square feet projected using the average facility standards based on the entire unincorporated area.

6.3 COUNTYWIDE FACILITIES

Countywide facilities include the following functions:

- General Administration includes Emergency Services, Assessor, Air Pollution, Environmental Health, Elections, and Recorder.
- Jails and countywide public protection services such as coroner, public administrator, and emergency services. The Sheriff's Department also provides services with a countywide orientation, including fingerprinting and identification services which are included in countywide public protection services.
- All justice system departments consisting of Superior and Municipal Courts, Probation, District Attorney, Public Defender, and Marshal.
- The Agriculture Department and Weights and Measures Division.
- The Public Works Department supports three countywide functions: 1) County landfill management for the Eastern Regional Landfill; 2) County landfill management for the Western Regional Sanitary Landfill Authority; and 3) flood control design and maintenance for the Placer County Flood Control and Water Conservation District. It is estimated that less than two percent of the DPW's office space and vehicles are devoted to these countywide functions.
- Welfare, Health Services, Animal Control and Libraries. These departments serve residents only, rather than a mix of employees and residents. (As the County does not provide library service in Roseville and Lincoln, the library service population is the remainder of the county population.)

Countywide facilities, in addition, include the balance of general administration facilities detailed under municipal-like services.

METHODOLOGY/ASSUMPTIONS

Tables 6-4 and 6-5 present the facility standards for services. Table 6-4 includes those functions that serve both resident and employee populations. The *Facilities Study* details the rationale for relative employee and resident weighting in the standards. Table 6-5 includes functions that strictly serve county residents. As with the municipal-like functions, the standards are expressed either in physical units or investment amounts per thousand residents or employees and reflect 1994 conditions with the exception of vehicle standards, which are based on 1992 inventories.

TABLE 6-4

**COUNTYWIDE FACILITY STANDARDS
Functions Serving Residents and Employees**

Function/Facility Type	Units	Per 1,000 Residents	Per 1,000 Employees
General Administration			
Administrative Office	sq ft	485	116
Parks Administration	sq ft	0	0
Warehouse/Communications Shop	sq ft	27	6
Archive	sq ft	11	3
Telephone	\$	\$9,444	\$2,267
Automation Systems	\$	\$36,045	\$8,651
Vehicles	\$	\$10,302	\$2,472
Justice System			
Administration/Office Space	sq ft	161	50
Superior Courtrooms and Ancillary Space	sq ft	51	16
Municipal Courtrooms and Ancillary Space	sq ft	87	27
Law Library	sq ft	4	1
Storage Space	sq ft	17	5
Juvenile Beds	beds	0.33	0.10
Vehicles	\$	\$982	\$304
Jails and Countywide Protection			
Adult Jail Beds	beds	2.2	0.7
Jail Administration Office Space	sq ft	24.9	7.7
Sheriff Department Office Space	sq ft	15.8	4.9
Coroners Facilities	sq ft	4.7	1.4
Vehicles	\$	\$564	\$175
Public Works			
Office Space	sq ft	10	2
Vehicles	\$	\$115	\$28
Agriculture			
Office	sq ft	20	5
Lab/Storage	sq ft	14	3
Vehicles	\$	\$330	\$79
Equipment	\$	\$93	\$22

Note: Costs expressed in 1994 dollars.

Source: Recht Hausrath & Associates, July 1994

TABLE 6-5
COUNTYWIDE FACILITY STANDARDS
Functions Serving Residents

Function/Facility Type	Units	Per 1,000 Residents
Libraries		
Library space	sq ft	325
Volumes	volumes	1,683
Automation	\$	\$1,565
Health		
Office	sq ft	211
Clinic Lab	sq ft	159
Vehicles	\$	\$866
Equipment	\$	\$2,852
Welfare		
Office	sq ft	138
Vehicles	\$	\$1,881
Animal Control		
Office	sq ft	2.2
Shelter	sq ft	52.3
Outdoor Pen/Storage	sq ft	2.4
Vehicles	\$	\$663

Note: Costs expressed in 1994 dollars.

Source: Recht Hausrath & Associates, July 1994

IMPLICATIONS OF THE LAND USE DIAGRAM

Required Countywide Facilities

Tables 6-6 and 6-7 present the estimated countywide facility requirements for the 1994 to 2010 time period. The figures cited in these tables represent an application of the facility standards shown in Tables 6-4 and 6-5 to estimated population and employment growth throughout Placer County from 1994 to 2010.

TABLE 6-6

**COUNTYWIDE REQUIRED FACILITIES
Functions Serving Residents and Employees**

Function/Facility Type	Units	1994-2010
General Administration		
Administrative Office	sq ft	64,700
Parks Administration	sq ft	0
Warehouse/Communications Shop	sq ft	3,600
Archive	sq ft	1,500
Telephone	\$	\$1,261,200
Automation Systems	\$	\$4,813,400
Vehicles	\$	\$1,375,700
Justice System		
Administration/Office Space	sq ft	22,500
Superior Courtrooms and Ancillary Space	sq ft	7,200
Municipal Courtrooms and Ancillary Space	sq ft	12,100
Law Library	sq ft	600
Storage Space	sq ft	2,400
Juvenile Beds	beds	46
Vehicles	\$	\$137,200
Jails and Countywide Protection		
Adult Jail Beds	beds	310
Jail Administration Office Space	sq ft	3,500
Sheriff Department Office Space	sq ft	2,200
Coroners Facilities	sq ft	700
Vehicles	\$	\$78,800
Public Works		
Office Space	sq ft	1,400
Vehicles	\$	\$15,400
Agriculture		
Office	sq ft	2,600
Lab/Storage	sq ft	1,800
Vehicles	\$	\$44,100
Equipment	\$	\$12,400

Note: Costs expressed in 1994 dollars.

Source: Recht Hausrath & Associates, July 1994.

TABLE 6-7

**COUNTYWIDE REQUIRED FACILITIES
Functions Serving Residents**

Function/Facility Type	Units	1994 -2010
Libraries		
Library Space	sq ft	18,100
Volumes	volumes	93,600
Automation	\$	\$87,000
Health		
Office	sq ft	23,700
Clinic Lab	sq ft	17,900
Vehicles	\$	\$97,300
Equipment	\$	\$320,300
Welfare		
Office	sq ft	15,500
Vehicles	\$	\$211,200
Animal Control		
Office	sq ft	200
Shelter	sq ft	5,900
Outdoor pen/storage	sq ft	300
Vehicles	\$	\$74,500

Note: Costs expressed in 1994 dollars.

Source: Recht Hausrath Associates, July 1994.

TABLE 6-8

**COUNTYWIDE FACILITIES COSTS
Functions Serving Residents and Employees**

Function/Facility Type	Cost Per Unit*	1990 -2010
General Administration		
Administrative Office	\$238	\$15,424,000
Parks Administration	\$238	\$0
Warehouse/Communications Shop	\$156	\$553,000
Archive	\$162	\$238,000
Telephone	\$1	\$1,261,000
Automation Systems	\$1	\$4,813,000
Vehicles	\$1	\$1,376,000
Subtotal		\$23,666,000
Justice System		
Administration/Office Space	\$238	\$5,360,000
Superior Courtrooms and Ancillary Space	\$213	\$1,530,000
Municipal Courtrooms and Ancillary Space	\$268	\$3,260,000
Law Library	\$217	\$133,000
Storage Space	\$156	\$371,000
Juvenile Beds	\$96,000	\$4,416,000
Vehicles	\$1	\$137,000
Subtotal		\$15,207,000
Jails and Countywide Protection		
Adult Jail Beds	\$51,000	\$15,810,000
Jail Administration Office Space	\$238	\$828,000
Sheriff Department Office Space	\$238	\$525,000
Coroners Facilities	\$184	\$120,000
Vehicles	\$1	\$79,000
Subtotal		\$17,362,000
Public Works		
Office Space	\$238	\$331,000
Vehicles	\$1	\$15,000
Subtotal		\$346,000
Agriculture		
Office	\$238	\$630,000
Lab/Storage	\$167	\$308,000
Vehicles	\$1	\$44,000
Equipment	\$1	\$12,000
Subtotal		\$995,000
TOTAL		\$57,576,000

*Cost per unit are dollars per square foot or per bed, expressed in 1994 dollars.
Source: Recht Hausrath Associates, July 1994.

TABLE 6-9
COUNTYWIDE FACILITIES COSTS
Functions Serving Residents

Function/Facility Type	Cost Per Unit*	1990 -2010
Libraries		
Library space	\$217	\$3,921,000
Volumes	\$30	\$2,807,000
Automation	\$1	\$87,000
Subtotal		\$6,815,000
Health		
Office	\$238	\$5,647,000
Clinic lab	\$213	\$3,809,000
Vehicles	\$1	\$97,000
Equipment	\$1	\$320,000
Subtotal		\$9,873,000
Welfare		
Office	\$238	\$3,693,000
Vehicles	\$1	\$211,000
Subtotal		\$3,904,000
Animal Control		
Office	\$238	\$59,000
Shelter	\$167	\$983,000
Outdoor Pen/Storage	\$1	\$22,000
Vehicles	\$1	\$74,000
Subtotal		\$1,138,000
TOTAL		\$21,730,000

*Cost per unit is dollars per square foot or library volume, expressed in 1994 dollars.

Source: Recht Hausrath Associates, July 1994.

Areas with Current Deficiencies

The *Criminal Justice Master Plan (CJMP)* identifies significant current deficiencies in justice facilities, jails and countywide protection facilities. The *Facilities Study* recommends increased standards for these facilities and identifies the current deficiency to be addressed. If the County decides to adopt these higher standards, the facilities required to serve growth would be higher than calculated above.

Similarly, the *Facilities Study* recommends that the County adopt a higher standard for library space than currently exists. The recommended standard is based on the California State Library guidelines which have not yet been adopted as policy by the County. For new development to meet this higher standard, the required facilities would be greater than indicated in Tables 6-7 and 6-9.

Alternative Funding Sources/Net Costs

Although most facility requirements must be funded with local revenue sources, for several functional areas, the County has specialized revenue sources that would meet some of the facility costs associated with growth. These revenue sources are discussed in the presentation of capital funding options. The revenues from those sources that are directly related to specific facilities are estimated below.

Justice and jails and countywide protection facilities can be financed with revenues from penalty assessments. The County deposits these locally derived revenues into two funds: 1) the County Courtroom Facilities Fund (Government Code Section 76005) and 2) the Criminal Justice Facility Temporary Construction Fund (Government Code Section 76004). It is anticipated that new development will contribute to these funds at approximately the same rate per year as the existing population. For the 1994 to 2010 period, new development's contribution to these funds will be approximately \$4.0 million. It is important to note that these revenue estimates assume that the penalty levels, rates and fund use restrictions remain constant over time.

The County anticipates that some of the costs of new welfare facilities will be covered by State and Federal assistance. These non-local revenues are determined by complicated cost sharing mechanisms, that are subject to change in the future. Assuming current practices, the County can expect to recover \$900,000 of welfare facility costs in the 1994 to 2010 period from State and Federal programs.

SUMMARY OF MUNICIPAL-LIKE AND COUNTYWIDE FACILITY COSTS

Table 6-10 summarizes the total costs of facilities to serve new development. Table 6-10 also shows the net facility costs after considering the specialized revenues dedicated to certain facilities.

TABLE 6-10**FACILITY COST SUMMARY**

Municipal-Like Facilities	
Sheriff's Patrol and Investigation	\$3,811,000
General Administration	\$7,735,000
Public Works	\$2,256,000
Subtotal	\$13,802,000
Countywide Facilities	
General Administration	\$23,666,000
Justice System	\$15,207,000
Jails and Countywide Protection	\$17,362,000
Public Works	\$346,000
Agriculture	\$995,000
Libraries	\$6,815,000
Health	\$9,873,000
Welfare	\$3,904,000
Animal Control	\$1,138,000
Subtotal	\$79,306,000
Cost Total	\$93,108,000
Specialized Revenues	
County Courtroom Facility Fund	\$1,783,000
Criminal Justice Facility Temp Construction Fund	\$2,401,000
State and Welfare Funding	\$948,000
Revenue Total	\$5,132,000
NET FACILITY COST	\$87,976,000

Source: Recht Hausrath Associates, July 1994.

6.4 FACILITY FUNDING OPTIONS

This section outlines the funding options for facilities needed to serve new development as described in Sections 6.2 and 6.3. The options described below review existing sources of funding for County-owned buildings, vehicles and equipment. This review is conducted for 11 categories of County facilities: general

government, public health and mental health, welfare, jails, justice system, libraries, public works, roads, and sheriff.

In summary, Federal and State funding for County facilities has been declining and the County has been able to obtain only modest amounts of funding from local funding sources. The County has cut back construction and acquisition of capital facilities despite significant increases in population. The Placer County Board of Supervisors is considering a policy that requires new development to pay for the full cost of facilities needed to serve the future growth accommodated by the *Countywide General Plan*.

This section, therefore, identifies new sources of local funding that will be needed to maintain current facility standards. The most significant of these local sources is a development impact fee levied on all new development within the county. The proposed fee program is described in detail in the *Facilities Study* (summer 1994). The report documents the amount of funding necessary to maintain current facility standards over the next 16 years of countywide growth.

GENERAL GOVERNMENT AND ADMINISTRATION

The facilities housing general government and administrative departments are funded through local revenue sources. The County does not anticipate that there will be any State, Federal, or other outside source of facility funding for these departments. Local sources include general obligation bonds, general fund revenues, and countywide impact fees. Special district funding (e.g., landscape and lighting assessments, Mello-Roos assessments) are generally reserved for project-specific facilities (e.g., schools, sewer treatment, roads, etc.).

PUBLIC & MENTAL HEALTH

Historically, the State has paid for a portion of the Health Department's leased space and funded expansion and remodeling of owned facilities. For example, the County has expanded its main medical clinic using a grant from tobacco tax funds. As of the 1992/93 fiscal year, however, the State implemented realignment policies that gave counties direct control over the revenues the State had previously used to fund health programs (i.e., one percent of the sales tax and a portion of motor vehicle in-lieu revenues). The County, therefore, now has discretion over how these revenues are allocated between annual operating expenditures and capital outlays. As a result of this discretion and dramatic declines in sales tax revenues, the County allocates all of the State's funding to annual operating expenditures. The County must therefore rely on local sources, including general obligation bonds, general fund revenues, and countywide impact fees to fund capital facility expansion and improvement. As noted above, special district funding is generally reserved for project-specific facilities and would not be applicable to County Health Department facilities.

WELFARE

The Welfare Department anticipates that some of the costs of new facilities will be covered by State and Federal assistance. Recent trends in State assistance, however, indicate that the County's local match will increase in the future. The most appropriate local sources include general obligation bonds, general fund revenues, and countywide impact fees.

JAILS

During the 1980's, the State provided limited capital funding for jail construction through allotments of Proposition 52 and 86 funds. At this time, the County has no unused Proposition 52 or 86 funds. Senate Bill 2557 jail booking fees only partially offset State funding cuts for jails operations and these fees do not provide any funding for capital facilities.

The County deposits revenues from fines and forfeitures into two funds: 1) the County Courtroom Facilities Fund and 2) the Criminal Justice Facility Temporary Construction Fund. The majority of these funds are restricted to capital investment, although the County may use some of these revenues for operating expenditures. Placer County uses the Criminal Justice Facility Temporary Construction Fund almost exclusively for jail construction. It is anticipated that the County will continue to use these funds to help construct new jails.

The remaining funding must come from other local sources. The most appropriate local sources include general obligation (G.O.) bonds, general fund revenues, and countywide impact fees. Historically, the Placer County electorate has not passed G.O. bonds for jail construction; thus, local funding sources will most likely be limited to impact fees.

JUSTICE SYSTEM

The majority of local revenues that may be applied to justice facilities come from fines, forfeitures, and other penalty assessments deposited into the County Courtroom Facilities Fund and the Criminal Justice Facility Temporary Construction Fund. Placer County uses the Courtroom Facilities Fund almost exclusively for courtroom construction. The County is using these funds to pay the debt service on the recent renovation of the Historic Courthouse (Superior Court) in Auburn. (This debt will be retired in 1996.) After 1996 these funds will be available for other courthouse construction or renovation projects.

State grants have partially funded County justice facilities in the past. Recently, however, voters have not approved State bond measures for jail construction and justice facilities. The availability of Federal grants for any County capital facilities is also considered to be extremely unlikely in the current Federal budget climate.

The remaining funding, therefore, must come from other local sources. The most appropriate local sources include general obligation bonds, general fund revenues, and countywide impact fees.

LIBRARIES

Until the recent Federal and State budget cutbacks, funding sources for new library construction included State or Federal grants. The State's current fiscal austerity will create strong competition for the few remaining funding sources for new library construction. Since Placer County recently received a grant for Granite Bay, it is unlikely that the Library will succeed in securing additional grants in the near future.

The Library has limited sources of capital funding. Construction of the Auburn-Main library was funded by a bond which will be retired in FY 1993/94. Future general obligation bonds will require a two-thirds vote of the electorate which typically has been difficult to obtain. The County, however, does not rule out this option for the future, and if a bond measure is passed, new development will receive credit for its share of the bond revenues.

Another source of local revenues for library facilities are community donations. They are collected through various "Friends of the Library" groups. These donations have funded several renovations and improvements to the Auburn-Placer Library System branches to better serve existing residents. These donations, however, are episodic and intended to improve existing facilities rather than fund capital expansion to serve growth.

The County used general fund revenues to fund the local match requirements for the Granite Bay Branch grant. Given the recent fiscal squeeze on the County caused by the State's budget problems, however, the Library is unlikely to secure significant funding from the general fund to finance additional capital facilities.

In the past, the Library has accumulated reserve funds from its share of property tax revenue and used these funds toward capital facilities (e.g. a portion of the Granite Bay local match and system-wide automation). The first claim on the Library's property tax revenue is operating costs associated with existing facilities. Looking forward, therefore, the Library System will not be able to use its operating revenues to fund capital acquisitions.

An analysis by the 1991/92 Placer County Grand Jury concluded that the County should impose a library impact fee on new development as well as seeking additional Federal, State, local, and private funds. The County, therefore, expects new development will fund the facility costs associated with meeting its library needs. Specifically, appropriate local funding sources would be impact fees, special district assessments, and developer exactions.

PUBLIC WORKS

The Department of Public Works (DPW) funds expansion of its buildings, vehicles and equipment from a variety of sources in addition to the General Fund. They include Federal funds such as Federal Aid for Roadway Construction and the Forest Reserve Fund. The State also provides funds through the highway user's tax and the vehicle-in lieu tax, special aviation grants, and aid for highway construction. Of these Federal and State sources, DPW reports that almost all are related to road construction, maintenance and equipment. (The aviation grant is allocated to the Blue Canyon airport exclusively).

The DPW also charges a variety of charges for facilities, vehicles and equipment related to services, such as mapping and surveying service, design construction and engineering, and land use applications of various types. The funds from these charges are deposited into the General Fund. The General Fund is not currently considered a likely source for additional facilities funding; thus, some additional local funding such as countywide or unincorporated area impact fees will be necessary to fund at least a portion of these DPW facilities.

ROADS

During the early 1980s, the County Public Works Department created Traffic Limitation (TL) Zones within some of the community plan areas to assess new development for the cost of transportation improvements. The Department imposed impact fees that it initially kept at modest levels. By 1986, the Department had raised TL Zone fees to levels of full cost recovery. These fees fund the majority of road improvements that serve unincorporated growth.

TL Zone fees, however, do not fund improvements due to the cumulative impacts of countywide growth. These impacts cause traffic congestion on major regional arterials. Funding for the majority of

improvements has come from State and Federal sources such as State gas taxes, Federal Highway Trust Funds and ISTEA. The County is currently studying the need for additional funding from local sources that may be needed to fully mitigate the impact of countywide growth on regional arterials. Possible local sources include a half cent sales tax and countywide development impact fee.

SHERIFF

Historically, the County has funded acquisition of Sheriff patrol and investigation facilities entirely with local revenue sources. Currently no state or federal programs provide funding for Sheriff facilities, therefore it is assumed that the Department will not have access to non-local funding sources (i.e., State and Federal assistance).

The County, therefore, must use local sources to fund construction of additional space at its headquarters or new substations. The most appropriate local sources include general obligation bonds, general fund revenues, and countywide impact fees. The County could fund new substations through formation of special districts (e.g., Mello-Roos) or developer exactions.

6.5 GENERAL PLAN POLICY RESPONSE

While the effects of the *General Plan* on County facilities and services are not being considered here as impacts according to CEQA, the *Policy Document* does include several policies and programs that will help address the County's needs in this area. The following are references to those policies:

Policies

- 4.A.1. *Where new development requires the construction of new public facilities, the new development shall fund its fair share of the construction. The County shall require dedication of land within newly developing areas for public facilities, where necessary.*
- 4.A.3. *The County shall require that new urban development is planned and developed according to urban facility standards.*

Programs

- 4.1. *The County, in consultation with school districts and other service providers, shall establish thresholds beyond which new residential development will be restricted until adequate public services and facilities are provided. The extent of development limitations should reflect the severity of the service and facility needs.*
- 4.2. *The County should establish an annual monitoring and reporting program to evaluate facility capacity and service levels.*
- 4.3. *The County should ensure that capital improvement programs (CIPs) or area facilities plans are prepared in conjunction with new community plans and specific plans and annually-updated. These CIPs should identify improvement needs for the succeeding five-year period.*
- 4.4. *The County shall continue to require developers to obtain will-serve letters from all providers of public facilities and services to new development.*

These policies and programs are intended to ensure that, as new development occurs, the County will be able to ensure the timely development of public facilities and maintenance of adequate service levels.

Policies

- 4.B.1. The County shall require that new development pay its fair share of the cost of all existing facilities it uses based on the demand for these facilities attributable to the new development; exceptions may be made when new development generates significant public benefits (e.g., low income housing, needed health facilities) and when alternative sources of funding can be identified to offset foregone revenues.*
- 4.B.2. The County shall require that new development pay the cost of upgrading existing public facilities or construction of new facilities that are needed to serve the new development; exceptions may be made when new development generates significant public benefits (e.g., low income housing, needed health facilities) and when alternative sources of funding can be identified to offset foregone revenues.*
- 4.B.3. The County shall require, to the extent legally possible, that new development pay the cost of providing public services that are needed to serve the new development; exceptions may be made when new development generates significant public benefits (e.g., low income housing, needed health facilities) and when alternative sources of funding can be identified to offset foregone revenues. This includes working with the cities to require new development within city limits to mitigate impacts on countywide facilities and services.*
- 4.B.4. The County shall seek broad-based funding sources for public facilities and services that benefit current and future residents of the county.*
- 4.B.5. When adopting, amending, and imposing fees and developer exactions, the County shall consider the effects of such fees and exactions on project economics and the County's development goals, and for residential development, housing affordability. This consideration shall recognize any increase in the value of property resulting from County-granted entitlements, including the redesignation of agricultural land for development.*

Programs

- 4.6. The County shall develop and adopt ordinances specifying acceptable methods for new development to pay for new capital facilities and expanded services. Possible mechanisms include development fees, assessment districts, land/facility dedications, and county service areas.*
- 4.7. The County shall adopt fee schedules for new development to fund needed public facilities and services.*

These policies and programs provide for policies and funding programs that will help the County ensure that facility and service standards are maintained.