

**Land Use Assumptions,
Infrastructure Improvements Plan,
and Development Fee Report**

**Prepared for:
Coolidge, Arizona**

December 23, 2025



4701 Sangamore Road

Suite S240

Bethesda, MD 20816

301.320.6900

www.TischlerBise.com

[PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK]

TABLE OF CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	1
ARIZONA DEVELOPMENT FEE ENABLING LEGISLATION.....	1
Necessary Public Services.....	1
Infrastructure Improvements Plan.....	2
Qualified Professionals.....	2
Conceptual Development Fee Calculation	3
Evaluation of Credits/Offsets.....	3
INTRODUCTION TO DEVELOPMENT FEES	3
REQUIRED FINDINGS	4
DEVELOPMENT FEE REPORT.....	5
DEVELOPMENT FEE COMPONENTS	6
CURRENT DEVELOPMENT FEES	7
PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT FEES	8
DIFFERENCE BETWEEN PROPOSED AND CURRENT DEVELOPMENT FEES	9
LAND USE ASSUMPTIONS	10
SUMMARY OF GROWTH INDICATORS.....	10
RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT	11
Occupancy Factors	11
Residential Estimates	12
Residential Projections	12
NONRESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT	13
Nonresidential Demand Factors.....	13
Nonresidential Estimates.....	13
Nonresidential Projections.....	14
AVERAGE WEEKDAY VEHICLE TRIPS	15
Residential Trip Generation Rates.....	15
Nonresidential Trip Generation Rates	15
Trip Rate Adjustments	16
Commuter Trip Adjustment.....	16
Adjustment for Pass-By Trips.....	16
Average Weekday Vehicle Trips	17
DEVELOPMENT PROJECTIONS.....	18
Average Weekday Vehicle Trips	19
FIRE FACILITIES.....	20
PROPORTIONATE SHARE	20
SERVICE AREA	21
RATIO OF SERVICE UNIT TO DEVELOPMENT UNIT	21
ANALYSIS OF CAPACITY, USAGE, AND COSTS OF EXISTING PUBLIC SERVICES.....	22
Fire Facilities – Incremental Expansion	22
Fire Apparatus – Incremental Expansion	23
Development Fee Report – Plan-Based	24
PROJECTED DEMAND FOR SERVICES AND COSTS	24
Fire Facilities – Incremental Expansion	25
Fire Apparatus – Incremental Expansion	26
FIRE FACILITIES DEVELOPMENT FEES.....	27

Revenue Credit/Offset.....	27
Fire Facilities Development Fees.....	27
FIRE FACILITIES DEVELOPMENT FEE REVENUE	28
PARKS AND RECREATIONAL FACILITIES IIP.....	29
PROPORTIONATE SHARE	29
SERVICE AREA	30
RATIO OF SERVICE UNIT TO DEVELOPMENT UNIT	30
ANALYSIS OF CAPACITY, USAGE, AND COSTS OF EXISTING PUBLIC SERVICES.....	30
Park Amenities – Incremental Expansion.....	31
Development Fee Report – Plan-Based	32
PROJECTED DEMAND FOR SERVICES AND COSTS	32
Park Amenities – Incremental Expansion.....	33
PARKS AND RECREATIONAL FACILITIES DEVELOPMENT FEES	34
Revenue Credit/Offset.....	34
Parks and Recreational Facilities Development Fees.....	34
PARKS AND RECREATIONAL FACILITIES DEVELOPMENT FEE REVENUE	35
POLICE FACILITIES	36
PROPORTIONATE SHARE	36
SERVICE AREA	37
RATIO OF SERVICE UNIT TO DEVELOPMENT UNIT	37
ANALYSIS OF CAPACITY, USAGE, AND COSTS OF EXISTING PUBLIC SERVICES.....	38
Police Facilities – Incremental Expansion	38
Police Vehicles – Incremental Expansion	39
Development Fee Report – Plan-Based	40
PROJECTED DEMAND FOR SERVICES AND COSTS	40
Police Facilities – Incremental Expansion	41
Police Vehicles – Incremental Expansion	42
POLICE FACILITIES DEVELOPMENT FEES	43
Revenue Credit/Offset.....	43
Police Facilities Development Fees	43
POLICE FACILITIES DEVELOPMENT FEE REVENUE.....	44
STREET FACILITIES IIP	45
PROPORTIONATE SHARE	45
SERVICE AREA	45
RATIO OF SERVICE UNIT TO DEVELOPMENT UNIT	45
Residential Trip Generation Rates.....	45
Nonresidential Trip Generation Rates	46
Trip Rate Adjustments	46
Commuter Trip Adjustment.....	46
Adjustment for Pass-By Trips	47
Average Weekday Vehicle Trips	47
Local Trip Lengths.....	48
Trip Length Weighting Factor.....	48
Local Vehicle Miles Traveled.....	48
PROJECTED DEMAND FOR SERVICES AND COSTS	49
ANALYSIS OF CAPACITY, USAGE, AND COSTS OF EXISTING PUBLIC SERVICES.....	50
Street Improvements – Incremental Expansion	50
Development Fee Report – Plan-Based	51
STREET FACILITIES DEVELOPMENT FEES.....	52
Revenue Credit/Offset.....	52

Street Facilities Development Fees.....	52
STREET FACILITIES DEVELOPMENT FEE REVENUE	53
WASTEWATER FACILITIES IIP	54
PROPORTIONATE SHARE	54
SERVICE AREA	54
RATIO OF SERVICE UNIT TO DEVELOPMENT UNIT	55
ANALYSIS OF CAPACITY, USAGE, AND COSTS OF EXISTING PUBLIC SERVICES.....	56
Existing Flow	56
PROJECTED DEMAND FOR SERVICES AND COSTS	56
Projected Flow	57
Treatment – Plan-Based	58
Development Fee Report – Plan-Based	58
WASTEWATER FACILITIES DEVELOPMENT FEES	58
Revenue Credit/Offset.....	58
Wastewater Facilities Development Fees.....	59
WASTEWATER FACILITIES DEVELOPMENT FEE REVENUE	60
APPENDIX A: FORECAST OF REVENUES OTHER THAN FEES	61
REVENUE PROJECTIONS	61
APPENDIX B: PROFESSIONAL SERVICES.....	63
APPENDIX C: LAND USE DEFINITIONS.....	64
RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT	64
NONRESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT	65

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The City of Coolidge, Arizona, contracted with TischlerBise to document land use assumptions, prepare the Infrastructure Improvements Plan (hereinafter referred to as the “IIP”), and update development fees pursuant to Arizona Revised Statutes (“ARS”) § 9-463.05 (hereafter referred to as the “Enabling Legislation”). Municipalities in Arizona may assess development fees to offset infrastructure costs to a municipality for necessary public services. The development fees must be based on an Infrastructure Improvements Plan and Land Use Assumptions. The IIP for each type of infrastructure is in the middle section of this document. The proposed development fees are displayed in the Development Fee Report in the next section.

Development fees are one-time payments used to construct system improvements needed to accommodate new development. The fee represents future development’s proportionate share of infrastructure costs. Development fees may be used for infrastructure improvements or debt service for growth related infrastructure. In contrast to general taxes, development fees may not be used for operations, maintenance, replacement, or correcting existing deficiencies. This update of Coolidge’s Infrastructure Improvements Plan and associated update to its development fees includes the following necessary public services:

1. Fire Facilities
2. Parks and Recreational Facilities
3. Police Facilities
4. Street Facilities
5. Wastewater Facilities

This plan includes all necessary elements required to be in full compliance with SB 1525.

ARIZONA DEVELOPMENT FEE ENABLING LEGISLATION

The Enabling Legislation governs how development fees are calculated for municipalities in Arizona.

Necessary Public Services

Under the requirements of the Enabling Legislation, development fees may only be used for construction, acquisition or expansion of public facilities that are necessary public services. “Necessary public service” means any of the following categories of facilities that have a life expectancy of three or more years and that are owned and operated on behalf of the municipality: water, wastewater, storm water, library, street, fire, police, and parks and recreational. Additionally, a necessary public service includes any facility that was financed before June 1, 2011, and that meets the following requirements:

1. Development fees were pledged to repay debt service obligations related to the construction of the facility.
2. After August 1, 2014, any development fees collected are used solely for the payment of principal and interest on the portion of the bonds, notes, or other debt service obligations issued before June 1, 2011, to finance construction of the facility.

Infrastructure Improvements Plan

Development fees must be calculated pursuant to an IIP. For each necessary public service that is the subject of a development fee, by law, the IIP shall include the following seven elements:

1. A description of the existing necessary public services in the service area and the costs to update, improve, expand, correct or replace those necessary public services to meet existing needs and usage and stricter safety, efficiency, environmental or regulatory standards, which shall be prepared by qualified professionals licensed in this state, as applicable.
2. An analysis of the total capacity, the level of current usage and commitments for usage of capacity of the existing necessary public services, which shall be prepared by qualified professionals licensed in this state, as applicable.
3. A description of all or the parts of the necessary public services or facility expansions and their costs necessitated by and attributable to development in the service area based on the approved Land Use Assumptions, including a forecast of the costs of infrastructure, improvements, real property, financing, engineering and architectural services, which shall be prepared by qualified professionals licensed in this state, as applicable.
4. A table establishing the specific level or quantity of use, consumption, generation or discharge of a service unit for each category of necessary public services or facility expansions and an equivalency or conversion table establishing the ratio of a service unit to various types of land uses, including residential, commercial, and industrial.
5. The total number of projected service units necessitated by and attributable to new development in the service area based on the approved Land Use Assumptions and calculated pursuant to generally accepted engineering and planning criteria.
6. The projected demand for necessary public services or facility expansions required by new service units for a period not to exceed ten years.
7. A forecast of revenues generated by new service units other than development fees, which shall include estimated state-shared revenue, highway users revenue, federal revenue, ad valorem property taxes, construction contracting or similar excise taxes and the capital recovery portion of utility fees attributable to development based on the approved Land Use Assumptions and a plan to include these contributions in determining the extent of the burden imposed by the development.

Qualified Professionals

The IIP must be developed by qualified professionals using generally accepted engineering and planning practices. A qualified professional is defined as “a professional engineer, surveyor, financial analyst or planner providing services within the scope of the person’s license, education, or experience.” TischlerBise is a fiscal, economic, and planning consulting firm specializing in the cost of growth services. Our services include development fees, fiscal impact analysis, infrastructure financing analyses, user fee/cost of service studies, capital improvement plans, and fiscal software. TischlerBise has prepared over 800 development fee studies over the past 30 years for local governments across the United States.

Conceptual Development Fee Calculation

In contrast to project-level improvements, development fees fund growth-related infrastructure that will benefit multiple development projects, or the entire service area (usually referred to as system improvements). The first step is to determine an appropriate demand indicator for the particular type of infrastructure. The demand indicator measures the number of service units for each unit of development. For example, an appropriate indicator of the demand for parks is population growth and the increase in population can be estimated from the average number of persons per housing unit. The second step in the development fee formula is to determine infrastructure improvement units per service unit, typically called level-of-service (LOS) standards. In keeping with the park example, a common LOS standard is improved park acres per thousand people. The third step in the development fee formula is the cost of various infrastructure units. To complete the park example, this part of the formula would establish a cost per acre for land acquisition and/ or park amenities.

Evaluation of Credits/Offsets

Regardless of the methodology, a consideration of credits/offsets is integral to the development of a legally defensible development fee. There are two types of credits/offsets that should be addressed in development fee studies and ordinances. The first is a revenue credit/offset due to possible double payment situations, which could occur when other revenues may contribute to the capital costs of infrastructure covered by the development fee. This type of credit/offset is integrated into the fee calculation, thus reducing the fee amount. The second is a site-specific credit or developer reimbursement for dedication of land or construction of system improvements. This type of credit is addressed in the administration and implementation of the development fee program. For ease of administration, TischlerBise normally recommends developer reimbursements for system improvements.

INTRODUCTION TO DEVELOPMENT FEES

Development fees are one-time payments used to fund capital improvements necessitated by future development. Development fees have been utilized by local governments in various forms for at least fifty years. Development fees do have limitations and should not be regarded as the total solution for infrastructure financing needs. Rather, they should be considered one component of a comprehensive portfolio to ensure adequate provision of public facilities with the goal of maintaining current levels of service in a community. Any community considering facility fees should note the following limitations:

- 1) Fees can only be used to finance capital infrastructure and cannot be used to finance ongoing operations and / or maintenance and rehabilitation costs.
- 2) Fees cannot be deposited in the General Fund. The funds must be accounted for separately in individual accounts and earmarked for the capital expenses for which they were collected.
- 3) Fees cannot be used to correct existing infrastructure deficiencies unless there is a funding plan in place to correct the deficiency for all current residents and businesses in the community.

REQUIRED FINDINGS

There are three reasonable relationship requirements for development fees that are closely related to “rational nexus” or “reasonable relationship” requirements enunciated by a number of state courts. Although the term “dual rational nexus” is often used to characterize the standard by which courts evaluate the validity of development fees under the U. S. Constitution, we prefer a more rigorous formulation that recognizes three elements: “impact or need,” “benefit,” and “proportionality.” The dual rational nexus test explicitly addresses only the first two, although proportionality is reasonably implied, and was specifically mentioned by the U.S. Supreme Court in the *Dolan* case. The reasonable relationship language of the statute is considered less strict than the rational nexus standard used by many courts. Individual elements of the nexus standard are discussed further in the following paragraphs.

Demonstrating an Impact. All future development in a community creates additional demands on some, or all, public facilities provided by local government. If the supply of facilities is not increased to satisfy that additional demand, the quality or availability of public services for the entire community will deteriorate. Development fees may be used to recover the cost of development-related facilities, but only to the extent that the need for facilities is a consequence of development that is subject to the fees. The *Nollan* decision reinforced the principle that development exactions may be used only to mitigate conditions created by the developments upon which they are imposed. That principle clearly applies to development fees. In this study, the impact of development on improvement needs is analyzed in terms of quantifiable relationships between various types of development and the demand for specific facilities, based on applicable level-of-service standards.

Demonstrating a Benefit. A sufficient benefit relationship requires that development fee revenues be segregated from other funds and expended only on the facilities for which the fees were charged. Fees must be expended in a timely manner and the facilities funded by the fees must serve the development paying the fees. However, nothing in the U.S. Constitution or the State enabling Act authorizing development fees requires that facilities funded with fee revenues be available *exclusively* to development paying the fees. In other words, existing development may benefit from these improvements as well.

Procedures for the earmarking and expenditure of fee revenues are typically mandated by the State Enabling Legislation, as are procedures to ensure that the fees are expended expeditiously or refunded. All requirements are intended to ensure that developments benefit from the fees they are required to pay. Thus, an adequate showing of benefit must address procedural as well as substantive issues.

Demonstrating Proportionality. The requirement that exactions be proportional to the impacts of development was clearly stated by the U.S. Supreme Court in the *Dolan* case (although the relevance of that decision to development fees has been debated) and is logically necessary to establish a proper nexus. Proportionality is established through the procedures used to identify development-related facility costs, and in the methods used to calculate development fees for various types of facilities and categories of development. The demand for facilities is measured in terms of relevant and measurable attributes of development.

DEVELOPMENT FEE REPORT

Development fees for the necessary public services made necessary by new development must be based on the same level of service (LOS) provided to existing development in the service area. There are three basic methodologies used to calculate development fees. They examine the past, present, and future status of infrastructure. The objective of evaluating these different methodologies is to determine the best measure of the demand created by new development for additional infrastructure capacity. Each methodology has advantages and disadvantages in a particular situation and can be used simultaneously for different cost components.

Reduced to its simplest terms, the process of calculating development fees involves two main steps: (1) determining the cost of development-related capital improvements and (2) allocating those costs equitably to various types of development. In practice, though, the calculation of development fees can become quite complicated because of the many variables involved in defining the relationship between development and the need for facilities within the designated service area. The following paragraphs discuss basic methodologies for calculating development fees and how those methodologies can be applied.

- **Cost Recovery** (past improvements) - The rationale for recoupment, often called cost recovery, is that new development is paying for its share of the useful life and remaining capacity of facilities already built, or land already purchased, from which new growth will benefit. This methodology is often used for utility systems that must provide adequate capacity before new development can take place.
- **Incremental Expansion** (concurrent improvements) - The incremental expansion methodology documents current LOS standards for each type of public facility, using both quantitative and qualitative measures. This approach assumes there are no existing infrastructure deficiencies or surplus capacity in infrastructure. New development is only paying its proportionate share for growth-related infrastructure. Revenue will be used to expand or provide additional facilities, as needed, to accommodate new development. An incremental expansion cost method is best suited for public facilities that will be expanded in regular increments to keep pace with development.
- **Plan-Based** (future improvements) - The plan-based methodology allocates costs for a specified set of improvements to a specified amount of development. Improvements are typically identified in a long-range facility plan and development potential is identified by a land use plan. There are two basic options for determining the cost per demand unit: (1) total cost of a public facility can be divided by total demand units (average cost), or (2) the growth-share of the public facility cost can be divided by the net increase in demand units over the planning timeframe (marginal cost).

DEVELOPMENT FEE COMPONENTS

Shown below, Figure 1 summarizes service areas, methodologies, and infrastructure cost components for the proposed fees.

Figure 1: Proposed Development Fee Service Areas, Methodologies, and Cost Components

Necessary Public Service	Service Area	Cost Recovery	Incremental Expansion	Plan-Based	Cost Allocation
Fire	Citywide	N/A	Fire Facilities, Fire Apparatus	Fire Facilities, Development Fee Report	Population, Jobs
Parks and Recreation	Citywide	N/A	Park Amenities	Development Fee Report	Population, Jobs
Police	Citywide	N/A	Police Facilities, Police Vehicles	Police Facilities, Development Fee Report	Population, Jobs
Street	Citywide	N/A	N/A	Street Improvements, Development Fee Report	VMT
Wastewater	Citywide	N/A	N/A	Treatment, Development Fee Report	Gallons

Calculations throughout this report are based on an analysis conducted using Excel software. Most results are discussed in the report using two, three, and four decimal places, which represent rounded figures. However, the analysis itself uses figures carried to their ultimate decimal places; therefore, the sums and products generated in the analysis may not equal the sum or product if the reader replicates the calculation with the factors shown in the report (due to the rounding of figures shown, not in the analysis).

CURRENT DEVELOPMENT FEES

Current development fees are assessed per dwelling unit for residential development and per 1,000 square feet of floor area for nonresidential development. Current development fees for wastewater are assessed by meter size and type.

Figure 2: Current Development Fees

Residential Fees per Unit					
Development Type	Fire	Parks & Recreational	Police	Street	Current Fees
Single Family	\$426	\$1,058	\$0	\$3,235	\$4,719
Multi-Family	\$361	\$896	\$0	\$2,070	\$3,327

Nonresidential Fees per 1,000 Square Feet					
Development Type	Fire	Parks & Recreational	Police	Street	Current Fees
Industrial	\$130	\$243	\$0	\$635	\$1,008
Commercial / Retail	\$825	\$358	\$0	\$4,245	\$5,428
Office & Other Services	\$322	\$454	\$0	\$3,679	\$4,455
Institutional	\$322	\$454	\$0	\$3,679	\$4,455

Meter Size	Current Fees
0.75-inch	\$2,183
1.00-inch	\$3,645
1.50-inch	\$7,268
2.0-inch	\$11,633
3.0-inch	\$23,288

PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT FEES

Proposed development fees will be assessed per dwelling unit for residential development and per 1,000 square feet of floor area for nonresidential development. Proposed development fees for wastewater will be assessed by meter size and type. The proposed fire, parks and recreation, and police facilities fees include a credit/offset, because Coolidge’s construction transaction privilege tax rate exceeds the amount of the transaction privilege tax rate imposed on the majority of other transaction privilege tax classifications.

The proposed fees represent the maximum allowable fees. Coolidge may adopt fees that are less than the amounts shown; however, a reduction in development fee revenue will necessitate an increase in other revenues, a decrease in planned capital improvements, and/or a decrease in level-of-service standards. All costs in the Development Fee Report represent current dollars with no assumed inflation over time. If costs change significantly over time, development fees should be recalculated.

Figure 3: Proposed Development Fees

Residential Fees per Unit					
Development Type	Fire	Parks & Recreational	Police	Street	Proposed Fees
Single Family	\$1,618	\$1,213	\$1,660	\$5,270	\$9,761
Multi-Family	\$1,288	\$965	\$1,321	\$3,766	\$7,341

Nonresidential Fees per 1,000 Square Feet					
Development Type	Fire	Parks & Recreational	Police	Street	Proposed Fees
Industrial	\$321	\$192	\$329	\$1,295	\$2,137
Commercial	\$1,650	\$215	\$1,693	\$6,838	\$10,396
Office & Other Services	\$732	\$331	\$751	\$2,954	\$4,768
Institutional	\$1,007	\$308	\$1,033	\$4,061	\$6,409

Fees per Meter		
Meter Size	Capacity Ratio ¹	Proposed Fees ²
0.75-inch	1.00	\$5,674
1.00-inch	1.67	\$9,475
1.50-inch	3.33	\$18,894
2.00-inch	5.33	\$30,241
3.00-inch	10.67	\$60,539

1. AWWA Manual of Water Supply Practices M-1, 7th Edition

2. Meters larger than 3.0 inches multiplied by average day gallons from (1) City of Coolidge Wastewater Master Plan (2020), (2) a submitted water study, or (3) other estimated wastewater flow.

DIFFERENCE BETWEEN PROPOSED AND CURRENT DEVELOPMENT FEES

The differences between the proposed and current development fees are displayed below in Figure 4.

Figure 4: Difference Between Proposed and Current Development Fees

Residential Fees per Unit					
Development Type	Fire	Parks & Recreational	Police	Street	Difference
Single Family	\$1,192	\$155	\$1,660	\$2,035	\$5,042
Multi-Family	\$927	\$69	\$1,321	\$1,696	\$4,014

Nonresidential Fees per 1,000 Square Feet					
Development Type	Fire	Parks & Recreational	Police	Street	Difference
Industrial	\$191	(\$51)	\$329	\$660	\$1,129
Commercial	\$825	(\$143)	\$1,693	\$2,593	\$4,968
Office & Other Services	\$410	(\$123)	\$751	(\$725)	\$313
Institutional	\$685	(\$146)	\$1,033	\$382	\$1,954

Fees per Meter	
Meter Size	Difference
0.75-inch	\$3,491
1.00-inch	\$5,830
1.50-inch	\$11,626
2.00-inch	\$18,608
3.00-inch	\$37,251

LAND USE ASSUMPTIONS

Arizona’s Development Fee Act requires the preparation of Land Use Assumptions, which are defined in Arizona Revised Statutes § 9-463.05(T)(6) as:

“projections of changes in land uses, densities, intensities and population for a specified service area over a period of at least ten years and pursuant to the General Plan of the municipality.”

The estimates and projections of residential and nonresidential development in this Land Use Assumptions document are for all areas within Coolidge. The current demographic estimates and future development projections will be used in the Infrastructure Improvements Plan (IIP) and in the calculation of development fees. Current demographic data estimates for 2024 are used in calculating levels of service (LOS) provided to existing development in Coolidge. Arizona’s Enabling Legislation requires fees to be updated at least every five years and limits the IIP to a maximum of 10 years.

SUMMARY OF GROWTH INDICATORS

Key land use assumptions include population, housing units, and employment projections. TischlerBise projects development based on a combination of Maricopa Association of Governments (MAG) projections and Central Arizona Governments (CAG) projections.

Development projections are summarized in Figure L9 and Figure L10. These projections will be used to estimate fee revenue and to indicate the anticipated need for growth-related infrastructure. However, development fee methodologies are designed to reduce sensitivity to development projections in the determination of the proportionate share fee amounts. If actual development occurs at a slower rate than projected, fee revenue will decline, but so will the need for growth-related infrastructure. In contrast, if development occurs at a faster rate than anticipated, fee revenue will increase, but Coolidge will also need to accelerate infrastructure improvements to keep pace with the actual rate of development. During the next 10 years, residential development projections indicate a population increase of 26,000 persons in 9,124 housing units, and nonresidential development projections indicate an employment increase of 4,396 jobs in approximately 2,887,000 square feet of floor area.

RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT

This section details current estimates and future projections of residential development including population and housing units.

Occupancy Factors

According to the U.S. Census Bureau, a household is a housing unit occupied by year-round residents. Development fees often use per capita standards and persons per housing unit (PPHU) or persons per household (PPH) to derive proportionate share fee amounts. When PPHU is used in the fee calculations, infrastructure standards are derived using year-round population. When PPH is used in the fee calculations, the development fee methodology assumes a higher percentage of housing units will be occupied, thus requiring seasonal or peak population to be used when deriving infrastructure standards. TischlerBise recommends that development fees for residential development be imposed according to the number of persons per housing unit.

Occupancy calculations require data on population and the types of units by structure. The 2010 census did not obtain detailed information using a “long-form” questionnaire. Instead, the U.S. Census Bureau switched to a continuous monthly mailing of surveys, known as the American Community Survey (ACS), which has limitations due to sample-size constraints. For example, data on detached housing units are now combined with attached single units (commonly known as townhouses, which share a common sidewall, but are constructed on an individual parcel of land). For development fees in Coolidge, detached units and attached units are included in the “Single-Family” category. The second residential category includes duplexes, all structures with two or more units on an individual parcel of land, mobile home units, recreational vehicles, and all other units.

Figure L1 below shows the occupancy estimates for Coolidge based on 2018-2022 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates. Single-family units averaged 2.94 persons per housing unit and multi-family units averaged 2.34 persons per housing unit. The estimates shown below are used only to calculate occupancy factors and may not match population and housing unit estimates shown throughout this report.

Figure L1: Occupancy Factors

Housing Type	Persons	Households	Persons per Household	Housing Units	Persons per Housing Unit	Housing Mix	Vacancy Rate
Single-Family ¹	12,390	3,723	3.33	4,220	2.94	84.9%	11.78%
Multi-Family ²	1,748	655	2.67	748	2.34	15.1%	12.43%
Total	14,138	4,378	3.23	4,968	2.85	100.0%	11.88%

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 2018-2022 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates

1. Includes detached and attached (i.e., townhouses) units.

2. Includes dwellings in structures with two or more units, mobile homes, RVs, and all other units.

Residential Estimates

For 2024, the Central Arizona Governments (CAG) *Pinal County Municipality Projections for July 1, 2023-July 1, 2060* estimates a total population of 19,200 persons living citywide. Converting population to housing units using the occupancy factors shown in Figure L1 results in a 2024 housing estimate of 6,738 total units. For this study, the analysis assumes the occupancy factors shown in Figure L1 will remain constant throughout the 10-year projection period.

Residential Projections

Population and housing unit projections are used to illustrate the possible future pace of service demands, revenues, and expenditures. To the extent these factors change, the projected need for infrastructure will also change. If development occurs at a more rapid rate than projected, the demand for infrastructure will increase at a corresponding rate. If development occurs at a slower rate than projected, the demand for infrastructure will also decrease.

TischlerBise projects population based on the *Pinal County Municipality Projections for July 1, 2023-July 1, 2060* published by the CAG. Projected population growth over the next 10 years is an additional 26,000 residents.

To convert population to housing units, occupancy factors shown in Figure L1 are applied to the population projections shown in Figure L2. For example, the 10-year increase of 26,000 residents multiplied by 88% of residents in single family units, divided by 2.94 persons per housing unit equals 7,750 new single-family units. Based on these assumptions, the 10-year projections include an increase of 26,000 persons and 9,124 housing units.

Figure L2: Residential Projections

Coolidge, Arizona	2024	2025	2026	2027	2028	2029	2034	10-Year Increase
	Base Year	1	2	3	4	5	10	
Population	19,200	20,600	22,720	24,840	26,960	29,080	45,200	26,000
Housing Units								
Single Family	5,723	6,140	6,772	7,404	8,036	8,668	13,473	7,750
Multi-Family	1,014	1,088	1,200	1,312	1,424	1,536	2,388	1,374
Total	6,738	7,229	7,973	8,717	9,461	10,205	15,862	9,124

NONRESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT

This section details current estimates and future projections of nonresidential development including jobs and nonresidential floor area.

Nonresidential Demand Factors

TischlerBise uses the term jobs to refer to employment by place of work. In Figure L3, gray shading indicates the nonresidential development prototypes used to derive employment densities. For nonresidential development, TischlerBise uses data published in Trip Generation, Institute of Transportation Engineers, 11th Edition (2021). The prototype for industrial development is Manufacturing (ITE 140) with 528 square feet of floor area per employee. For office development, the proxy is General Office (ITE 710) with 307 square feet of floor area per employee. Institutional development uses Government Office (ITE 730) with 330 square feet of floor area per employee. The prototype for commercial development is Shopping Center (ITE 820) with 471 square feet of floor area per employee.

Figure L3: Nonresidential Demand Units

ITE Code	Land Use / Size	Demand Unit	Wkdy Trip Ends Per Dmd Unit ¹	Wkdy Trip Ends Per Employee ¹	Emp Per Dmd Unit	Sq Ft Per Emp
110	Light Industrial	1,000 Sq Ft	4.87	3.10	1.57	637
130	Industrial Park	1,000 Sq Ft	3.37	2.91	1.16	864
140	Manufacturing	1,000 Sq Ft	4.75	2.51	1.89	528
150	Warehousing	1,000 Sq Ft	1.71	5.05	0.34	2,953
254	Assisted Living	bed	2.60	4.24	0.61	na
610	Hospital	1,000 Sq Ft	10.77	3.77	2.86	350
620	Nursing Home	bed	3.06	3.31	0.92	na
710	General Office (avg size)	1,000 Sq Ft	10.84	3.33	3.26	307
720	Medical-Dental Office	1,000 Sq Ft	36.00	8.71	4.13	242
730	Government Office	1,000 Sq Ft	22.59	7.45	3.03	330
770	Business Park	1,000 Sq Ft	12.44	4.04	3.08	325
820	Shopping Center (avg size)	1,000 Sq Ft	37.01	17.42	2.12	471

1. Trip Generation, Institute of Transportation Engineers, 11th Edition (2021).

Nonresidential Estimates

Shown below, 2024 MAG estimates for Coolidge equal 6,075 jobs. Applying the employment multipliers shown in Figure L3 to employment estimates shown in Figure L4 results in a nonresidential floor area estimate of 2,519,140 square feet.

Figure L4: Nonresidential Estimates

Nonresidential Category	2024 Jobs ¹	Percent of Total Jobs	Square Feet per Job ²	2024 Estimated Floor Area ³	Jobs per 1,000 Sq. Ft. ²
Industrial	1,871	31%	528	987,994	1.89
Commercial	1,225	20%	471	577,163	2.12
Office & Other Service	1,262	21%	307	387,373	3.26
Institutional	1,717	28%	330	566,610	3.03
Total	6,075	100%		2,519,140	

1. Maricopa Association of Governments (MAG).

2. Trip Generation, Institute of Transportation Engineers, 11th Edition (2021).

3. TischlerBise calculation (2024 jobs X square feet per job).

Nonresidential Projections

Employment and floor area projections are used to illustrate the possible future pace of service demands, revenues, and expenditures. To the extent these factors change, the projected need for infrastructure will also change. If development occurs at a more rapid rate than projected, the demand for infrastructure will increase at a corresponding rate. If development occurs at a slower rate than projected, the demand for infrastructure will also decrease.

TischlerBise projects nonresidential development using employment data published by the Maricopa Association of Governments (MAG). Projected employment growth over the next 10 years includes an additional 4,396 jobs.

To convert employment to nonresidential floor area, nonresidential demand factors shown in Figure L3 are applied to the employment projections shown below. For example, the 10-year increase of 2,504 industrial jobs multiplied by 528 square feet per industrial job equals approximately 1,322,000 square feet of industrial development. Based on these assumptions, the 10-year projections include an increase of approximately 2,045,000 square feet.

Figure L5: Nonresidential Projections

Coolidge, Arizona	2024	2025	2026	2027	2028	2029	2034	10-Year Increase
	Base Year	1	2	3	4	5	10	
Employment								
Industrial	1,871	2,177	2,482	2,787	3,092	3,398	4,375	2,504
Commercial	1,225	1,247	1,268	1,289	1,310	1,331	1,956	731
Office & Other Services	1,262	1,281	1,300	1,319	1,339	1,358	1,454	192
Institutional	1,717	1,797	1,877	1,957	2,037	2,117	2,686	969
Total	6,075	6,501	6,927	7,352	7,778	8,203	10,472	4,396
Nonres. Floor Area (x1,000)								
Industrial	988	1,149	1,310	1,472	1,633	1,794	2,310	1,322
Commercial	577	587	597	607	617	627	921	344
Office & Other Services	387	393	399	405	411	417	446	59
Institutional	567	593	619	646	672	699	886	320
Total	2,519	2,723	2,926	3,129	3,333	3,536	4,564	2,045

AVERAGE WEEKDAY VEHICLE TRIPS

Coolidge will use average weekday vehicle trips (AWVT) for fire facilities fees. Components used to determine AWVT include average weekday vehicle trip generation rates, adjustments for commuting patterns, and adjustments for pass-by trips.

Residential Trip Generation Rates

For residential development, TischlerBise uses trip generation rates published in Trip Generation, Institute of Transportation Engineers, 11th Edition (2021). For single-family development, the proxy is Single Family Detached Housing (ITE 210), and this type of development generates 9.43 average weekday vehicle trip ends per unit. For multi-family development, the proxy is Multifamily Housing Low-Rise (ITE 220), and this type of development generates 6.74 average weekday vehicle trip ends per unit.

Nonresidential Trip Generation Rates

For nonresidential development, TischlerBise uses trip generation rates published in Trip Generation, Institute of Transportation Engineers, 11th Edition (2021). The prototype for industrial development is Manufacturing (ITE 140) which generates 4.75 average weekday vehicle trip ends per 1,000 square feet of floor area. The prototype for commercial development is Shopping Center (ITE 820) which generates 37.01 average weekday vehicle trips per 1,000 square feet of floor area. For office & other services development, the proxy is General Office (ITE 710), and it generates 10.84 average weekday vehicle trip ends per 1,000 square feet of floor area. Institutional development uses Government Office (ITE 730) and generates 22.59 average weekday vehicle trip ends per 1,000 square feet of floor area.

Figure L6: Average Weekday Vehicle Trip Ends by Land Use

ITE Code	Land Use / Size	Demand Unit	Wkdy Trip Ends Per Dmd Unit ¹	Wkdy Trip Ends Per Employee ¹	Emp Per Dmd Unit	Sq Ft Per Emp
110	Light Industrial	1,000 Sq Ft	4.87	3.10	1.57	637
130	Industrial Park	1,000 Sq Ft	3.37	2.91	1.16	864
140	Manufacturing	1,000 Sq Ft	4.75	2.51	1.89	528
150	Warehousing	1,000 Sq Ft	1.71	5.05	0.34	2,953
254	Assisted Living	bed	2.60	4.24	0.61	na
610	Hospital	1,000 Sq Ft	10.77	3.77	2.86	350
620	Nursing Home	bed	3.06	3.31	0.92	na
710	General Office (avg size)	1,000 Sq Ft	10.84	3.33	3.26	307
720	Medical-Dental Office	1,000 Sq Ft	36.00	8.71	4.13	242
730	Government Office	1,000 Sq Ft	22.59	7.45	3.03	330
770	Business Park	1,000 Sq Ft	12.44	4.04	3.08	325
820	Shopping Center (avg size)	1,000 Sq Ft	37.01	17.42	2.12	471

1. Trip Generation, Institute of Transportation Engineers, 11th Edition (2021).

Trip Rate Adjustments

To calculate street facilities fees, trip generation rates require an adjustment factor to avoid double counting each trip at both the origin and destination points. Therefore, the basic trip adjustment factor is 50 percent. As discussed further in this section, the development fee methodology includes additional adjustments to make the fees proportionate to the infrastructure demand for particular types of development.

Commuter Trip Adjustment

Residential development has a larger trip adjustment factor of 64 percent to account for commuters leaving Coolidge for work. According to the 2009 National Household Travel Survey (see Table 30) weekday work trips are typically 31 percent of production trips (i.e., all out-bound trips, which are 50 percent of all trip ends). As shown in Figure L7, the U.S. Census Bureau’s OnTheMap web application indicates 88 percent of resident workers traveled outside of Coolidge for work in 2021. In combination, these factors ($0.31 \times 0.50 \times 0.88 = 0.14$) support the additional 14 percent allocation of trips to residential development.

Figure L7: Commuter Trip Adjustment

Trip Adjustment Factor for Commuters ¹	
Employed Residents	5,684
Residents Living and Working in Coolidge	689
Residents Commuting Outside Coolidge for Work	4,995
Percent Commuting out of Coolidge	88%
Additional Production Trips ²	14%
Residential Trip Adjustment Factor	64%

1. U.S. Census Bureau, OnTheMap Application (version 6.8.1) and LEHD Origin-Destination Employment Statistics,

2. According to the National Household Travel Survey (2009)*, published in December 2011 (see Table 30), home-based work trips are typically 30.99 percent of “production” trips, in other words, out-bound trips (which are 50 percent of all trip ends). Also, LED OnTheMap data from 2021 indicate that 88 percent of Coolidge’s workers travel outside the city for work. In combination, these factors ($0.3099 \times 0.50 \times 0.88 = 0.14$) account for 14 percent of additional production trips. The total adjustment factor for residential includes attraction trips (50 percent of trip ends) plus the journey-to-work commuting adjustment (14 percent of production trips) for a total of 64 percent.

*<http://nhts.ornl.gov/publications.shtml> ; Summary of Travel Trends - Table "Daily Travel Statistics by Weekday vs. Weekend"

Adjustment for Pass-By Trips

For commercial and institutional development, the trip adjustment factor is less than 50 percent because these types of development attract vehicles as they pass by on arterial and collector roads. For example, when someone stops at a convenience store on the way home from work, the convenience store is not the primary destination. For the average shopping center, ITE data indicate 34 percent of the vehicles that enter are passing by on their way to some other primary destination. The remaining 66 percent of attraction trips have the commercial site as their primary destination. Because attraction trips are half of all trips, the trip adjustment factor is 66 percent multiplied by 50 percent, or approximately 33 percent of the trip ends.

Average Weekday Vehicle Trips

Shown below in Figure L8, multiplying average weekday vehicle trip ends and trip adjustment factors (discussed on the previous page) by Coolidge’s existing development units provides the average weekday vehicle trips generated by existing development. As shown below, Coolidge’s existing citywide development generates 54,636 vehicle trips on an average weekday.

Figure L8: Average Weekday Vehicle Trips by Land Use

Development Type	Dev Unit	ITE Code	Weekday VTE	Trip Adj	2024 Dev Units	2024 Veh Trips
Single Family	HU	210	9.43	64%	5,723	34,541
Multi-Family	HU	220	6.74	64%	1,014	4,376
Industrial	KSF	130	4.75	50%	988	2,346
Commercial	KSF	820	37.01	33%	577	7,049
Office & Other Services	KSF	710	10.84	50%	387	2,100
Institutional	KSF	610	22.59	33%	567	4,224
Total						54,636

DEVELOPMENT PROJECTIONS

Provided below is a summary of development projections used in the Development Fee Report. Base year estimates for 2024 are used in the fee calculations. Development projections are used to illustrate a possible future pace of demand for service units and cash flows resulting from revenues and expenditures associated with those demands.

Figure L9: Development Projections Summary

Coolidge, Arizona	2024	2025	2026	2027	2028	2029	2030	2031	2032	2033	2034	10-Year Increase
	Base Year	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	
Population	19,200	20,600	22,720	24,840	26,960	29,080	31,200	34,700	38,200	41,700	45,200	26,000
Housing Units												
Single Family	5,723	6,140	6,772	7,404	8,036	8,668	9,300	10,343	11,387	12,430	13,473	7,750
Multi-Family	1,014	1,088	1,200	1,312	1,424	1,536	1,649	1,833	2,018	2,203	2,388	1,374
Total	6,738	7,229	7,973	8,717	9,461	10,205	10,949	12,177	13,405	14,633	15,862	9,124
Employment												
Industrial	1,871	2,177	2,482	2,787	3,092	3,398	3,703	3,871	4,039	4,207	4,375	2,504
Commercial	1,225	1,247	1,268	1,289	1,310	1,331	1,352	1,503	1,654	1,805	1,956	731
Office & Other Services	1,262	1,281	1,300	1,319	1,339	1,358	1,377	1,396	1,415	1,435	1,454	192
Institutional	1,717	1,797	1,877	1,957	2,037	2,117	2,197	2,319	2,442	2,564	2,686	969
Total	6,075	6,501	6,927	7,352	7,778	8,203	8,629	9,090	9,550	10,011	10,472	4,396
Nonres. Floor Area (x1,000)												
Industrial	988	1,149	1,310	1,472	1,633	1,794	1,955	2,044	2,133	2,221	2,310	1,322
Commercial	577	587	597	607	617	627	637	708	779	850	921	344
Office & Other Services	387	393	399	405	411	417	423	429	435	440	446	59
Institutional	567	593	619	646	672	699	725	765	806	846	886	320
Total	2,519	2,723	2,926	3,129	3,333	3,536	3,740	3,946	4,152	4,358	4,564	2,045

Average Weekday Vehicle Trips

TischlerBise uses the projections shown below for nonresidential fire facilities fees.

Figure L10: Average Weekday Vehicle Trips Summary

Coolidge, Arizona		Base	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	10-Year Increase
		2024	2025	2026	2027	2028	2029	2030	2031	2032	2033	2034	
Development	Single Family Units	5,723	6,140	6,772	7,404	8,036	8,668	9,300	10,343	11,387	12,430	13,473	7,750
	Multi-Family Units	1,014	1,088	1,200	1,312	1,424	1,536	1,649	1,833	2,018	2,203	2,388	1,374
	Industrial KSF	988	1,149	1,310	1,472	1,633	1,794	1,955	2,044	2,133	2,221	2,310	1,322
	Commercial KSF	577	587	597	607	617	627	637	708	779	850	921	344
	Office & Other Services KSF	387	393	399	405	411	417	423	429	435	440	446	59
	Institutional KSF	567	593	619	646	672	699	725	765	806	846	886	320
Avg Weekday Vehicle Trips	Single-Family Trips	34,541	37,059	40,873	44,687	48,501	52,314	56,128	62,425	68,721	75,018	81,314	46,774
	Multi-Family Trips	4,376	4,695	5,178	5,661	6,145	6,628	7,111	7,909	8,706	9,504	10,302	5,926
	Residential Trips	38,917	41,754	46,051	50,348	54,645	58,942	63,239	70,334	77,428	84,522	91,616	52,699
	Industrial Trips	2,346	2,729	3,112	3,495	3,878	4,261	4,644	4,854	5,065	5,276	5,487	3,140
	Commercial Trips	7,049	7,170	7,292	7,413	7,535	7,656	7,777	8,647	9,516	10,385	11,254	4,205
	Office & Other Services Trips	2,100	2,132	2,163	2,195	2,227	2,259	2,291	2,323	2,355	2,387	2,419	319
	Institutional Trips	4,224	4,421	4,618	4,814	5,011	5,208	5,405	5,706	6,006	6,307	6,608	2,384
	Nonresidential Trips	15,719	16,452	17,185	17,918	18,651	19,384	20,117	21,530	22,942	24,355	25,768	10,049
	Total Vehicle Trips	54,636	58,206	63,236	68,266	73,296	78,326	83,356	91,863	100,370	108,877	117,384	62,749

FIRE FACILITIES

ARS § 9-463.05 (T)(7)(f) defines the eligible facilities and assets for the Fire Facilities IIP:

“Fire and police facilities, including all appurtenances, equipment and vehicles. Fire and police facilities do not include a facility or portion of a facility that is used to replace services that were once provided elsewhere in the municipality, vehicles and equipment used to provide administrative services, helicopters or airplanes or a facility that is used for training firefighters or officers from more than one station or substation.”

The Fire Facilities IIP includes components for fire facilities, fire apparatus, and the cost of preparing the Fire Facilities IIP and related development fee report. The incremental expansion methodology is used for fire facilities and fire apparatus. The plan-based methodology is used for the development fee report.

PROPORTIONATE SHARE

ARS § 9-463.05 (B)(3) states that the development fee shall not exceed a proportionate share of the cost of necessary public services needed to accommodate new development. The Fire Facilities IIP and development fees will allocate the cost of fire services between residential and nonresidential based on functional population. Based on 2021 estimates from the U.S. Census Bureau’s OnTheMap web application, residential development accounts for approximately 79 percent of functional population and nonresidential development accounts for the remaining 21 percent.

Figure F1: Proportionate Share

Demand Units in 2021				
Residential				
Population	14,291		Demand Hours/Day	Person Hours
Residents Not Working	8,607		20	172,140
Employed Residents	5,684			
Employed in Coolidge		689	14	9,646
Employed outside Coolidge		4,995	14	69,930
			Residential Subtotal	251,716
			Residential Share	79%
Nonresidential				
Non-working Residents	8,607		4	34,428
Jobs Located in Coolidge	3,106			
Residents Employed in Coolidge		689	10	6,890
Non-Resident Workers (inflow commuters)		2,417	10	24,170
			Nonresidential Subtotal	65,488
			Nonresidential Share	21%
			Total	317,204

Source: Arizona Office of Economic Opportunity (population), U.S. Census Bureau, OnTheMap Application and LEHD Origin-Destination Employment Statistics, Version 6.8.1 (employment).

The proportionate share of costs attributable to residential development will be allocated to population and then converted to an appropriate amount by type of housing unit. Since nonresidential calls for service were unavailable by specific nonresidential use, TischlerBise recommends using vehicle trips as the demand indicator for nonresidential demand for fire infrastructure. Trip generation rates are used for nonresidential development because vehicle trips are highest for commercial developments, such as shopping centers, and lowest for industrial development. Office and institutional trip rates fall between the other two categories. This ranking of trip rates is consistent with the relative demand for fire infrastructure from nonresidential development.

SERVICE AREA

Coolidge’s Fire Department strives to provide a uniform response time within the city limits; therefore, there is a single service area for the Fire Facilities IIP.

RATIO OF SERVICE UNIT TO DEVELOPMENT UNIT

ARS § 9-463.05(E)(4) requires:

“A table establishing the specific level or quantity of use, consumption, generation or discharge of a service unit for each category of necessary public services or facility expansions and an equivalency or conversion table establishing the ratio of a service unit to various types of land uses, including residential, commercial and industrial.”

Figure F2 displays the demand indicators for residential and nonresidential land uses. For residential development, the table displays the number of persons per housing unit. For nonresidential development, the table displays the average weekday vehicle trips per thousand square feet of floor area.

Figure F2: Ratio of Service Unit to Development Unit

Residential Development	
Development Type	Persons per Housing Unit ¹
Single Family	2.94
Multi-Family	2.34

Nonresidential Development			
Development Type	AWVTE per 1,000 Sq Ft ¹	Trip Rate Adjustment	AWVT per 1,000 Sq Ft ¹
Industrial	4.75	50%	2.38
Commercial	37.01	33%	12.21
Office & Other Services	10.84	50%	5.42
Institutional	22.59	33%	7.45

1. See Land Use Assumptions

ANALYSIS OF CAPACITY, USAGE, AND COSTS OF EXISTING PUBLIC SERVICES

ARS § 9-463.05(E)(1) requires:

“A description of the existing necessary public services in the service area and the costs to upgrade, update, improve, expand, correct or replace those necessary public services to meet existing needs and usage and stricter safety, efficiency, environmental or regulatory standards, which shall be prepared by qualified professionals licensed in this state, as applicable.”

ARS § 9-463.05(E)(2) requires:

“An analysis of the total capacity, the level of current usage and commitments for usage of capacity of the existing necessary public services, which shall be prepared by qualified professionals licensed in this state, as applicable.”

Fire Facilities – Incremental Expansion

Coolidge currently provides 10,528 square feet of fire facilities to existing development, and Coolidge plans to construct additional fire facilities to serve future development.

To allocate the proportionate share of demand for fire facilities to residential and nonresidential development, this analysis uses functional population shown in Figure F1. Coolidge’s existing level of service for residential development is 0.4332 square feet per person (10,528 square feet X 79 percent residential share / 19,200 persons). The nonresidential level of service is 0.1406 square feet per vehicle trip (10,528 square feet X 21 percent nonresidential share / 15,719 vehicle trips).

Coolidge Fire Department provided a cost estimate for new facilities that is \$950 per square foot. For fire facilities, the cost is \$411.52 per person (0.4332 square feet per person X \$950 per square foot) and \$133.62 per vehicle trip (0.1406 square feet per vehicle trip X \$950 per square foot).

Figure F3: Existing Level of Service

Description	Square Feet
Station 1	7,047
Station 2	3,481
Total	10,528

Source: Coolidge Fire Department

Cost Factors	
Cost per Square Foot	\$950

Level-of-Service (LOS) Standards	
Existing Square Feet	10,528
Residential	
Residential Share	79%
2024 Population	19,200
Square Feet per Person	0.4332
Cost per Person	\$411.52
Nonresidential	
Nonresidential Share	21%
2024 Trips	15,719
Square Feet per Trip	0.1406
Cost per Trip	\$133.62

Source: Coolidge Fire Department

Fire Apparatus – Incremental Expansion

Coolidge currently serves existing development with 8 fire apparatus, and Coolidge plans to acquire additional fire apparatus to serve future development. The replacement cost of the existing fleet is \$6,080,000.

To allocate the proportionate share of demand for fire apparatus to residential and nonresidential development, this analysis uses functional population outlined in Figure F1. Coolidge’s existing level of service for residential development is 0.0003 units per person (8 units X 79 percent residential share / 19,200 persons). The nonresidential level of service is 0.0001 units per vehicle trip (8 units X 23 percent nonresidential share / 15,719 vehicle trips).

Based on the total cost of Coolidge’s existing fire apparatus, the weighted average cost for a new fire apparatus is \$760,000 per unit (\$6,080,000 total cost / 8 units). For fire apparatus, the cost is \$250.17 per person (0.0003 units per person X \$760,000 per unit) and \$81.23 per vehicle trip (0.0001 units per vehicle trip X \$760,000 per unit).

Figure F4: Existing Level of Service

Description	Units	Unit Cost	Total Cost
Pumper	3	\$900,000	\$2,700,000
Aerial	1	\$2,500,000	\$2,500,000
Water Tender	1	\$500,000	\$500,000
Brush Truck	1	\$200,000	\$200,000
Command Vehicle	2	\$90,000	\$180,000
Total	8	\$760,000	\$6,080,000

Source: Coolidge Fire Department

Cost Factors	
Weighted Average per Unit	\$760,000

Level-of-Service (LOS) Standards	
Existing Units	8
Residential	
Residential Share	79%
2024 Population	19,200
Units per Person	0.0003
Cost per Person	\$250.17
Nonresidential	
Nonresidential Share	21%
2024 Trips	15,719
Units per Trip	0.0001
Cost per Trip	\$81.23

Source: Coolidge Fire Department

Development Fee Report – Plan-Based

The cost to prepare the Fire Facilities IIP and related development fee report totals \$8,808. Coolidge plans to update its report every five years. Based on this cost, proportionate share, and five-year projections of future development from the *Land Use Assumptions* document, the cost is \$0.70 per person and \$0.50 per vehicle trip.

Figure F5: IIP and Development Fee Report

Necessary Public Service	Cost	Proportionate Share		Service Unit	5-Year Change	Cost per Service Unit
Fire	\$8,808	Residential	79%	Population	9,880	\$0.70
		Nonresidential	21%	Trips	3,665	\$0.50
Parks and Recreational	\$8,808	Residential	92%	Population	9,880	\$0.82
		Nonresidential	8%	Jobs	2,128	\$0.33
Police	\$8,808	Residential	79%	Population	9,880	\$0.70
		Nonresidential	21%	Trips	3,665	\$0.50
Street	\$17,616	All	100%	VMT	68,167	\$0.26
Wastewater	\$14,680	All	100%	Gallons	672,077	\$0.02
Total	\$58,720					

PROJECTED DEMAND FOR SERVICES AND COSTS

ARS § 9-463.05(E)(5) requires:

“The total number of projected service units necessitated by and attributable to new /development in the service area based on the approved land use assumptions and calculated pursuant to generally accepted engineering and planning criteria.”

ARS § 9-463.05(E)(6) requires:

“The projected demand for necessary public services or facility expansions required by new service units for a period not to exceed ten years.”

As shown in the *Land Use Assumptions* document, Coolidge’s population is expected to increase by 26,000 persons and nonresidential vehicle trips are expected to increase by 10,049 over the next 10 years. To maintain the existing level of service, Coolidge will need to construct 12,676 square feet of fire facilities, and expand the apparatus fleet by approximately 10 units over the next 10 years. The following pages include a more detailed projection of demand for services and costs for the Fire Facilities IIP.

Fire Facilities – Incremental Expansion

Coolidge plans to maintain its level of service for fire facilities over the next 10 years. Based on a projected population increase of 26,000 persons, future residential development demands approximately 11,263 square feet of fire facilities (26,000 additional persons X 0.4332 square feet per person). With projected nonresidential trip growth of 10,049 trips, future nonresidential development demands approximately 1,413 square feet of fire facilities (10,049 additional trips X 0.1406 square feet per trip). Future development demands approximately 12,676 square feet of fire facilities at a cost of \$12,024,361 (12,676 square feet X \$950 per square foot). Coolidge may use development fees to construct additional fire facilities.

Figure F6: Projected Demand

Type of Infrastructure	Level of Service	Demand Unit	Cost per Sq Ft
Fire Facilities	0.4332 Square Feet	per Person	\$950
	0.1406 Square Feet	per Trip	

Demand for Fire Facilities					
Year	Population	Trips	Square Feet		
			Residential	Nonresidential	Total
2024	19,200	15,719	8,317	2,211	10,528
2025	20,600	16,452	8,924	2,314	11,238
2026	22,720	17,185	9,842	2,417	12,259
2027	24,840	17,918	10,760	2,520	13,280
2028	26,960	18,651	11,679	2,623	14,302
2029	29,080	19,384	12,597	2,726	15,323
2030	31,200	20,117	13,515	2,829	16,345
2031	34,700	21,530	15,031	3,028	18,060
2032	38,200	22,942	16,548	3,227	19,774
2033	41,700	24,355	18,064	3,426	21,489
2034	45,200	25,768	19,580	3,624	23,204
10-Yr Increase	26,000	10,049	11,263	1,413	12,676

Growth-Related Expenditures	\$10,699,628	\$1,342,732	\$12,042,361
-----------------------------	--------------	-------------	--------------

Fire Apparatus – Incremental Expansion

Coolidge plans to maintain its level of service for fire apparatus over the next 10 years. Based on a projected population increase of 26,000 persons, future residential development demands approximately 8.6 fire apparatus (26,000 additional persons X 0.0003 units per person). With projected nonresidential vehicle trip growth of 10,049 trips, future nonresidential development demands approximately 1.1 fire apparatus (10,049 additional trips X 0.0001 units per trip). Future development demands approximately 9.6 fire apparatus at a cost of \$7,320,584 (9.6 units X \$760,000 per unit). Coolidge may use development fees to expand its fire apparatus fleet.

Figure F7: Projected Demand

Type of Infrastructure	Level of Service	Demand Unit	Cost per Unit
Fire Apparatus	0.0003 Units	per Person	\$760,000
	0.0001 Units	per Trip	

Demand for Fire Apparatus					
Year	Population	Trips	Units		
			Residential	Nonresidential	Total
2024	19,200	15,719	6.3	1.7	8.0
2025	20,600	16,452	6.8	1.8	8.5
2026	22,720	17,185	7.5	1.8	9.3
2027	24,840	17,918	8.2	1.9	10.1
2028	26,960	18,651	8.9	2.0	10.9
2029	29,080	19,384	9.6	2.1	11.6
2030	31,200	20,117	10.3	2.2	12.4
2031	34,700	21,530	11.4	2.3	13.7
2032	38,200	22,942	12.6	2.5	15.0
2033	41,700	24,355	13.7	2.6	16.3
2034	45,200	25,768	14.9	2.8	17.6
10-Yr Increase	26,000	10,049	8.6	1.1	9.6

Growth-Related Expenditures	\$6,504,333	\$816,251	\$7,320,584
-----------------------------	-------------	-----------	-------------

FIRE FACILITIES DEVELOPMENT FEES

Revenue Credit/Offset

A revenue credit/offset is necessary for development fees, because Coolidge’s construction transaction privilege tax rate exceeds the amount of the transaction privilege tax rate imposed on the majority of other transaction privilege tax classifications. Coolidge will apply the entire revenue credit/offset to fire, parks and recreation, and police facilities fees. Appendix A contains the forecast of revenues required by Arizona’s Enabling Legislation (ARS § 9-463.05(E)(7)).

Fire Facilities Development Fees

Infrastructure components and cost factors for fire facilities are summarized in the upper portion of Figure F8. The cost per service unit for fire facilities is \$550.39 per person and \$135.08 per trip.

Fire facilities development fees for residential development are assessed according to the number of persons per housing unit. The fee of \$1,618 for a single-family unit is calculated using a cost per service unit of \$550.39 per person multiplied by a demand unit of 2.94 persons per housing unit.

Nonresidential development fees are calculated using average weekday vehicle trips as the service unit. The fee of \$321 per 1,000 square feet of industrial development is derived from a cost per service unit of \$135.08 per vehicle trip multiplied by a demand unit of 2.38 AWWTE per 1,000 square feet.

Figure F8: Fire Facilities Development Fees

Fee Component	Cost per Person	Cost per Trip
Fire Facilities	\$411.52	\$133.62
Fire Apparatus	\$250.17	\$81.23
Development Fee Report	\$0.70	\$0.50
Sub-Total	\$662.40	\$215.35
Excess Construction Sales Tax	(\$112.00)	(\$80.26)
Total	\$550.39	\$135.08

Residential Fees per Unit				
Development Type	Persons per Housing Unit ¹	Proposed Fees	Current Fees	Difference
Single Family	2.94	\$1,618	\$426	\$1,192
Multi-Family	2.34	\$1,288	\$361	\$927

Nonresidential Fees per 1,000 Square Feet				
Development Type	Trips per 1,000 Sq Ft ¹	Proposed Fees	Current Fees	Difference
Industrial	2.38	\$321	\$130	\$191
Commercial	12.21	\$1,650	\$825	\$825
Office & Other Services	5.42	\$732	\$322	\$410
Institutional	7.45	\$1,007	\$322	\$685

1. See Land Use Assumptions

FIRE FACILITIES DEVELOPMENT FEE REVENUE

Appendix A contains the forecast of revenues required by Arizona’s enabling legislation (ARS § 9-463.05(E)(7)). In accordance with state law, this report includes an IIP for fire facilities needed to accommodate future development. Projected fee revenue shown in Figure F9 is based on the development projections in the *Land Use Assumptions* document and the updated fire facilities development fees. If development occurs at a more rapid rate than projected, the demand for infrastructure will increase and development fee revenue will increase at a corresponding rate. If development occurs at a slower rate than projected, the demand for infrastructure will also decrease, along with development fee revenue. Projected development fee revenue equals \$15,667,210 and projected expenditures equals \$17,971,004.

Figure F9: Fire Facilities Development Fee Revenue

Fee Component	Growth Share	Existing Share	Total
Fire Facilities	\$12,042,361	\$0	\$12,042,361
Fire Apparatus	\$7,320,584	\$0	\$7,320,584
Development Fee Report	\$8,808	\$0	\$8,808
Excess Construction Sales Tax	(\$1,400,749)	\$0	(\$1,400,749)
Total	\$17,971,004	\$0	\$17,971,004

		Single Family \$1,618 per unit	Multi-Family \$1,288 per unit	Industrial \$321 per 1,000 sq ft	Commercial \$1,650 per 1,000 sq ft	Office & Other \$732 per 1,000 sq ft	Institutional \$1,007 per 1,000 sq ft
Year		Hsg Unit	Hsg Unit	KSF	KSF	KSF	KSF
Base	2024	5,723	1,014	988	577	387	567
Year 1	2025	6,140	1,088	1,149	587	393	593
Year 2	2026	6,772	1,200	1,310	597	399	619
Year 3	2027	7,404	1,312	1,472	607	405	646
Year 4	2028	8,036	1,424	1,633	617	411	672
Year 5	2029	8,668	1,536	1,794	627	417	699
Year 6	2030	9,300	1,649	1,955	637	423	725
Year 7	2031	10,343	1,833	2,044	708	429	765
Year 8	2032	11,387	2,018	2,133	779	435	806
Year 9	2033	12,430	2,203	2,221	850	440	846
Year 10	2034	13,473	2,388	2,310	921	446	886
10-Year Increase		7,750	1,374	1,322	344	59	320
Projected Revenue		\$12,540,901	\$1,769,289	\$424,202	\$567,541	\$43,197	\$322,080

Projected Fee Revenue	\$15,667,210
Total Expenditures	\$17,971,004

PARKS AND RECREATIONAL FACILITIES IIP

ARS § 9-463.05 (T)(7)(g) defines the facilities and assets that can be included in the Parks and Recreational Facilities IIP:

“Neighborhood parks and recreational facilities on real property up to thirty acres in area, or parks and recreational facilities larger than thirty acres if the facilities provide a direct benefit to the development. Park and recreational facilities do not include vehicles, equipment or that portion of any facility that is used for amusement parks, aquariums, aquatic centers, auditoriums, arenas, arts and cultural facilities, bandstand and orchestra facilities, bathhouses, boathouses, clubhouses, community centers greater than three thousand square feet in floor area, environmental education centers, equestrian facilities, golf course facilities, greenhouses, lakes, museums, theme parks, water reclamation or riparian areas, wetlands, zoo facilities or similar recreational facilities, but may include swimming pools.”

The Parks and Recreational Facilities IIP includes components for park amenities, and the cost of preparing the Parks and Recreational Facilities IIP and related Development Fee Report. The incremental expansion methodology is used for park amenities. The plan-based methodology is used for the Development Fee Report.

PROPORTIONATE SHARE

ARS § 9-463.05 (B)(3) states that the development fee shall not exceed a proportionate share of the cost of necessary public services needed to accommodate new development. The Parks and Recreational Facilities IIP and development fees allocate the cost of necessary public services between residential and nonresidential based on functional population. The Arizona Office of Economic Opportunity estimates Coolidge’s 2021 population equal to 14,291 persons. Based on 2021 estimates from the U.S. Census Bureau’s OnTheMap web application, 2,417 inflow commuters traveled to Coolidge for work in 2021. The proportionate share is based on cumulative impact hours per year with a resident potentially impacting parks and recreational facilities 8,760 hours per year and an inflow commuter potentially impacting parks and recreational facilities 1,600 hours per year. For parks and recreational facilities, residential development generates 92 percent of demand and nonresidential development generates the remaining eight percent of demand.

Figure PR1: Proportionate Share

Development Type	Service Unit	Impact Days per Year	Cumulative Impact Days per Year	Proportionate Share
Residential	14,291 residents ¹	365	5,216,215	92%
Nonresidential	2,417 inflow commuters	200	483,400	8%
Total			5,699,615	100%

1. Arizona Office of Economic Opportunity, 2021

2. U.S. Census Bureau, OnTheMap Application and LEHD Origin-Destination Employment Statistics, Version 6.8.1, 2021

Residential Impact: 24 hours per day X 365 days per year

Nonresidential Impact: 8 hours per day X 4 days per week X 50 weeks per year

SERVICE AREA

Coolidge provides parks and recreation facilities to all development within the city limits; therefore, there is a citywide service area for the Parks and Recreational Facilities IIP.

RATIO OF SERVICE UNIT TO DEVELOPMENT UNIT

ARS § 9-463.05(E)(4) requires:

“A table establishing the specific level or quantity of use, consumption, generation or discharge of a service unit for each category of necessary public services or facility expansions and an equivalency or conversion table establishing the ratio of a service unit to various types of land uses, including residential, commercial and industrial.”

Figure PR2 displays the demand indicators for residential and nonresidential land uses. For residential development, the table displays the number of persons per housing unit. For nonresidential development, the table displays the number of employees per thousand square feet of floor area.

Figure PR2: Ratio of Service Unit to Development Unit

Residential Development	
Development Type	Persons per Housing Unit ¹
Single Family	2.94
Multi-Family	2.34

Nonresidential Development	
Development Type	Jobs per 1,000 Sq Ft ¹
Industrial	1.89
Commercial	2.12
Office & Other Services	3.26
Institutional	3.03

1. See Land Use Assumptions

ANALYSIS OF CAPACITY, USAGE, AND COSTS OF EXISTING PUBLIC SERVICES

ARS § 9-463.05(E)(1) requires:

“A description of the existing necessary public services in the service area and the costs to upgrade, update, improve, expand, correct or replace those necessary public services to meet existing needs and usage and stricter safety, efficiency, environmental or regulatory standards, which shall be prepared by qualified professionals licensed in this state, as applicable.”

ARS § 9-463.05(E)(2) requires:

“An analysis of the total capacity, the level of current usage and commitments for usage of capacity of the existing necessary public services, which shall be prepared by qualified professionals licensed in this state, as applicable.”

Park Amenities – Incremental Expansion

Coolidge currently provides 236 park amenities in its existing parks and plans to construct additional park amenities to serve future development. Based on cost estimates, the total cost of Coolidge’s existing park amenities is \$10,522,290.

To allocate the proportionate share of demand for park amenities to residential and nonresidential development, this analysis uses the proportionate share shown in Figure PR1. Coolidge’s existing LOS for residential development is 0.01131 units per person (236 units X 92 percent residential share / 19,200 persons). For nonresidential development, the existing LOS is 0.00311 units per job (236 units X eight percent nonresidential share / 6,075 jobs).

Based on the total cost of Coolidge’s existing park amenities, the weighted average cost for park amenities is \$44,586 per unit (\$10,522,290 total cost / 236 units). For park amenities, the cost is \$504.19 per person (0.01131 units per person X \$44,586 per unit) and \$138.56 per job (0.00311 units per job X \$44,586 per unit).

Figure PR3: Existing Level of Service

Description	Units	Unit Cost	Total Cost
Pavilions	1	\$72,000	\$72,000
Bathrooms	3	\$450,000	\$1,350,000
Playgrounds	7	\$500,000	\$3,500,000
Basketball Courts	5	\$85,000	\$425,000
Baseball Fields	5	\$717,158	\$3,585,790
Soccer Fields	1	\$252,000	\$252,000
Parking Spaces	214	\$6,250	\$1,337,500
Total	236	\$44,586	\$10,522,290

Cost Factors	
Weighted Average per Unit	\$44,586

Level-of-Service (LOS) Standards	
Existing Units	236
Residential	
Residential Share	92%
2024 Population	19,200
Units per Person	0.01131
Cost per Person	\$504.19
Nonresidential	
Nonresidential Share	8%
2024 Jobs	6,075
Units per Job	0.00311
Cost per Job	\$138.56

Source: Coolidge Parks and Recreation Department

Development Fee Report – Plan-Based

The cost to prepare the Parks and Recreational Facilities IIP and development fees totals \$8,808. Coolidge plans to update its report every five years. Based on this cost, proportionate share, and five-year projections of new development from the *Land Use Assumptions* document, the cost is \$0.82 per person and \$0.33 per job.

Figure PR4: IIP and Development Fee Report

Necessary Public Service	Cost	Proportionate Share		Service Unit	5-Year Change	Cost per Service Unit
Fire	\$8,808	Residential	79%	Population	9,880	\$0.70
		Nonresidential	21%	Trips	3,665	\$0.50
Parks and Recreational	\$8,808	Residential	92%	Population	9,880	\$0.82
		Nonresidential	8%	Jobs	2,128	\$0.33
Police	\$8,808	Residential	79%	Population	9,880	\$0.70
		Nonresidential	21%	Trips	3,665	\$0.50
Street	\$17,616	All	100%	VMT	68,167	\$0.26
Wastewater	\$14,680	All	100%	Gallons	672,077	\$0.02
Total	\$58,720					

PROJECTED DEMAND FOR SERVICES AND COSTS

ARS § 9-463.05(E)(5) requires:

“The total number of projected service units necessitated by and attributable to new development in the service area based on the approved land use assumptions and calculated pursuant to generally accepted engineering and planning criteria.”

ARS § 9-463.05(E)(6) requires:

“The projected demand for necessary public services or facility expansions required by new service units for a period not to exceed ten years.”

As shown in the *Land Use Assumptions* document, Coolidge’s population is expected to increase by 26,000 persons and employment is expected to increase by 4,396 jobs over the next 10 years. To maintain the existing levels of service, Coolidge will need to construct approximately 308 park amenities. The following pages include a more detailed projection of demand for services and costs for the Parks and Recreational Facilities IIP.

Park Amenities – Incremental Expansion

Coolidge plans to maintain its existing level of service for park amenities over the next 10 years. Based on a projected population increase of 26,000 persons, future residential development demands an additional 294 park amenities (26,000 additional persons X 0.01131 amenities per person). With projected employment growth of 4,396 jobs, future nonresidential development demands approximately 13.7 park amenities (4,396 additional jobs X 0.00311 amenities per job). Future development demands 307.7 additional park amenities at a cost of \$13,718,167 (307.7 amenities X \$44,586 per amenity). Coolidge may use development fees to construct additional park amenities in existing and future parks.

Figure PR5: Projected Demand

Type of Infrastructure	Level of Service	Demand Unit	Cost per Unit
Park Amenities	0.01131 Units	per Person	\$44,586
	0.00311 Units	per Job	

Demand for Park Amenities					
Year	Population	Jobs	Units		
			Residential	Nonresidential	Total
2024	19,200	6,075	217.1	18.9	236.0
2025	20,600	6,501	233.0	20.2	253.2
2026	22,720	6,927	256.9	21.5	278.5
2027	24,840	7,352	280.9	22.8	303.7
2028	26,960	7,778	304.9	24.2	329.0
2029	29,080	8,203	328.8	25.5	354.3
2030	31,200	8,629	352.8	26.8	379.6
2031	34,700	9,090	392.4	28.2	420.6
2032	38,200	9,550	432.0	29.7	461.7
2033	41,700	10,011	471.6	31.1	502.7
2034	45,200	10,472	511.1	32.5	543.7
10-Yr Increase	26,000	4,396	294.0	13.7	307.7

Growth-Related Expenditures	\$13,109,020	\$609,148	\$13,718,167
-----------------------------	--------------	-----------	--------------

PARKS AND RECREATIONAL FACILITIES DEVELOPMENT FEES

Revenue Credit/Offset

A revenue credit/offset is necessary for development fees, because Coolidge’s construction transaction privilege tax rate exceeds the amount of the transaction privilege tax rate imposed on the majority of other transaction privilege tax classifications. Coolidge will apply the entire revenue credit/offset to fire, parks and recreation, and police facilities fees. Appendix A contains the forecast of revenues required by Arizona’s Enabling Legislation (ARS § 9-463.05(E)(7)).

Parks and Recreational Facilities Development Fees

Infrastructure components and cost factors for parks and recreational facilities are summarized in the upper portion of Figure PR6. The cost per service unit is \$412.60 per person and \$101.58 per job.

Parks and recreational facilities fees for residential development are assessed according to the number of persons per housing unit. The fee of \$1,213 for a single-family unit is calculated using a cost per service unit of \$412.60 per person multiplied by a demand unit of 2.94 persons per housing unit.

Nonresidential development fees are calculated using jobs as the service unit. The fee of \$192 per 1,000 square feet of industrial development is derived from a cost per service unit of \$101.58 per job multiplied by a demand unit of 1.89 jobs per 1,000 square feet.

Figure PR6: Parks and Recreational Facilities Development Fees

Fee Component	Cost per Person	Cost per Job
Park Amenities	\$504.19	\$138.56
Development Fee Report	\$0.82	\$0.33
Sub-Total	\$505.01	\$138.89
Excess Construction Sales Tax	(\$92.41)	(\$37.31)
Total	\$412.60	\$101.58

Residential Fees per Unit				
Development Type	Persons per Housing Unit ¹	Proposed Fees	Current Fees	Difference
Single Family	2.94	\$1,213	\$1,058	\$155
Multi-Family	2.34	\$965	\$896	\$69

Nonresidential Fees per 1,000 Square Feet				
Development Type	Jobs per 1,000 Sq Ft ¹	Proposed Fees	Current Fees	Difference
Industrial	1.89	\$192	\$243	(\$51)
Commercial	2.12	\$215	\$358	(\$143)
Office & Other Services	3.26	\$331	\$454	(\$123)
Institutional	3.03	\$308	\$454	(\$146)

1. See Land Use Assumptions

PARKS AND RECREATIONAL FACILITIES DEVELOPMENT FEE REVENUE

Appendix A contains the forecast of revenues required by Arizona’s Enabling Legislation (ARS § 9-463.05(E)(7)).

In accordance with state law, this report includes an IIP for parks and recreational facilities needed to accommodate new development. Projected fee revenue shown in Figure PR7 is based on the development projections in the *Land Use Assumptions* document and the updated development fees for parks and recreational facilities shown in Figure PR6. If development occurs at a more rapid rate than projected, the demand for infrastructure will increase and development fee revenue will increase at a corresponding rate. If development occurs at a slower rate than projected, the demand for infrastructure will also decrease, along with development fee revenue. Projected development fee revenue equals \$11,173,794, and projected expenditures equal \$12,734,579.

Figure PR7: Parks and Recreational Facilities Development Fee Revenue

Fee Component	Growth Share	Existing Share	Total
Park Amenities	\$13,718,167	\$0	\$13,718,167
Development Fee Report	\$8,808	\$0	\$8,808
Excess Construction Sales Tax	(\$992,396)	\$0	(\$992,396)
Total	\$12,734,579	\$0	\$12,734,579

		Single Family \$1,213 per unit	Multi-Family \$965 per unit	Industrial \$192 per 1,000 sq ft	Commercial \$215 per 1,000 sq ft	Office & Other \$331 per 1,000 sq ft	Institutional \$308 per 1,000 sq ft
Year		Hsg Unit	Hsg Unit	KSF	KSF	KSF	KSF
Base	2024	5,723	1,014	988	577	387	567
Year 1	2025	6,140	1,088	1,149	587	393	593
Year 2	2026	6,772	1,200	1,310	597	399	619
Year 3	2027	7,404	1,312	1,472	607	405	646
Year 4	2028	8,036	1,424	1,633	617	411	672
Year 5	2029	8,668	1,536	1,794	627	417	699
Year 6	2030	9,300	1,649	1,955	637	423	725
Year 7	2031	10,343	1,833	2,044	708	429	765
Year 8	2032	11,387	2,018	2,133	779	435	806
Year 9	2033	12,430	2,203	2,221	850	440	846
Year 10	2034	13,473	2,388	2,310	921	446	886
10-Year Increase		7,750	1,374	1,322	344	59	320
Projected Revenue		\$9,401,345	\$1,326,588	\$253,803	\$74,080	\$19,538	\$98,441

Projected Fee Revenue	\$11,173,794
Total Expenditures	\$12,734,579

POLICE FACILITIES

ARS § 9-463.05 (T)(7)(f) defines the eligible facilities and assets for the Police Facilities IIP:

“Fire and police facilities, including all appurtenances, equipment and vehicles. Fire and police facilities do not include a facility or portion of a facility that is used to replace services that were once provided elsewhere in the municipality, vehicles and equipment used to provide administrative services, helicopters or airplanes or a facility that is used for training firefighters or officers from more than one station or substation.”

The Police Facilities IIP includes components for Police facilities, Police vehicles, and the cost of preparing the Police Facilities IIP and related development fee report. The incremental expansion methodology is used for Police facilities and Police vehicles. The plan-based methodology is used for the development fee report.

PROPORTIONATE SHARE

ARS § 9-463.05 (B)(3) states that the development fee shall not exceed a proportionate share of the cost of necessary public services needed to accommodate new development. The Police Facilities IIP and development fees will allocate the cost of Police services between residential and nonresidential based on functional population. Based on 2021 estimates from the U.S. Census Bureau’s OnTheMap web application, residential development accounts for approximately 79 percent of functional population and nonresidential development accounts for the remaining 21 percent.

Figure P1: Proportionate Share

Demand Units in 2021				
Residential				
Population	14,291		Demand Hours/Day	Person Hours
Residents Not Working	8,607		20	172,140
Employed Residents	5,684			
Employed in Coolidge		689	14	9,646
Employed outside Coolidge		4,995	14	69,930
			Residential Subtotal	251,716
			Residential Share	79%
Nonresidential				
Non-working Residents	8,607		4	34,428
Jobs Located in Coolidge	3,106			
Residents Employed in Coolidge		689	10	6,890
Non-Resident Workers (inflow commuters)		2,417	10	24,170
			Nonresidential Subtotal	65,488
			Nonresidential Share	21%
			Total	317,204

Source: Arizona Office of Economic Opportunity (population), U.S. Census Bureau, OnTheMap Application and LEHD Origin-Destination Employment Statistics, Version 6.8.1 (employment).

The proportionate share of costs attributable to residential development will be allocated to population and then converted to an appropriate amount by type of housing unit. Since nonresidential calls for service were unavailable by specific nonresidential use, TischlerBise recommends using vehicle trips as the demand indicator for nonresidential demand for Police infrastructure. Trip generation rates are used for nonresidential development because vehicle trips are highest for commercial developments, such as shopping centers, and lowest for industrial development. Office and institutional trip rates fall between the other two categories. This ranking of trip rates is consistent with the relative demand for Police infrastructure from nonresidential development.

SERVICE AREA

Coolidge’s Police Department strives to provide a uniform response time within the city limits; therefore, there is a single service area for the Police Facilities IIP.

RATIO OF SERVICE UNIT TO DEVELOPMENT UNIT

ARS § 9-463.05(E)(4) requires:

“A table establishing the specific level or quantity of use, consumption, generation or discharge of a service unit for each category of necessary public services or facility expansions and an equivalency or conversion table establishing the ratio of a service unit to various types of land uses, including residential, commercial and industrial.”

Figure P2 displays the demand indicators for residential and nonresidential land uses. For residential development, the table displays the number of persons per housing unit. For nonresidential development, the table displays the average weekday vehicle trips per thousand square feet of floor area.

Figure P2: Ratio of Service Unit to Development Unit

Residential Development	
Development Type	Persons per Housing Unit ¹
Single Family	2.94
Multi-Family	2.34

Nonresidential Development			
Development Type	AWVTE per 1,000 Sq Ft ¹	Trip Rate Adjustment	AWVT per 1,000 Sq Ft ¹
Industrial	4.75	50%	2.38
Commercial	37.01	33%	12.21
Office & Other Services	10.84	50%	5.42
Institutional	22.59	33%	7.45

1. See Land Use Assumptions

ANALYSIS OF CAPACITY, USAGE, AND COSTS OF EXISTING PUBLIC SERVICES

ARS § 9-463.05(E)(1) requires:

“A description of the existing necessary public services in the service area and the costs to upgrade, update, improve, expand, correct or replace those necessary public services to meet existing needs and usage and stricter safety, efficiency, environmental or regulatory standards, which shall be prepared by qualified professionals licensed in this state, as applicable.”

ARS § 9-463.05(E)(2) requires:

“An analysis of the total capacity, the level of current usage and commitments for usage of capacity of the existing necessary public services, which shall be prepared by qualified professionals licensed in this state, as applicable.”

Police Facilities – Incremental Expansion

Coolidge currently provides 16,000 square feet of Police facilities to existing development, and Coolidge plans to construct additional Police facilities to serve future development.

To allocate the proportionate share of demand for Police facilities to residential and nonresidential development, this analysis uses functional population shown in Figure P1. Coolidge’s existing level of service for residential development is 0.6583 square feet per person (16,000 square feet X 79 percent residential share / 19,200 persons). The nonresidential level of service is 0.2138 square feet per vehicle trip (16,000 square feet X 21 percent nonresidential share / 15,719 vehicle trips).

Coolidge Police Department indicated that future police facilities will cost \$750 per square feet to construct. For Police facilities, the cost is \$493.75 per person (0.6583 square feet per person X \$750 per square foot) and \$160.32 per vehicle trip (0.2138 square feet per vehicle trip X \$750 per square foot).

Figure P3: Existing Level of Service

Description	Square Feet
Police Station 204	16,000
Total	16,000

Source: Coolidge Police Department

Cost Factors	
Cost per Square Foot	\$750

Level-of-Service (LOS) Standards	
Existing Square Feet	16,000
Residential	
Residential Share	79%
2024 Population	19,200
Square Feet per Person	0.6583
Cost per Person	\$493.75
Nonresidential	
Nonresidential Share	21%
2024 Trips	15,719
Square Feet per Trip	0.2138
Cost per Trip	\$160.32

Source: Coolidge Police Department

Police Vehicles – Incremental Expansion

Coolidge currently serves existing development with 38 Police vehicles, and Coolidge plans to acquire additional Police vehicles to serve future development. The replacement cost of the existing fleet is \$4,500,000.

To allocate the proportionate share of demand for Police vehicles to residential and nonresidential development, this analysis uses functional population outlined in Figure P1. Coolidge’s existing level of service for residential development is 0.0016 units per person (38 units X 79 percent residential share / 19,200 persons). The nonresidential level of service is 0.0005 units per vehicle trip (38 units X 21 percent nonresidential share / 15,719 vehicle trips).

Based on the total cost of Coolidge’s existing Police vehicles, the weighted average cost for a new Police vehicle is \$118,421 per unit (\$4,500,000 total cost / 38 units). For Police vehicles, the cost is \$185.16 per person (0.0016 units per person X \$118,421 per unit) and \$60.12 per vehicle trip (0.0005 units per vehicle trip X \$118,421 per unit).

Figure P4: Existing Level of Service

Description	Units	Unit Cost	Total Cost
Patrol Vehicles	34	\$120,000	\$4,080,000
Investigations Vehicles	4	\$105,000	\$420,000
Total	38	\$118,421	\$4,500,000

Source: Coolidge Police Department

Cost Factors	
Weighted Average per Unit	\$118,421

Level-of-Service (LOS) Standards	
Existing Units	38
Residential	
Residential Share	79%
2024 Population	19,200
Units per Person	0.0016
Cost per Person	\$185.16
Nonresidential	
Nonresidential Share	21%
2024 Trips	15,719
Units per Trip	0.0005
Cost per Trip	\$60.12

Source: Coolidge Police Department

Development Fee Report – Plan-Based

The cost to prepare the Police Facilities IIP and related development fee report totals \$8,808. Coolidge plans to update its report every five years. Based on this cost, proportionate share, and five-year projections of future development from the *Land Use Assumptions* document, the cost is \$0.70 per person and \$0.50 per vehicle trip.

Figure F10: IIP and Development Fee Report

Necessary Public Service	Cost	Proportionate Share		Service Unit	5-Year Change	Cost per Service Unit
Fire	\$8,808	Residential	79%	Population	9,880	\$0.70
		Nonresidential	21%	Trips	3,665	\$0.50
Parks and Recreational	\$8,808	Residential	92%	Population	9,880	\$0.82
		Nonresidential	8%	Jobs	2,128	\$0.33
Police	\$8,808	Residential	79%	Population	9,880	\$0.70
		Nonresidential	21%	Trips	3,665	\$0.50
Street	\$17,616	All	100%	VMT	68,167	\$0.26
Wastewater	\$14,680	All	100%	Gallons	672,077	\$0.02
Total	\$58,720					

PROJECTED DEMAND FOR SERVICES AND COSTS

ARS § 9-463.05(E)(5) requires:

“The total number of projected service units necessitated by and attributable to new /development in the service area based on the approved land use assumptions and calculated pursuant to generally accepted engineering and planning criteria.”

ARS § 9-463.05(E)(6) requires:

“The projected demand for necessary public services or facility expansions required by new service units for a period not to exceed ten years.”

As shown in the *Land Use Assumptions* document, Coolidge’s population is expected to increase by 26,000 persons and nonresidential vehicle trips are expected to increase by 10,049 over the next 10 years. To maintain the existing level of service, Coolidge will need to construct 19,265 square feet of Police facilities, and expand the vehicle fleet by approximately 46 units over the next 10 years. The following pages include a more detailed projection of demand for services and costs for the Police Facilities IIP.

Police Facilities – Incremental Expansion

Coolidge plans to maintain its level of service for Police facilities over the next 10 years. Based on a projected population increase of 26,000 persons, future residential development demands approximately 17,117 square feet of Police facilities (26,000 additional persons X 0.6583 square feet per person). With projected nonresidential trip growth of 10,049 trips, future nonresidential development demands approximately 2,148 square feet of Police facilities (10,049 additional trips X 0.2138 square feet per trip). Future development demands approximately 19,265 square feet of Police facilities at a cost of \$14,448,521 (19,265 square feet X \$750 per square foot). Coolidge may use development fees to construct additional Police facilities.

Figure P5: Projected Demand

Type of Infrastructure	Level of Service	Demand Unit	Cost per Sq Ft
Police Facilities	0.6583 Square Feet	per Person	\$750
	0.2138 Square Feet	per Trip	

Demand for Police Facilities					
Year	Population	Trips	Square Feet		
			Residential	Nonresidential	Total
2024	19,200	15,719	12,640	3,360	16,000
2025	20,600	16,452	13,562	3,517	17,078
2026	22,720	17,185	14,957	3,673	18,631
2027	24,840	17,918	16,353	3,830	20,183
2028	26,960	18,651	17,749	3,987	21,735
2029	29,080	19,384	19,144	4,143	23,288
2030	31,200	20,117	20,540	4,300	24,840
2031	34,700	21,530	22,844	4,602	27,446
2032	38,200	22,942	25,148	4,904	30,052
2033	41,700	24,355	27,453	5,206	32,659
2034	45,200	25,768	29,757	5,508	35,265
10-Yr Increase	26,000	10,049	17,117	2,148	19,265

Growth-Related Expenditures	\$12,837,500	\$1,611,021	\$14,448,521
-----------------------------	--------------	-------------	--------------

Police Vehicles – Incremental Expansion

Coolidge plans to maintain its level of service for Police vehicles over the next 10 years. Based on a projected population increase of 26,000 persons, future residential development demands approximately 40.7 Police vehicles (26,000 additional persons X 0.0016 units per person). With projected nonresidential vehicle trip growth of 10,049 trips, future nonresidential development demands approximately 5.1 Police vehicles (10,049 additional trips X 0.0005 units per trip). Future development demands approximately 45.8 Police vehicles at a cost of \$5,418,195 (45.8 units X \$118,421 per unit). Coolidge may use development fees to expand its Police vehicle fleet.

Figure P6: Projected Demand

Type of Infrastructure	Level of Service	Demand Unit	Cost per Unit
Police Vehicles	0.0016 Units	per Person	\$118,421
	0.0005 Units	per Trip	

Demand for Police Vehicles					
Year	Population	Trips	Units		
			Residential	Nonresidential	Total
2024	19,200	15,719	30.0	8.0	38.0
2025	20,600	16,452	32.2	8.4	40.6
2026	22,720	17,185	35.5	8.7	44.2
2027	24,840	17,918	38.8	9.1	47.9
2028	26,960	18,651	42.2	9.5	51.6
2029	29,080	19,384	45.5	9.8	55.3
2030	31,200	20,117	48.8	10.2	59.0
2031	34,700	21,530	54.3	10.9	65.2
2032	38,200	22,942	59.7	11.6	71.4
2033	41,700	24,355	65.2	12.4	77.6
2034	45,200	25,768	70.7	13.1	83.8
10-Yr Increase	26,000	10,049	40.7	5.1	45.8

Growth-Related Expenditures	\$4,814,063	\$604,133	\$5,418,195
-----------------------------	-------------	-----------	-------------

POLICE FACILITIES DEVELOPMENT FEES

Revenue Credit/Offset

A revenue credit/offset is necessary for development fees, because Coolidge’s construction transaction privilege tax rate exceeds the amount of the transaction privilege tax rate imposed on the majority of other transaction privilege tax classifications. Coolidge will apply the entire revenue credit/offset to fire, parks and recreation, and police facilities fees. Appendix A contains the forecast of revenues required by Arizona’s Enabling Legislation (ARS § 9-463.05(E)(7)).

Police Facilities Development Fees

Infrastructure components and cost factors for Police facilities are summarized in the upper portion of Figure P7. The cost per service unit for Police facilities is \$564.69 per person and \$138.59 per trip.

Police facilities development fees for residential development are assessed according to the number of persons per housing unit. The fee of \$1,660 for a single-family unit is calculated using a cost per service unit of \$564.69 per person multiplied by a demand unit of 2.94 persons per housing unit.

Nonresidential development fees are calculated using average weekday vehicle trips as the service unit. The fee of \$329 per 1,000 square feet of industrial development is derived from a cost per service unit of \$138.59 per trip multiplied by a demand unit of 2.38 AWWTE per 1,000 square feet.

Figure P7: Police Facilities Development Fees

Fee Component	Cost per Person	Cost per Trip
Police Facilities	\$493.75	\$160.32
Police Vehicles	\$185.16	\$60.12
Development Fee Report	\$0.70	\$0.50
Sub-Total	\$679.61	\$220.94
Excess Construction Sales Tax	(\$114.92)	(\$82.35)
Total	\$564.69	\$138.59

Residential Fees per Unit				
Development Type	Persons per Housing Unit ¹	Proposed Fees	Current Fees	Difference
Single Family	2.94	\$1,660	\$0	\$1,660
Multi-Family	2.34	\$1,321	\$0	\$1,321

Nonresidential Fees per 1,000 Square Feet				
Development Type	Trips per 1,000 Sq Ft ¹	Proposed Fees	Current Fees	Difference
Industrial	2.38	\$329	\$0	\$329
Commercial	12.21	\$1,693	\$0	\$1,693
Office & Other Services	5.42	\$751	\$0	\$751
Institutional	7.45	\$1,033	\$0	\$1,033

1. See Land Use Assumptions

POLICE FACILITIES DEVELOPMENT FEE REVENUE

Appendix A contains the forecast of revenues required by Arizona’s enabling legislation (ARS § 9-463.05(E)(7)). In accordance with state law, this report includes an IIP for Police facilities needed to accommodate future development. Projected fee revenue shown in Figure P8 is based on the development projections in the *Land Use Assumptions* document and the updated Police facilities development fees. If development occurs at a more rapid rate than projected, the demand for infrastructure will increase and development fee revenue will increase at a corresponding rate. If development occurs at a slower rate than projected, the demand for infrastructure will also decrease, along with development fee revenue. Projected development fee revenue equals \$16,074,221 and projected expenditures equals \$18,438,332.

Figure P8: Police Facilities Development Fee Revenue

Fee Component	Growth Share	Existing Share	Total
Police Facilities	\$14,448,521	\$0	\$14,448,521
Police Apparatus	\$5,418,195	\$0	\$5,418,195
Development Fee Report	\$8,808	\$0	\$8,808
Excess Construction Sales Tax	(\$1,437,193)	\$0	(\$1,437,193)
Total	\$18,438,332	\$0	\$18,438,332

		Single Family \$1,660 per unit	Multi-Family \$1,321 per unit	Industrial \$329 per 1,000 sq ft	Commercial \$1,693 per 1,000 sq ft	Office & Other \$751 per 1,000 sq ft	Institutional \$1,033 per 1,000 sq ft
Year		Hsg Unit	Hsg Unit	KSF	KSF	KSF	KSF
Base	2024	5,723	1,014	988	577	387	567
Year 1	2025	6,140	1,088	1,149	587	393	593
Year 2	2026	6,772	1,200	1,310	597	399	619
Year 3	2027	7,404	1,312	1,472	607	405	646
Year 4	2028	8,036	1,424	1,633	617	411	672
Year 5	2029	8,668	1,536	1,794	627	417	699
Year 6	2030	9,300	1,649	1,955	637	423	725
Year 7	2031	10,343	1,833	2,044	708	429	765
Year 8	2032	11,387	2,018	2,133	779	435	806
Year 9	2033	12,430	2,203	2,221	850	440	846
Year 10	2034	13,473	2,388	2,310	921	446	886
10-Year Increase		7,750	1,374	1,322	344	59	320
Projected Revenue		\$12,866,764	\$1,815,263	\$435,197	\$582,252	\$44,317	\$330,428

Projected Fee Revenue	\$16,074,221
Total Expenditures	\$18,438,332

STREET FACILITIES IIP

ARS § 9-463.05 (T)(7)(e) defines the eligible facilities and assets for the Street Facilities IIP:

“Street facilities located in the service area, including arterial or collector streets or roads that have been designated on an officially adopted plan of the municipality, traffic signals and rights-of-way and improvements thereon.”

The Street Facilities IIP includes components for street improvements and the cost of preparing the Street Facilities IIP and related Development Fee Report. A hybrid of the plan-based and incremental expansion methodologies is used for urban minor arterial street improvements, and a plan-based methodology is used for the Development Fee Report.

PROPORTIONATE SHARE

ARS § 9-463.05 (B)(3) states that the development fee shall not exceed a proportionate share of the cost of necessary public services needed to accommodate new development. The Street Facilities IIP and development fees will allocate the cost of necessary public services between residential and nonresidential based on trip generation rates, trip adjustment factors, and trip lengths.

SERVICE AREA

A single city wide service area is used for the Street Facilities IIP.

RATIO OF SERVICE UNIT TO DEVELOPMENT UNIT

ARS § 9-463.05(E)(4) requires:

“A table establishing the specific level or quantity of use, consumption, generation or discharge of a service unit for each category of necessary public services or facility expansions and an equivalency or conversion table establishing the ratio of a service unit to various types of land uses, including residential, commercial and industrial.”

Coolidge will use vehicle miles traveled (VMT) as the demand units for street facilities fees. Components used to determine VMT include average weekday vehicle trip generation rates, adjustments for commuting patterns and pass-by trips, and trip length weighting factors.

Residential Trip Generation Rates

For residential development, TischlerBise uses trip generation rates published in [Trip Generation](#), Institute of Transportation Engineers, 11th Edition (2021). For single-family development, the proxy is Single Family Detached Housing (ITE 210), and this type of development generates 9.43 average weekday vehicle trip ends per unit. For multi-family development, the proxy is Multifamily Housing Low-Rise (ITE 220), and this type of development generates 6.74 average weekday vehicle trip ends per unit.

Nonresidential Trip Generation Rates

For nonresidential development, TischlerBise uses trip generation rates published in Trip Generation, Institute of Transportation Engineers, 11th Edition (2021). The prototype for industrial development is Manufacturing (ITE 140) which generates 4.75 average weekday vehicle trip ends per 1,000 square feet of floor area. The prototype for commercial development is Shopping Center (ITE 820) which generates 37.01 average weekday vehicle trips per 1,000 square feet of floor area. For office & other services development, the proxy is General Office (ITE 710), and it generates 10.84 average weekday vehicle trip ends per 1,000 square feet of floor area. Institutional development uses Government Office (ITE 730) and generates 22.59 average weekday vehicle trip ends per 1,000 square feet of floor area.

Figure S1: Average Weekday Vehicle Trip Ends by Land Use

ITE Code	Land Use / Size	Demand Unit	Wkdy Trip Ends Per Dmd Unit ¹	Wkdy Trip Ends Per Employee ¹	Emp Per Dmd Unit	Sq Ft Per Emp
110	Light Industrial	1,000 Sq Ft	4.87	3.10	1.57	637
130	Industrial Park	1,000 Sq Ft	3.37	2.91	1.16	864
140	Manufacturing	1,000 Sq Ft	4.75	2.51	1.89	528
150	Warehousing	1,000 Sq Ft	1.71	5.05	0.34	2,953
254	Assisted Living	bed	2.60	4.24	0.61	na
610	Hospital	1,000 Sq Ft	10.77	3.77	2.86	350
620	Nursing Home	bed	3.06	3.31	0.92	na
710	General Office (avg size)	1,000 Sq Ft	10.84	3.33	3.26	307
720	Medical-Dental Office	1,000 Sq Ft	36.00	8.71	4.13	242
730	Government Office	1,000 Sq Ft	22.59	7.45	3.03	330
770	Business Park	1,000 Sq Ft	12.44	4.04	3.08	325
820	Shopping Center (avg size)	1,000 Sq Ft	37.01	17.42	2.12	471

1. Trip Generation, Institute of Transportation Engineers, 11th Edition (2021).

Trip Rate Adjustments

To calculate street facilities fees, trip generation rates require an adjustment factor to avoid double counting each trip at both the origin and destination points. Therefore, the basic trip adjustment factor is 50 percent. As discussed further in this section, the development fee methodology includes additional adjustments to make the fees proportionate to the infrastructure demand for particular types of development.

Commuter Trip Adjustment

Residential development has a larger trip adjustment factor of 64 percent to account for commuters leaving Coolidge for work. According to the 2009 National Household Travel Survey (see Table 30) weekday work trips are typically 31 percent of production trips (i.e., all out-bound trips, which are 50 percent of all trip ends). As shown in Figure S2, the U.S. Census Bureau's OnTheMap web application indicates 88 percent of resident workers traveled outside of Coolidge for work in 2021. In combination, these factors ($0.31 \times 0.50 \times 0.88 = 0.14$) support the additional 14 percent allocation of trips to residential development.

Figure S2: Commuter Trip Adjustment

Trip Adjustment Factor for Commuters ¹	
Employed Residents	5,684
Residents Living and Working in Coolidge	689
Residents Commuting Outside Coolidge for Work	4,995
Percent Commuting out of Coolidge	88%
Additional Production Trips ²	14%
Residential Trip Adjustment Factor	64%

1. U.S. Census Bureau, OnTheMap Application (version 6.8.1) and LEHD Origin-Destination Employment Statistics,

2. According to the National Household Travel Survey (2009)*, published in December 2011 (see Table 30), home-based work trips are typically 30.99 percent of “production” trips, in other words, out-bound trips (which are 50 percent of all trip ends). Also, LED OnTheMap data from 2021 indicate that 88 percent of Coolidge's workers travel outside the city for work. In combination, these factors ($0.3099 \times 0.50 \times 0.88 = 0.14$) account for 14 percent of additional production trips. The total adjustment factor for residential includes attraction trips (50 percent of trip ends) plus the journey-to-work commuting adjustment (14 percent of production trips) for a total of 64 percent.

*<http://nhts.ornl.gov/publications.shtml> ; Summary of Travel Trends - Table "Daily Travel Statistics by Weekday vs. Weekend"

Adjustment for Pass-By Trips

For commercial and institutional development, the trip adjustment factor is less than 50 percent because these types of development attract vehicles as they pass by on arterial and collector roads. For example, when someone stops at a convenience store on the way home from work, the convenience store is not the primary destination. For the average shopping center, ITE data indicate 34 percent of the vehicles that enter are passing by on their way to some other primary destination. The remaining 66 percent of attraction trips have the commercial site as their primary destination. Because attraction trips are half of all trips, the trip adjustment factor is 66 percent multiplied by 50 percent, or approximately 33 percent of the trip ends.

Average Weekday Vehicle Trips

Shown below in Figure S3, multiplying average weekday vehicle trip ends and trip adjustment factors (discussed on the previous page) by Coolidge’s existing development units provides the average weekday vehicle trips generated by existing development. As shown below, Coolidge’s existing citywide development generates 54,636 vehicle trips on an average weekday.

Figure S3: Average Weekday Vehicle Trips by Land Use

Development Type	Dev Unit	ITE Code	Weekday VTE	Trip Adj	2024 Dev Units	2024 Veh Trips
Single Family	HU	210	9.43	64%	5,723	34,541
Multi-Family	HU	220	6.74	64%	1,014	4,376
Industrial	KSF	130	4.75	50%	988	2,346
Commercial	KSF	820	37.01	33%	577	7,049
Office & Other Services	KSF	710	10.84	50%	387	2,100
Institutional	KSF	610	22.59	33%	567	4,224
Total						54,636

Local Trip Lengths

According to Coolidge Public Works, Coolidge provides 17.05 lane miles of arterials. Using a capacity standard of 8,750 vehicles per lane mile, Coolidge’s existing arterial network provides 149,188 vehicle miles of capacity (17.05 lane miles X 8,750 vehicles per lane mile). To calculate the local trip length, TischlerBise divides estimated vehicle miles of capacity by estimated average weekday vehicle trips. The unweighted local average trip length is 2.73 miles (149,188 vehicle miles of capacity / 54,636 average weekday vehicle trips). The calibration of average trip length includes the same adjustment factors used in the development fee calculations (i.e., commuter trip adjustment, pass-by trip adjustment, and average trip length adjustment). With these refinements, the weighted-average trip length is 2.610 miles. The analysis will use the local trip length shown below to calculate VMT.

Trip Length Weighting Factor

The street facilities development fee methodology includes a percentage adjustment, or weighting factor, to account for trip length variation by type of land use. As documented in Table 6a, Table 6b, and Table 6c of the 2017 National Household Travel Survey, vehicle trips from residential development are approximately 117 percent of the average trip length. The residential trip length adjustment factor includes data on home-based work trips, social, and recreational purposes. Conversely, shopping trips associated with commercial development are roughly 75 percent of the average trip length while other nonresidential development typically accounts for trips that are 73 percent of the average for all trips.

Local Vehicle Miles Traveled

Shown below are the demand indicators for residential and nonresidential land uses related to vehicle miles traveled (VMT). For residential development, the table displays VMT per housing unit. For nonresidential development, the table displays VMT generated per 1,000 square feet of floor area (per room for lodging, and per bed for assisted living).

Figure S4: Ratio of Service Unit to Development Unit

Residential Development					
Development Type	AWVTE per unit ¹	Trip Adjustment ²	Average Trip Length (miles)	Trip Length Adjustment	Avg Wkdy VMT per Unit
Single Family	9.43	64%	2.61	117%	18.43
Multi-Family	6.74	64%	2.61	117%	13.17

Nonresidential Development					
Development Type	AWVTE per 1,000 Sq Ft ¹	Trip Adjustment ¹	Average Trip Length (miles)	Trip Length Adjustment	Avg Wkdy VMT per 1,000 Sq Ft ¹
Industrial	4.75	50%	2.61	73%	4.53
Commercial	37.01	33%	2.61	75%	23.91
Office & Other Services	10.84	50%	2.61	73%	10.33
Institutional	22.59	33%	2.61	73%	14.20

1. Trip Generation, Institute of Transportation Engineers, 11th Edition (2021).
2. TischlerBise calculation based on OnTheMap Application (version 6.8.1) and LEHD Origin-Destination Employment Statistics, 2022; and 2022 National Household Travel Survey.
3. TischlerBise Calculation
4. National Household Travel Survey

PROJECTED DEMAND FOR SERVICES AND COSTS

ARS § 9-463.05(E)(5) requires:

“The total number of projected service units necessitated by and attributable to new development in the service area based on the approved land use assumptions and calculated pursuant to generally accepted engineering and planning criteria.”

ARS § 9-463.05(E)(6) requires:

“The projected demand for necessary public services or facility expansions required by new service units for a period not to exceed ten years.”

As shown in the *Land Use Assumptions* document, Coolidge’s housing stock is expected to increase by 9,124 units and nonresidential floor area is expected to increase by 2,045,000 square feet over the next 10 years. Based on the trip generation factors discussed in this section, projected development will create an additional 180,294 vehicle miles of travel over the next 10 years. Shown below in Figure S5, Coolidge will need to construct approximately 20.6 lane miles of street improvements over the next 10 years to maintain the existing levels of service.

Figure S5: Projected Travel Demand

Development Type	Dev Unit	ITE Code	Weekday VTE	Trip Adj	Trip Length Wt Factor	Weekday VMT
Single Family	HU	210	9.43	64%	117%	18.43
Multi-Family	HU	220	6.74	64%	117%	13.17
Industrial	KSF	130	4.75	50%	73%	4.53
Commercial	KSF	820	37.01	33%	75%	23.91
Office & Other Services	KSF	710	10.84	50%	73%	10.33
Institutional	KSF	610	22.59	33%	73%	14.20

Avg Trip Length (miles)	2.610
Vehicle Capacity Per Lane	8,750

Coolidge, Arizona	Base	1	2	3	4	5	10	10-Year Increase
	2024	2025	2026	2027	2028	2029	2034	
Single Family Units	5,723	6,140	6,772	7,404	8,036	8,668	13,473	7,750
Multi-Family Units	1,014	1,088	1,200	1,312	1,424	1,536	2,388	1,374
Industrial KSF	988	1,149	1,310	1,472	1,633	1,794	2,310	1,322
Commercial KSF	577	587	597	607	617	627	921	344
Office & Other Services KSF	387	393	399	405	411	417	446	59
Institutional KSF	567	593	619	646	672	699	886	320
Single Family Trips	34,541	37,059	40,873	44,687	48,501	52,314	81,314	46,774
Multi-Family Trips	4,376	4,695	5,178	5,661	6,145	6,628	10,302	5,926
Residential Trips	38,917	41,754	46,051	50,348	54,645	58,942	91,616	52,699
Industrial Trips	2,346	2,729	3,112	3,495	3,878	4,261	5,487	3,140
Commercial Trips	7,049	7,170	7,292	7,413	7,535	7,656	11,254	4,205
Office & Other Services Trips	2,100	2,132	2,163	2,195	2,227	2,259	2,419	319
Institutional Trips	4,224	4,421	4,618	4,814	5,011	5,208	6,608	2,384
Nonresidential Trips	15,719	16,452	17,185	17,918	18,651	19,384	25,768	10,049
Total Vehicle Trips	54,636	58,206	63,236	68,266	73,296	78,326	117,384	62,749
Vehicle Miles of Travel (VMT)	149,157	159,225	173,750	188,275	202,799	217,324	329,451	180,294
Annual Increase		10,068	14,525	14,525	14,525	14,525	24,401	
Arterial Lane Miles	17.05	18.2	19.9	21.5	23.2	24.8	37.65	20.6
Annual Increase		1.15	1.66	1.66	1.66	1.66	2.79	2.1

ANALYSIS OF CAPACITY, USAGE, AND COSTS OF EXISTING PUBLIC SERVICES

ARS § 9-463.05(E)(1) requires:

“A description of the existing necessary public services in the service area and the costs to upgrade, update, improve, expand, correct or replace those necessary public services to meet existing needs and usage and stricter safety, efficiency, environmental or regulatory standards, which shall be prepared by qualified professionals licensed in this state, as applicable.”

ARS § 9-463.05(E)(2) requires:

“An analysis of the total capacity, the level of current usage and commitments for usage of capacity of the existing necessary public services, which shall be prepared by qualified professionals licensed in this state, as applicable.”

Street Improvements – Incremental Expansion

Coolidge currently provides approximately 17.05 lane miles of arterial streets to existing development, and Coolidge plans to construct additional street improvements to serve future development. Coolidge’s existing level of service is 1.1429 lane miles per 10,000 VMT (17.05 lane miles / (149,157 VMT / 10,000)).

Based on Public Works Department estimates of recent and planned street improvements, the construction cost for street improvements is \$2,500,000 per lane mile. The analysis uses this cost as a proxy for future growth-related street improvement costs, and Coolidge may use development fees to construct street improvements to serve future development. In the next 10 years new development will demand approximately 20.61 additional lane miles to maintain the existing LOS, at a cost of \$51,512,685 (20.61 lane miles X \$2,500,000 per lane mile). For street improvements, the cost is \$285.71 per VMT (\$51,512,685 / 180,294 VMT).

Figure S6: Cost Allocation

Level-of-Service (LOS) Standards	
Arterial Lane Miles	17.05
2024 VMT	149,157
Lane Miles per 10,000 VMT	1.1429

Cost Factors	
10-Year VMT Increase	180,294
Cost per Additional Lane Mile	\$2,500,000
Additional Lane Miles Needed to Maintain LOS	20.61
10-Year Growth Cost, Lane Miles	\$51,512,685
Cost per VMT	\$285.71

Source: Coolidge Public Works Department

Development Fee Report – Plan-Based

The cost to prepare the Street Facilities IIP and related Development Fee Report totals \$17,616. Coolidge plans to update its report every five years. Based on this cost, proportionate share, and five-year projections of new residential and nonresidential development from the *Land Use Assumptions* document, the cost is \$0.26 per VMT.

Figure S7: IIP and Development Fee Report

Necessary Public Service	Cost	Proportionate Share		Service Unit	5-Year Change	Cost per Service Unit
Fire	\$8,808	Residential	79%	Population	9,880	\$0.70
		Nonresidential	21%	Trips	3,665	\$0.50
Parks and Recreational	\$8,808	Residential	92%	Population	9,880	\$0.82
		Nonresidential	8%	Jobs	2,128	\$0.33
Police	\$8,808	Residential	79%	Population	9,880	\$0.70
		Nonresidential	21%	Trips	3,665	\$0.50
Street	\$17,616	All	100%	VMT	68,167	\$0.26
Wastewater	\$14,680	All	100%	Gallons	672,077	\$0.02
Total	\$58,720					

STREET FACILITIES DEVELOPMENT FEES

Revenue Credit/Offset

A revenue credit/offset is necessary for development fees, because Coolidge’s construction transaction privilege tax rate exceeds the amount of the transaction privilege tax rate imposed on the majority of other transaction privilege tax classifications. Coolidge will apply the entire revenue credit/offset to fire, parks and recreation, and police facilities fees. Appendix A contains the forecast of revenues required by Arizona’s Enabling Legislation (ARS § 9-463.05(E)(7)).

Street Facilities Development Fees

Infrastructure components and cost factors for street facilities are summarized in the upper portion of Figure S8. The cost per service unit for street facilities is \$285.97 per VMT.

Figure S8: Street Facilities Development Fees

Fee Component	Cost per VMT
Street Improvements	\$285.71
Development Fee Report	\$0.26
Total	\$285.97

Residential Fees per Unit				
Development Type	Avg Wkdy VMT per Unit ¹	Proposed Fees	Current Fees	Difference
Single Family	18.43	\$5,270	\$3,235	\$2,035
Multi-Family	13.17	\$3,766	\$2,070	\$1,696

Nonresidential Fees per 1,000 Square Feet				
Development Type	Avg Wkdy VMT per 1,000 Sq Ft ¹	Proposed Fees	Current Fees	Difference
Industrial	4.53	\$1,295	\$635	\$660
Commercial	23.91	\$6,838	\$4,245	\$2,593
Office & Other Services	10.33	\$2,954	\$3,679	(\$725)
Institutional	14.20	\$4,061	\$3,679	\$382

1. See Land Use Assumptions

STREET FACILITIES DEVELOPMENT FEE REVENUE

Appendix A contains revenue forecasts required by Arizona’s Enabling Legislation (ARS § 9-463.05(E)(7)).

Projected fee revenue shown in Figure S9 is based on the development projections in the *Land Use Assumptions* document and the updated street facilities development fees. If development occurs faster than projected, the demand for infrastructure will increase along with development fee revenue. If development occurs slower than projected, the demand for infrastructure will decrease and development fee revenue will decrease at a similar rate. Projected development fee revenue equals \$51,531,807, and projected expenditures equal \$51,530,301.

Figure S9: Street Facilities Development Fee Revenue

Fee Component	Growth Share	Existing Share	Total
Street Improvements	\$51,512,685	\$0	\$51,512,685
Development Fee Report	\$17,616	\$0	\$17,616
Total	\$51,530,301	\$0	\$51,530,301

		Single Family \$5,270 per unit	Multi-Family \$3,766 per unit	Industrial \$1,295 per 1,000 sq ft	Commercial \$6,838 per 1,000 sq ft	Office & Other \$2,954 per 1,000 sq ft	Institutional \$4,061 per 1,000 sq ft
Year		Hsg Unit	Hsg Unit	KSF	KSF	KSF	KSF
Base	2023	5,723	1,014	988	577	387	567
Year 1	2024	6,140	1,088	1,149	587	393	593
Year 2	2025	6,772	1,200	1,310	597	399	619
Year 3	2026	7,404	1,312	1,472	607	405	646
Year 4	2027	8,036	1,424	1,633	617	411	672
Year 5	2028	8,668	1,536	1,794	627	417	699
Year 6	2029	9,300	1,649	1,955	637	423	725
Year 7	2030	10,343	1,833	2,044	708	429	765
Year 8	2031	11,387	2,018	2,133	779	435	806
Year 9	2032	12,430	2,203	2,221	850	440	846
Year 10	2033	13,473	2,388	2,310	921	446	886
10-Year Increase		7,750	1,374	1,322	344	59	320
Projected Revenue		\$40,824,031	\$5,171,040	\$1,712,206	\$2,352,375	\$174,048	\$1,298,105

Projected Fee Revenue	\$51,531,804
Total Expenditures	\$51,530,301

WASTEWATER FACILITIES IIP

ARS § 9-463.05 (T)(7)(b) defines the eligible facilities and assets for the Wastewater Facilities IIP:

“Wastewater facilities, including collection, interception, transportation, treatment and disposal of wastewater, and any appurtenances for those facilities.”

The Wastewater Facilities IIP includes components for treatment, and the cost of preparing the Wastewater Facilities IIP and related Development Fee Report. The plan-based methodology is used for treatment, and the Development Fee Report.

PROPORTIONATE SHARE

ARS § 9-463.05 (B)(3) states that the development fee shall not exceed a proportionate share of the cost of necessary public services needed to accommodate new development. The Wastewater Facilities IIP and development fees will allocate the cost of necessary public services between both residential and nonresidential development using average day flow factors.

SERVICE AREA

A single city wide service area is used for the Wastewater Facilities IIP.

RATIO OF SERVICE UNIT TO DEVELOPMENT UNIT

ARS § 9-463.05(E)(4) requires:

“A table establishing the specific level or quantity of use, consumption, generation or discharge of a service unit for each category of necessary public services or facility expansions and an equivalency or conversion table establishing the ratio of a service unit to various types of land uses, including residential, commercial and industrial.”

According to the City of Coolidge Wastewater Master Plan (2020) the average dwelling unit has 3 persons and each person uses 63 gallons of wastewater. This results in a gallons per EDU estimate of 189 gallons. Wastewater development fees are assessed by meter size, and the analysis uses average day flow from residential units of 189 gallons per day as the flow factor for a 0.75-inch meter. For 1.00-inch and above, average day flow is calculated by multiplying average day flow by the capacity ratio for the corresponding meter size. For meters larger than 3.0 inches, average day flow is calculated from (1) City of Coolidge Design Standards, (2) a submitted water study, or (3) other estimated wastewater flow.

Figure WW1: Wastewater Ratio of Service Unit to Development Unit

Average Day Flow per EDU	
Persons per Dwelling Unit	3.00
Gallons per Capita	63
Gallons per EDU	189

Source: City of Coolidge Wastewater Master Plan (2020).

Fees per Meter	
Meter Size	Capacity Ratio ¹
0.75-inch	1.00
1.00-inch	1.67
1.50-inch	3.33
2.00-inch	5.33
3.00-inch	10.67

1. AWWA Manual of Water Supply Practices M-1, 7th Edition
2. Meters larger than 3.0 inches multiplied by average day gallons from (1) City of Coolidge Wastewater Master Plan (2020), (2) a submitted water study, or (3) other estimated wastewater flow.

ANALYSIS OF CAPACITY, USAGE, AND COSTS OF EXISTING PUBLIC SERVICES

ARS § 9-463.05(E)(2) requires:

“An analysis of the total capacity, the level of current usage and commitments for usage of capacity of the existing necessary public services, which shall be prepared by qualified professionals licensed in this state, as applicable.”

Existing Flow

Using data from the City of Coolidge Wastewater Master Plan (2020), the average day flow from Coolidge wastewater customers in 2024 is estimated to be 1,238,037 gallons. In 2024 residential flow was 1,146,600 average daily gallons, and nonresidential flow was 91,437 average daily gallons.

Figure WW2: Existing Flow

Coolidge, Arizona	2024
	Base Year
City Population	19,200
Wastewater Population	18,200
EDUs	
Residential	6,067
Nonresidential	484
Total	6,550
Average Day Flow	
Residential	1,146,600
Nonresidential	91,437
Total	1,238,037

PROJECTED DEMAND FOR SERVICES AND COSTS

ARS § 9-463.05(E)(1) requires:

“A description of the existing necessary public services in the service area and the costs to upgrade, update, improve, expand, correct or replace those necessary public services to meet existing needs and usage and stricter safety, efficiency, environmental or regulatory standards, which shall be prepared by qualified professionals licensed in this state, as applicable.”

ARS § 9-463.05(E)(5) requires:

“The total number of projected service units necessitated by and attributable to new development in the service area based on the approved land use assumptions and calculated pursuant to generally accepted engineering and planning criteria.”

ARS § 9-463.05(E)(6) requires:

“The projected demand for necessary public services or facility expansions required by new service units for a period not to exceed ten years.”

Projected Flow

Shown below, Figure WW3 includes projected average day flow over the next 10 years. To project future wastewater flow, the analysis uses data from the City of Coolidge Wastewater Master Plan (2020) and development projections for Coolidge. Based on this analysis, projected average day flow increases by 1,768,624 gallons over the next 10 years.

Figure WW3: Projected Flow

Coolidge, Arizona	2024	2025	2026	2027	2028	2029	2034	10-Year Increase
	Base Year	1	2	3	4	5	10	
City Population	19,200	20,600	22,720	24,840	26,960	29,080	45,200	26,000
Wastewater Population	18,200	19,600	21,720	23,840	25,960	28,080	44,200	26,000
EDUs								
Residential	6,067	6,533	7,240	7,947	8,653	9,360	14,733	8,667
Nonresidential	484	521	577	634	690	746	1,175	691
Total	6,550	7,054	7,817	8,580	9,343	10,106	15,908	9,358
Average Day Flow								
Residential	1,146,600	1,234,800	1,368,360	1,501,920	1,635,480	1,769,040	2,784,600	1,638,000
Nonresidential	91,437	98,471	109,122	119,773	130,423	141,074	222,062	130,624
Total	1,238,037	1,333,271	1,477,482	1,621,693	1,765,903	1,910,114	3,006,662	1,768,624
Treatment Capacity	2,000,000	2,000,000	2,000,000	2,000,000	2,000,000	2,000,000	2,000,000	0
Utilization	62%	67%	74%	81%	88%	96%	150%	88%

Treatment – Plan-Based

The City of Coolidge plans to expand wastewater treatment capacity to serve future development over the next 10 years. These improvements will cost \$90,000,000 and will have a total treatment capacity of 3,000,000 gallons. Dividing the total cost of \$90,000,000 by the total capacity of 3,000,000 gallons yields a cost of \$30.00 per gallon.

Figure WW4: Cost Factors

Treatment	
Planned Wastewater Treatment Plant Cost	\$90,000,000
÷ Total Capacity (average day gallons)	3,000,000
Cost per Gallon	\$30.00
x 10-Year Additional Flow (gallons)	1,768,624
10-Year Revenue Collections	\$53,058,733

Source: Coolidge Public Works Department

Development Fee Report – Plan-Based

The cost to prepare the Wastewater Facilities IIP and related Development Fee Report totals \$14,680. Coolidge plans to update its report every five years. Based on this cost, proportionate share, and five-year projections of new residential and nonresidential development from the *Land Use Assumptions* document, the cost is \$0.02 per gallon.

Figure WW5: IIP and Development Fee Report

Necessary Public Service	Cost	Proportionate Share		Service Unit	5-Year Change	Cost per Service Unit
Fire	\$8,808	Residential	79%	Population	9,880	\$0.70
		Nonresidential	21%	Trips	3,665	\$0.50
Parks and Recreational	\$8,808	Residential	92%	Population	9,880	\$0.82
		Nonresidential	8%	Jobs	2,128	\$0.33
Police	\$8,808	Residential	79%	Population	9,880	\$0.70
		Nonresidential	21%	Trips	3,665	\$0.50
Street	\$17,616	All	100%	VMT	68,167	\$0.26
Wastewater	\$14,680	All	100%	Gallons	672,077	\$0.02
Total	\$58,720					

WASTEWATER FACILITIES DEVELOPMENT FEES

Revenue Credit/Offset

A revenue credit/offset is necessary for development fees, because Coolidge’s construction transaction privilege tax rate exceeds the amount of the transaction privilege tax rate imposed on the majority of other transaction privilege tax classifications. Coolidge will apply the entire revenue credit/offset to fire, parks and recreation, and police facilities fees. Appendix A contains the forecast of revenues required by Arizona’s Enabling Legislation (ARS § 9-463.05(E)(7)).

Wastewater Facilities Development Fees

The cost per service unit is \$30.02 per gallon for wastewater facilities development fees, and Coolidge will assess wastewater facilities development fees by meter size to new development. The base 0.75-inch meter is equivalent to a single-family unit, and a capacity ratio is used to convert the base meter fee proportionately for larger meters. The capacity ratios are calculated based on data published in *AWWA Manual of Water Supply Practices M-1, 7th Edition*.

Wastewater facilities development fees are calculated by multiplying the cost per gallon by the average day gallons per EDU (single-family unit) and the associated capacity ratio. For example, the 0.75-inch fee (single-family fee) of \$5,674 is calculated using a cost per service unit of \$30.02 per gallon, multiplied by 189 average day gallons, multiplied by a capacity ratio of 1.00. For meters larger than 3.00 inches, the fee is calculated using a cost per service unit of \$30.02 per gallon multiplied by average day gallons from (1) City of Coolidge Design Standards, (2) a submitted water study, or (3) other estimated wastewater flow.

Figure WW6: Wastewater Facilities Development Fees

Fee Component	Cost per Gallon
Treatment	\$30.00
Development Fee Report	\$0.02
Total	\$30.02

Development Type	Average Day Gallons
Single Family	189

Fees per Meter				
Meter Size	Capacity Ratio ¹	Proposed Fees ²	Current Fees	Difference
0.75-inch	1.00	\$5,674	\$2,183	\$3,491
1.00-inch	1.67	\$9,475	\$3,645	\$5,830
1.50-inch	3.33	\$18,894	\$7,268	\$11,626
2.00-inch	5.33	\$30,241	\$11,633	\$18,608
3.00-inch	10.67	\$60,539	\$23,288	\$37,251

1. AWWA Manual of Water Supply Practices M-1, 7th Edition

2. Meters larger than 3.0 inches multiplied by average day gallons from (1) City of Coolidge Wastewater Master Plan (2020), (2) a submitted water study, or (3) other estimated wastewater flow.

WASTEWATER FACILITIES DEVELOPMENT FEE REVENUE

Appendix A contains revenue forecasts required by Arizona’s Enabling Legislation (ARS § 9-463.05(E)(7)).

Projected fee revenue shown in Figure WW7 is based on development projections and the updated wastewater facilities development fees in Figure WW6. For nonresidential development, the analysis uses a 0.75-inch meter. If development occurs faster than projected, the demand for infrastructure will increase along with development fee revenue. If development occurs slower than projected, the demand for infrastructure will decrease and development fee revenue will decrease at a similar rate. Projected development fee revenue equals \$53,096,164 and projected expenditures equals \$90,014,680. Based on the actual mix of meter sizes used by future nonresidential accounts, the projected development fee revenue shown below will change.

Figure WW7: Wastewater Facilities Development Fees Revenue

Fee Component	Growth Share	Total
Treatment	\$53,058,733	\$90,000,000
Development Fee Report	\$14,680	\$14,680
Total	\$53,073,413	\$90,014,680

		Single-Family \$5,674 per meter	Nonresidential \$5,674 per meter
Year		EDU	EDU
Base	2024	6,067	484
Year 1	2025	6,533	521
Year 2	2026	7,240	577
Year 3	2027	7,947	634
Year 4	2028	8,653	690
Year 5	2029	9,360	746
Year 6	2030	10,067	803
Year 7	2031	11,233	896
Year 8	2032	12,400	989
Year 9	2033	13,567	1,082
Year 10	2034	14,733	1,175
10-Year Increase		8,667	691
Projected Revenue		\$49,174,667	\$3,921,498

Projected Fee Revenue	\$53,096,164
Total Expenditures	\$90,014,680

APPENDIX A: FORECAST OF REVENUES OTHER THAN FEES

ARS § 9-463.05(E)(7) requires:

“A forecast of revenues generated by new service units other than development fees, which shall include estimated state-shared revenue, highway users revenue, federal revenue, ad valorem property taxes, construction contracting or similar excise taxes and the capital recovery portion of utility fees attributable to development based on the approved land use assumptions, and a plan to include these contributions in determining the extent of the burden imposed by the development as required in subsection B, paragraph 12 of this section.”

ARS § 9-463.05(B)(12) states,

“The municipality shall forecast the contribution to be made in the future in cash or by taxes, fees, assessments or other sources of revenue derived from the property owner towards the capital costs of the necessary public service covered by the development fee and shall include these contributions in determining the extent of the burden imposed by the development. Beginning August 1, 2014, for purposes of calculating the required offset to development fees pursuant to this subsection, if a municipality imposes a construction contracting or similar excise tax rate in excess of the percentage amount of the transaction privilege tax rate imposed on the majority of other transaction privilege tax classifications, the entire excess portion of the construction contracting or similar excise tax shall be treated as a contribution to the capital costs of necessary public services provided to development for which development fees are assessed, unless the excess portion was already taken into account for such purpose pursuant to this subsection.”

REVENUE PROJECTIONS

Coolidge has a higher-than-normal construction excise tax rate; therefore, the required offset described above is applicable. Shown in Figure A1, Coolidge provided the required forecast of non-development fee revenue from identified sources that can be attributed to future development over a period of five years. Except for excess construction sales tax revenue, Coolidge directs the revenues shown below to non-development fee eligible capital needs including maintenance, repair, and replacement. Coolidge will use excess construction sales tax revenue to offset the fire, parks and recreation, and police facilities development fees.

Figure A1: Revenue Projections

Source	FY25-26	FY26-27	FY27-28	FY28-29	FY29-30
General Sales Tax	\$10,872,152	\$11,143,956	\$11,533,995	\$11,764,674	\$12,058,791
Construction Sales Tax	\$3,582,172	\$3,671,726	\$3,800,236	\$3,876,241	\$3,973,147
State Sales Tax	\$2,626,172	\$2,691,827	\$2,759,122	\$2,828,101	\$2,898,803
Auto in Lieu Tax	\$1,333,916	\$1,367,264	\$1,401,445	\$1,436,482	\$1,472,394
State Revenue Sharing	\$3,696,537	\$3,678,593	\$3,807,344	\$3,883,490	\$3,980,578
Subtotal, General Fund	\$22,110,949	\$22,553,366	\$23,302,142	\$23,788,988	\$24,383,713
HURF Revenue	\$1,466,386	\$1,503,046	\$1,555,653	\$1,586,766	\$1,626,435
Wastewater Revenue	\$893,755	\$916,099	\$939,001	\$962,476	\$986,538
Total	\$24,471,090	\$24,972,511	\$25,796,796	\$26,338,230	\$26,996,686

Shown in Figure A2, is forecast of construction sales tax revenue over a period of five years. Based on projections provided by City staff, total construction sales tax revenue is \$15,321,350 over the next five years. TischlerBise calculated that the excess revenue from the construction sales tax over the next 5 years is \$3,830,338.

Figure A2: Construction Sales Tax

	FY25-26	FY26-27	FY27-28	FY28-29	FY29-30	TOTAL
Excess Portion of Construction Sales Tax (1%)	\$895,543	\$917,932	\$950,059	\$969,060	\$993,287	\$3,830,338
Total Construction Sales Tax (4.0%)	\$3,582,172	\$3,671,726	\$3,800,236	\$3,876,241	\$3,973,147	\$15,321,350

As shown in Figure A3, the analysis allocates the excess construction sales tax revenue for the next five years to projected development during the next five years. The credit per service unit shown below is included as a credit in the fire, parks and recreational, and police development fee calculations.

Figure A3: Excess Construction Sales Tax Credit

Necessary Public Service	Offset Amount	Proportionate Share		Service Unit	5-Year Change	Credit per Service Unit
Fire	\$1,400,749	Residential	79%	Population	9,880	\$112.00
		Nonresidential	21%	Trips	3,665	\$80.26
Parks and Recreational	\$992,396	Residential	92%	Population	9,880	\$92.41
		Nonresidential	8%	Jobs	2,128	\$37.31
Police	\$1,437,193	Residential	79%	Population	9,880	\$114.92
		Nonresidential	21%	Trips	3,665	\$82.35

APPENDIX B: PROFESSIONAL SERVICES

As stated in Arizona’s development fee enabling legislation, “a municipality may assess development fees to offset costs to the municipality associated with providing necessary public services to a development, including the costs of infrastructure, improvements, real property, engineering and architectural services, financing and professional services required for the preparation or revision of a development fee pursuant to this section, including the relevant portion of the infrastructure improvements plan” (see ARS § 9-463.05.A). Because development fees must be updated at least every five years, the cost of professional services is allocated to the projected increase in service units, over five years (see Figure B1). Qualified professionals must develop the IIP, using generally accepted engineering and planning practices. A qualified professional is defined as “a professional engineer, surveyor, financial analyst or planner providing services within the scope of the person's license, education or experience”.

Figure B1: Cost of Professional Services

Necessary Public Service	Cost	Proportionate Share		Service Unit	5-Year Change	Cost per Service Unit
Fire	\$8,808	Residential	79%	Population	9,880	\$0.70
		Nonresidential	21%	Trips	3,665	\$0.50
Parks and Recreational	\$8,808	Residential	92%	Population	9,880	\$0.82
		Nonresidential	8%	Jobs	2,128	\$0.33
Police	\$8,808	Residential	79%	Population	9,880	\$0.70
		Nonresidential	21%	Trips	3,665	\$0.50
Street	\$17,616	All	100%	VMT	68,167	\$0.26
Wastewater	\$14,680	All	100%	Gallons	672,077	\$0.02
Total	\$58,720					

APPENDIX C: LAND USE DEFINITIONS

RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT

As discussed below, residential development categories are based on data from the U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey. Development fees will be assessed to all new residential units. One-time development fees are determined by site capacity (i.e., number of residential units).

Single Family:

1. Single-family detached is a one-unit structure detached from any other house, that is, with open space on all four sides. Such structures are considered detached even if they have an adjoining shed or garage. A one-family house that contains a business is considered detached if the building has open space on all four sides.
2. Single-family attached (townhouse) is a one-unit structure that has one or more walls extending from ground to roof separating it from adjoining structures. In row houses (sometimes called townhouses), double houses, or houses attached to nonresidential structures, each house is a separate, attached structure if the dividing or common wall goes from ground to roof.

Multi-Family:

1. Includes units in structures containing two or more housing units, further categorized as units in structures with “2, 3 or 4, 5 to 9, 10 to 19, 20 to 49, and 50 or more apartments.”
2. Includes both occupied and vacant mobile homes, to which no permanent rooms have been added. Mobile homes used only for business purposes or for extra sleeping space and mobile homes for sale on a dealer's lot, at the factory, or in storage are not counted in the housing inventory.
3. Includes any living quarters occupied as a housing unit that does not fit the other categories (e.g., houseboats, railroad cars, campers, and vans). Recreational vehicles, boats, vans, railroad cars, and the like are included only if they are occupied as a current place of residence.

NONRESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT

The proposed general nonresidential development categories (defined below) can be used for all new construction. Nonresidential development categories represent general groups of land uses that share similar average weekday vehicle trip generation rates and employment densities (i.e., jobs per thousand square feet of floor area).

Commercial: Establishments primarily selling merchandise, eating/drinking places, entertainment uses, and lodging. By way of example, commercial includes shopping centers, supermarkets, pharmacies, restaurants, bars, nightclubs, automobile dealerships, movie theaters, and lodging.

Industrial: Establishments primarily engaged in the production, transportation, or storage of goods. By way of example, industrial includes manufacturing plants, distribution warehouses, trucking companies, utility substations, power generation facilities, and telecommunications buildings.

Institutional: Public and quasi-public buildings providing educational, social assistance, or religious services. By way of example, institutional includes schools, universities, churches, daycare facilities, and government buildings.

Office and Other Services: Establishments providing management, administrative, professional, or business services; personal and health care services. By way of example, Office and Other services includes banks, business offices, and hospitals.