CITY OF MIRAMAR, FLORIDA

MUNICIPAL SERVICES IMPACT FEE STUDY

September 13, 2016

Public Resources Management Group, Inc.
Utility, Rate, Financial, and Management Consultants

Public Resources Management Group, Inc.
Utility, Rate, Financial, and Management Consultants

September 13, 2016

Honorable Mayor and Members
of the City Commission
City of Miramar
2300 Civic Center Place
Miramar, FL 33025-6577

Subject: **Municipal Services Impact Fee Study**

Ladies and Gentlemen:

We have completed our study of Municipal Services Impact Fees for police services, fire and rescue services, and parks and recreation services (the "Impact Fees") for the City of Miramar (the "City") and have summarized the results of our analysis, assumptions, and conclusions in this report, which is submitted for your consideration. This report summarizes the basis for the proposed Impact Fees to provide funds to help meet the City's capital expenditure requirements.

During the course of the study, it was determined that the proposed impact fees should meet a number of goals and objectives. These goals and objectives dealt primarily with fee sufficiency and level. Specifically, the major objectives considered in this study included:

- The Impact Fees should be sufficient to fund the projected capital requirements associated with providing service to population growth and new development;
- The Impact Fees should not be used to fund any capital deficiencies associated with providing services to existing customers; and
- The Impact Fees should be based upon reasonable level of service standards that meet the needs of the City, do not create an unfair burden relative to capital needs, and are similar to industry standards.

The proposed Municipal Services Impact Fees presented in this report should meet the above objectives as identified by the City. As such, based on information provided by the City and the assumptions and considerations reflected in this report, Public Resources Management Group, Inc. considers the proposed fees to be cost-based, reasonable, and representative of the capital funding requirements of the City.

341 NORTH MAITLAND AVENUE – SUITE 300 – MAITLAND, FL 32751
TELEPHONE: (407) 628-2600 • FAX: (407) 628-2610 • EMAIL: PRMG@PRMGinc.com

We appreciate the cooperation and assistance given to us by the City and its staff in the completion of this study.

Respectfully submitted,

Public Resources Management Group, Inc.

Henry L. Thomas
Vice President

Shawn A. Ocasio
Rate Consultant

HLT/dlc
Attachments

CITY OF MIRAMAR

MUNICIPAL SERVICES IMPACT FEE STUDY

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CITY OF MIRAMAR

MUNICIPAL SERVICES IMPACT FEE STUDY

TABLE OF CONTENTS (cont'd.)

CITY OF MIRAMAR

MUNICIPAL SERVICES IMPACT FEE STUDY

LIST OF TABLES

CITY OF MIRAMAR

MUNICIPAL SERVICES IMPACT FEE STUDY

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The purpose of an impact fee is to assign, to the extent practical, growth-related capital costs to those new customers responsible for such costs. To the extent population growth and associated development imposes identifiable capital costs to municipal services, equity and modern capital funding, practices suggest the assignment of such costs to those residents or system users responsible for such costs. The City of Miramar (the "City") has recognized this capital funding strategy as being an appropriate method of funding the increased capital requirements of the City. The City has adopted impact fees for the following services:

- Water Service;
- Wastewater Service;
- Police Protection Services;
- Fire Protection / Emergency Medical Services;
- Community Parks Land Dedication; and
- Recreation.

This report only addresses the current municipal services impact fees associated with police protection, fire / EMS services, and community parks land dedication and recreational services. The current police and fire impact fees have not been reviewed since the 2008 study but have been indexed annually for inflation. The current recreation impact fees were last updated after completion of the study in 2004. Since the implementation of the current fees, several aspects of the City have changed, including: i) future land use projections; and ii) capital needs required to maintain levels of service. As a result of these changes, the City retained Public Resources Management Group, Inc. ("PRMG") to review the fees and recommend changes to the level of the fees charged, where considered warranted.

The following is a summary of the observations and recommendations developed during our investigation, analyses, and preparation of the study.

1. The current impact fees are applied to two distinct customer classes: i) residential; and ii) non-residential (i.e., commercial and industrial). The following is a summary of the municipal services impact fees currently in effect.

Municipal Service Impact Fee [1]	Residential (per Dwelling Unit)	Non-Residential (per Sq.Ft.)
Police Protection	$222.00	$0.32
Fire Protection / EMS Services	209.00	0.41
Recreation [2]	1,210.00	N/A
Community Parks Land Dedication [2][3]	1,486.09	N/A
Total Municipal Service Impact Fees	$3,127.09	$0.73

[1] As set forth in Resolution No. 05-286.
[2] Assumes single-family homes with three bedrooms.
[3] Amount charged to dwellings not covered by a park agreement.

2. The method of impact fee application used by the City is the cost per dwelling unit for the residential class and the cost per square foot of development for the non-residential class (referred to in this report as the Equivalent Impact Fee Units). The utilization of these units is common and is used to some degree by all public agencies surveyed. It is recommended that this method of fee application be continued by the City at this time.

3. At the time of the 2010 Census, the City's population was 122,041. In 2015, the estimated population was 132,035 residents according to the University of Florida Bureau of Business and Economic Research ("BEBR") and represents an average annual compound growth rate in residential population of approximately 1.6% since the 2010 Census. The projected population in 2020 and at buildout is anticipated to be 138,881 and 170,000, respectively.

4. Figures provided by the City indicate that a total of approximately 15,784,034 square feet of non-residential development was located within the City in 2015. Based on the City's anticipated development report, and discussions with City staff, it has been estimated that an additional 6,820,102 square feet of non-residential development subject to impact fees will be constructed through buildout.

5. The level of service standard used for the development of the police services impact fee is the number of full-time officers per 1,000 population. This standard is commonly used in the establishment of police services impact fees and, based on budgeted staffing and population levels for Fiscal Year 2017, the City provides a level of service of 1.58 officers per 1,000 population.

6. Based on the direct costs to equip a full-time police officer (e.g., uniform, weaponry, vehicle), the recognition of an additional police substation and new headquarters, and the level of service standards used for providing police protection services, the cost per Equivalent Impact Fee unit was determined. Based on the capital costs required for police protection services, the impact fees for this function are as follows:

	Police Services Impact Fee [*]	
	Residential (Dwelling Unit)	Non-Residential (Sq.Ft.)
Proposed Impact Fee (Rounded)	$736.00	$0.58

[*] Derived from Section 3.

7. The level of service standard used for the development of the fire protection services impact fee is the maintenance of first response time of six (6) minutes or less per fire and rescue alarm. The capital costs included in the fee were recognized in order to maintain this standard and were predicated on discussions with the City regarding future staffing and facility requirements to maintain the response time standard. The City's staffing projections result in approximately 1.10 full-time firefighters per 1,000 population.

8. Based on the capital costs to equip a full-time firefighter (e.g., fire apparel, self-contained breathing apparatus), the cost of vehicles for proper response and firefighting (e.g., pumper

truck), the recognition of a pro rata allocation of the cost of current and anticipated emergency management and fire / EMS station facilities, and the level of service standard used for providing fire protection, the cost per equivalent impact fee unit was determined. Based on the capital costs required for fire protection service, the impact fees for this function are as follows:

	Fire Services Impact Fee [*]	
	Residential (Unit)	Non-Residential (Sq.Ft.)
Proposed Impact Fee (Rounded)	$574.00	$0.58

[*] Derived from Section 4.

9. In the development of the police and fire / EMS service impact fees, we have recognized the anticipated expansion of Public Safety facilities by the City in order to more effectively serve the City's fire protection needs and to accommodate growth in the western portion of the City. Based on discussions with City staff, this expansion includes a new EMS / Fire-Rescue Station (No. 107) and relocation of EMS / Fire-Rescue Station No. 84. It was assumed that the cost of the expansion would be funded primarily by the use of impact fees, either directly from the collection of fees over time or by the use of a specific financing mechanism, which would recognize the impact fees as a pledged revenue (primary source) for repayment of any borrowings.

10. The level of service standard for parks, as adopted by the City in its Comprehensive Plan, is based on the amount of open space provided for such services. The current standard for this service is 4.0 acres per 1,000 population.

    Based on an inventory of open space dedicated to parks, the City currently has a surplus of available open space, as it relates to the satisfaction of the level of service standards as of the current year.

11. The recreation impact fee was based on the estimated cost of facilities (buildings, ball fields, basketball courts, picnic facilities, etc.) planned to meet the recreational facility standards assumed for the City. Based on the expected costs of these facilities and the level of service standard for recreational facilities, the cost per equivalent impact fee unit was determined. Based on the capital costs required to provide recreational services, the recommended impact fees for this function are as follows:

Proposed Fee per	**Residential Recreation Services Impact Fee [1]**	
Bedroom Count (Rounded)	Residential [2]	Non-Residential
1 Bedroom	$475.00	N/A
2 Bedrooms	876.00	N/A
3 Bedrooms	1,277.00	N/A
4 Bedrooms	1,678.00	N/A
5 Bedrooms	2,079.00	N/A
6 Bedrooms	2,480.00	N/A
For each additional bedroom over 6	401.00	N/A

[1] Derived from Section 5.

[2] Pursuant to City's Impact Fee Ordinance, the City differentiates between estimated persons per household (based on number of bedrooms).

The recreation impact fee only provides benefits to the residential class and, therefore, a non-residential fee is not considered appropriate.

12. The community parks land dedication impact fee was based on the average estimated cost per acre of land planned, not covered by a park agreement, to meet open space requirements assumed for the City. Based on the average estimated cost of acre of land, the recommended impact fees for this function are as follows:

Proposed Fee per Bedroom Count (Rounded)	**Residential Community Parks Land Dedication Impact Fee [1]**	
	Residential (Unit) [2]	Non-Residential
1 Bedroom	$753.00	N/A
2 Bedrooms	1,389.00	N/A
3 Bedrooms	2,025.00	N/A
4 Bedrooms	2,661.00	N/A
5 Bedrooms	3,298.00	N/A
6 Bedrooms	3,934.00	N/A
For Each Additional Bedroom Over 6	636.00	N/A

[1] Derived from Section 5.
[2] Pursuant to City's Impact Fee Ordinance, the City differentiates between estimated persons per household (based on number of bedrooms).

13. The effect of the proposed change in impact fee levels from the existing rates to the recommended fees for the residential classification is shown below:

Municipal Service Impact Fee	**Residential (per Dwelling Unit)**			
	Existing	Proposed	Difference	Percent
Police Protection	$222.00	$736.00	$514.00	231.5%
Fire Protection	209.00	574.00	365.00	174.6%
Recreation [1]	1,210.00	1,277.00	67.00	5.5%
Community Parks [1][2]	1,486.09	2,025.00	538.91	36.3%
Total Municipal Service Impact Fees	$3,127.09	$4,612.00	$1,484.91	47.5%

[1] Assumes the average size of a dwelling unit is three bedrooms.
[2] Includes units not covered by a park agreement.

14. The effect of the change in impact fee levels from the existing rates to the recommended fees for the non-residential classification is shown below:

Municipal Service Impact Fee	**Non-Residential (per Sq.Ft.)**			
	Existing	Proposed	Difference	Percent
Police Protection	$0.32	$0.58	$0.26	81.3%
Fire Protection	0.41	0.58	0.17	41.5%
Recreation	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Community Parks	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Total Non-Residential Municipal Service Impact Fees	$0.73	$1.16	$0.43	58.9%

SECTION 1

INTRODUCTION

INTRODUCTION

The City of Miramar (the "City") is located in the southwestern portion of Broward County (the "County") and encompasses approximately 31 square miles. The City's population in 2015 was estimated at 132,035 by University of Florida Bureau of Business and Economic Research ("BEBR"), and has increased at an average growth rate of 1.6% (9,994 additional residents) since the 2010 Census. Based on growth rates experienced over the last couple of years, population estimates and projections provided by the City's Planning Department, the City's population growth rate is projected to decrease to an annual average growth rate of approximately 1.02% annually until buildout, which is estimated to be approximately 170,000 residents.

In order to serve the anticipated growth and maintain adequate levels of service, the City has identified a significant amount of capital improvement expenditures related to the demand for municipal services. In order to provide an appropriate source of funding for these improvements, and in order to avoid eroding other existing revenue sources, the City authorized Public Resources Management Group, Inc. ("PRMG") to review and update the current impact fees for Police Protection, Fire Protection, Community Services (Recreation), and Community Parks Land Dedication impact fees.

AUTHORIZATION

PRMG was authorized by the City to update the municipal impact fees pursuant to an Agreement between the City and PRMG. The scope of work for this project, as defined in the Agreement, was to:

1. For each service, review and analyze the capital requirements of the City that are needed to meet the level of service standards for the municipal function. This analysis included a review of: i) the existing and future facility and equipment needs as defined by the multi-year capital improvement program for each municipal function; ii) service area population and development demographics and future needs; and iii) services provided for each class of customers.

2. Develop an appropriate fee to be charged to new development in order to recover the growth-related capital costs of providing municipal services. This analysis includes the apportionment of costs among customer / development classifications and the development of the fee per equivalent billing unit.

3. Develop a comparison of the impact fees and associated billing attributes of similar charges imposed by other jurisdictions.

4. Prepare a report that documents our analyses, assumptions, and conclusions for consideration by the City Manager and City Commission.

CRITERIA FOR IMPACT FEES

The purpose of impact fees is to assign, to the extent practical, growth-related capital costs to those new customers responsible for such additional costs. To the extent new population growth and associated development imposes identifiable capital costs to municipal services, modern capital funding practices include the assignment of such costs to those residents or system users responsible for those costs rather than the existing population base. Generally, this practice has been labeled as "growth paying its own way" to avoid burdening existing users with the cost of expansion.

Within the State of Florida, a recently adopted statute authorizes the use of impact fees, which was developed based on case law before the Florida courts and broad grants of power including the home rule power of Florida counties and municipalities. Section 163.31801 of the Florida Statutes was created on June 14, 2006, and is referred to as the "Florida Impact Fee Act." Within this section, the Legislature finds that impact fees are an important source of revenue for local government to use in funding the infrastructure necessitated by new growth. Section 163.31801 of the Florida Statutes further provides that an impact fee adopted by ordinance of a county or municipality or by resolution of a special district must, at a minimum:

1. Require that the calculation of the impact fee be based on the most recent and localized data;

2. Provide for accounting and reporting of impact fee revenues and expenditures in a separate accounting fund;

3. Limit administrative charges for the collection of impact fees to actual costs; and

4. Require that notice be provided no less than ninety (90) days before the effective date of an ordinance or resolution imposing a new or amended impact fee.

Additionally, the Florida Impact Fee Act requires that audits of financial statements of local governmental entities and district school boards that are performed by a certified public accountant pursuant to F.S. 218.39 and submitted to the Audited General must include an affidavit signed by the chief financial officer of the local governmental entity or district school board stating that the local governmental entity or district school board has complied with this section.

On May 21, 2009, Florida House Bill 227 became law, and this legislation added the following language to the Florida Impact fee Act:

> *"In any action challenging an impact fee, the government has the burden of proving by a preponderance of the evidence that the imposition or amount of the fee meets the requirements of state legal precedent or this section. The court may not use a deferential standard."*

The Florida Impact Fee Act is further reinforced through existing Florida case law and the Municipal Home Rule Powers Act that grants Florida municipalities the governmental,

corporate, and proprietary powers to enable them to conduct municipal government, perform municipal functions, and render municipal services, as limited by legislation or as prohibited by state constitution or general law. Florida courts have ruled that the Municipal Home Rule Powers Act grants the requisite power and authority to establish valid impact fees. The authority for Florida governments to implement valid system impact fees is further granted in the Florida Growth Management Act of 1985[1].

The initial precedent for impact fees in Florida was set in the Florida Supreme Court decision, *Contractors and Builders Association of Pinellas Authority v. The City of Dunedin, Florida*. In this case, the Court's ruling found that an equitable cost recovery mechanism, such as impact fees, could be levied for a specific purpose by a Florida municipality. An impact fee should not be considered as a special assessment or an additional tax. A special assessment is predicated upon an estimated increase in property value as a result of an improvement being constructed in the vicinity of the property. Further, the assessment must be directly and reasonably related to the benefit that the property receives. Conversely, impact fees are not related to the value of the improvement to the property, but rather to the property's use of the public facility.

Until property is put to use and developed, there is no burden upon servicing facilities and the land use may be entirely unrelated to the value or assessment basis of the underlying land. Impact fees are distinguishable from taxes primarily in the direct relationship between amount charged and the measurable quantity of public facilities required. In the case of taxation, there is no requirement that the payment be in proportion to the quantity of public services consumed since tax revenue can be expended for any legitimate public purpose.

Based on Section 163.31801 of the Florida Statutes and existing Florida case law, certain conditions are required to develop a valid impact fee. Generally, it is our understanding that these conditions involve the following issues:

1. The impact fee must meet the "dual rational nexus" test. First, impact fees are valid when a reasonable impact or rationale exists between the anticipated need for additional capital facilities and the growth in population. Second, impact fees are valid when a reasonable association, or rational nexus, exists between the expenditure of the impact fee proceeds and the benefits accruing to the growth from those proceeds. Thus, the "dual rational nexus" test requires that impact fees should be based on the cost of projects necessitated by growth, and when collected, these fees should be spent on those same growth related projects.

2. The system of fees and charges should be set up so that there is not an intentional windfall to existing users.

3. The impact fee should only cover the capital cost of construction and related costs thereto (engineering, legal, financing, administrative, etc.) for capital expansions or other

[1] The Act allows for impact fees under land use regulation by stating:

> *"This section shall be construed to encourage the use of innovative land development regulations which include provisions such as the transfer of development rights, incentive and inclusionary zoning, planned unit development, impact fees, and performance zoning."* [Florida Statutes, § 163.3202(3)].

additional capital requirements that are required solely due to growth. Therefore, expenses due to rehabilitation or replacement of a facility serving existing customers (e.g., replacement of a capital asset) or an increase in the level of service should be borne by all users of the facility (i.e., existing and future users). Likewise, increased expenses due to operation and maintenance of that facility should be borne by all users of the facility.

4. The City should maintain an impact fee resolution that explicitly restricts the use of impact fees collected. Therefore, impact fee revenue should be set aside in a separate account, and separate accounting must be made for those funds to ensure that they are used only for the lawful purposes described above.

5. The City shall provide advanced notice of not less than ninety (90) days before the effective date of a resolution amending the existing impact fees.

Based on the criteria above, the impact fees developed in subsequent sections herein: i) include only the cost of capital facilities necessary to serve growth; ii) do not reflect renewal and replacement of any existing capital assets currently serving existing users; and iii) do not include any costs of operation and maintenance.

Fair share rules require that the fees can only be used for capital expenditures that are attributable to new growth. The fees cannot be used to finance level of service deficiencies or the replacement of existing facilities required to provide services to existing users. The rules do allow for establishing different fees for different classes of customers. Additionally, the fair share rules recognize that the cost of facilities used by both existing customers and new growth must be apportioned between the two user groups with respect to fee development and utilization such that: i) the user groups are treated equally; and ii) one group does not subsidize the other.

The rational nexus or benefit rule requires that there be a reasonable relationship between the need for capital facilities (which deals with level of service) and the benefits to be received by new growth for which the fee will be expended. There are two conditions that limit where and when an impact fee can be collected and used. With respect to the first condition, although there is no specific limit as to distance between an applicant's paying the fee and the capital expenditure to be constructed by the fee, there should be a geographical relationship between fee collection and use. The assets recognized in the determination of the fee (which represent facilities attributable to all users) and the overall management of the system are considered to be system-wide and not based on specific utility zones or geographical areas. As such, the impact fees are determined on a system-wide basis. The second nexus condition recognizes that the property must receive a benefit from the public services for which the fee is being applied.

The credit rule recognizes that if an agency has received property in the form of cost-free capital or there is specific revenue (taxes) that will be used for the capital expenditures necessitated by new growth, a credit should be applied to the impact fee. Examples of cost free capital include grants, contributions by developers, and other sources that provide funds for the capital expenditures. The credit rule allows for the recovery of costs from new development through impact fees, net of such cost-free capital.

IMPACT FEE METHODS

There are several different methods for the calculation of an impact fee. The calculation is dependent on: i) the type of fee being calculated (e.g., water, police services, recreation, transportation, etc.); ii) the availability of cost, engineering, and other local data (e.g., household and population projections); iii) current levels of service; and iv) other related items. The proposed Municipal Services Impact Fees reflected in this report are based on two methods: i) the improvements-driven method and ii) the standards-driven method. Both methods have been utilized in the development of impact fees for local governments in Florida.

The improvements-driven method is an approach that utilizes a specific list of existing or planned capital improvements over a period of time. For example, the fee may correspond to the level of capital improvements that have been identified in the capital improvements element of the Comprehensive Plan or capital improvement budget of the local government. The standards-driven method does not utilize the cost of improvements based on anticipated needs as stated in the capital improvement plan but rather uses a set of theoretical standards to determine the cost of the improvements associated with new growth. For example, the standards-driven method used to calculate police protection services impact fees would consider the cost of each additional officer required to maintain a level of service standard required by the City. As each community may not be reflective of the survey results, a City may adopt its own standards, and many do so as part of the Comprehensive Plan. The primary difference between the two methodologies is how the capital costs, which must be recovered from the application of the fee, are calculated.

Both methodologies have their advantages and disadvantages. The advantages associated with the improvements-driven method include the following:

- Based solely on budgeted capital improvements, thus providing a definite relationship between the level of fee and need.

- The use of fees can be shown to be attributable to growth based on the capital improvement plan utilized in the analysis as opposed to capital deficiencies in the system.

There are several disadvantages associated with the improvements-driven method. Some of the disadvantages include the following:

- The fee may be based on an intermediate range forecast of capital improvements (e.g., five years), which may not reflect the true level of needs since major capital improvements may be beyond the time frame of the capital forecast.

- The fee does not take into account unused capacity at existing facilities which should be allocated to the users of the facilities.

- The forecast of capital improvements required for new development is still an estimate of cost and is subject to revisions and updates.

- It may be difficult to apportion to cost of specific improvements among present deficiencies, growth, and excess capacity.

With respect to the standards-driven method, there also exist certain advantages and disadvantages with respect to the determination of the fee. The advantages include the following:

- The fee is based on a defined level of service and type of facility and it may be easier to determine the standard cost of the capital facilities associated with such level.

- Provides governments with more flexibility in the use of the collected fees in that they can identify future capital needs in advance of establishing the specific capital budget.

- The development of the fee does not require a detailed projection of future capital improvements and associated costs and is more applicable to the needs of a small municipality due to constraints of staff and resources.

As one would expect, there are also disadvantages associated with the standards-driven method. The disadvantages include:

- The capital costs for the impact fee may not be associated with anticipated or current capital needs as identified by the City, thus increasing the potential of not providing a clear relationship between the fee and its use.

- The development of the standard cost for capital facilities is based primarily on engineering, planning, and financial judgment, although this may be somewhat mitigated by the level of service standards included in the Comprehensive Planning Process.

The proposed impact fees herein for the municipal services include the application of both the standards-driven and improvement-driven methods based on the capital facilities required to provide services and meet the City's service level standards. Where appropriate, the blending of both methods occurred and a more complete discussion of the methods used for the determination of the impact fees is presented in Sections 3, 4, and 5.

SUMMARY OF REPORT

In addition to Section 1, this report has been subdivided into four (4) other sections. The following is a brief discussion of the remaining sections included in this report.

Section 2 – Service Area: This section of the report provides a general discussion of the population and non-residential development forecast that was used in the design of the impact fees.

Section 3 – Police Protection Services Impact Fee: This section discusses the development of the proposed impact fee for police services, including the capital requirements associated with providing police services, the methodology for the determination of the proposed fees, assumptions utilized in the design of the fees, and other factors associated with the fee determination.

Section 4 – Fire Rescue Services Impact Fee: This section discusses the development of the proposed impact fee for fire protection services, including the capital requirements associated with providing fire protection services, the methodology for the determination of the proposed fees, assumptions utilized in the design of the fees, and other factors associated with the fee determination.

Section 5 – Parks and Recreation Services Impact Fees: Included in this section is a discussion of the development of the Recreation Services and Community Parks Land Dedication impact fees. This section provides a discussion of the capital requirements associated with providing parks and recreational facilities to the City's residents, the methodology for the determination of the proposed fees, assumptions utilized in the design of the fees, and other factors associated with the fee determination.

(Remainder of page intentionally left blank)

SECTION 2

SERVICE AREA

GENERAL

This section provides a general discussion of the current service area, including population and housing statistics. Additionally, the anticipated growth in the City's population is discussed within this section.

POPULATION AND DEVELOPMENT FORECAST

In order to develop municipal impact fees, it is necessary to develop a forecast of the population of the City in order to: i) have an appropriate planning horizon to ensure that capital improvement needs and costs are apportioned over a suitable growth segment; ii) link the level of service requirements to the capital facility plan; and iii) identify any deficiencies in existing capital facilities related to the level of service standards and current population served.

As shown on the following table, the 2010 Census reported 122,041 permanent residents. Based on population projections developed by City and recent historical trends, it is estimated that the existing population in 2015 was 132,035 and that the City will continue to grow to a buildout population of approximately 170,000 residents. As discussed in Section 1, the annual average population growth rate during the forecast period is projected to be approximately 1.02%. The projected population and dwelling unit figures through buildout are as follows:

Historical and Projected Population and Dwelling Units [*]

Year	Population	Dwelling Units	Average Person per Dwelling Unit
2000	72,739	23,058	3.15
2010	122,041	40,294	3.03
2014	128,431	37,864	3.39
2015	132,035	37,724	3.50
2016	133,377	38,108	3.50
2017	134,732	38,495	3.50
2020	138,881	39,680	3.50
2025	146,081	41,737	3.50
2030	153,655	43,901	3.50
2035	161,621	46,177	3.50
Buildout	170,000	48,571	3.50

[*] Amounts derived from 2009 and 2010 Censuses and estimates for 2014 as obtained from BEBR and Florida Housing Data Clearinghouse as well as from information provided by the City.

Estimates of the City's population at buildout were developed to apportion certain capital facilities between existing users and future growth that are intended to provide an adequate level of service beyond the City's near term growth and development plan. To the extent the projections materially change in the future development of the City or in relation to the type of developments, it would be beneficial for the City to reevaluate the impact fees developed in this report as it normally would do with other revenue sources.

Based on the anticipated development reports provided by the City, the non-residential development projected to occur during the forecast period that will be subject to impact fees is estimated as follows:

Estimated Non-Residential Development [*]

	Estimated 2017	Buildout
Square Feet of Development	16,106,412	22,604,136
Net Change in Square Feet of Development		6,497,724

[*] Based on data provided by the City.

(Remainder of page intentionally left blank)

SECTION 3

POLICE SERVICES IMPACT FEE

GENERAL

This section provides a discussion of the development and design of the impact fee for police protection services. Included in this section is a discussion of the level of service requirements, capital costs included in the fee determination, and the design of the impact fee for police services to be applied to new growth within the City.

LEVEL OF SERVICE REQUIREMENTS

In the evaluation of the capital facility needs for providing municipal services such as police protection, a level of service ("LOS") standard should be developed. Pursuant to Section 163.3164, Florida Statutes, the "level of service" means an indicator of the extent or degrees of service provided by, or proposed to be provided by a facility based on and related to the operational characteristics of the facility. Level of service shall indicate the capacity per unit of demand for each public facility or service. Essentially, the level of service standards are established in order to ensure that adequate facility capacity will be provided for future development and for purposes of issuing development orders or permits, pursuant to Section 163.3202(2)(g) of the Florida Statutes. As further stated in the statutes, each local government shall establish a LOS standard for each public facility located within the boundary for which such local government has authority to issue development orders or permits. Such LOS standards are set for each individual facility or facility type and not on a system-wide basis.

For police services, the City has not formally adopted a level of service for this function since this service is not an element of the comprehensive planning process as required by the Department of Community Affairs. In developing the level of service standard for police protection services, the number of police officers and attendant equipment, base facilities and vehicle costs are generally predicated on a population standard. Specifically, the general standard used in the development of the capital costs for police protection services is the number of police officers required to service each population increment of 1,000 people. This standard is commonly used by such entities, as the Federal Bureau of Investigation, Department of Justice, the Florida Department of Law Enforcement, and other public agencies in resource planning and development of staffing needs. Based on information provided by the City's Police Department, there currently are 213 full-time sworn officers budgeted in Fiscal Year 2017 to serve a total population of 134,732 permanent residents. This translates to a current level of service being provided by the City of 1.58 full-time sworn officers per 1,000 population served. Based on discussions with the Police Department, the targeted level of service is 1.85. However, based on the staffing history of the City, the current level of service is more appropriate in the determination of the impact fee. In the future as the City increases Police Department staffing to achieve the higher 1.85 standard the fees should be adjusted accordingly. The following indicates how the City's level of service compares with police staffing guidelines as published by state and national law enforcement agencies:

- The Federal Bureau of Investigation, U.S. Department of Justice, Uniform Crime Report for 2014 reports an average standard of 2.7 police officers per 1,000 population for the Southern United States.

- The Florida Department of Law Enforcement reports an overall an average of 2.46 officers per 1,000 population for 2014.

In addition to the guidelines used by state and national agencies, PRMG conducted a survey of public jurisdictions with respect to actual full-time sworn personnel to population relationships. This survey is shown below and includes the City's data for comparison purposes.

Agency Information - Full-Time Personnel to Population Ratios

Police Department (Agency) Name	Estimated Service Area Population	Sworn Personnel	Per 1,000 Population
Miramar P.D.	134,732	213	1.58
Other Agencies			
Coral Springs P.D.	124,282	208	1.67
Davie P.D.	96,908	188	1.94
Ft. Lauderdale P.D.	175,123	515	2.94
Hollywood P.D.	144,926	323	2.23
Pembroke Pines P.D.	159,922	239	1.49

As can be seen above, the City's current level of service expressed as the number of sworn officers per 1,000 population is lower than most of the other communities surveyed. Based on the City's historical staffing levels; however, using the level of service of 1.58 full-time sworn officers per 1,000 population as the standard for estimating future staffing requirements appears reasonable for the purposes of this study as the City does not have current plans and funds appropriated to increase staffing that would result in a higher standard. It should be noted that the cost of eliminating the current LOS deficiency is not included in the derivation of the proposed impact fees herein.

Each full time sworn officer requires a complement of support staff, equipment, and base facilities, as follows:

Support Staff:

- Administrative staff support is considered ancillary to the provision of police protection services; therefore, the facility requirements of administrative support staff are included in the calculation of facility requirements for full-time sworn officers. Based on data provided by and discussions with the City, the current administrative (non-sworn) personnel level is 82 full-time employees that provide the necessary support and administrative functions for the Police Department. This equates to a LOS for administrative support staff of 0.60 staff persons per 1,000 population or 0.38 persons per full-time sworn officer position.

Equipment:

- Each sworn officer must be equipped with uniforms, weapons, and other relevant personal equipment (including personal communications) to perform his / her duties.

Equipment (cont'd.):

- The department fleet currently consists of patrol cars, other non-patrol use sedans, a SWAT truck, a surveillance van, a transport van, pickup trucks, an armored vehicle, and leased motorcycles that are functional and available for use. Based on the current amount of fleet being maintained on behalf of the department and recognizing the number of current full-time sworn officers of the City (213 officers), the current level of service equates to 1.0 vehicle for each full time sworn officer. The City's goal is to maintain the current level of service of 1.0 vehicle for each of the City's new full-time sworn officers. Generally, each vehicle must be equipped with relevant communications, detection / surveillance, and defense equipment.

Base Facilities:

- The current facilities of the Police Department include the new headquarters building and the west substation. These two buildings include the furnishings and communications equipment required to accommodate sworn officers and support staff.

RESOURCE NEEDS ANALYSIS

Currently, the Police Department consists of 213 full-time sworn police officers and 81 support personnel. Based on the assumed level of service standards and population projections for the City, it is anticipated that the City will need a police force of 269 sworn full-time police officers to provide police protection services by buildout. This represents an increase of 56 police officers over the existing staffing level. Additional support staff (administrative personnel) will also need to be increased accordingly, as will equipment (personal and vehicular) for the officers.

Summary of Full-Time Police Personnel

	No. of Employees	
Personnel Description	Fiscal Year 2017	Buildout [*]
Full-Time Sworn Officers	213	269
Support Personnel	81	102
Total Personnel	294	371

[*] Sworn officers assumed for buildout based on level of service of 1.58 full-time police officers per 1,000 population. Support personnel based on level of service of 0.60 support personnel per 1,000 population.

Based on discussions with City staff, additional facilities are required to support the current staff, and any increases in staff needed to support growth. As a result, the City's capital improvement plan included plans for new headquarters (now completed and in service as of the date of this report) and police substation.

The method used to develop the police services impact fees includes a combination of the standards-driven method and the improvements-driven method, both of which were described in Section 1. The standards-driven method was used to determine the direct capital cost to equip a full-time police officer. The improvements-driven method was used to determine the base facility costs (e.g., police station) allocable to a full-time police officer. In the development of the next increment of cost, two separate capital cost parameters were recognized. The first parameter deals with the costs of directly equipping the next increment of police protection services (i.e., a full-time police officer). These capital costs include vehicles, personal communication equipment, uniforms, weaponry, and other support related equipment and machinery. The second parameter involves the facilities required to house the additional operational and support staff and includes investment in the land, buildings and furnishings allocable to the police service function. These facilities comprise a sizable portion of the capital investment for providing police services and must be allocated between existing and new residences and commercial land uses.

Table 3-2 summarizes the estimated incremental capital costs to equip a full-time police officer for the City recognizing the cost parameters described above. The estimated capital cost of an additional full-time police officer is approximately $200,736, including the cost of personal equipment, vehicles and equipment, and allocated station costs. Table 3-2 provides a breakdown of the individual cost items. The following is a summary of the estimated incremental capital cost required to equip and support a full-time police officer:

Summary of Allocated Costs

	Amount [*]	Percent
Personnel Equipment Costs	$19,435.00	9.7%
Vehicles and Equipment Costs	35,203.21	17.5%
Allocated Station Costs	146,098.45	72.8%
Total Allocated Costs	$200,736.66	100.00%

[*] Derived from Table 3-2.

As can be seen above, a major identifiable cost of equipping a full-time police officer involves the cost of vehicles and equipment. This cost accounts for 17.5% of the total allocated capital cost. The cost of capital facilities and major equipment represents the largest component of capital cost associated with providing police services, accounting for approximately 72.8% of the total cost.

DESIGN OF POLICE SERVICES IMPACT FEE

The method used to determine the police services impact fee was based upon a four step process. Table 3-4 summarizes the results of the approach. The following is a brief description of the method used in this study:

- Development of Total Capital Need – Based on population projections, level of service standards, and allocated incremental capital costs per police officer. This amount is the total allocated capital cost of each additional police officer required to serve the projected population growth.

- Allocation of Costs to Customer Class – This step allocates capital costs of additional police officers to the residential and commercial customer classes. The allocation is based on the number of service calls made by the Police Department, a parameter used as the nexus or link between need and cost.

- Development of Equivalent Impact Fee Units – This step estimates the number of equivalent impact fee units that are projected to be added to the City. This is the number of units for which the City must provide municipal services. For the residential class, the equivalent unit is a dwelling unit (residence) and for the non-residential class, the equivalent unit is the square footage of the development.

- Calculation of Cost per Equivalent Impact Fee Unit – Once the total capital costs allocated to future growth are estimated, the per customer equivalent impact fee units were determined, and the cost per equivalent unit was calculated.

Police Services Impact Fee Assumptions

The development of the police services impact fees required a number of assumptions. The major assumptions used in the development of the proposed impact fees as shown on Tables 3-2 through 3-4 are as follows:

1. In the development of the capital costs required to equip a full-time police officer, the identifiable capital costs of providing police protection services were allocated to establish the cost of providing the next incremental full-time police officer. The costs were allocated to the next increment of service (one full-time sworn officer) based on the following allocation parameters:

    a. The direct cost of equipping one full-time sworn police officer (e.g., uniforms and personal equipment) was allocated 100.00%, with the exception of 50% allocated cost of the training facility, in estimate of the incremental cost of equipping a full-time police officer. The direct costs reflected in this analysis include only those costs that are initially funded by the City at the time each officer is added. For example, newly-hired police officers are required to initially purchase their gun belt, handcuffs, and boots. As those items need to be replaced, it is done at the expense of the department. Additionally, those items costing less than $1,000 are not considered capital expenditures by the City and were not included in the analysis. The capital cost to equip a new officer with personal equipment as reflected in the analysis was estimated to be $19,435 per officer.

    b. Based on discussions with department staff, it is assumed that the level of service for vehicles will be 1.0 vehicle per new full-time officer. The total cost of equipping a new officer with a vehicle and the allocated cost of the other vehicles required to provide police protection service to the City is estimated at $35,203 per additional officer.

    c. The capital expenditures for the base facilities and major equipment recognize that increases to maintain the current level of service standards are required in order to serve the City's population through buildout. The allocation of the capital cost of these

facilities was based on the level of service standards and the population projections of the City. The allocated cost of police facilities and major equipment for one full-time police officer was estimated to equal $146,098 based on the cost of constructing and furnishing the West Substation facility, the estimated cost of the new headquarters facility and new substation, and other capital items as provided by Police Department staff.

2. In the development of the incremental capital costs per police officer, it was assumed that the current level of service would be maintained during the forecast period and through buildout. This level of service includes not only the amount of full-time officers to serve the general population of the City, but also the required number of vehicles and equipment required in addition to the police officers. As previously mentioned, the current level of service assumed in this study is 1.58 full-time police officers per 1,000 of population.

3. The estimated incremental cost of providing for a full-time police officer was allocated between the residential and non-residential customer classifications based on the latest reliable call data for Fiscal Years 2014 through 2015, the latest reliable figures provided by the Police Department. The allocation is shown on Table 3-3 and is summarized below:

(Remainder of page intentionally left blank)

Allocation of Service Calls [*]

	Total	Residential	Non-Residential	Traffic/Other
Fiscal Year 2014 - 2015				
Number of Calls	146,911	110,183	36,728	46,068
Allocation of Traffic Calls		34,551	11,517	
Adjusted Number of Calls		144,734	48,245	
Estimated Dwelling Units – 2017		38,495		
Estimated Sq.Ft. of Non-Residential Development – 2017			16,106,412	
Average Calls for Service				
Per Dwelling Unit		1.88		
Per Sq.Ft. of Non-Residential Development			0.001498	
Projected Growth During Forecast Period				
Dwelling Units		10,077		
Sq.Ft. of Non-Residential Development			6,497,724	
Projected Calls Resulting from Growth				
Dwelling Units		18,944		
Sq.Ft. of Non-Residential Development			9,732	
Total Calls Projected	28,675			
Percent of Calls Allocated to Growth		66.06%	33.94%	

[*] Derived from Table 3-3.

For the purposes of this study, traffic calls were assigned to the customer classes based on the percent relationship of the specifically identified service calls for such classes.

Based on the average number of service calls for the Fiscal Years 2014 to 2015 period as shown above, the number of calls allocated to each class of customer was assumed for the forecast period as follows:

Allocation of Service Calls

Customer Class	Percentage
Residential	66.06%
Non-Residential	33.94%

4. The residential equivalent impact fee units represent the net change in the number of dwelling units to be constructed in the City during the planning period of this report (i.e., buildout). The increase in total residential dwelling units for the period 2017 through buildout is estimated to be 10,077 units. This forecast was based on population projections and average persons per household data provided by the City.

5. The non-residential equivalent impact fee units represent the net change in the square footage of commercial and industrial developments assumed to be constructed during the planning period of this study (i.e., buildout). Projections utilized in this study and based on

the existing level of development for the non-residential class and the City's assumption that non-residential development would increase by 6,497,724 square feet.

Impact Fee Calculation

Based on the above-referenced assumptions, the allocated incremental capital facilities, and the population and land use projections of the City, the police services impact fees for the residential and non-residential customer classifications were developed. As shown in Table 3-4 at the end of this report, the cost per equivalent impact fee unit by customer classification was determined as follows:

Calculation of Police Services Impact Fees [*]

	Residential	Non-Residential
Additional Full-Time Police Officers Required through Buildout	56	56
Incremental Capital Facilities Allocable to Growth through Buildout	$7,426,323	$3,814,930
Incremental Equivalent Impact Fee Unit	10,077 Dwelling Units	6,497,724 Sq.Ft.
Cost per Equivalent Impact Fee Unit	$736.96	$0.5871
Rounded Cost per Unit	$736.00	$0.58

[*] Derived from Table 3-4.

As can be seen above, the police services impact fee per equivalent impact fee unit (by class of customer) is summarized as follows:

Proposed Impact Fees

Customer Class	Fee per Equivalent Impact Fee Unit
Residential	$736.00 per Dwelling Unit
Non-Residential	$0.58 per Square Foot

Taking into account the methodology used for the determination of the fee and the estimates associated with determining the capital requirements, it appears that the proposed impact fee utilizing the City's current LOS standard appears reasonable. It should be noted that in the development of the fee per equivalent impact fee unit, no credits associated with developer land dedication or other similar activities have been recognized. It should also be noted that the proposed incremental capital improvements do not include any inflationary allowances. As a matter of policy, several communities have adopted a general credit to recognize that the use of General Fund monies to fund incremental capital improvements may occur. Based on the directives of the City, no general credit to the fee for the potential use of General Fund monies towards future capital projects has been assumed or recognized.

In the development of the cost per equivalent impact fee unit, it was determined that the rate should be applied on a "per dwelling unit" basis for the residential class and a "per square footage" of commercial development basis for the non-residential class consistent with the City's existing application method. These factors are used throughout the state as the equivalent impact fee unit for fee determination as shown on Table 3-5. The use of these equivalency factors was

based on discussions with the City and the fact the City currently uses these parameters for the application of existing fees, comparisons of fee applicability provisions of neighboring jurisdictions, and promotion of administrative simplicity. For the residential class, the City directed PRMG to maintain the application of the fees based on the number of dwelling units served, without differentiation as to type of residence (single-family, multi-family, mobile home, etc.). For the non-residential class, it is proposed that the fee would be predicated on the square footage of new commercial construction or development, which generally equates to the link between size of facility and police protection services (based on number of employees, traffic, and general services). Many jurisdictions attempt to breakdown the non-residential sector into various categories based on a variety of parameters, including service calls, trip generation statistics that relate to use, and other factors. Based on discussions with the City, a review of the rate methodology used by other neighboring jurisdictions and to maintain administrative simplicity dealing with the adoption of the new fees, the total non-residential square footage relationship was considered appropriate at this time.

IMPACT FEE COMPARISONS

In order to provide the City additional information about the proposed impact fees, a comparison of the proposed fees for the City and those charged by other neighboring jurisdictions was prepared. Table 3-5 at the end of this report summarizes the impact fees for police protection services charged by other communities with the proposed rates of the City. While the non-residential fees are generally comparable with similar fees charged by other communities, the residential fee is significantly higher than most of the municipalities in the comparison. Reasons for this difference may be due to: i) the general characteristics of the City relative to residential and commercial development; ii) the density of the area; and iii) the recently completed construction of new facilities to meet growth where the fees of other cities may reflect recovery embedded (historical) costs of such facilities.

Additionally, as shown in Table 3-5 for other communities, the fees charged to the residential class are applied using a "per dwelling unit" basis, which is consistent with the recommended fee applicability provisions of the City's proposed fees. For the non-residential class and, as previously discussed, the fees are applied on the basis of the amount of square foot of facility development. (This was consistent for all of the public agencies surveyed.) In some instances, communities do differentiate the application of the fee between specific land uses within the non-residential or commercial class.

(Remainder of page intentionally left blank)

SECTION 4

FIRE PROTECTION SERVICES IMPACT FEE

GENERAL

This section provides a discussion of the development and design of the impact fee for fire protection services. Included in this section is a discussion of the level of service requirements, capital costs, included as the basis for the determination of the fee, and the design of the fee to be applied to new growth within the City.

LEVEL OF SERVICE REQUIREMENTS

Per City ordinance, the City has adopted a level of service of 1.7 firefighters per 1,000 population. The adopted level of service is consistent with the national minimum recommended standard. In addition to providing adequate personnel to handle various service requests, the Miramar Fire Department ("MFD") must also be able to respond to service calls within a specified time period to maintain Insurance Service Organization ("ISO") property insurance ratings in the community. As a practical matter, the City's response time standard of six (6) minutes is based upon recognized industry standards not only having to do with property protection, but also in providing Emergency Medical Support ("EMS") services. In each case, it is necessary to reach property and residents of the City within the time frame standard to maximize the effectiveness of fire suppression activities and / or emergency medical care. The City has indicated that the average response time is generally consistent with the six-minute threshold.

In order to meet the service standards required of the community for responding to fire and rescue alarms, the City and the cities located in Broward County, as well as Broward County Fire Rescue, entered into a "Consolidated" Mutual Fire, Rescue, Emergency or Disaster Interlocal Agreement for fire protection and rescue service in 1984 (the "Interlocal Agreement"). The purpose of the Interlocal Agreement is to provide for reciprocal firefighting / hazardous materials / rescue / extraction / emergency management assistance in case of disasters that could occur within the geographical service area covered by the Interlocal Agreement. In addition to the Interlocal Agreement, the City has also entered into an interlocal agreement providing for the furnishing of emergency medical services to a portion of Broward County, Florida (the "EMS Agreement"). Pursuant to the EMS Agreement, which became effective on October 1, 1983, the City agreed to become an advanced life support services provider and assist in a specific geographical territory within unincorporated Broward County as defined in the EMS Agreement.

In determining the needed facilities and equipment to provide adequate fire protection and emergency medical services for the City's future population, PRMG interviewed staff and conducted a general review of the City's fire protection / emergency medical service budget in order to estimate existing and future needs. The City presently operates four (4) emergency management service stations that are located strategically within the corporate limits of the City's service area. The City has determined the need for a fifth facility, Station 107, which will be operational beginning in Fiscal Year 2017. The stations are summarized below:

Emergency Management Service Stations

Station Number	Location
Station 19	6700 Miramar Parkway
Station 70	9001 Miramar Parkway
Station 84 (Headquarters)	14801 SW 27th Street
Station 100	2800 SW 184th Avenue
Station 107	11811 Miramar Parkway

Generally, the level of service standard for fire protection services and emergency medical services is based on response times in a first alarm situation. The City is committed to maintaining an average response time of six minutes or less. Another method used to characterize level of service needs deals with the number of firefighters per 1,000 residents. Currently, the City has 13 support personnel and 138 full-time firefighters / EMTs.

For the purposes of the development of the impact fees for fire protection service, the current staffing levels were recognized in the determination of the total applicable costs for growth. Based on this current staffing level and projected population levels, the LOS equates to 1.10 firefighters per 1,000 population. Although it does not meet its level of service target of 1.7 firefighters per 1,000 population, the City, as previously discussed, has entered into a mutual-aid agreement with surrounding municipalities to promote staffing efficiency and allow for reduced staffing. Impact fees for future development were based on the City's staffing plan and requirements related to new equipment and facilities. As a result, an overall staffing level of 158 firefighters was projected for the year 2020.

Unlike police protection services that can be added in relatively small increments, fire protection resources must be added in larger increments tied to staffing of new facilities and equipment which, consist generally of personnel teams, engine apparatus, and emergency management service stations. Therefore, the appropriate determination of impact fees is based on the "improvements" method whereby total capital requirements needed to service the future population were projected and allocated.

RESOURCE NEEDS ANALYSIS

At this time, the Fire Department consists of 138 budgeted full-time firefighters / emergency medical technicians and other personnel, as summarized previously. Based on discussions with the City and the assumed level of service reflected in this report for fire protection and emergency medical services, it is anticipated that the City will need to add an additional 15 full-time firefighters to maintain acceptable fire protection services (six-minute response time) and achieve the LOS requirements, as planned, through the year 2020. As discussed in Section 1, the method used to determine the fire protection services impact fees includes a combination of the standards-driven and improvement-driven methods. As previously discussed for the police services impact fee, the standards-driven method was used to determine the typical capital costs to equip a firefighter. The improvement-driven method was utilized in the allocation of costs associated with major capital facilities that service the City's first alarm service area. As such, two separate capital cost parameters were recognized. The first parameter deals with the costs of directly equipping the next increment of fire protection services (i.e., a full-time firefighter). These capital facilities would include uniforms, self-contained breathing apparatus ("SCBA"),

and other direct firefighting apparatus and apparel. The second parameter deals with the facilities required to house the firefighters and includes investment in the land, buildings and furnishings associated with the existing and planned fire station and other related facilities. Additionally, this category of costs also includes the investment in firefighting vehicles and trucks (e.g., pumper trucks, tanker trucks, etc.), rescue equipment (e.g., extraction tools), and emergency medical equipment. These expenditures comprise a sizable portion of the capital investment for providing fire services and must be allocated between existing and new residential and commercial land uses.

Table 4-1 at the end of this report summarizes the estimated capital costs allocated to each additional firefighter hired by the City to maintain the current level of service. As summarized below, approximately $250,224 in allocable capital costs per firefighter / EMT has been identified in order to provide fire protection services within the City's emergency management response area for during the forecast period. As shown below, the primary costs are associated with vehicle expenditures and the cost of base facilities:

	Allocated Capital Costs	
	Amount [*]	Percent
Personnel Equipment	$23,562.12	9.4%
Vehicle and Related Equipment	52,021.03	20.8%
Buildings and Stations	186,416.54	74.5%
Grants	(11,775.40)	(4.7%)
Total Recognized Capital Costs	$250,224.29	100.00%

[*] Derived from Table 4-1. Includes the allocated portion of grants projected to be received during the forecast period.

In the development of the capital costs as shown on Table 4-1, the cost of existing assets that have excess capacity available to serve the future fire protection and emergency medical service needs of the City are recognized. Since the City must invest in the facilities in advance to provide service, it is necessary to recognize the portion of such facilities available to serve growth in the impact fee calculation. Based on an analysis of the growth potential within the City, this investment in current assets that are available to serve future growth represents a significant portion of the facility costs in the derivation of the fee.

DESIGN OF FIRE PROTECTION SERVICES IMPACT FEE

The method used to determine the fire protection services impact fee was based upon the same four step process as was described for the determination of the police impact fee. Table 4-2 at the end of this report summarizes the results of the approach. The following is a brief description of the method used in this study.

- Development of Total Capital Need – Based on discussions with the City and the Fire Department and the level of service requirements related to the maintenance of first response time, the incremental facilities and related costs to serve the population through the year 2020 reflected in the analysis was developed.

- Allocation of Costs to Customer Class – This step allocates the identifiable capital costs incurred for maintaining the current LOS as growth materializes to the customer classes. The allocation was based on the number of service calls made by the Fire Department, which is the parameter used as the link between need and cost.

- Development of Equivalent Impact Fee Units – This step develops the estimated number of equivalent impact fee units that are anticipated to be added to the City and for which the City must provide additional municipal services. For the residential class, the equivalent unit is a dwelling unit (residence) and for the non-residential class, the equivalent unit is the square footage of the development.

- Calculation of Cost per Equivalent Impact Fee Unit – Once the total capital costs allocable to the future growth and the equivalent impact fee units were determined, the cost per equivalent unit was calculated.

Fire Protection Services Impact Fee Assumptions

The development of the fire protection services impact fees required several assumptions. The major assumptions used in the development of the proposed impact fees as shown on Table 4-2 are as follows:

1. In the development of the capital costs allocable to serve the projected fire protection needs of the City, it was assumed that the planned level of service will be achieved by the City throughout the forecast period and buildout.

2. In the development of the total capital costs of providing fire protection services through the year 2020, an estimate of the total capital costs required for service was developed. The total capital costs were based on information provided by and discussions with the City's Fire Department and include the following assumptions:

    a. The estimated cost of equipping a full-time firefighter primarily includes the cost of self-contained breathing apparatus equipment ("SCBA"), communications equipment, and bunker gear. The costs for these items were based on information provided by the City, which recognized the total direct cost of the various items required to fully equip a firefighter. The current direct cost to equip a full-time firefighter / medic was estimated to be $23,562 per employee.

    b. Based on the City's capital improvement plan for the City's Fire Department, one new facility will be required to meet the level of service response time during the forecast period. The City has determined that a new 14,485 square foot fire rescue and emergency management substation (No. 107) will be required to meet the level of service response time necessary for the area during the forecast period reflected in this report (by the year 2020). The estimated current capital cost recognized in this study for the new station, including allowances for design and administration, is $5,239,949 based on estimates prepared by the City.

    c. Based on planning information and discussions with the City, and in order to maintain the LOS standards assumed in this report as the City grows, three new firefighting

vehicles costing an estimated total of $1,825,000 have been included in the calculation of the impact fees.

d. The costs for other related equipment allocable to fire protection and emergency medical services (e.g., extrication tools, trucks, and other miscellaneous equipment) was based on the detailed inventory of current assets as provided by the City. Additional costs were recognized to account for estimated capital expenditures due to the increase in firefighting personnel for the projection period.

3. The cost of the facilities directly associated with personnel was allocated to growth based on the: i) level of service standard assumed for this study; and ii) the population projections for the forecast period. The costs allocated on the basis of the number of full-time firefighters included: i) the direct costs of equipping a firefighter; ii) vehicles and trucks used by Fire Department personnel; and iii) certain miscellaneous equipment required for fire protection and emergency medical services including computers, communication equipment, and furnishings. The percentage factor used to allocate the costs to future growth was estimated as follows:

	Estimated Firefighter Personnel Requirements
Firefighters / Medics Personnel Requirements	
Population Estimated at 2020	138,881
Total Staffing Requirements at 2020 [*]	153
Current Staffing – Firefighters / Medics	138
Net Staffing Required to Meet Future Needs (Station 107)	15
Percent Allocable to Future Growth	100.00%
Level of Service Standard – Population Basis	1.10

[*] Amount does not include support personnel.

4. The estimated cost of providing fire protection services was allocated between the residential and non-residential customer classifications based on the estimated number of service calls made by the Fire Department for the fiscal years ended 2014 and 2015. The determination of the fire service calls to the customer classifications was performed using two parameters. With respect to those service call responses directly allocable to a particular class of customers (e.g., residential, non-residential) based on information compiled by the Fire Department, such amounts were directly assigned to such classes. The allocation of the responses to fire-related emergencies is summarized below:

(Remainder of page intentionally left blank)

Allocation of Service Calls [*]

	Residential	Non-Residential
Total Fiscal Year Direct Service Calls	8,033	3,443
Dwelling Units – 2016	38,108	
Sq.Ft. of Non-Residential Development – 2016		15,944,408
Average Calls for Service		
Per Dwelling Unit	0.11	
Per Sq.Ft. of Non-Residential Development		0.000108
Projected Growth 2016 - 2020		
Dwelling Units	1,573	
Sq.Ft. of Non-Residential Development		1,014,585
Projected Calls for Service Resulting from Growth		
Dwelling Units	164	
Non-Residential Development		102
Percent of Calls Allocable to Growth	60.22%	39.78%

[*] Derived from Table 4-2.

5. The residential equivalent impact fee units represent the net change in the number of dwelling units to be constructed in the City during the planning period of this report (i.e., through the year 2020). Based on: i) population projections of the City; ii) estimated average number of persons per dwelling unit of 3.50 persons per household; and iii) assuming no significant change in the size of the City due to annexation, all as provided by the City, the increase of 1,573 dwelling units was estimated through fiscal year 2020.

6. The non-residential equivalent impact fee units represent the net change in the estimated square footage of commercial and industrial development to be constructed during the planning period of this report (i.e., through fiscal year 2020). Based on anticipated development reports provided by the City, it was estimated that approximately 1,014,585 square feet of non-residential development will occur that is subject to the payment of impact fees through fiscal year 2020.

Impact Fee Calculation

Based on the above-referenced assumptions, the allocated capital facilities identified or considered necessary to maintain the level of service requirements, and the population and land use projections of the City, the fire protection services impact fees for the residential and non-residential customer classifications were determined. As shown in Table 4-3 at the end of this report, the cost per equivalent impact fee unit by customer classification was determined as follows:

(Remainder of page intentionally left blank)

Summary of Allocated Costs

	Residential [*]	Non-Residential [*]
Total Allocated Capital Costs	$904,058	$597,288
Total Equivalent Impact Fee Units	1,573 Dwelling Units	1,014,585 Sq.Ft.

[*] Derived from Table 4-3.

Based on the above information, the fire protection / emergency medical services impact fee per equivalent unit (by class of customer) was estimated to be as follows:

Summary of Proposed Impact Fees

	Fee per Equivalent Impact Fee Unit
Residential	$574.00 per Dwelling Unit
Non-Residential	$0.58 per Square Foot

Taking into account the methodology used for the determination of the fee and the estimates associated with determining the fire protection capital needs of the City, the proposed impact fees utilizing the assumed LOS standard appear reasonable. It should be noted that in the development of the fee per equivalent impact fee unit, no credits associated with developer land dedication or similar activities have been recognized. It should also be noted that the proposed capital program assumed to develop the recommended impact fees do not include any significant adjustment for inflationary allowances. As a matter of policy, several communities have adopted a general credit to recognize that the use of General Fund monies to fund the incremental capital improvements on expenditures may occur. Based on the directives of the City, no general credit to the fee for the potential use of General Fund monies towards future capital projects has been assumed or recognized. Essentially, it is the intent of the City to fully fund the capital expenditures associated with growth from impact fees to the fullest extent possible. Any differences in timing (cash collection and expenditure payment) will be administered by the City to ensure that the nexus between the need and the level of the fee charged is maintained.

In the development of the cost per equivalent impact fee unit, it was determined that the rate should be applied on a "per dwelling unit" basis for the residential class and a "per square footage" of commercial development for the non-residential class. These factors are used throughout the state as the equivalent impact fee unit for fee determination as shown on Table 4-3. The use of these equivalency factors was based on discussions with the City, comparisons of fee applicability provisions of neighboring jurisdictions, and promotion of administrative simplicity. For the non-residential class, it is proposed that the fee would be predicated on the square footage of new commercial construction or development. Many jurisdictions attempt to breakdown the non-residential sector into various categories based on a variety of parameters including service calls, trip generation statistics that are assumed to relate to use, and other factors. Based on discussions with the City, a review of the rate methodology used by other neighboring jurisdictions and to maintain administrative simplicity dealing with the adoption of the new fees, the total non-residential square footage relationship is considered appropriate at this time.

IMPACT FEE COMPARISONS

In order to provide the City additional information about the proposed impact fees, a comparison of the proposed fees for the City and those charged by other neighboring jurisdictions was prepared. Table 4-4 at the end of this report summarizes the impact fees for fire protection services charged by other communities with the proposed rates of the City. As can be seen in the comparison, the proposed non-residential fees are higher than the average fee; however, the residential fees are generally more competitive on average when compared with similar fees charged by other communities. As stated previously, reasons for this difference may include: i) the general characteristics of the City relative to residential and commercial development; ii) density of the area; and iii) the need of the City to construct new future facilities to meet growth where the fees of other cities may reflect recovery embedded (historical) costs of such facilities. No analysis of the derivation of the fees charged by the other communities was performed in this study due to the limitation of the study's scope.

Additionally, as shown in Table 4-4 for other communities, the fees charged to the residential class are applied using a "per dwelling unit" basis, which is consistent with the recommended fee applicability provisions of the City's proposed fees. For the non-residential class and, as previously discussed, the fees are applied on the basis of the amount of square foot of facility development. (This was consistent for all public agencies surveyed.) Several counties and cities do differentiate fees per square foot between specific land uses within the non-residential or commercial class, which were generally based on the amount of service calls per specific rate category or "trip ends."

(Remainder of page intentionally left blank)

SECTION 5

PARKS AND RECREATION IMPACT FEES

GENERAL

This section provides a discussion of the development and design of the proposed impact fees for parks and recreational services. Included in this section is a discussion of adopted level of service ("LOS") standards, facility requirements, and related capital costs included as the basis for the fee determination, and the design of the fee to be applied to new growth within the City.

DEFINITION OF RECREATIONAL FACILITIES

The Florida Department of Environmental Protection ("FDEP") has identified seven classifications or categories of parks. The seven classifications are: i) Equipped play area and tot lot; ii) neighborhood park; iii) community park; iv) urban open space; v) urban-district park; vi) regional park; and vii) beach access site. There are specific site guidelines for the recreational classifications that are basically directed towards size, accessibility, and population requirements. The following is a discussion of selected site guidelines as identified by the FDEP:

Equipped Play Area and Tot Lot – These recreational areas generally consist of open areas with play apparatus for school age or preschool children. Usually, these areas range in size from one-quarter to one acre and serve neighborhoods of between 500 and 2,500 people. Recommended facilities include playground equipment, benches and picnic tables, landscaping and open space.

Neighborhood Park – These recreational areas generally consist of a variety of facilities designed for the specific needs of the neighborhood. This park is usually considered as a "walk-to" park where access is directed towards the local residents of the neighborhood. The park is usually designed to serve a radius of up to a half mile and has a size ranging from five to ten acres (i.e., approximately two acres per 1,000 people). Recommended facilities include playground equipment, recreational buildings, multipurpose courts, sports fields, picnic areas, and open space.

Community Park – These recreational areas are considered as "ride-to" parks and are located on major collector or arterial streets. This type of park is designed to serve the needs of four to six neighborhoods or generally a radius of up to three miles. It is recommended that this type of park be a minimum of twenty (20) acres based on a minimum standard of two (2) acres per 1,000 population. Just as the neighborhood park is designed to serve the needs of the neighborhood, a community park is designed to meet the needs of the surrounding community. Recommended facilities may include swimming pools, ball fields, tennis courts, playground equipment, multipurpose courts, recreation buildings, sports fields, and other associated equipment. The park should also include allowances for open space, adequate parking, and landscaping. The facilities included in the neighborhood park may also be included in a community park.

Urban Open Space – These areas are landscaped or natural open areas usually located within built-up areas and may serve a variety of population sizes based on the size of the open space.

The principal function of these areas is to provide a buffer to congested environments. Facilities for this type of park may include benches, commemorative structures, trails, and paths.

The foregoing recreational facilities may also be classified into two categories: resource-based and activity-based. Resource-based sites and facilities are defined as those centered around particular natural resources. These sites provide opportunities for activities such as picnics, hiking, water sports, fishing or just exploring nature. Activity-based recreational sites and facilities are defined as those developed for the enjoyment of particular commercial or non-commercial activities. These sites include facilities for basketball, baseball, football, soccer, golf, amusement parks, arcades, water parks, and senior citizen centers.

Historically, neighborhood parks and community parks have comprised most of the public recreational facilities within the City. Due to the size of Miramar and the Broward County (the "County") population in the surrounding communities, there was a need to develop a regional park. Recognizing the importance of this need to City residents, the City Commission passed Resolution No. 03-76 in 2002 to assume responsibility for the construction, operation, and future maintenance of the planned Miramar Regional Park, for the benefit of the City's existing and future residents. As part of the Interlocal Agreement with the County, the County provided approximately $16,000,000 in funding for the park. In addition to a large inventory of parks, the City provides an array of public recreational activities for its residents. These activities are provided in the form of picnic areas, exercise trails, tennis and basketball courts, football and baseball fields, and other athletic activities. Involvement within the City is further encouraged through community and senior centers. The City's existing public recreational facilities provide diverse recreational opportunities for all residents.

LEVEL OF SERVICE STANDARDS

Since 1986, the City has maintained a LOS for recreational open space including a set of standards for recreational facilities. With respect to open space, and as referenced in the City's Comprehensive Plan, the City has adopted an LOS standard of four (4) acres per 1,000 residents. The City currently owns and maintains an extensive inventory of parks. The City currently has 582.07 acres considered applicable toward its recreation space level of service. City owned facilities include Community Parks and applicable school recreation acreage (122.69 acres), Neighborhood Parks (74.31 acres), and Regional Parks (385.06 acres). Based on the current estimated population of 133,377, the City has a surplus of 48.56 acres. The City's buildout population is currently estimated at 170,000 residents, which will require approximately 680.00 acres of open space.

(Remainder of page intentionally left blank)

Summary of Current LOS Surplus/(Deficiency)

Description	Amount
2016 Estimated Total Population	133,377
Open Space LOS	4.0 Acres per 1,000 Population
Required Acres	533.51 Acres
Current City Inventory	582.07 Acres
Current Surplus	48.56 Acres

Many recreational service impact fees include a component for open space. It should be noted, however, that the open space allocated to future growth is not a contributing basis for the proposed impact fees. The City has adopted a separate ordinance to ensure that open space standards are met through required land donations or separately adopted fee contributions that are inclusive of land allocations only, which is discussed later in this section. Therefore, the discussion above is for informational purposes only and shows that the City has achieved its LOS as it relates to open space within the Comprehensive Plan. In addition to open space, the City's Comprehensive Plan also includes goals and objectives relating to recreational facilities. While not specific, the Comprehensive Plan indicates under Section VI. Recreation and Open Space Element, Goal 1, Objective 1.1, Policy 1.1.5, the need to "continue to provide a minimum of recreational facilities, as per the Florida Recreation and Parks Association level of service standards for recreational facilities." It is assumed that the projects included in the Community Services capital plan, which served as the basis for the impact fees, were developed based on the objectives of the City's Comprehensive Plan regarding recreation facilities.

DESIGN OF RECREATIONAL FACILITY IMPACT FEE

A blend of the standards-driven and the improvements-driven methods was used to determine the Recreation impact fee. With this approach, the standards-driven method was used in determining the facilities required to provide the City's level of service standards for recreation. The improvements-driven method can be used to allocate these costs to the population served, which in this case are the number of households at buildout. When combined with the estimated cost of the existing facilities, the total capital investment in recreation facilities can be projected and allocated per household on a system-wide "buy-in" basis. It should be noted that in the development of the proposed impact fees, the total cost or capital investment in facilities is reduced by grants and other funding contributions The following is a brief description of the three-step process used in this study:

- Development of Total Capital Need – Based on the City's cost of developing existing and future park facilities, and population projections, the total cost to serve the City's residents is developed.

- Development of Equivalent Impact Fee Units – This step develops the estimated number of equivalent impact fee units such that a specific rate can be developed. This municipal service is applicable only to the residential class and the equivalent unit is considered to be a resident (per person application).

- Calculation of Cost per Equivalent Impact Fee Unit – Once the total capital costs allocable to the future growth of the City and the per customer equivalent impact fee units were estimated, the cost per equivalent impact fee unit was calculated. The impact fee unit per resident (person) was then assigned to each dwelling unit (residence) based on a resident per room basis.

Recreational Facility Impact Fee Assumptions

In the development of the recreation facility component of the recreation impact fees, several assumptions were required. The major assumptions used in the development of the impact fees are as follows:

1. The recreation impact fee was calculated using a blend of the standards-driven and improvements-driven methods. The standards-driven method was used in determining the recreation needs of the City and it was assumed that the projects detailed in the City's capital improvements plan incorporated the standards within the design of the various recreation facilities noted in the plan. The improvements-driven method refers to the allocation of the cost of these facilities to the projected growth in population through buildout.

2. The total cost of the existing recreation facilities, planned improvements to those facilities, and future parks is $114,617,273 based on data provided by City staff. This cost does not include land, which as discussed previously, is not a part of the recreation impact fee calculation.

3. City staff has provided data indicating a total of $42,864,908 in contributions from other sources, including grants and donations, which have been or are projected to be received toward the funding of the City's recreation facilities. The contributions from other sources were included as a credit in the calculation of the recreation impact fee.

4. The fee per person was based on the buildout population provided by the City of 170,000 residents.

Recreational Facility Impact Fee Calculation

Based on the above-referenced assumptions, the recreation facility impact fee as calculated on Table 5-1 was determined as follows:

(Remainder of page intentionally left blank)

Calculation of Recreational Facility Impact Fee

Description	Amount
Projected Population at Buildout	170,000
Estimated Current Population	133,377
Projected Remaining Growth in Population through Buildout	36,623
Percentage of Cost of Facilities Attributable to Growth	21.54%
Total Cost of Recreation Facilities	$114,617,273
Total Contributions From Other Sources	42,864,908
Total Cost After Contributions from Other Sources	71,752,365
Cost of Facilities Allocated to Growth	15,457,570
Projected Growth In Population Through Buildout	$36,623
Average Cost of Facilities Per Person	$422.07

In the development of the cost per equivalent impact fee unit, discussed earlier, it was determined that the impact fee rate be determined per resident (person) and then be allocated to dwelling units (residence) on a resident per room basis. This application accounts for variations based on the number of bedrooms per household. The following summarizes the proposed rates (rounded) on a per bedroom basis:

1 Bedroom	$475.00
2 Bedrooms	876.00
3 Bedrooms	1,277.00
4 Bedrooms	1,678.00
5 Bedrooms	2,079.00
6 Bedrooms	2,480.00
For Each Additional Bedroom Over 6	401.00

COMMUNITY PARKS LAND DEDICATION

As previously discussed, the City has adopted a separate ordinance to ensure that open space standards are met through required land donations or separately adopted fee contributions that are inclusive of land allocations only. As adopted by Sections 508.14.1 and 508.14.2 of the City's Code of Ordinances, a development with a park agreement may:

1. Dedicate land equal at least four (4) acres of land for every 1,000 potential residents estimated to occupy the development; or

2. Deposit into the City's park development fund an amount equal to the fair market value of the land otherwise to be dedicated. The City and the developer select separate real estate appraisers and the average of the two appraisers' values is considered the fair market value of the property.

However, developments within a mixed-use category located within the Transit Oriented Corridor District and Country Ranches (i.e., developments without a park agreement) are exempt from the above process and must pay a specific Community Parks Land Dedication impact fee.

Community Parks Land Dedication Impact Fee Calculation

Based on data provided by and discussions with the City, the community parks land dedication impact fee, as calculated on Table 5-2, was determined as follows:

Calculation of Community Parks Land Dedication Impact Fee

Description	Amount
Total Cost of Land Excluded	$11,706,550
Total Land Excluded (Acres)	69.93
Average Cost per Acre of Land	$167,415.00
Level of Service	4 Acres per 1,000 Population
Population Served per Acre	250 Residents
Average Cost per Person	$669.66

In the development of the cost per equivalent impact fee unit, discussed earlier, it was determined that the impact fee rate be determined per resident (person) and then be allocated to dwelling units (residence) on a resident per room basis. This application accounts for variations based on the number of bedrooms per household. The following summarizes the proposed rates (rounded) on a per bedroom basis:

1 Bedroom	$753.00
2 Bedrooms	1,389.00
3 Bedrooms	2,025.00
4 Bedrooms	2,661.00
5 Bedrooms	3,298.00
6 Bedrooms	3,934.00
For Each Additional Bedroom Over 6	636.00

IMPACT FEE COMPARISONS

In order to provide the City additional information about the proposed impact fees, a comparison of the proposed fees for the City and those charged by other jurisdictions was prepared. Table 5-3 at the end of this report summarizes the impact fees for recreational services charged by other communities with the proposed rates of the City. Please note that each community may establish a different LOS standard to meet its demographic needs for recreation facilities and activities. The City can anticipate variances between other communities.

(Remainder of page intentionally left blank)

Table 3-1
City of Miramar, Florida
Municipal Impact Fee Study

Summary of Existing Police Personnel

Line No.	Description	FY 2015 Actual [1]	FY 2016 Budgeted [1]	FY 2016 Actual [1]	FY 2017 Budgeted [1]	Allocation to Future Officers: Allocation Basis	Allocation to Future Officers: Achieved LOS
	Personnel						
1	Office of the Chief	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0		
2	Community Oriented Policing	125.5	138.5	131.5	141.5		
3	Specialized Support	35.0	31.0	31.0	31.0		
4	Criminal Investigations	31.0	31.0	31.0	31.0		
5	**Total Sworn Officers**	201.5	210.5	203.5	213.5	Per 1,000 Population	1.58
6	Code Compliance	15.0	15.0	15.0	15.0		
7	Property & Evidence	8.0	8.0	8.0	8.0		
8	Strategic Investigations	21.0	21.0	21.0	21.0		
9	Police Support Services	29.0	29.0	29.0	37.0		
10	**Total Personnel**	274.5	283.5	276.5	294.5		
11	Targeted Level of Service					Per 1,000 Population	1.58

Footnotes:

[1] Personnel levels shown based on the budget information provided by City Staff.

Table 3-2
City of Miramar, Florida
Municipal Impact Fee Study

Summary of Capital Costs to Provide Police Protection Services [1]

Line No.	Description	Total Amount [1]	Allocation Basis		Allocation Percentage	Allocated Cost [2]
	Equipment Costs per Full Time Officer:					
1	Uniform	$800.00	Direct Assign	[1]	100.00%	$800.00
2	Communication Equipment	6,500.00	Direct Assign	[1]	100.00%	6,500.00
3	Computer (Licensing and accessories)	8,000.00	Direct Assign	[1]	100.00%	8,000.00
4	Sidearm & Taser	1,025.00	Direct Assign	[1]	100.00%	1,025.00
5	Protective Clothing	1,235.00	Direct Assign	[1]	100.00%	1,235.00
6	Training - Academy	3,750.00	Direct Assign	[1]	50.00%	1,875.00
7	Total Equipment Costs Per Full Time Officer	$21,310.00				$19,435.00
	Vehicles and Related Equipment:					
8	Patrol Vehicles	$32,400.00	Vehicle LOS	[2]	100.00%	$32,400.00
9	Radar Gun	1,463.22	Vehicle LOS	[2]	100.00%	1,463.22
10	Other Vehicles	285,419.00	Current Officers	[3]	0.47%	1,340.00
11	Total Vehicles and Equipment	$319,282.22				$35,203.21
	Facilities and Major Equipment:					
12	New Headquarters & Supporting Assets	$28,693,197.00	Buildout	[4]	0.37%	$106,666.16
13	New Historic Police Substation	2,883,410	Buildout	[4]	0.37%	10,719.00
14	Land - Rock-Kim P	1,256,757.33	Buildout	[4]	0.37%	4,671.96
15	West Police Station	4,485,084.00	Buildout	[4]	0.37%	16,673.17
16	Other Facilities	227,630.00	Current Officers	[3]	0.47%	1,068.69
17	Other Major Equipment	1,341,788.10	Current Officers	[3]	0.47%	6,299.47
18	Total Facilities and Major Equipment	$38,887,866.43				$146,098.45
19	Total Allocated Costs Per Full-time Officer					$200,736.66
	Grants:					
20	Miscellaneous	$0.00	Direct Assign		100.00%	$0.00
21	Total Grants Applicable to Fee Calculation	$0.00				$0.00
22	Allocated Costs Per Full-time Officer After Grants					$200,736.66

Footnotes:

[1] Amounts based on information provided by the City.

[2] Allocated on basis of level of one vehicle and related equipment per officer.

[3] Allocation based on the current number of officers calculated as follows:

Current LOS:

Estimated 2017 population	134,732
Currently Required Number of Full Time Officers Based on LOS	213.00
*Level of Service Standard (officers per 1000 Pop.)	1.58
Percent Allocation to One Officer	0.47%

[4] Assumes these facilities and equipment will serve the community through City Buildout with an estimated population of 170,000. The allocation is calculated as follows:

Number of Officers Required at Buildout based on current LOS:

Estimated Population at Buildout	170,000
*Level of Service Standard (officers per 1000 Pop.)	1.58
Required Number of Full Time Officers at Buildout	269.00
Percent Allocation to One Officer	0.37%

* Based on targeted level of service

Table 3-3
City of Miramar, Florida
Municipal Impact Fee Study

Allocation of Service Calls Among Customer Classes

Line No.	Description	Number of Calls For Service: Total [1]	Residential	Commercial	Traffic / Other [2]
	Total Calls for Fiscal Years 2014 - 2015				
1	Number of Calls	146,911	110,183	36,728	46,068
2	Percent (%)	100.00%	75.00%	25.00%	N/A
3	Allocated Traffic / Other	46,068	34,551	11,517	
4	Percent (%)	100.00%	75.00%	25.00%	
5	Total Allocated Calls	192,979	144,734	48,245	
6	Estimated Dwelling Units - 2017		38,495		
7	Estimated Sq. Ft. of Non-Residential Development			16,106,412	
	Average Annual Calls for Service				
8	Per Dwelling Unit		1.88		
9	Per Sq. Ft. of Non-Residential Development			0.001498	
	Projected Growth During Forecast Period (2017 - Buildout)				
10	Dwelling Units		10,077		
11	Sq. Ft. of Non-Residential Development			6,497,724	
	Projected Calls for Service Resulting From Growth				
12	Dwelling Units		18,944		
13	Sq. Ft. of Non-Residential Development			9,732	
14	Total Calls Projected from Growth During Forecast Perio	28,675			
15	Percent of Total Projected Calls (%)	100.00%	66.06%	33.94%	

Footnotes:

[1] Amounts based on information provided by the City of Miramar Police Department.

[2] Service calls for other and traffic related incidents assumed to be in direct proportion to Residential and Non-Residential calls.

Table 3-4
City of Miramar, Florida
Municipal Impact Fee Study

Design of Police Protection Services Impact Fee

Line No.	Description	Total System	Residential	Non-residential
1	Total Allocated Cost Per Full Time Officer [1]	$200,736.66		
	Allocation to Customer Classes			
2	Calls for Service [2]		66.06%	33.94%
3	Allocated Costs for Full Time Officers		$132,612.92	$68,123.75
	Additional Officer Requirements to Serve Population Needs of Forecast Period [3]			
4	Full Time Officers		56.0	56.0
5	Estimated Incremental Capital Costs Allocable to Growth		$7,426,323.48	$3,814,929.76
	Incremental Equivalent Impact Fee Units [4]			
6	Residential Dwelling Units		10,077	
7	Square Feet of Commercial Development			6,497,724
8	Cost per Equivalent Impact Fee Unit		$736.96	$0.5871
9	Rounded Cost		$736.00	$0.58

Footnotes:

[1] Derived From Table 3-2.

[2] Derived from Table 3-3 based on information provided by the City's Police Department; service calls for traffic related incidents assumed to be in direct proportion to other service calls.

[3] Represents the incremental number of police officers required to serve the estimated population at buildout based on a level o service equating to 1.64 full time officers per 1,000 of population Amount estimated as follows:

	FY 2017	Buildout	Difference
Total Population	134,732	170,000	35,268
Level of Service (Officers per 1,000 pop.)	1.58	1.58	0.00
Required Full-time Officers to Meet Existing LOS	213.00	269.00	56.00

[4] Amounts shown represent the net increase in residential dwelling units and non-residential construction (square feet) for the period 2016 to Buildout as shown below:

	Residential Units	Non-residential Square Feet	Commercial Sq. Ft. per Residential Unit
Total Res. Units/Sq. Ft. of Develop - Buildout	48,571	22,604,136	465
Total Res. Units/Sq. Ft. of Develop - Est. FY 2017	38,495	16,106,412	418
Difference (Anticipated Growth)	10,077	6,497,724	N/A

Table 3-5
City of Miramar, Florida
Municipal Impact Fee Study

Police Protection Services Impact Fee Comparison

Line No.	Description	Residential			Non-Residential [1]
		Single Family	Multi-Family	Mobile Home	
	City of Miramar, Florida				
1	Existing	$222.00	$217.00	$217.00	$0.320
2	Proposed	736.00	736.00	736.00	$0.580
	Other Florida Communities:				
3	City of Boca Raton	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
4	City of Boynton Beach	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
5	City of Coconut Creek [2]	312.00	156.00	234.00	0.156 - 4.905
6	City of Cooper City [3]	45.50	45.50	45.50	0.037
7	City of Coral Gables	1,142.00	700.00	1,142.00	0.04 - 1.09
8	City of Dania Beach	368.00	368.00	368.00	0.184
9	Town of Davie	306.87	119.03	306.87	0.300
10	City of Deerfield Beach	110.51	65.49	65.49	0.0578 - 0.3295
11	City of Delray Beach	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
12	City of Fort Lauderdale	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
13	City of Hallandale	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
14	City of Hollywood	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
15	City of Lake Mary	165.00	165.00	165.00	0.082
16	City of Margate	372.38	372.38	372.38	0.994
17	City of Melbourne	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
18	City of Miami	164.00	144.00	164.00	0.038 - 0.751
19	City of Miami Beach	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
20	Orange County	271.00	319.00	263.00	0.032 - .494
21	City of Orlando	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
22	City of Oviedo	243.18	137.09	283.71	0.041 - 0.938
23	City of Palm Beach Gardens [2]	511.00	391.00	447.00	0.0190 - 0.2450
24	City of Pembroke Pines	60.00	60.00	60.00	0.070
25	City of Plantation	658.00	465.00	618.00	0.075-0.695
26	City of Pompano Beach	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
27	Village of Royal Palm Beach [2]	43.00	55.00	49.00	0.020 - 0.1310
28	City of Sunrise	28.04	0.00	28.04	0.00216 - 0.08608
29	City of Tamarac	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
30	City of West Palm Beach	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
31	City of Weston	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
32	City of Wilton Manors	91.50	91.50	91.50	0.061
33	City of Winter Garden	339.00	339.00	339.00	0.650
34	Other Florida Communities' Average	$290.61	$221.83	$280.14	$0.4383

Footnotes:

[1] All amounts shown represent dollars per square foot ($/s.f.) of non-residential development.

[2] The amount of the impact fee for a residential unit depends on the unit's size (sq. ft.). For the purpose of this comparison, it was assumed that a single family residence contains 2,000 square feet, a multi-family residence contains 1,000 square feet, and a mobile home residence contains 1,500 square feet of floored space.

[3] Amounts shown reflect 50% of the City's Public Safety Impact Fee (Fire and Police), which includes recovery of costs associated with police protection and fire rescue services.

Table 4-1
City of Miramar, Florida
Municipal Impact Fee Study

Summary of Existing Fire Rescue Personnel

Line No.	Description	FY 2015 Staff [1]	FY 2016 Budgeted [1]	Allocation to Future Officers: Allocation Basis	Allocation to Future Officers: Achieved LOS
	Personnel				
1	Fire Protection	58.0	63.5		
2	Emergency Medical Services	53.0	58.5		
3	Other Certified Firefighter Personnel	15.0	16.0		
4	**Total Certified Firefighters**	126.0	138.0	Per 1,000 Population	1.03
5	Communications	1.0	1.0		
6	Clerk / Tech / Firefighter Paramedic Trainee	12.0	12.0		
7	**Total Personnel**	139.0	151.0		
8	Targeted Level of Service			Per 1,000 Population	1.10

Footnotes:

[1] Personnel levels shown based on the budget information provided by City Staff.

Table 4-2
City of Miramar, Florida
Municipal Impact Fee Study

Summary of Capital Costs to Provide Fire Protection Services

Line No.	Description	Total Amount [1]	Allocation Basis	Allocation Percentage	Allocated Cost [2]
	Equipment Costs per Firefighter:				
1	Bunker Gear	$1,860.00	Direct Assign	100.00%	$1,860.00
2	Helmet	325.00	Direct Assign	100.00%	325.00
3	Gloves	125.00	Direct Assign	100.00%	125.00
4	Boots	326.00	Direct Assign	100.00%	326.00
5	Structural Boots	747.00	Direct Assign	100.00%	747.00
6	Face Shield	79.00	Direct Assign	100.00%	79.00
7	Gloves - Alt	127.00	Direct Assign	100.00%	127.00
8	Hood	56.00	Direct Assign	100.00%	56.00
9	Other Rescue Equipment	2,360,286.80	2020 Firefighter/EMS [3]	0.65%	15,426.71
10	Portable and Mobile Radios	352,024.41	2020 Firefighter/EMS [3]	0.65%	2,300.81
11	Air & Light Support Unit	300,000.00	2020 Firefighter/EMS [3]	0.65%	1,960.78
12	City Legacy Radio System	35,007.95	2020 Firefighter/EMS [3]	0.65%	228.81
13	Total Equipment Costs Per Full Time Firefighter	$3,050,964.16			$23,562.12
	Vehicles and Related Equipment:				
14	Ambulances	$1,250,472.00	2020 Firefighter/EMS [3]	0.65%	$8,173.02
15	Fire Engines & Pumpers	2,811,595.00	2020 Firefighter/EMS [3]	0.65%	18,376.44
16	Tower Truck	795,405.00	2020 Firefighter/EMS [3]	0.65%	5,198.73
17	Other Fire / Rescue Vehicles	841,217.00	2020 Firefighter/EMS [3]	0.65%	5,498.15
18	Vehicle Related Equipment	18,013.00	2020 Firefighter/EMS [3]	0.65%	117.73
19	New Advanced Life Support Rescue (Station 107)	375,000.00	2020 Firefighter/EMS [3]	0.65%	2,450.98
20	New Advanced Life Support Quint (Station 107)	850,000.00	2020 Firefighter/EMS [3]	0.65%	5,555.56
21	New Special Operations Vehicle	600,000.00	2020 Firefighter/EMS [3]	0.65%	3,921.57
22	Fire-Rescue Vehicle Leasing	417,516.18	2020 Firefighter/EMS [3]	0.65%	2,728.86
23	Total Equipment Costs Per Full Time Firefighter	$7,959,218.18			$52,021.03
	Fire Stations:				
24	Fire Station 19	$4,373,652.29	2020 Firefighter/EMS [3]	0.65%	$28,585.96
25	Fire Station 70	4,340,413.20	2020 Firefighter/EMS [3]	0.65%	28,368.71
26	Fire Station 84	2,080,212.45	2020 Firefighter/EMS [3]	0.65%	13,596.16
27	Fire Station 100	2,388,423.00	2020 Firefighter/EMS [3]	0.65%	15,610.61
28	Fire Station 107	580,290.00	2020 Firefighter/EMS [3]	0.65%	3,792.75
29	Admin Building	3,666,654.33	Total Firefighter/EMS [4]	0.53%	19,607.78
30	New - Fire Station 107	4,659,659.00	2020 Firefighter/EMS [3]	0.65%	30,455.29
31	Fire Station Logistics Relocation to Fire Headquarters	500,000.00	Total Firefighter/EMS [4]	0.53%	2,673.80
32	Fire Station 84 Relocation	6,690,000.00	2020 Firefighter/EMS [3]	0.65%	43,725.49
33	Total Fire Station	$29,279,304.27			$186,416.54
	Grants:				
34	Grant Amounts Received	($2,202,000.00)	Total Firefighter/EMS [4]	0.53%	($11,775.40)
35	Total Allocated Costs per Full time Firefighter				$250,224.29

Footnotes:

[1] Amounts based on information provided by the City of Miramar Fire Department.

[2] Represents estimated cost to provide fire protection and rescue services on a "per-Firefighter/EMS" basis.

[3] Allocation based on the total number of Firefighters/EMS projected for Fiscal Year 2020 and was calculated as follows:

Projected Staffing:	
Total Firefighters in Fiscal Year 2020	153.00
Percent Allocation to One Firefighter	0.65%

[4] Allocation based on the total number of Firefighters/EMS required for the estimated Buildout population and was calculated as follows:

Number of Firefighters estimated for Buildout based on current LOS:	
Estimated Population at Buildout	170,000
Level of Service Standard (Firefighters per 1000 Pop.)	1.10
*Estimated Number of Full Time Firefighters at Buildout	187.00
Percent Allocation to One Firefighter	0.53%

* Based on discussions with Fire Department staff

Table 4-3
City of Miramar, Florida
Municipal Impact Fee Study

Allocation of Service Calls Among Customer Classes

Line No.	Description	Number of Calls For Service		
		Total [1]	Residential	Commercial
	Total Calls for Fiscal Years 2014 - 2015			
1	Number of Calls	11,475	8,033	3,443
2	Percent (%) [2]	100.00%	70.00%	30.00%
3	Total Allocated Calls	11,475	8,033	3,443
4	Estimated Dwelling Units - 2016		38,108	
5	Estimated Sq. Ft. of Non-Residential Development			15,944,408
	Average Annual Calls for Service			
6	Per Dwelling Unit		0.11	
7	Per Sq. Ft. of Non-Residential Development			0.000108
	Projected Growth During Forecast Period (2016 - 2020)			
8	Dwelling Units		1,573	
9	Sq. Ft. of Non-Residential Development			1,014,585
	Projected Calls for Service Resulting From Growth			
10	Dwelling Units		166	
11	Sq. Ft. of Non-Residential Development			110
12	Total Calls Projected from Growth During Forecast Perio	275		
13	Percent of Total Projected Calls (%)	100.00%	60.22%	39.78%

Footnotes:

[1] Amounts based on discussions with the City of Miramar Fire Department.

[2] Service calls for other and traffic related incidents assumed to be in direct proportion to Residential and Non-Residential calls.

Table 4-4
City of Miramar, Florida
Municipal Impact Fee Study

Design of Fire Protection Services Impact Fee

Line No.	Description	Total System	Residential	Non-residential
1	Total Allocated Costs per Full time Firefighter [1]	$250,224.29		
	Allocation to Customer Classes			
2	Percent of Calls for Service [2]		60.22%	39.78%
3	Allocated Costs		$150,676.32	$99,547.97
	Additional Firefighters Required to Serve Population Needs of Forecast Period [3]			
4	Full Time Firefighters & EMS Personnel		6.0	6.0
5	Estimated Incremental Capital Costs Allocable to Growth		$904,057.91	$597,287.85
	Total Equivalent Impact Fee Units [4]			
6	Residential Dwelling Units		1,573	
7	Square Feet of Commercial Development			1,014,585
8	Cost per Equivalent Impact Fee Unit		$574.73	$0.5887
9	Rounded Fee		$574.00	$0.58

Footnotes:

[1] Derived From Table 4-2.

[2] Derived from Table 4-3 based on information provided by the City's Fire Department; service calls for traffic related incidents assumed to be in direct proportion to other service calls.

[3] Represents the incremental number of Firefighters / EMS Personnel required to serve the estimated population at Builtout based on a level of service equating to 1.14 full time officers per 1,000 of population Amount estimated as follows:

	FY 2016	FY 2020	Difference
Servicable Population	133,377	138,881	5,504
Level of Service (Firefighters/EMS per 1,000 pop.)	1.10	1.10	0.00
Required Full-time Officers to Meet Existing LOS	147.00	153.00	6.00

[4] Amounts shown represent the net increase in residential dwelling units and non-residential construction (square feet) for the period 2016 to Buildout as shown below:

	Residential Units	Non-residential Square Feet	Commercial Sq. Ft. per Residential Unit
Total Res. Units/Sq. Ft. of Development Serviceable - 2020	39,680	16,958,993	427
Total Res. Units/Sq. Ft. of Develop - Est. FY 2016	38,108	15,944,408	418
Difference (Anticipated Growth)	1,573	1,014,585	N/A

Table 4-5
City of Miramar, Florida
Municipal Impact Fee Study

Fire / EMS Services Impact Fee Comparison

Line No.	Description	Residential			Non-Residential [1]
		Single Family	Multi-Family	Mobile Home	
	City of Miramar, Florida				
1	Existing	$209.00	$204.00	$204.00	$0.4100
2	Proposed	574.00	574.00	574.00	0.5800
	Other Florida Communities:				
3	City of Boca Raton	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
4	City of Boynton Beach	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
5	City of Coconut Creek [2]	586.00	293.00	439.50	0.293
6	City of Cooper City [3]	45.50	45.50	45.50	0.0370
7	City of Coral Gables	2,790.00	1,711.00	2,790.00	0.01 - 1.03
8	City of Dania Beach	778.00	778.00	778.00	0.3890
9	Town of Davie	410.00	159.06	40.32	0.0414 - 0.0517
10	City of Deerfield Beach	218.38	129.41	129.41	0.1011 - 0.3737
11	City of Delray Beach	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
12	City of Fort Lauderdale	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
13	City of Hallandale	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
14	City of Hollywood	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
15	City of Lake Mary	175.00	175.00	175.00	0.1290
16	City of Margate	415.44	415.44	415.44	0.8228
17	City of Melbourne	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
18	City of Miami	704.00	619.00	704.00	0.003 - 0.368
19	City of Miami Beach	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
20	Orange County	270.00	197.00	270.00	0.049 - .297
21	City of Orlando	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
22	City of Oviedo	435.01	245.23	507.52	0.231 - 1.89787
23	City of Palm Beach Gardens [2]	390.00	298.00	341.00	0.0184 - 1.115
24	City of Pembroke Pines	60.00	60.00	60.00	0.1000
25	City of Plantation	686.00	485.00	643.00	.078-.725
26	City of Pompano Beach	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
27	Village of Royal Palm Beach [2]	339.00	341.00	340.00	0.103 - 0.6970
28	City of Sunrise	62.69	55.32	62.69	0.0543 - 0.20594
29	City of Tamarac	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
30	City of West Palm Beach	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
31	City of Weston	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
32	City of Wilton Manors	60.00	60.00	60.00	0.0400
33	City of Winter Garden	491.00	491.00	491.00	0.8500
34	Other Florida Communities' Average	$495.33	$364.33	$460.69	$0.3584

Table 4-5
City of Miramar, Florida
Municipal Impact Fee Study

Fire / EMS Services Impact Fee Comparison

Footnotes:

[1] All amounts shown represent dollars per square foot ($/s.f.) of non-residential development.

[2] The amount of the impact fee for a residential unit depends on the unit's size (sq. ft.). For the purpose of this comparison, it was assumed that a single family residence contains 2,000 square feet, a multi-family residence contains 1,000 square feet, and a mobile home residence contains 1,500 square feet of floored space.

[3] Amounts shown reflect 50% of the City's Public Safety Impact Fee (Fire and Police), which includes recovery of costs associated with police protection and fire rescue services.

Table 5-1
City of Miramar, Florida
Municipal Impact Fee Study

Design of Recreation Impact Fee

Line No.	Description		Total Amount
1	Cost of Existing Land, Facilities and Activity Related Assets		$110,852,995
2	Cost of Future Land, Facilities and Activity Related Assets		3,764,278
3	Total Cost of Recreation Facilities [1]		$114,617,273
4	Less Estimated Land Contributions and Grant Funded Facilities [2]		$42,864,908
5	Total Cost After Contributions From Other Sources		$71,752,365
6	Projected Population at Builtout		170,000
7	Estimated Current Population		133,377
8	Projected Remaining Growth in Population Through Buildout		36,623
9	Percentage of Cost of Facilities Attributable to Growth		21.54%
10	Cost of Facilites Attributable to Growth		$15,457,570
	Impact Fee Calculation		
11	Cost of Facilites Attributable to Growth		$15,457,570
12	Projected Remaining Growth in Population Through Buildout		36,623
13	Average Cost of Facilities per Person		$422.07
	Rates per Bedroom per Equivalent Residential Unit [3]	Basis	
14	1 Bedroom	1.125	$475.00
15	2 Bedroom	2.075	876.00
16	3 Bedroom	3.025	1,277.00
17	4 Bedroom	3.975	1,678.00
18	5 Bedroom	4.925	2,079.00
19	6 Bedroom	5.875	2,480.00
20	For each additional Bedroom over 6	0.950	401.00

Footnotes

[1] Reflects known capital costs of improvements, existing and future, as provided by the City.

[2] Estimate for Grants and Other Contributions for Existing and Future Capital Improvement Projects based on review of historical data and as provided and known by the City.

[3] Relationships shown pursuant to the existing Impact Fee Ordinance.

Table 5-2
City of Miramar, Florida
Municipal Impact Fee Study

Design of Community Parks Land Dedication Impact Fee

Line No.	Description	Total Amount
	Land Dedication Fee Calculation	
1	Total Value of Exempt Land [1]	$11,706,550
2	Acres of Exempt Land [1]	69.93
3	Average Cost per Acre of Land	$167,414.54
4	Level of Service per 1,000 Population (Acres)	4.00
5	Average Cost per Acre per Person	$669.66
	Rates per Bedroom per Equivalent Residential Unit [2]	
6	1 Bedroom	$753.00
7	2 Bedroom	1,389.00
8	3 Bedroom	2,025.00
9	4 Bedroom	2,661.00
10	5 Bedroom	3,298.00
11	6 Bedroom	3,934.00
12	For each additional Bedroom over 6	636.00

Footnotes

[1] Amounts shown based on data provided by the City.

[2] Calculation based on relationships shown pursuant to the existing Impact Fee and Land Dedication Ordinances.

Number of Bedrooms per Household	Relationship
1 Bedroom	1.125
2 Bedroom	2.075
3 Bedroom	3.025
4 Bedroom	3.975
5 Bedroom	4.925
6 Bedroom	5.875
For Each Additional Bedroom over 6	0.950

Table 5-3
City of Miramar, Florida
Municipal Impact Fee Study

Recreation Impact Fee Comparison [1]

Line No.	Description	Residential Single Family	Residential Multi-Family	Residential Mobile Home
	City of Miramar, Florida			
1	Existing	$1,210.00	$1,210.00	$1,210.00
2	Proposed	1,277.00	$876.00	$876.00
	Other Florida Communities:			
3	City of Boca Raton [3]	4,570.00	3,500.00	3,500.00
4	City of Boynton Beach	875.00	678.00	875.00
5	City of Coconut Creek	N/A	N/A	N/A
6	City of Cooper City	1,280.00	1,280.00	1,280.00
7	City of Coral Gables	6,602.00	4,049.00	6,602.00
8	City of Dania Beach	1,825.00	1,364.00	1,140.00
9	Town of Davie	1,625.95	630.67	630.67
10	City of Deerfield Beach	N/A	N/A	N/A
11	City of Delray Beach	500.00	500.00	500.00
12	City of Fort Lauderdale [4]	2,375.00	1,875.00	2,175.00
13	City of Hallandale	N/A	N/A	N/A
14	City of Hollywood	N/A	N/A	N/A
15	City of Lake Mary	335.00	335.00	335.00
16	City of Margate	N/A	N/A	N/A
17	City of Melbourne	540.00	450.00	540.00
18	City of Miami	6,818.00	5,998.00	5,998.00
19	City of Miami Beach	N/A	N/A	N/A
20	Orange County	971.71	701.99	727.86
21	City of Orlando	N/A	N/A	N/A
22	City of Oviedo	1,348.87	759.02	1,572.92
23	City of Palm Beach Gardens [4]	3,737.00	2,858.00	3,267.00
24	City of Pembroke Pines	N/A	N/A	N/A
25	City of Plantation [2]	706.00	501.00	657.00
26	City of Pompano Beach	776.00	480.00	580.00
27	Village of Royal Palm Beach [4]	1,303.00	859.00	1,081.00
28	City of Sunrise [2]	831.78	609.98	609.98
29	City of Tamarac	N/A	N/A	N/A
30	City of West Palm Beach	N/A	N/A	N/A
31	City of Weston	N/A	N/A	N/A
32	City of Wilton Manors	1,224.28	976.51	1,258.28
33	City of Winter Garden	1,300.00	1,159.00	874.00
34	Other Florida Communities' Average	$1,977.23	$1,478.21	$1,710.19

Table 5-3
City of Miramar, Florida
Municipal Impact Fee Study

Recreation Impact Fee Comparison [1]

Footnotes:

[1] This comparison only shows local park and recreation impact fees; it does not include park and recreation impact fees that might be charged by the county in which the municipality is located.

[2] Amounts shown assume single family homes with three bedrooms, multi-family dwellings with two bedrooms, and mobile homes with two bedrooms.

[3] The amount of the impact fee for a residential unit depends on the unit's size (sq. ft.). For the purpose of this comparison, it was assumed that a single family residence contains 2,000 - 3,599 square feet, and multi-family, and mobile homes contain 1,400 - 1,999 square feet of floored space.

[4] The amount of the impact fee for a residential unit depends on the unit's size (sq. ft.). For the purpose of this comparison, it was assumed that a single family residence contains 2,000 square feet, a multi-family residence contains 1,000 square feet, and a mobile home residence contains 1,500 square feet of floored space.