



JAMES A. NOYES, Director

# COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES

## DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS

900 SOUTH FREMONT AVENUE  
ALHAMBRA, CALIFORNIA 91803-1331  
Telephone: (626) 458-5100  
www.ladpw.org

ADDRESS ALL CORRESPONDENCE TO:  
P.O. BOX 1460  
ALHAMBRA, CALIFORNIA 91802-1460

IN REPLY PLEASE  
REFER TO FILE: **LD-4**

May 28, 2002

The Honorable Board of Supervisors  
County of Los Angeles  
383 Kenneth Hahn Hall of Administration  
500 West Temple Street  
Los Angeles, CA 90012-2756

Dear Supervisors:

**HEARING ON THE UPDATES OF THE BOUQUET CANYON AND EASTSIDE BRIDGE  
AND MAJOR THOROUGHFARE CONSTRUCTION FEE DISTRICTS  
CITY OF SANTA CLARITA/COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES  
SUPERVISORIAL DISTRICT 5  
3 VOTES**

**IT IS RECOMMENDED THAT YOUR BOARD:**

1. Instruct the Executive Officer to file the enclosed Bridge and Major Thoroughfare (B&T) Reports with the Director of Public Works, and schedule a public hearing for the proposed updates of the Bouquet Canyon and Eastside (formerly Route 126) Construction Fee Districts.
2. At the conclusion of the public hearing, and in the event written protests represent less than 50 percent of the assessable area within each of the B&T Districts:
  - a. Find the proposed updates to be statutorily exempt from the provisions of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) pursuant to CEQA State Guideline Section 21080(8)(D).
  - b. Adopt the enclosed Resolutions for the Bouquet Canyon and Eastside Districts, which were approved as to form by County Counsel, setting the revised boundaries, listing bridge and highway projects for which

the districts are expected to provide a total of \$396 million in funding, establishing the revised fees and delegating the authority to the Director of Public Works to conduct annual inflation adjustment reviews of the fees for the Districts.

3. Authorize Public Works to continue administering the subject Districts.
4. Instruct Public Works to record certified copies of the adopted Resolutions with the Registrar-Recorder/County Clerk's Office.

#### **PURPOSE/JUSTIFICATION OF RECOMMENDED ACTION**

On October 1, 1985, and July 21, 1987, your Board adopted the Bouquet Canyon and Route 126 Bridge and Major Thoroughfare Construction Fee Districts, respectively. Those Districts were adopted pursuant to Government Code Section 66484 and County Code Section 21.32.200. On April 2, 1991, the Board of Supervisors approved fee revisions to both Districts. The City of Santa Clarita adopted the Districts on November 28, 1989, and in 1993 renamed the Route 126 District as the Eastside Bridge and Major Thoroughfare Construction Fee District.

The current updates of the Districts are different from the previous updates in that these updates reanalyze build-out development and expand scopes of District improvements. Instead of including only selected improvement projects, the updated Districts propose to fully improve all roadways identified on the City and County circulation elements, including intersections and freeway interchanges. Improvements will include full-width grading, base, pavement, curb, gutter, sidewalk, medians, striping, bus pads (where applicable), bike lanes (where applicable), fully improved and signalized intersections, signal interconnect (where applicable), street lighting, roadway-related utility relocation, drainage structures within road right of way, and full improvements for bridges and freeway interchanges. Right of way is assumed to be dedicated by individual development projects, except for State highway projects and roadway widenings that are unrelated to private development.

The updated Districts will finance the construction of the proposed District improvements. The improvement projects will provide full mitigation of traffic impacts of new development by providing funding for the construction of new bridges and major thoroughfares and additions to existing facilities.

The Honorable Board of Supervisors  
May 28, 2002  
Page 3

On July 30, 1991, your Board approved a Cooperative Agreement between the County of Los Angeles and the City of Santa Clarita. The Agreement provided for the City and County to work together on all District matters and establish the Districts' fees within their respective jurisdictions. The City updated the Districts within its jurisdictional boundaries on March 26, 2002. Both agencies will cooperate with each other in the collection of fees and the construction of the proposed highway improvements to serve the areas. The Bouquet Canyon and Eastside Districts are expected to provide \$158.62 million and \$237.37 million, respectively, to fund the construction of bridge and highway improvements needed by new development.

Adoption of the enclosed Resolutions will authorize the fee revisions. The Resolutions define the improvements; set the method of fee apportionments; provide for annual fee increases tied to the Los Angeles Regional Construction Cost Index to help insure full funding of projects, and separate biennial review to reassess development trends, construction costs, and refinements of the project scope. The Resolutions also comply with the requirements of Government Code Section 66000, et seq., regarding development fees.

To address the issue of financial impact that the proposed fees would have on smaller developments currently in the approval process, Public Works is recommending that developers be given the option of paying the existing fee rate or the proposed rate between the effective date of the proposed fee and September 1, 2002 (assuming the effective date is prior to September 1). This will allow projects that are in the later stages of design to move forward as planned during this period. Developers paying the lower rate will receive credits based on the existing rate structure.

Once adopted, certified copies of the Resolutions will be recorded with the Registrar-Recorder/County Clerk's Office.

### **Implementation of Strategic Plan Goals**

This action is consistent with the County Strategic Plan Goal of Fiscal Responsibility as these benefit assessments provide sufficient funds to continue constructing our road and bridge facilities in an effective manner. It also satisfies the goal of Service Excellence since constructing our road and bridge facilities provide traffic mitigation to residents that improve the quality of life in the County.

### **FISCAL IMPACT/FINANCING**

All the revenues generated from the updates of the Districts will be expended on the proposed District projects. There will be no fiscal impact to the County's General Fund.

Sufficient funds will be available from the Districts' updates to finance the proposed improvements. The proposed fee increases will not affect Public Works' current fiscal year budget. This will have no impact on net County cost for the current or future fiscal years.

### **FACTS AND PROVISIONS/LEGAL REQUIREMENTS**

Public Works has determined that the Districts' updates are statutorily exempt from the provisions of the CEQA pursuant to CEQA State Guideline Section 21080(8)(D) in that the Districts are only obtaining funds for capital projects necessary to maintain services within existing service areas.

Public Works has developed, in addition to the generally adopted fee rate categories, a rate sheet for nontypical land uses, which includes special cases, such as senior housing, mobile homes, churches, and golf courses. Traffic impacts for each category were used to develop the rates.

A public hearing must be held, under the provisions of Government Code Section 66484, and notice thereof must be given pursuant to Government Code Section 65091, prior to approval of the updates. According to Government Code Section 66484 (a)6, the fee revisions must be rejected in the event of a majority protest (based on area of developable land). The proposed Resolutions approved as to form by County Counsel and containing the necessary information are enclosed for your Board's use following conclusion of the hearing. Once adopted, certified copies of the Resolutions will be recorded with the Registrar-Recorder/County Clerk's Office.

### **IMPACT OF CURRENT SERVICES (OR PROJECTS)**

Approval of the requested updates by your Board will ensure the timely completion of the much-needed roadway and bridge improvements to serve the current circulation needs created by new developments within the subject Districts. The Districts' improvements will help mitigate the additional traffic congestion impacts generated by approved subdivisions

The Honorable Board of Supervisors  
May 28, 2002  
Page 5

and building permits within the Districts.

**CONCLUSION**

Please return one copy of the letter indicating your Board's action at the conclusion of the hearing and copies of the recorded Resolutions.

Respectfully submitted,

JAMES A. NOYES  
Director of Public Works

JKC:ca

C:\WINNT\Profiles\jclopez\Local Settings\Temporary Internet Files\OLK103\BouquetEastsideBoardLetter.wpd

Enc.

cc: Chief Administrative Office  
County Counsel

**RESOLUTION OF THE  
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS OF THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES  
RELATING TO THE REVISION OF  
FEES AND IMPROVEMENT PROJECTS  
FOR THE BOUQUET CANYON  
BRIDGE AND MAJOR THOROUGHFARE CONSTRUCTION FEE DISTRICT**

WHEREAS, the Board of Supervisors of the County of Los Angeles adopted the Bouquet Canyon Bridge and Major Thoroughfare (B&T) Construction Fee District (District) on October 1, 1985, for the funding of certain highway improvements (District improvements); and

WHEREAS, on May 9, 1991, the Board of Supervisors updated the established fees for the District as follows:

Residential Property:

Single-Family	\$ 4,000/unit
Townhouse	\$ 3,200/unit
Apartment	\$ 2,800/unit

Non-Residential Property:

Neighborhood Commercial	\$ 4,000/gross acre
Commercial	\$ 20,000/gross acre
Industrial	\$ 12,000/gross acre

WHEREAS, the District fees established by the Board of Supervisors at the time of District formation and the prior update were based upon the estimated total improvement costs and the estimated potential development within the District at that time; and

WHEREAS, the estimated total improvement costs for the District have increased substantially since the last District update due to the increases in the scope of the projects and the addition of projects identified in the Los Angeles County Santa Clarita Valley Area Plan and the City of Santa Clarita Circulation Plan; and

WHEREAS, as a result of the above facts, the projected revenue from collection of District fees at the existing fee rates will be insufficient to fully finance the proposed District improvements; and

WHEREAS, there is a need to revise the District fees to provide for sufficient revenue to fully finance the proposed District improvements as is demonstrated in the Bouquet Canyon B&T Construction Fee District Update Report presented to the Board of Supervisors; and

WHEREAS, the District is within the jurisdictions of the County of Los Angeles and the City of Santa Clarita; and

WHEREAS, the revisions to the District fees contained in this Resolution will apply in both City and County jurisdictions; and

WHEREAS, the requirements for notice and public hearing in relation to the proposed fee revisions have been met in accordance with Government Code Section 65091; and

WHEREAS, the Public Works has determined that the District update is statutorily exempt from the provisions of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) pursuant to CEQA State Guideline Section 21080(8)(D) in that the District is only obtaining funds for capital projects necessary to maintain services within existing service areas; and

WHEREAS, the City and County will be responsible for preparation of any subsequent environmental documentation that may be required for the Bouquet Canyon B&T Construction Fee District improvement projects, the preparation of the construction plans, the acquisition of any needed right of way, and the construction of the improvements; and

WHEREAS, applicable requirements regarding revision of development fees, as set forth in government Code Section 66000 et. seq., have been satisfied; and

WHEREAS, developers will be given the option of paying the existing fee rate or the proposed rate between the effective date of the proposed fee and September 1, 2002; and

WHEREAS, in addition to the generally adopted fee rate categories, Public Works has developed and has on file a rate sheet for nontypical land uses that are based on specific traffic impacts.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Board of Supervisors:

- A. Considered the District update is statutorily exempt from the provisions of the CEQA pursuant to CEQA State Guideline Section 21080(8)(D).
- B. Finds that the estimated total cost of the District improvements is \$158.62 million.
- C. Approves the construction fees shown in the Report and the construction fees are as follows:

Residential Property:

Single-Family	\$ 14,200/unit
Townhouse/Condo	\$ 11,360/unit
Apartment	\$ 9,940/unit

Non-Residential Property:

Commercial	\$ 71,000/ gross acre
Industrial	\$ 42,600/ gross acre

- D. Hereby delegates authority to the Director of Public Works to use the developed rate sheet and calculate the specific fee rates for nontypical land uses.
- E. The approved revised District fees will be implemented within both the City and County jurisdiction areas.
- F. The method of fee apportionment for the revised District fees is set forth in the Bouquet Canyon Bridge and Major Thoroughfare Construction Fee District Update Report, attached hereto as Exhibit A.
- G. The revised District fees are to finance completion of the Bouquet Canyon B&T Construction Fee District Improvements as generally identified in Exhibit A, Attachment C.
- H. The revised District fees collected pursuant to this Resolution shall be used to finance, or where appropriate, to provide reimbursement for financing of, the District improvements.



- I. Hereby approves the automatic annual increase of District fees pursuant to the method of calculation indicated in the District Report in Exhibit A.
- J. The County and possibly other governmental agencies may contribute or make loans to the Bouquet Canyon B&T Construction Fee District Fund.
- K. Advancement of funds by developers to the District Fund for early completion of District projects may be accepted and later reimbursed by the District Fund or be compensated with credit against future fees.
- L. There is reasonable relationship between the proposed revised District fee's use for the District improvements and the affected subdivision and building permit approvals to which the fees apply since this new development will directly benefit from the improved traffic circulation provided for by the completion of the District improvements.
- M. There continues to be a reasonable relationship between the need for the District improvements and the affected subdivision and building permit approvals because the District improvements will help mitigate the additional traffic congestion impacts generated by those approvals.
- N. Hereby approves that developers will be given the option of paying the existing fee rate or the proposed rate during the time period between the effective date of the proposed fee and September 1, 2002 (assuming the effective date is prior to September 1). Developers paying the lower rate will receive credits based on the existing rate structure.

The foregoing Resolution was on the \_\_\_\_\_ day of May 2002, adopted by the Board of Supervisors of the County of Los Angeles and ex-officio the governing body of all other special assessment and taxing districts, agencies, and authorities for which said Board so acts.

VIOLET VARONA-LUKENS  
Executive Officer of the  
Board of Supervisors of the  
County of Los Angeles

By \_\_\_\_\_  
Deputy

APPROVED TO FORM

LLOYD W. PELLMAN  
County Counsel

By \_\_\_\_\_  
Deputy

JKCca

C:\WINNT\Profiles\jclopez\Local Settings\Temporary Internet  
Files\OLK103\BouquetEastsideBoardLetter.wpd

**RESOLUTION OF THE  
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS FOR THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES  
RELATING TO THE REVISION OF  
FEES AND IMPROVEMENT PROJECTS  
FOR THE EASTSIDE  
BRIDGE AND MAJOR THOROUGHFARE CONSTRUCTION FEE DISTRICT**

WHEREAS, the Board of Supervisors of the County of Los Angeles adopted the Eastside (formerly named Route 126) Bridge and Major Thoroughfare (B&T) Construction Fee District (District) on July 21, 1987, for the funding of certain highway improvements (District improvements); and

WHEREAS, on May 9, 1991, the Board of Supervisors updated the established fees for the District as follows:

Residential Property:

Single-Family	\$ 4,800/unit
Townhouse	\$ 3,840/unit
Apartment	\$ 3,360/unit

Non-Residential Property:

Commercial	\$24,000/gross acre
Industrial	\$14,400/gross acre

WHEREAS, the District fees established by the Board of Supervisors at the time of District formation and the prior update were based upon the estimated total improvement costs and the estimated potential development within the District at that time; and

WHEREAS, the estimated total improvement costs for the District have increased substantially since the last District update due to the increases in the scope of the projects and the additional of projects identified in the Los Angeles County Santa Clarita Valley Area Plan and the City of Santa Clarita Circulation Plan; and

WHEREAS, as a result of the above facts, the projected revenue from collection of District fees at the existing fee rates will be insufficient to fully finance the proposed District improvements; and

WHEREAS, there is a need to revise the District fees to provide for sufficient revenue to fully finance the proposed District improvements as is demonstrated in the Eastside B&T Construction Fee District Update Report presented to the Board of Supervisors; and

WHEREAS, the District is within the jurisdictions of the County of Los Angeles and the City of Santa Clarita; and

WHEREAS, the revisions to the District fees contained in this Resolution will apply in both City and County jurisdictions; and

WHEREAS, the requirements for notice and public hearing in relation to the proposed fee revisions have been met in accordance with Government Code Section 65091; and

WHEREAS, Public Works has determined that the District update is statutorily exempt from the provisions of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) pursuant to CEQA State Guideline Section 21080(8)(D) in that the District is only obtaining funds for capital projects necessary to maintain services within existing service areas; and

WHEREAS, the City and County will be responsible for preparation of any subsequent environmental documentation that may be required for the Eastside B&T Construction Fee District improvement projects, the preparation of the construction plans, the acquisition of any needed right of way, and the construction of the improvements; and

WHEREAS, applicable requirements regarding revision of development fees, as set forth in government Code Section 66000 et. seq., have been satisfied; and

WHEREAS, developers will be given the option of paying the existing fee rate or the proposed rate between the effective date of the proposed fee and September 1, 2002; and

WHEREAS, in addition to the generally adopted fee rate categories, Public Works has developed and has on file a rate sheet for nontypical land uses that are based on specific traffic impacts.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Board of Supervisors:

- A. Considered the District update is statutorily exempt from the provisions of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) pursuant to CEQA State Guideline Section 21080(8)(D).
- B. Finds that the estimated total cost of the District improvements is \$237.37 million.

- C. Approves the construction fees shown in the Report and the construction fees are as follows:

Residential Property:

Single-Family	\$ 14,700/unit
Townhouse/Condo	\$ 11,760/unit
Apartment	\$ 10,290/unit

Non-Residential Property:

Commercial	\$ 73,500/ gross acre
Industrial	\$ 44,100/ gross acre

- D. Hereby delegates authority to the Director of Public Works to use the developed rate sheet and calculate the specific fee rates for nontypical land uses.
- E. The approved revised District fees will be implemented within both the City and County jurisdiction areas.
- F. The method of fee apportionment for the revised District fees is set forth in the Eastside Bridge and Major Thoroughfare Construction Fee District Update Report, attached hereto as Exhibit A.
- G. The revised District fees are to finance completion of the Eastside B&T Construction Fee District Improvements as generally identified in Exhibit A, Attachment C.
- H. The revised District fees collected pursuant to this Resolution shall be used to finance, or where appropriate, to provide reimbursement for financing of, the District improvements.
- I. Hereby approves the automatic annual increase of District fees pursuant to the method of calculation indicated in the District Report in Exhibit A.
- J. The County and possibly other governmental agencies may contribute or make loans to the Eastside B&T Construction Fee District Fund.
- K. Advancement of funds by developers to the District Fund for early completion of District projects may be accepted and later reimbursed by the District Fund or be compensated with credit against future fees.

- L. There is reasonable relationship between the proposed revised District fee's use for the District improvements and the affected subdivision and building permit approvals to which the fees apply since this new development will directly benefit from the improved traffic circulation provided for by the completion of the District improvements.
- M. There continues to be a reasonable relationship between the need for the District improvements and the affected subdivision and building permit approvals because the District improvements will help mitigate the additional traffic congestion impacts generated by those approvals.
- N. That developers will be given the option of paying the existing fee rate or the proposed rate during the time period between the effective date of the proposed fee and September 1, 2002 (assuming the effective date is prior to September 1). Developers paying the lower rate will receive credits based on the existing rate structure.

The foregoing Resolution was on the \_\_\_\_\_ day of May 2002, adopted by the Board of Supervisors of the County of Los Angeles and ex officio the governing body of all other special assessment and taxing districts, agencies, and authorities for which said Board so acts.

VIOLET VARONA-LUKENS  
 Executive Officer of the  
 Board of Supervisors of the  
 County of Los Angeles

By \_\_\_\_\_  
 Deputy

APPROVED TO FORM

LLOYD W. PELLMAN  
 County Counsel

By \_\_\_\_\_  
 Deputy

JKC:ca

## **NOTICE OF PUBLIC HEARING**

### **COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS**

#### **THE BOUQUET CANYON AND EASTSIDE BRIDGE AND MAJOR THOROUGHFARE CONSTRUCTION FEE DISTRICTS**

The County of Los Angeles Board of Supervisors will hold a public hearing to discuss the proposed updates prepared for the Bouquet Canyon and Eastside (formerly named Route 126) Bridge and Major Thoroughfare (B&T) Construction Fee Districts. The proposed updates of those Districts, located in the City of Santa Clarita and the unincorporated area of Los Angeles, California 91350, 91351, and 91354, will revise the existing fees to be levied against future subdivisions and building permits activities to construct bridge and highway improvements. Those proposed improvement projects are identified in the Los Angeles County General Plan and the City of Santa Clarita General Plan. Existing developments are not subject to the fees. The two Districts are generally within the boundaries of Bouquet Canyon Road to the west, the Angeles National Forest to the north, Route 14 Highway to the east, and Placerita Canyon Road to the south.

Said hearing will be held on May 28, 2002, at 9:30 a.m., Kenneth Hahn Hall of Administration, 500 West Temple Street (corner of Temple Street and Grand Avenue), Room 381, Los Angeles, California 90012. The Board of Supervisors will consider and may adopt the resolutions. Further, notice is given that the Board of Supervisors may continue this hearing from time to time. Written comments may be sent to the Executive Office of the Board of Supervisors at the above address. If you do not understand this notice or need more information, please call John Chin of Public Works at (626) 458-4918.

Si no entiende esta noticia o si necesita mas informacion, favor de llamar a este numero (626) 458-4918.

## **PROPOSED BRIDGE AND MAJOR THOROUGHFARE CONSTRUCTION FEE DISTRICTS**

On October 1, 1985, and July 21, 1987, the County of Los Angeles Board of Supervisors adopted the Bouquet Canyon and Eastside B&T Districts, respectively. The District fees established at the time of formations and the prior updates were base upon the estimated total improvement costs and the estimated potential development within the Districts at that time. However, the estimated total improvement costs for the Districts have increased substantially since the last updates. The increases are due to the increases in the scope of the projects and the additional of projects identified in the Los Angeles County and City of Santa Clarita General Plans. As a result of the above facts, the projected revenue from collections of District fees at the existing fee rates will be insufficient to fully finance the improvements in those Districts. Therefore, there is a need to revise the district fees for those Districts to provide sufficient revenue to fully finance their respective proposed District improvements as is demonstrated in the District Update Reports presented to the Board of Supervisors. This document is to properly notify all parties affected as legally required for the County of Los Angeles Board of Supervisors to update those fee districts for construction of the proposed improvements.

### **THE PROPOSED UPDATE OF THOSE FEE DISTRICTS AFFECT ONLY NEW DEVELOPMENT**

#### **THE PROPOSED FEE PROGRAMS DOES NOT AFFECT:**

- EXISTING HOMES
- EXISTING COMMERCIAL OR INDUSTRIAL BUILDINGS
- BUILDING PERMITS FOR RESIDENTIAL REMODELING OR ADDITIONS
- BUILDING PERMITS FOR RECONSTRUCTION OF EXISTING RESIDENTIAL BUILDINGS WHICH DO NOT INCREASE THE NUMBER OF DWELLING UNITS

New fees would be imposed upon new development projects within the communities of the subject Districts and will be apportioned based upon the amount of traffic estimated to be created by each type of NEW development. The amount of new development anticipated within the Bouquet Canyon B&T District boundary is estimated to be 7,386 residential units and 462 acres of commercial and industrial development. The amount within the Eastside District boundary is 12,598 residential units and 644 acres of commercial and industrial development. The proposed fee rates are calculated as follows:

<u>Bouquet B&amp;T District</u>	<u>Existing Fee</u>	<u>Proposed Fee</u>
1. Single-Family Residential	\$ 4,000 per unit	\$14,200 per unit
2. Townhouse/Condo	\$ 3,200 per unit	\$11,360 per unit
3. Apartment	\$ 2,800 per unit	\$ 9,940 per unit
4. Industrial	\$12,000 per gross acre	\$42,600 per gross acre
5. Commercial	\$20,000 per gross acre	\$71,000 per gross acre



<u>Eastside B&amp;T District</u>	<u>Existing Fee</u>	<u>Proposed Fee</u>
1. Single-Family Residential	\$ 4,800 per unit	\$14,700 per unit
2. Townhouse/Condo	\$ 3,840 per unit	\$11,760 per unit
3. Apartment	\$ 3,360 per unit	\$10,290 per unit
4. Industrial	\$14,400 per gross acre	\$44,100 per gross acre
5. Commercial	\$24,000 per gross acre	\$73,500 per gross acre

Payment of the fees would be required at the time of: a) recordation of new subdivisions, or b) new building permit issuance, in the cases where subdivision of land has been recorded prior to establishing of those Districts.

The proposed revised boundaries of those Area of Benefit are illustrated on the map contained in this notice. Action by the Board of Supervisors will affect only those areas within the unincorporated Los Angeles County that are within the boundaries.

You have the right to appear at said hearing and be heard on this matter, or you may submit written comments prior to the close of the hearing, addressed to Ms. Violet Varona-Lukens, Executive Officer-Clerk of the Board of Supervisors, County of Los Angeles, 383 Kenneth Hahn Hall of Administration, 500 West Temple Street, Los Angeles, California 90012. The District Reports are available for review at:

Canyon Country Library  
18536 Soledad Canyon Road  
Santa Clarita, CA 91351

Valencia Library  
23743 Valencia Boulevard  
Santa Clarita, CA 91355

Los Angeles County Department of Public Works  
Land Development Division, 4th Floor  
900 South Fremont Avenue  
Alhambra, CA 91803-1331

For information, please call Public Works at (626) 458-4918.

Si no entiende esta noticia o si necesita mas informacion, favor de llamar a este numero (626) 458-4918.

By order of the Board of Supervisors of the County of Los Angeles, State of California.

Dated \_\_\_\_\_

Ms. Violet Varona-Lukens  
Executive Officer-Clerk

of the Board of Supervisors

AFFIDAVIT OF POSTING

STATE OF CALIFORNIA )  
 ) ss.  
COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES )

Pursuant to Government Code Section 65091(4)(B), John Chin, Supervising Civil Engineering Assistant for the County of Los Angeles Department of Public Works, being duly sworn, says that on the \_\_\_\_\_ 2002, he posted one copy of the attached notice at the following locations:

1. Canyon Country Library  
18536 Soledad Canyon Road  
Santa Clarita, CA 91351
2. Valencia Library  
23743 Valencia Boulevard  
Santa Clarita, CA 91355
3. City of Santa Clarita  
23920 West Valencia Boulevard, Suite 300  
Santa Clarita, CA 91355-2107
4. Hall of Administration  
383 Kenneth Hahn Hall of Administration  
500 West Temple Street  
Los Angeles, CA 90012-2756

\_\_\_\_\_  
John Chin

This Instrument was acknowledged before me  
this \_\_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_, 2002  
in witness whereof I herewith set my hand.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Barry S. Witler, Senior Civil Engineer

**NOTICE OF PUBLIC HEARING**

**(Mailing)**

**COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES  
DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS**

**THE BOUQUET CANYON  
BRIDGE AND MAJOR THOROUGHFARE  
CONSTRUCTION FEE DISTRICT**

The County of Los Angeles Board of Supervisors will hold a public hearing to discuss the proposed update prepared for the Bouquet Canyon Bridge and Major Thoroughfare (B&T) Construction Fee District. The proposed update of the District, located in the City of Santa Clarita/unincorporated area of Los Angeles, California 91350, 91351, and 91354, will revise the existing fees to be levied against future subdivision and building permit activities to construct bridge and highway improvements. Those proposed improvement projects are identified in the Los Angeles County and City of Santa Clarita General Plans. Existing developments are not subject to the fee. The District boundary generally between Bouquet Canyon Road to the west, the Angeles National Forest to the north, Whites Canyon Road to the east, and Soledad Canyon Road to the south.

Said hearing will be held on May 28, 2002, at 9:30 a.m., Kenneth Hahn Hall of Administration, 500 West Temple Street (corner of Temple Street and Grand Avenue), Room 381, Los Angeles, California 90012. The Board of Supervisors will consider and may adopt the resolutions. Further, notice is given that the Board of Supervisors may continue this hearing from time to time. Written comments may be sent to the Executive Office of the Board of Supervisors at the above address. If you do not understand this notice or need more information, please call John Chin of Public Works at (626) 458-4918.

Si no entiende esta noticia o si necesita mas informacion, favor de llamar a este numero (626) 458-4918.



**PROPOSED BRIDGE AND MAJOR THOROUGHFARE  
CONSTRUCTION FEE DISTRICT**

On October 1, 1985, the County of Los Angeles Board of Supervisors adopted the Bouquet Canyon B&T District. The District fees established at the time of formation and the prior update were base upon the estimated total improvement cost and the estimated potential development within the District at that time. However, the estimated total improvement cost for the District has increased substantially since the last update. The increase is due to the increase in the scope of the projects and the additional of projects identified in the Los Angeles County General Plan and the City of Santa Clarita Area Plans. As a result of the above facts, the projected revenue from collection of District fees at the existing fee rates will be insufficient to fully finance the improvements in the District. Therefore, there is a need to revise the district fees for the District to provide sufficient revenue to fully finance the District improvements as is demonstrated in the District Update Report presented to the Board of Supervisors. This document is to properly notify all parties affected as legally required for the County of Los Angeles Board of Supervisors to update the fee district for construction of the proposed improvements.

**THE PROPOSED UPDATE OF THE FEE DISTRICT AFFECT ONLY NEW  
DEVELOPMENT**

**THE PROPOSED FEE PROGRAM DOES NOT AFFECT:**

- EXISTING HOMES
- EXISTING COMMERCIAL OR INDUSTRIAL BUILDINGS
- BUILDING PERMITS FOR RESIDENTIAL REMODELING OR ADDITIONS
- BUILDING PERMITS FOR RECONSTRUCTION OF EXISTING RESIDENTIAL BUILDINGS WHICH DO NOT INCREASE THE NUMBER OF DWELLING UNITS

New fees would be imposed upon new development projects within the community of the subject District and will be apportioned based upon the amount of traffic estimated to be created by each type of NEW development. The amount of new development anticipated within the Bouquet Canyon B&T District boundary is estimated to be 7,386 residential units and 462 acres of commercial and industrial developments.

<u>Bouquet B&amp;T District</u>	<u>Existing Fee</u>	<u>Proposed Fee</u>
1. Single-Family Residential	\$ 4,000 per unit	\$14,200 per unit
2. Townhouse/Condo	\$ 3,200 per unit	\$11,360 per unit
3. Apartment	\$ 2,800 per unit	\$ 9,940 per unit
4. Industrial	\$12,000 per gross acre	\$42,600 per gross acre
5. Commercial	\$20,000 per gross acre	\$71,000 per gross acre

Payment of the fees would be required at the time of: a) recordation of new subdivisions, or b) new building permit issuance, in the cases where subdivision of land has been recorded

prior to establishing this District.

The proposed revised boundary of the Area of Benefit is illustrated on the map contained in this notice. Action by the Board of Supervisors will affect only those areas within the unincorporated Los Angeles County that are within the boundary.

You have the right to appear at said hearing and be heard on this matter, or you may submit written comments prior to the close of the Hearing, addressed to Ms. Violet Varona-Lukens, Executive Officer-Clerk of the Board of Supervisors, County of Los Angeles, 383 Kenneth Hahn Hall of Administration, 500 West Temple Street, Los Angeles, California 90012. The District Report is available for review at:

Canyon Country Library  
18536 Soledad Canyon Road  
Santa Clarita, CA 91351

Valencia Library  
23743 Valencia Boulevard  
Santa Clarita, CA 91355

Los Angeles County Department of Public Works  
Land Development Division, 4th Floor  
900 South Fremont Avenue  
Alhambra, CA 91803-1331

For information, please call Public Works at (626) 458-4918.

Si no entiende esta noticia o si necesita mas informacion, favor de llamar a este numero (626) 458-4918.

By order of the Board of Supervisors of the County of Los Angeles, State of California.

Dated \_\_\_\_\_

Ms. Violet Varona-Lukens  
Executive Officer-Clerk  
of the Board of Supervisors

2802 002 001,002  
2812 010 004,011  
LSM26 ET AL  
4371 GELCOE AVE NO B6  
MARINA DEL REY CA 90292

2802 002 003  
KATZ, ALFRED D AND CECELIA E  
P O BOX 17206  
BEVERLY HILLS CA 90209

2802 002 004, 005  
SHERBURNE, FRED AND ALVERIA  
3100 E AIRPORT WAY  
LONG BEACH CA 90806

2812 003 108  
MCILVAINE, WILLIAM D AND LAU  
20334 DELIGHT ST  
CANYON COUNTRY CA 91351

2812 003 025  
MELAMED, GEROGE AND ROSET TR  
200 ASHDALE AVE  
LOS ANGELES CA 90049

2812 003 026  
BOXER, JOEL E AND SANDOR T  
5301 ORRVILLE AVE  
WQODLAND HILLS CA 91367

2812 003 027  
WILSON, WILLIAM CO TR ET AL  
P O BOX 514  
BIG BEAR LAKE CA 92315

2812 003 035, 017  
LONER, ROBERT AND SUSAN J  
29341 N LUZON  
SAUGUS CA 91350

2812 003 036  
RENER, MARK K AND MICHELE  
12953 SIERRA HWY  
SANTA CLARITA CA 91390

2812 003 037  
MILLER, DWIGHT H, JR AND ELLA  
15842 CINDY CT  
CANYON COUNTRY CA 91387

2812 003 038  
VLACH, DONALD D ET AL  
25347 AVENIDA RONADA  
VALENCIA C A 91355

2812 003 041, 044  
BUTTERFIELD, WAYNE A CO TR  
270 MONTE PL  
ARCADIA CA 91006

2812 003 042  
TRESSEL, DON R CO TR  
3401 E CORTEZ ST  
WEST COVINA CA 91791

2812 003 043  
KOUTES, CYNTHIA  
27163 MANOR CIR  
VALENCIA CA 91354

2813 004 001  
LIBES, ARIK  
29050 N ILANA LN  
SAUGUS CA 91350

2813 004 002, 009, 012, 013, 014  
GATEWAYS HOSPITAL AND  
1891 EFFIE ST  
LOS ANGELES CA 90026

2813 004 003  
BRIDGES, MARGUERITE M  
17601 HERCULES ST  
HESPARIA CA 92345

2813 004 004  
DAVIS, HAROLD J CO TR  
16000 CALAHAN ST  
SEPULVEDA CA 91343

2812 004 005  
CARVER, WARREN W AND LORITA  
27711 STARDALE DR  
SAUGUS CA 91350

2812 004 006  
HARRIS, JANET M TR  
12177 S STONERIDGE CIR  
PARADISE CA 95969

2812 004 007  
MCKNIGHT, THOMAS J ET AL  
28763 CAUCH ST  
SANTA CLARITA CA 91390

2812 004 010  
ARNOLD, THOMAS JR AND GLENDA  
29256 SNAPDRAGON PL  
CANYON COUNTRY CA 91387

2812 010 002  
2812 004 001  
WEINER, C AND S TRS ET AL  
22311 DELIA CT  
CALABASAS CA 91302

2812 005 001  
HOLT, BUD  
1651 W CENTRUY BL  
LOS ANGELES CA 90047

2812 005 023  
LOFLAND, CHRISTOPHER G AND  
23645 MEADOWRIDGE DR N K  
NEWHALL CA 91321

2812 005 024  
UPCHURCH, SHIRLEY A  
2940 LOS ROBLES RD  
THOUSAND OAKS CA 91362

2812 005 026  
LEATHERMAN, LEROY D AND RUTH  
29114 BOUQUET CANYON RD  
SAUGUS CA 91390

2812 005 030  
HARE, ROBERT A TR  
P O BOX 491788  
LOS ANGELES CA 90049

2812 005 031  
SERIL, JUANITA  
28937 BOUQUET CANYON RD  
SAUGUS CA 91390

2812 005 040  
O'LEARY, JAMES P AND CONNIE  
28840 BOUQUET CANYON RD  
SAUGUS CA 91390

2812 005 042  
BENEFIELD, J D AND MARY  
1301 W RIVERSIDE DR  
BURBANK CA 91506

2812 005 043  
GILVERT, PATRICIA A  
25852 MCBEAN PKWY NO 701  
VALENCIA CA 91355

2812 005 044  
MASCARENAS, DAVID AND LESLI  
28868 BOUQUET CANYON RD  
SANTA CLARITA CA 91390

2812 006 010  
KUMAR, PETER  
9171 FIVE HARBORS DR  
HUNTINGTON BEACH CA 92646

2812 006 011  
KUMAR, PETER  
1211 N BROADWAY  
SANTA ANA CA 92701

2812 006 012  
PANDA, RICHARD A AND SUSAN J  
20506 CALHAVEN DR  
SAUGUS CA 91390

2812 007 002, 028, 045  
RODGERS, JAMES C AND JOYCE S  
28048 BOUQUET CANYON RD NO  
SAUGUS CA 91350

2812 009 040  
HOOK, JOHN D  
105 S EL CAMINO REAL  
SAN CLEMENTE CA 92672

2812 010 001  
SALESIAN SOCIETY  
1100 FRANKLIN ST  
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94109



2812 010 003  
LOFLAND, SNADRA D  
18752 HEATHER GLN  
SANTA ANA CA 92705

2812 010 006  
ELKIN, PATRICIA A AND  
20401 SOLEDAD CANYON RD NO  
CANYON COUNTRY CA 91351

2812 010 010  
TOMLINSON, ROBERT J AND IREN  
16728 KNOLLWOOD DR  
GRANADA HILLS CA 91344

MONROVIA CA 91016  
2812 005 032, 033, 034, 035  
HSU, ANDREW  
147 E OLIVE AVE  
MONROVIA CA 91016

2812 009 003  
TRABUCO LTE  
450 MERRYMAN LN  
WINCHESTER VA 22601

2812 010 001  
SALESIAN SOCIETY  
1100 FRANKLIN ST  
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94109

2812 014 001  
GAMMON, MICHAEL R  
20823 FRANWOOD DR  
SANTA CLARITA CA 91350

2812 027 002  
KARIM, HANIF M  
21063 SUSAN CAROLE DR  
SAUGUS CA 91350

2812 027 004  
GAFFNEY, PHILIP A AND JEAN F  
21051 SUSAN CAROLE DR  
SAUGUS CA 91350

2812 027 006  
KNIGHT MICHAEL L AND DEBRA  
21039 SUSAN CAROLE DR  
SAUGUS CA 91350

2812 010 005  
GOINGS, FRED H AND VIRGINIA  
31 S BARNEBURG RD  
MEDFORD OR 97504

2812 010 009  
KAUDER, ARTHUR W AND  
42844 19TH ST W  
LANCASTER CA 93534

2812 005 004, 18, 19  
2812 006 001, 002, 004, 005  
2813 011 023  
OVERLAND NATIONAL LAND FUND  
147 E OLIVE AVE

2812 009 002  
GROUP SEVEN FINANCIAL LLC  
27 SPECTRUM POINTE DR 305  
LAKE FOREST CA 92630

2812 009 027  
LOH, WELLINGTON AND IRENE W  
30659 RUE VALOIS  
RANCHO PALOS VERDES CA 90275

2812 013 017  
BRAUN, THEODORE C AND SANDI  
3814 PEACHTREE COVE  
BARTLETT TN 38135

2812 027 001  
BOWMAN, PATRICK H AND DALE L  
21069 SUSAN CAROLD DR  
SANTA CLARITA CA 91350

2812 027 003  
PAYTON, ROY AND SUSANA L  
21059 SUSAN CAROLE DR  
SAUGUS CA 91350

2812 027 005  
RAZO, ABEL AND ANGELA  
21045 SUSAN CAROLE DR  
SAUGUS CA 91350

2812 027 007  
WARREN, HARRY J AND OLIVIA M  
21033 SUSAN CAROLE DR  
SAUGUS CA 91350

2812 027 008  
RASPBERRY, PERCY AND MARIA  
21027 SUSAN CAROLE DR  
SANTA CLARITA CA 91350

2812 027 009  
TORRALBA, QUIRINO N AND HAYD  
21021 SUSAN CAROLE DR  
SAUGUS CA 91350

2812 027 010  
KIRK, JAMES AND SUSANA  
21017 SUSAN CAROLE DR  
SANTA CLARITA CA 91350

2812 027 011  
TITSWORTH, PAUL S AND ANNE M  
21011 SUSAN CAROLE DR  
SAUGUS CA 91350

2812 027 012  
AMBROSE, BRUCE A AND DIANE B  
27893 WELLSTON DR  
SANTA CLARITA CA 91350

2812 027 013  
GUNN, ROSE LORE B  
27883 WELLSTON DR  
SANTA CLARITA CA 91350

2812 027 017  
COHN, JAMES M AND ALURA J TR  
21026 SUSAN CAROLE DR  
SANTA CLARITA CA 91350

2812 027 018  
MCBROOM, GARY L  
21032 SUSAN CAROLE DR  
SAUGUS CA 91350

2812 027 019  
WEST, WILLIAM L AND LILIANA  
21040 SUSAN CAROLE DR  
SAUGUS CA 91350

2812 027 020  
WIESE, GREGORY AND JANET TRS  
21042 SUSAN CAROLE DR  
SANTA CLARITA CA 91350

2812 027 021  
STRANGE, MICHAEL AND REBECCA  
21044 SUSAN CAROLE DR  
SANTA CLARITA CA 91350

2812 027 022  
OLMOS, HIGINIO AND SUSAN  
21046 SUSAN CAROLE DR  
SAUGUS CA 91350

2812 027 023  
ANDERSON, CHRISTOPHER B AND  
21054 SUSAN CAROLE DR  
SANTA CLARITA CA 91350

2812 027 024  
SANDERS, DARIN K AND TRACEY  
27822 RADFALL CT  
SANTA CLARITA CA 91350

2812 027 025  
BIERFELDT, TROY AND JEFFIFER  
27816 RADFALL CT  
SANTA CLARITA CA 91350

2812 027 026  
COOKE, STEPHEN L AND JANET M  
27806 RADFALL CT  
SANTA CLARITA CA 91350

2812 027 027  
GRUPP, VICKI L TR  
27802 RADFALL CT  
SANTA CLARITA CA 91350

2812 027 028  
LARGE, KEVIN B AND NANCEE S  
20902 SUSAN CAROLE DR  
SANTA CLARITA CA 91350

2812 027 029  
THOMPSON, LAURIE A AND  
20906 SUSAN CAROLE DR  
SAUGUS CA 91350

2812 027 030  
KUROWSKI, DANIEL D AND LISA  
20918 SUSAN CAROLE DR  
SANTA CLARITA CA 91350

2812 027 031  
NEUMAN, ROGER L TR  
20930 SUSAN CAROLE DR  
SANTA CLARITA CA 91350

2812 027 032  
SCHRAGE, JAMES C AND PATRICIA  
20940 SUSAN CAROLE DR  
SAUGUS CA 91350

2812 027 033  
LANG, PAUL H JR AND LISA R  
20950 SUSAN CAROLE DR  
SANTA CLARITA CA 91350

2812 027 034  
CAMPOS, RAUL A AND CLEMENCIA  
20958 SUSAN CIRCLE DR  
SAUGUS CA 91350

2813 005 005, 006  
2813 013 001, 008  
2813 015 001  
LYONS, CHARLES J JR AND MARY  
3752 PARKVIEW DR  
LAKEWOOD CA 90712

2813 006 013  
FORREST, GARL E AND BARBARA  
30230 BOUQUET CANYON RD  
SAUGUS CA 91390

2813 006 035  
ELMENS DORP, TONNY  
30344 BOUQUET CANYON RD  
SAUGUS CA 91390

2813 010 002, 003  
WALNUT LAND CO INC  
2210 S AZUSA AVE  
WEST COVINA CA 91792

2812 037 001  
HOLT, BUD  
1651 W CENTURY BL  
LOS ANGELES CA 90047

2812 037 008  
SANTINO, WILLIAM J  
18800 ESGUERRA RD  
SANTA CLARITA CA 91390

2812 043 002  
JACKSON, BRUCE L AND SUSAN  
18430 ESQUERRA RD  
SAUGUS CA 91390

2812 043 003  
MUELLER, WILLIAM A TR  
3302 SCADLOCK LN  
SHERMAN OAKS CA 91403

2812 043 004  
PRO VALUE PROPERTIES  
P O BOX 1065  
BURBANK CA 91507

2813 005 001  
ZIEGLER, KARYN ET AL TRS  
2133 S 80TH ST  
WEST ALLIS WI 52319

2813 005 002, 003, 004  
DUTTON, MAUDELENE ET AL TRS  
9940 WESTWANDA DR  
BEVERLY HILLS CA 90210

2813 006 001  
COLETTO, DALE M  
24127 DEL MONTE DR 111  
VALENCIA CA 91355

2813 006 002  
MINCO  
3204 COLONIAL AVE  
LOS ANGELES CA 90066

2813 006 003  
CARLUCCI, LOUIS AND DIANE M  
11118 VENTRUA BL  
STUDIO CITY CA 91604

2813 006 009  
PONCE, FERNANDO  
18451 TEXAS CANYON RD  
SAUGUS CA 91390

2813 006 010  
KOZUSZKO, KRISTI A  
14662 COBALT ST  
SYLMAR CA 91342

2813 006 024, 028, 029  
ARBOGAST, ROY H AND LYNNE C  
30355 BOUQUET CANYON RD  
SAUGUS CA 91390

2813 006 033  
BAUER, LEO R JR AND LAURA S  
21631 SPICE CT  
SAUGUS CA 91350

2813 006 036  
LINGROSSO, ANTHONY AND ALICE  
P O BOX 800188  
SANTA CLARITA CA 91380

2813 007 001, 003  
REDMOND, JOHN  
30177 BOUQUET CANYON RD  
SAUGUS CA 91390

2813 007 004  
KNERR, R P AND  
1330 SANTA MARGARITA DR  
ARCADIA CA 91006

2813 008 009  
ARAKELIAN, RONALD J CO TR  
P O BOX 60009  
CITY OF INDUSTRY CA 91715

2813 008 011  
FABRE, BRIAN  
29902 BOUQUET CANYON RD  
SAUGUS CA 91390

2813 008 018  
KAFKAMP, HENK L AND BLANCA A  
2767 SAFFRON LN  
SANTA CLARITA CA 91350

2813 008 021  
PHILLIPS, RODGER AND SUZANNE  
30040 BOUQUET CANYON RD  
SAUGUS CA 91390

2813 008 031, 2813 009 006  
LAUREN, JANINE  
30035 BOUQUET CANYON RD  
SAUGUS CA 91390

2813 009 001  
ARAKELIAN, RONALD J CO TR  
P O BOX 60009  
CITY OF INDUSTRY CA 91715

2813 010 001  
HARRIS, NORMAN H  
P O BOX 800520  
SAUGUS CA 91380

2813 010 008  
RASSP, HERMAN CO TR  
P O BOX 6548  
BURBANK CA 91510

2813 010 011, 013  
HARRIS, NORMAN H AND CYNTHIA  
P O BOX 800520  
SAUGUS CA 91380

2813 010 012  
HARRIS, NORMAN H  
22931 8TH ST  
NEWHALL CA 91321

2813 012 001  
2813 010 014, 015, 016  
VELUZAT, RENE P AND PATTI S  
P O BOX 220219  
NEWHALL CA 91322

2813 011 001  
SIMMS, MICHAEL G AND CHRISTI  
12900 BRADLEY AVE  
SYLMAR CA 91342

2813 011 003  
KILLEN, KENNETH AND JENNIE  
P O BOX 802066  
SANTA CLARITA CA 91380

2813 011 004  
RASSP, HERMAN CO TR  
P O BOX 6548  
BURBANK CA 91510

2813 011 005, 014  
DUDRA, WILLIAM P AND LOIS K  
19523 CHADWAY ST  
CANYON COUNTRY CA 91351

2813 011 006  
LEIX, FREDERICK W CO-TR  
P O BOX 8243  
SISTERS OR 97759

2813 011 007, 009  
ADAMS, WINSTON C AND DOREEN  
29957 BOUQUET CANYON RD  
SAUGUS CA 91390

2813 011 010  
YAMAMOTO, DAVID T  
934 S ST ANDREWS PL  
LOS ANGELES CA 90019

2813 011 011  
PERL, STEVE A  
4809 W CYPRESS ST  
PHOENIX AZ 85035

2813 011 012, 016, 018, 021, 022  
2813 013 005, 281 014 007  
PURCELL, PAMELA V TR  
16594 KNOLLWOOD DR  
GRANADA HILLS CA 91344

2813 011 013  
MANN, JAMES P AND  
3544 E AVENUE T2  
PALMDALE CA 93550

2813 011 015  
PALMIERI, ANTHONY AND JOSEPH  
28246 ROBIN CREST CT  
CANYON COUNTRY CA 91387

2813 012 005  
LOMBARDI, ROBERT AND JOANN T  
23734 VALENCIA BL 304  
VA;EMCOA CA 01355

2813 013 002, 003  
2813 015 007, 008, 009, 010, 011  
COMBS, MARJORIE F  
1225 N GRANADA AVE NO  
ALHAMBRA CA 91801

2813 013 013, 014, 016  
VASQUEZ PROPERTIES LLC  
2716 OCEAN PARK BL STE 2  
SANTA MONICA CA 90405

3244 031 013, 014  
B K K CO INC  
2550 W 237TH ST  
TORRANCE CA 90505

2813 013 007  
SHANNON, GLADYS H & FOREST E  
P O BOX 987  
CULVER CITY CA 90230

2813 013 009  
CARBEN, MICHAEL AND VALYRIE  
19592 SHADOW RIDGE WY  
NORTHRIDGE CA 91326

2813 013 026  
GLAVIN, RALPH H AND CHARLOTT  
29755 BOUQUET CANYON RD  
SAUGUS CA 91390

2813 014 002  
LOMBARDI, ROBERT E AND JOANN  
29527 BOUQUET CANYON RD  
SAUGUS CA 91390

2801 001 003, 005  
SHIREY, BOB G TR ET AL  
10675 BRYNE AVE  
LOS MOLINOS CA 96055

2801 001 013  
CANYON VIEW LIMITED  
9265 GLENOAKS BL  
SUN VALLEY CA 91352

2801 001 023  
STANDARD, GRAYSON AND BETTY  
1314 PENN LN  
GARDNERVILLE NV 89410

2801 001 024, 009  
STANFORD, GLENN  
30100 GREENWATER DR  
TEHACHAPI CA 93561

2801 001 025, 026  
BAKER, MARY C  
P O BOX 3029  
CORRALES NM 87048

2801 001 027  
BOECKMANN, H E, II AND JANE  
15505 ROSCOE BL  
NORTH HILLS CA 91343

2802 003 006  
ARARAT HOME OF LOS ANGELES  
15105 MISSION HILLS RD  
MISSION HILLS CA 91345

2802 003 007  
STEVENS, LARRY L AND JOAN F  
28320 WINTERDALE DR  
CANYON COUNTRY CA 91387

2802 003 008  
AGAJANIAN, LORRAINE CO TR  
1240 S GRAND AVE  
PASADENA CA 91105

2802 003 018  
SHARMA, KIM AND ADITYA  
18706 GOODVALE RD  
CANYON COUNTRY CA 91351

2802 003 022  
LEVITT, MORRIS AND FAYE TRS  
10124 EMPYREAN WY RM 4104  
LOS ANGELES CA 90067

2805 001 020  
BERECZ, ZOLTON J AND BEATRIX  
25032 HIGHSRING AVE  
NEWHALL CA 91321

2805 001 025  
CARPENTER, RANDY CO TR  
27121 FURNIVALL AVE  
SANTA CLARITA CA 91351

2805 001 027  
RANDALL, HOWARD F AND MARYJA  
10731 DELCO AVE  
CHATSWORTH CA 91311

2805 001 028  
RANDALL, DARRIN AND LESLIE  
P O BOX 4463  
CHATSWORTH CA 91311

2805 002 002, 008, 009  
CANYON VIEW LIMITED  
9265 GLENOAKS BL  
SUN VALLEY CA 91352

2805 014 019  
HILL, JOHN  
27756 SAND CANYON RD  
CANYON COUNTRY CA 91387

2805 024 001  
SOLEDAD CANYON RD ASSOCIATE  
P O BOX 998  
VENTURA CA 93002

2805 025 018, 030  
WEITKAMP, FREDRICK CO TR ET  
10724 WHITE OAK AVE  
GRANADA HILLS CA 91344

2805 025 029  
SCAR II LTD  
P O BOX 998  
VENTURA CA 93002

2805 025 037, 050, 051  
PULSIPHER, LEE C AND RUTH L  
P O BOX 998  
VENTURA CA 93002

2805 025 039  
TABACK, MORRIS AND ANNETTE T  
17538 GLEDHILL ST  
NORTHRIDGE CA 91325

2805 025 041  
CRUZ, VIRGINIA ET AL  
5865 PANAMA DR  
BUENA PARK CA 90620

2806 006 014  
MONSON, JOAN A TR  
21159 ELDER CREEK DR  
SANTA CLARITA CA 91350

2806 013 001  
INDUSTRIAL SECURITY REAL  
9265 GLENOAKS BL  
SUN VALLEY CA 91352

2807 023 037  
SUNNYGLEN CORP  
17985 SKY PARK CIR NO  
IRVINE CA 92614

2807 023 038  
SAUGUS CANYON HOME OWNERS ASSOC  
2 CIVIC PLAZA STE 250  
NEWPORT BEACH CA 92660

2809 001 015, 019  
SUTTER POINT PLAZA LLC  
1850 S SEPULVEDA BL STE  
LOS ANGELES CA 90025

2809 026 023  
CANUTT, BERNICE AND EDWARD T  
2814 CALMGARDEN RD  
ACTON CA 93510

2812 008 003, 013, 022, 031  
F O M G INC  
4924 BALBOA BL NO 284  
ENCINO CA 91316

2812 008 021  
BABYAN, SIROP  
1105 S ADAMS ST  
GLENDALE CA 91205

2812 009 002  
GROUP SEVEN FINANCIAL LLC  
27 SPECTRUM POINTE DR 305  
LAKE FOREST CA 92630

2812 009 003  
TRABUCO LTD  
450 MERRYMAN LN  
WINCHESTER VA 22601

2811 001 133  
2849 001 001, 014, 017  
NEWHALL LAND AND FARMING CO  
23823 VALENCIA BL  
VALENCIA CA 91355

2849 004 006  
GIBSON, BEULAH I TR  
7256 E S9TH ST  
TUCSON AZ 85710

2849 004 010  
JOHNSON, LORI M TR  
3372 STONE RIDGE LN  
LOS ANGELES CA 90077

3244 098 020  
3244 027 034, 035, 036  
FIRST NATIONWIDE SAVE AND  
9800 S SEPULVEDA BL  
LOS ANGELES CA 90045

3244 037 031, 032  
AMERICAN STORES PROPERTIES  
P O BOX 20  
BOISE ID 83726

# FINAL REVIEW COPY

Revised: March 20, 2002

Revised: April 30, 2002

## BOUQUET CANYON BRIDGE AND MAJOR THOROUGHFARE CONSTRUCTION FEE DISTRICT UPDATE REPORT

Prepared for:

---

LOS ANGELES COUNTY DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS

---



and

---

CITY OF SANTA CLARITA TRANSPORTATION and ENGINEERING SERVICES

---



APRIL, 2002

---



**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

I. SUMMARY ..... 1

II. THE BRIDGE AND MAJOR THOROUGHFARE CONSTRUCTION FEE DISTRICT..... 4

    A. AUTHORITY ..... 4

    B. PURPOSE ..... 5

    C. CONCEPT ..... 5

    D. DISTRICT FORMATION AND STATUS ..... 5

III. BOUQUET CANYON AREA ACCESS..... 8

    A. BACKGROUND ..... 8

    B. EXISTING CIRCULATION AND PROPOSED DISTRICT IMPROVEMENTS ..... 8

IV. THE BOUQUET CANYON BRIDGE AND MAJOR THOROUGHFARE CONSTRUCTION FEE DISTRICT ..... 11

    A. THE DISTRICT BOUNDARY ..... 11

    B. PROPOSED IMPROVEMENTS AND ESTIMATED COSTS ..... 11

    C. IMPROVEMENT PHASING..... 13

    D. DEVELOPMENT ANALYSIS ..... 13

    E. TRAFFIC AND LAND USE ANALYSIS ..... 13

    F. THE DISTRICT FEE ..... 14

    G. CONSTRUCTION OF DISTRICT IMPROVEMENTS IN LIEU OF PAYING FEES AND CREDIT/CASH REQUESTS ..... 17

    H. PROVISIONS FOR UPDATING COSTS AND UNIT INFORMATION ..... 18

    I. PROPOSAL FOR DISTRICT CLOSURE ..... 19

    J. DISTRICT FUNDS ..... 19

    K. THE ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS ..... 19

**FIGURES**

FIGURE 1 DISTRICT BOUNDARY AND REGIONAL IMPROVEMENTS ..... 20  
FIGURE 2 DISTRICT IMPROVEMENTS..... 21  
FIGURE 3 FILED MAPS AND VACANT LAND ..... 22

**TABLES**

TABLE 1 CURRENT DISTRICT FEES ..... 2  
TABLE 2 PROPOSED DISTRICT FEES..... 3  
TABLE 3 DESCRIPTION OF ORIGINAL ROADWAY AND BRIDGE IMPROVEMENTS ..... 6  
TABLE 4 ANALYSIS OF DISTRICT FUNDS ..... 7  
TABLE 5 SOFT COST PERCENTAGES ..... 12  
TABLE 6A BRIDGE AND MAJOR THOROUGHFARE IMPROVEMENTS ..... C-2  
TABLE 6B DETAILED DESCRIPTION OF BRIDGE AND MAJOR THOROUGHFARE IMPROVEMENTS .. C-3  
TABLE 7 INTERSECTION IMPROVEMENTS ..... C-6  
TABLE 8 DISTRICT SHARE OF REGIONAL IMPROVEMENTS..... C-7  
TABLE 9A FDU ESTIMATE (FILED MAPS WITHIN THE DISTRICT) ..... D-2  
TABLE 9B FDU ESTIMATE (VACANT LAND-CITY-NO FILED MAP)..... D-3  
TABLE 9C FDU ESTIMATE (VACANT LAND-COUNTY-NO FILED MAP) ..... D-4  
TABLE 10 SUMMARY OF DEVELOPMENT ANALYSIS ..... D-4

**ATTACHMENTS**

ATTACHMENT A CODE PERTAINING TO B&T DISTRICTS ..... A-1  
ATTACHMENT B LEGAL DESCRIPTION..... B-1  
ATTACHMENT C DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSED IMPROVEMENTS AND ESTIMATED COSTS ..... C-1  
ATTACHMENT D DEVELOPMENT ANALYSIS ..... D-1  
ATTACHMENT E BRIDGE AND MAJOR THOROUGHFARE DISTRICT  
CASH/CREDIT REQUEST FORM ..... E-1

## I. Summary

---

The Bouquet Canyon Bridge and Major Thoroughfare Construction Fee District Update Report presents to the Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors and the City of Santa Clarita City Council an update for their approval to an existing area of benefit for financing specific improvements in the Bouquet Canyon area of the Santa Clarita Valley, within Los Angeles County and City of Santa Clarita jurisdictions. Improvements include, but are not limited to new and improved, roadways, bridges, intersections, and interchanges.

Updating the Bouquet Canyon Bridge and Major Thoroughfare Construction Fee District, hereinafter referred to as “District”, will provide an equitable financing mechanism by which new development within an identified area will share the costs of providing full mitigation improvements, as discussed in this summary.

State Subdivision Law and both the Los Angeles County and City of Santa Clarita codes authorize the use of bridge and major thoroughfare construction fee districts for the funding and construction of improvements, provided these facilities are identified on the local agency's adopted transportation element of its General Plan. Based on the transportation needs in this area of the Santa Clarita Valley, and the limitations of other funding sources, this funding method has been determined to be the best alternative to provide needed transportation related improvements.

This report describes the concept and mechanics of the District. Information included in this report will enable subject property owners to determine the District fee to be assessed against their property if and when it is developed.

### BRIDGE AND MAJOR THOROUGHFARE CONSTRUCTION FEE DISTRICTS IN THE SANTA CLARITA VALLEY

Certain areas of Los Angeles County and the City of Santa Clarita have topographical features that limit the ability to provide access. Prior to the 1980's, the County was able to assist developers in the funding and construction of needed highway improvements. However, gas tax revenue, formerly the traditional source of funding for new highway and bridge improvements, has not provided sufficient funding towards improvements in the Santa Clarita Valley. Due to the regional nature of many of the District improvements, the District shall pursue funding for eligible improvements from City, County, State, and Federal agencies, to supplement the adopted District fee.

The current highway system in the Santa Clarita Valley is considered adequate for existing development. However, at this time public funding is not available to adequately provide highway improvements for the future anticipated development in the Santa Clarita Valley. The Santa Clarita Valley Bridge and Major Thoroughfare Districts are designed to accommodate the needs of future development anticipated by both the Los Angeles County and City of Santa Clarita General Plans. A map showing the district is included as Figure 1.

NEED FOR DISTRICT UPDATING

The District was originally approved by the Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors on October 1, 1985. After its incorporation, the City of Santa Clarita adopted the District on November 28, 1989. The current District fee in the City of \$10,000 was approved by the City Council on September 14, 1999 and the Board of Supervisors approved the current District fee in the County on May 9, 1991. The current District fees are shown in Table 1.

TABLE 1 CURRENT DISTRICT FEES

Land Use Category	Current District Fee	
	County	City
Residential:		
Single Family (per unit)	\$4,000	\$10,000
Townhome/Condo (per unit)	\$3,200	\$8,000
Apartment (per unit)	\$2,800	\$7,000
Non-Residential:		
Commercial (per gross acre)	\$20,000	\$50,000
Industrial (per gross acre)	\$14,400	\$30,000

The District was originally established for the purpose of funding much-needed improvements to serve the circulation needs created by new developments within this District, originally estimated as \$24.55 million.

This District update is different from updates in the past where the District fee has been revised due only to changes in improvement costs and in the amount of proposed future development. This update re-analyzes build-out development of the District and expands on the scope of District improvements. Instead of including only five improvement projects, the updated District proposes to fully improve all roadways identified on the City and County circulation elements, including intersections and interchanges. Full mitigation improvements will include full-width grading, base, pavement, curb, gutter, sidewalk, medians, striping for capacity enhancement, bus turnouts or bus pads (where applicable), bike lanes (where applicable), fully improved and signalized intersections, signal interconnect (where applicable), street lighting, roadway-related utility relocation, drainage structures within road right-of-way, and full improvements for bridges and interchanges. Right of-way is assumed to be dedicated by individual development projects, except for State highway projects and roadway widenings that are unrelated to private development projects.

UPDATED DISTRICT FEE RATES

A development analysis, based on filed tentative maps, mid-point densities of the Santa Clarita Valley Area Plan, and mid-point densities of the City of Santa Clarita Zoning map, indicates that an estimated 7,386 residential units, 420 commercial land use acres, and 42 industrial land use acres are expected to be built within the District boundary. Remaining District improvements to roadways, bridges, intersections, and interchanges total an estimated \$158.62 million. The analysis concludes that a District fee increase is necessary to fully fund these improvements. The proposed District fees are shown in Table 2.

TABLE 2 PROPOSED DISTRICT FEES

Land Use Category	Proposed District Fee
	(City and County)
Residential:	
Single Family (per unit)	\$14,200
Townhome/Condo (per unit)	\$11,360
Apartment (per unit)	\$9,940
Non-Residential:	
Commercial (per gross acre)	\$71,000
Industrial (per gross acre)	\$42,600

## **II. The Bridge and Major Thoroughfare Construction Fee District**

### **A. AUTHORITY**

The State of California Government Code Section 66484, regarding Subdivisions, gives local agencies the authority to adopt local ordinances that "may require the payment of a fee as a condition of approval of a final map or as a condition of issuing a building permit for purposes of defraying the actual or estimated cost of constructing bridges over waterways, railways, freeways, and canyons, or constructing major thoroughfares." The local adopted ordinance must refer to the circulation element of its general plan, provide for a public hearing, provide for the establishment of boundaries of an area of benefit, and provide for the identification of the costs, a fair method of allocation of costs to the area of benefit and a fair fee apportionment (to be disclosed at the public hearing). Further, the local ordinance must provide that the payment of fees shall not be required unless the major thoroughfares are in addition to or a reconstruction of any existing thoroughfares serving the area at the time of district adoption, and that the planned bridge facility is an original bridge serving the area, or an addition to any existing bridge facility serving the area, at the time of district adoption. It must further provide that if owners of more than one-half of the area of property to be benefited by the improvement(s) file proper written protests, the district proceedings as proposed shall be abandoned for at least one year. The local ordinance allows acceptance of considerations in lieu of the payment of fees, permits a local agency to advance money from its general fund or road fund to be reimbursed from bridge and major thoroughfare funds, permits a local agency to incur an interest bearing indebtedness for the construction of bridge or major thoroughfare facilities, and does not preclude an agency from providing funds for the construction of bridge or major thoroughfare facilities to defray costs not allocated to the District.

The Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors adopted Ordinance No. 82-0050 on March 2, 1982, adding Section 21.32.200 to the Los Angeles County Code, providing for the establishment of bridge and major thoroughfare construction fees to be paid by subdivider or building permit applicants. Within the City of Santa Clarita, payment of such fees is established by City of Santa Clarita Subdivision Code Section 16.21.190 established on November 24, 1992. These codes are consistent with the requirements and provisions of the State law (County Code Section 21.32.200 and City Code Section 16.21.190 are included in Attachment A).

## **B. PURPOSE**

The District has been designed to accommodate the needs of future development anticipated by the City of Santa Clarita General Plan and the Los Angeles County Area Wide General Plan. Updating the District will provide local and regional benefits. Many of the District improvements will be eligible for local, state, and federal funding. The District intends to pursue all potential sources of out-of-district funding for these improvements including, but not limited to, State and Federal Gas Taxes, Propositions A and C Sales Tax, Transportation Planning and Development Sales Tax on Gasoline, County Transportation Tax, State Transportation Improvement Program funding, Federal Transportation Efficiency Act for the 21<sup>st</sup> Century funds, State and Federal Highway Trust Funds, special grants, and other sources that may be available. The District will provide the matching funds necessary to pursue greater funding from the aforementioned sources. A reasonable amount of outside funding has been anticipated and formulated into the proposed District fees. If outside funding, not anticipated in the District formation analysis or update, is received; or if funds anticipated are not received, the District costs will be revised, and the District fee may be adjusted accordingly.

## **C. CONCEPT**

As authorized by statutes cited above, the adoption of a specific area of benefit permits the County and City to levy a fee against future development located within the area of benefit. This funding method appropriately assesses developments, which create the need for additional improvements, for the additional public facility costs. The charge is levied in proportion to the estimated number of trips generated by the development, which is translated into Factored Development Units (FDUs). FDUs are described in more detail in the “Development Analysis” section of this report.

The adoption of this type of funding district does not charge existing development. The District fee is collected at the time of recordation of a final map or just prior to the issuance of a building permit.

## **D. DISTRICT FORMATION AND STATUS**

The District was originally approved by the Los Angeles Board of Supervisor’s on October 1, 1985 for the purpose of financing highway and bridge improvements in the Bouquet Canyon area of the Santa Clarita Valley. After incorporation, the City of Santa Clarita adopted the District on November 28, 1989. Five projects were proposed for construction within the original District including Rio Vista Road (now referred to as Santa Clarita Parkway), Newhall Ranch Road, Golden Valley Road, Plum Canyon Road, and Whites Canyon Road for a total cost originally estimated at \$24.55 million. These original roadway and bridge

improvements are listed and described in Table 3. Due to inflation, the estimated project costs have been increased substantially. The original improvements proposed to be funded by the District were derived from determination of the traffic needs of the then anticipated 8,600 residential units and non-residential development expected within the area of benefit and an analysis of highways (including bridges) designated on the Highway Plan of the adopted County General Plan. The District has funded the completion of several of the original improvements. Completed improvements are identified in Table 3.

The amount of District fees collected and expended in the District, along with accrued interest is summarized in Table 4.

TABLE 3 DESCRIPTION OF ORIGINAL ROADWAY AND BRIDGE IMPROVEMENTS

Completed	Improvement Description	Project Cost
	Rio Vista Road (now referred to as Santa Clarita Parkway): Newhall Ranch Road to Soledad Canyon Road	\$3,340,000
	Newhall Ranch Road to Soledad Canyon Road R/W acquisition Grading Drainage Construction for 2-lane highway 2-lane bridge construction Levee improvement work Preliminary and construction engineering	
	Plum Canyon Road: Easterly terminus of existing Plum Canyon Road to existing northerly terminus of Whites Canyon Road	\$2,600,000
Yes	Easterly terminus of existing Plum Canyon Road to existing northerly terminus of Whites Canyon Road Grading Drainage Construction for 2-lane highway Preliminary and construction engineering	
	Whites Canyon Road: Soledad Canyon Road to Sierra Highway	\$7,180,000
Yes	Soledad Canyon Road to Via Princessa R/W acquisition Grading Drainage Full-width roadway improvements Full-width bridge over the Santa Clara River Levee improvement work Preliminary and construction engineering	



TABLE 3 DESCRIPTION OF ORIGINAL ROADWAY AND BRIDGE IMPROVEMENTS

Completed	Improvement Description	Project Cost
Yes	Via Princessa to Sierra Highway R/W acquisition Drainage Construction for half-width roadway Half-width bridge construction at railroad crossing Preliminary and construction engineering	
	Newhall Ranch Road: Rio Vista Road (now referred to as Santa Clarita Parkway) to Golden Valley Road	\$2,730,000
	Rio Vista Road (now referred to as Santa Clarita Parkway) to Golden Valley Road R/W acquisition Grading Drainage Construction for 2-lane highway Preliminary and construction engineering	
	Golden Valley Road: Newhall Ranch Road to Soledad Canyon Road	\$8,700,000
	Newhall Ranch Road to Soledad Canyon Road R/W acquisition Grading Drainage Construction for 4-lane highway 2-lane bridge construction Bridge construction at railroad crossing Levee improvement work Preliminary and construction engineering	
<b>Total:</b>		\$24,550,000

TABLE 4 ANALYSIS OF DISTRICT FUNDS

District Fees	County	City	Total
Collections	\$25,253,422	\$9,011,420	\$34,264,842
Expenditures	\$23,133,405	\$2,455,676	\$35,589,081
Interest			\$791,776
Funds Available			\$9,467,537

### III. Bouquet Canyon Area Access

---

#### A. BACKGROUND

Historically, access to new development has been provided cooperatively by the County and land developers. The County funded its share with Gas Tax Funds. Land development was primarily concentrated in flatter areas, expanding away from urban centers. Public facilities were constructed to accommodate this expansion.

Much of the development in recent years and that which is expected to occur in the future is and will be in outlying areas where topography is more rugged and restrictive. As a result, the cost of providing necessary public facilities, including roadways will continue to increase.

#### B. EXISTING CIRCULATION AND PROPOSED DISTRICT IMPROVEMENTS

The primary road network for the District consists of eleven arterials that are classified as Major, Secondary, or Limited Secondary Highways on the City of Santa Clarita Circulation Element and the Los Angeles County Santa Clarita Valley Area Wide Circulation Plan.

The District will fund improvements to all of these highways except for Decoro Drive from Seco Canyon Road to the westerly district boundary, which has been fully improved, and Copper Hill Drive from the westerly district boundary to Seco Canyon Road, which will be paid for in the Valencia District.

In the past, updates have been prepared to specifically reflect changes in improvement costs of anticipated future development. This update differs from previous updates in that it re-analyzes build-out development of the District and expands the scope of District improvements. Instead of including only five improvement projects, the updated District proposes to provide full mitigation for all roadways identified on the City and County circulation elements, including intersections and interchanges.

Full mitigation improvements will include full-width grading, base, pavement, curb, gutter, sidewalk, medians, striping for capacity enhancement, bus turnouts or bus pads (where applicable), bike lanes (where applicable), fully improved and signalized intersections, signal interconnect (where applicable), street lighting, roadway-related utility relocation, drainage structures within road right-of-way, and full improvements for bridges and interchanges. Right of-way is assumed to be dedicated by individual development projects, except for State highway projects and roadway widenings or roadway construction that are unrelated to private development projects.

The arterials for the District are described below. Intersection improvements along the arterials and regional improvements are described in the Proposed Improvements and Estimated Costs Section of this Report.

1. NEWHALL RANCH ROAD: (major highway) is shown on the City of Santa Clarita and County of Los Angeles highway plans as a Major Highway. Newhall Ranch Road will be constructed to 6 lanes between Bouquet Canyon Road and Golden Valley Road, except for 700' east of Bouquet Canyon Road where the roadway is currently improved to 8 lanes. Despite being located in the Bouquet Canyon District, improvements to Newhall Ranch Road between the westerly District boundary and Bouquet Canyon Road, including the intersection of Newhall Ranch Road and Bouquet Canyon Road, will be funded by the Valencia B&T District.
2. BOUQUET CANYON ROAD: (major & secondary Highway) is an 8-lane Major Highway from Soledad Canyon Road to Seco Canyon Road, a 6-lane Major Highway from Seco Canyon Road to Vasquez Canyon Road, and a 4-lane Secondary Highway from Vasquez Canyon Road to the northerly District boundary. Bouquet Canyon Road currently varies from 2 to 8 lanes between Soledad Canyon Road and the northerly District boundary. The District will fully improve Bouquet Canyon Road to 6 lanes from Seco Canyon Road to Vasquez Canyon Road, and 4 lanes from Vasquez to the northerly District boundary. From the southerly District boundary to Seco Canyon Road, the Bouquet Canyon Road will be improved to 8 lanes, including the existing bridge over the Santa Clara River. Bouquet Canyon Road is to be realigned from approximately 1,000 feet north of Plum Canyon Road to Copper Hill Drive.
3. SANTA CLARITA PARKWAY: (major highway) is shown on the County and City highway plans as a Major Highway. Santa Clarita Parkway will be constructed as a 6-lane roadway between Bouquet Canyon Road and the southerly District boundary. Additionally, the District proposes to fund an interchange with Soledad Canyon Road.
4. WHITES CANYON ROAD: (major & secondary highway) exists as a Major Highway between Plum Canyon Road and Via Princessa, and is proposed as a Secondary Highway between Plum Canyon and Vasquez Canyon Road. Whites Canyon Road will be completed within the District as a six-lane roadway from Plum Canyon to Soledad Canyon Road. Whites Canyon Road will be extended eastward as a four-lane roadway from Plum Canyon Road to the easterly District boundary.
5. COPPER HILL DRIVE: (major & secondary highway) exists as a Secondary Highway throughout the District. Copper Hill Drive currently varies between 2 to 4 lanes within the District. The roadway is proposed to be improved to 4 lanes from Seco Canyon Road to Bouquet Canyon Road. From the Valencia District boundary to Seco Canyon Road, Copper Hill Drive is proposed to be fully improved to 6 lanes. From Seco Canyon Road to Bouquet Canyon Road, Copper Hill Drive will be improved to 4 lanes. The Valencia B&T District is responsible for financing that portion Copper Hill Drive within the Bouquet Canyon District between the westerly District boundary and Seco Canyon Road. The intersection of Copper Hill Drive and Seco Canyon Road will be funded by the Bouquet Canyon District.

6. GOLDEN VALLEY ROAD: (major & secondary highway) is shown as a Secondary Highway from Newhall Ranch Road to Plum Canyon Road, and a Major Highway from SR-14 to Newhall Ranch Road on the City and County Circulation Elements. Golden Valley Road will be constructed as a 4-lane roadway between Plum Canyon Road and Newhall Ranch Road. The remaining portion of Golden Valley Road, between Newhall Ranch Road and the southerly District boundary, will be fully improved to 6 lanes.
7. HASKELL CANYON ROAD: (secondary highway) varies from 2 to 4 lanes within the District and is classified by the City of Santa Clarita and the County of Los Angeles as a Secondary Highway. This roadway is proposed to be improved to 4 lanes, including the bridge over Bouquet Canyon Creek.
8. PLUM CANYON ROAD: (major highway) is classified as a Major Highway and currently exists as 6 lanes from Bouquet Canyon Road to Golden Valley Road. Plum Canyon Road now exists as 2 lanes from Golden Valley Road to Whites Canyon Road. Plum Canyon Road and will be improved to 6 lanes from Golden Valley Road to Whites Canyon Road.
9. VASQUEZ CANYON ROAD: (secondary highway) now exists as a 2-lane roadway, but is shown on the County highway plan as a Major Highway (pending downgrade to a Secondary Highway). Vasquez Canyon Road is proposed to be improved to a 4-lane roadway between Bouquet Canyon Road and the easterly District boundary.
10. SECO CANYON ROAD: (secondary highway) is a Secondary Highway from Bouquet Canyon Road to Copper Hill Drive and a Limited Secondary highway from Copper Hill Drive to the City limit. Seco Canyon Road currently exists as a 4-lane roadway from Bouquet Canyon Road to Tupelo Ridge Drive and as a 2-lane lane roadway from Tupelo Ridge Drive to the northerly City limit. Seco Canyon Road will be improved to a 4-lane roadway from Tupelo Ridge Drive to Copper Hill Drive.
11. DECORO DRIVE: (secondary highway) currently fully improved, exists and will remain as a 4-lane Secondary Highway between Seco Canyon Road and the westerly District boundary. No improvements are proposed for Decoro Drive.

## IV. The Bouquet Canyon Bridge and Major Thoroughfare Construction Fee District

### A. THE DISTRICT BOUNDARY

The legal description of the District (Area of Benefit) is included as Attachment B. It encompasses those properties, which have yet to be developed, and which will receive benefit from the improvements funded by the District. A map showing the location of the District is included as Figure 1. The boundaries were determined by the topographical features in the Bouquet Canyon area, ownership/parcel lines, national forest land boundaries, and existing and future access.

#### GENERAL BOUNDARY DESCRIPTION

##### West Boundary Line

Generally follows a major north-south ridgeline easterly of San Francisquito Canyon Road and westerly of Seco Canyon Road, the Metropolitan Water District right-of-way, and recorded subdivision boundaries and ownership lines.

##### North Boundary Line

Generally follows the Angeles National Forest.

##### East Boundary Line

Generally follows township and ownership lines in the vicinity of a north-south tending ridgeline emanating northerly from the intersection of Soledad Canyon Road with Sierra Highway

##### South Boundary Line

Generally follows the southerly line of the Santa Clara River and the northerly right-of-way of Soledad Canyon Road.

### B. PROPOSED IMPROVEMENTS AND ESTIMATED COSTS

Improvements to be funded by the District are based on a determination of the traffic needs of future development anticipated by the City and County General Plans and an analysis of the improvements designated on the highway plans of the adopted City of Santa Clarita Circulation Element and the County Highway Plan. Improvements and associated costs have been estimated for purposes of determining the District fee rates. Actual scope of work and costs may change as the improvements approach the final design stage.

Estimated costs of District improvements include construction costs based on “prevailing wage” and cost of materials; design costs and permitting fees, considered “soft costs” and

included in Table 5; and an administrative/management fee equal to 5% of the wage, materials, and soft costs.

TABLE 5 SOFT COST PERCENTAGES

	Intersection	Storm Drain	Road	Bridge	State Highways	
					Road	Interchange
Engineering-Design	10%	8%	6%	5%	8%	8.5%
Plan Check	3%	2.5%	2%	2%	3%	3%
Engineering-Field	3%	2%	5%	4%	7%	3%
Survey	3%	4%	5%	5%	8%	3%
Soils	1%	2%	5%	3%	7%	1%
Geology	0%	0%	0.5%	0.5%	0.5%	0%
Bonds/Fees	1%	8%	10%	4%	10%	1%
Erosion Control (SWPPP)	0.5%	0%	0.5%	0%	0.5%	0.5%
Army Corps/Fish & Game – Environmental Inspections	0%	0%	0%	1%	0%	0%
<b>TOTAL:</b>	<b>21.5%</b>	<b>26.5%</b>	<b>34.0%</b>	<b>24.5%</b>	<b>44.0%</b>	<b>20%</b>

The bridge and major thoroughfare improvements for highway segments and bridges are listed in Table 6A (Attachment C). Table 6A also includes limits of the proposed improvements and an estimated cost. A detailed listing of work items required for each highway segment and bridge is included in Table 6B (Attachment C).

Intersection improvements, along with a description and estimated cost, are included in Table 7 (Attachment C). Several interchanges have been identified as “regional” improvements. Therefore, each District being updated at this time will pay its “fair share” for each regional improvement based on the respective District’s percent share of projected vehicle trips that encounter the improvement.

Regional improvements; along with a description, percent share according to District, total estimated cost, and estimated cost to the District; are included in Table 8 (Attachment C). Regional improvements are shown in Figure 1.

All District improvements to roadways, bridges, intersections, and interchanges are shown in Figure 2 and described, with estimated costs, in Attachment C. Total costs for the remaining District-identified improvements total an estimated \$158.62 million as summarized below.

- ♦ Highway Segments and Bridges.....\$131.05 million
- ♦ Intersections .....\$3.20 million
- ♦ District Share of Regional Improvements .....\$24.37 million
- ♦ Estimated Cost of Improvements.....\$158.62 million

### C. IMPROVEMENT PHASING

Generally, the timing and phasing of construction of District improvements will be determined by when and where development occurs, as well as how many units. The amount of funds received may also determine the timing of improvements.

### D. DEVELOPMENT ANALYSIS

Future development is expected within the District and can be measured in terms of FDUs. The Quantity of FDUs was estimated for all vacant land within the District. Where a map has been filed (pending, approved, or recorded but not built) to develop vacant land, the FDUs were calculated from the residential development units and non-residential acreage specified in the filed map. Table 9A (Attachment D) includes a list of filed maps; along with the residential units, non-residential acres, and estimated FDUs. Conditioned fees associated with filed maps are also included in Table 9A (Attachment D) were applicable. The location and status of filed maps are shown in Figure 3.

The Quantity of FDUs for the remaining vacant land, within the City of Santa Clarita, was estimated based on the City of Santa Clarita zoning map and mid-point densities. Table 9B (Attachment D) includes a summary of vacant land within the City of Santa Clarita, zoning designations, and estimated FDUs. The Quantity of FDUs for the remaining vacant land, within Los Angeles County, was estimated based on the land use categories and mid-point densities designated in the Santa Clarita Valley Area Plan. Table 9C (Attachment D) includes a summary of vacant land within Los Angeles County, county land use designations, and estimated FDUs. Table 10 (Attachment D) summarizes the development units for residential land uses, the acres for non-residential land uses, and the estimated FDUs for residential and non-residential land uses. The location of vacant land, where no map has been filed, is also shown in Figure 3.

This analysis shows expected future development estimated at 8,688 FDUs, consisting of 7,386 residential units, 420 commercial acres, and 42 industrial use acres.

### E. TRAFFIC AND LAND USE ANALYSIS

The existing highway system adequately handles the traffic generated by existing development located within the District. As such, existing development would not require the additional highway improvements if additional development did not occur. Therefore, the improvements identified in this report are intended to accommodate the circulation needs of future development within the District and are expected to improve circulation for future development within the District. Regional improvements within, or funded by, this District are expected to improve circulation for future development on a Valley-wide basis.

Based on average mid-point densities and filed tentative maps, 42% of the future units will be single-family; 50% of the future units will be townhouse-type; and the remaining 8% of

the future units will be apartments. Non-residential uses are projected as 91% commercial and 9% industrial. The anticipated development quantified in the Development Analysis section and categorized above will require an improved circulation system.

## F. THE DISTRICT FEE

The District fee is calculated by dividing the estimated net cost of the remaining improvements by the estimated number of FDUs. The tables in Attachment D include an analysis of the estimated number of FDUs in the District. The net cost is the total estimated cost of improvements (included in Attachment A) minus anticipated grant funding, funds available as shown in Table 4, and District fees committed through developer agreements (See Table 9A). The total estimated cost of improvements, net cost of improvements, remaining development measured in FDUs, and the calculated District fee is shown below:

- ♦ Estimated Cost of Improvements.....\$158.62 million
- ♦ Anticipated Grant Funding .....\$20.07 million
- ♦ Funds available in District.....\$9.47 million
- ♦ Fees committed in Developer Agreements.....\$6.08 million
- ♦ Net Cost of Improvements .....\$123.00 million
- ♦ Remaining Development .....8,688 FDUs
- ♦ District Fee per FDU .....\$14,200 / FDU

To ensure equity of District fee assignment, the proposed District fee is proportionate to the degree to which future developments benefit from the proposed improvements. Therefore, the proportionate shares take into account the impacts of peak-hour vehicle trips on the system as identified in the City of Santa Clarita and Los Angeles County Circulation Plans. Each of the five major land use categories have assigned FDUs based on the average impact for that category relative to a single-family residence as shown below:

- ♦ Single Family ..... 1.0 FDU
- ♦ Condominium/Townhouse ..... 0.8 FDU
- ♦ Apartment ..... 0.7 FDU
- ♦ Commercial (per gross acre) ..... 5.0 FDUs
- ♦ Industrial (per gross acre)..... 3.0 FDUs



Future development's units and/or acres are multiplied by the assigned FDUs and multiplied by the District's adopted District fee per FDU resulting in a project's proportionate share of District fees. The District fees for each of the five major land use categories are included in Table 2.

The adoption of this type of funding district does not levy any fees against existing development. FDUs for recorded subdivisions, which are located within the District, were not included in the District fee calculation, as it has been assumed that District fees were paid at recordation. If District fees were not paid at recordation for non-residential land uses in the County area, then District fees may be collected for the issuance of a building permit. Because the City of Santa Clarita allows some projects to pay District fees after recordation at the building permit stage, some recorded maps were included in the development analysis.

## SPECIAL CASES

### Governmental Uses

Governmental improvements, such as those for schools, police, fire protection, and libraries, specifically needed to support benefited development, have been excluded from the development analysis as these uses are assumed to be exempt from District fee payment.

### Lands with Physical Development Constraints

The County General Plan includes designations for floodways, Significant Ecological Areas (SEA), and public service related lands. The City assigns such areas urban zoning designations. The updated District fee reflects potential development for all vacant lands with urban only zoning designation. Typically, very few FDUs are assigned to these areas.

Additionally, lands with physical development constraints such as landslides, faults, or other restricted use areas were considered for future development according to their County-assigned land use or City zoning designation. This assumption was made since, in many cases, these types of constraints can be mitigated. Furthermore, these restricted use-type areas can often be used to accommodate development features such as parking lots and setbacks; and residential densities or non-residential square footage can often be transferred from landslide areas to other developable portions of a site.

### Non-Typical Cases

The City and/or County may develop and have on file a rate sheet for non-typical land uses that do not fit the generally adopted fee rate categories. Special calculations for non-typical land uses may also be considered at the discretion of either the City or the County.

### Non-Residential Land Development not including a Land Division

The City and County codes regarding bridge and major thoroughfare fee payment allow for the collection of District fees at either the map recordation or building permit phases of a

project. It is the County's policy to collect only at map recordation unless no land division is proposed. District fees for land development not including a land division shall be paid prior to the issuance of a building permit.

District fees for non-residential uses that are part of a land division will be calculated based on the gross acreage within the map's boundaries.

District fees for non-residential uses on a vacant parcel that does not include a land division will be calculated based on the gross acreage within the vacant parcel boundary.

District fees for non-residential uses on an under-utilized parcel that does not include a land division will be calculated, at the discretion of the County or City, based on one of the following calculations:

**Retail Commercial**

$$\text{Total District Fee Obligation} = \frac{\text{gross building square footage}}{16,335} \times 5 \times \text{District Fee per FDU}$$

A typical District fee calculation for a retail commercial development involving a land division would assume gross project acreage (all area within a map or lot's boundaries) times 5 FDUs times the District fee per FDU. However, the above calculation determines the District fee obligation by estimating the gross project acreage based on a proposed building's gross square footage and an assumed Floor Area Ratio (FAR). For example, using an FAR of 0.375:1 (as outlined in the City of Santa Clarita's Unified Development Code for retail commercial uses), a retail commercial building on a one-acre (43,560 square feet) parcel would yield a building square footage of 16,335 (43,560 x 0.375 = 16,335). Conversely, if a lease project is submitted for District fee payment, an assumed gross acreage can be determined by taking the building's gross square footage and dividing it by 16,335, the equivalent of one acre of retail development.

**Office Commercial/Business Park**

$$\text{Total District Fee Obligation} = \frac{\text{gross building square footage}}{43,560} \times 5 \times \text{District Fee per FDU}$$

Using an FAR of 1.0:1, an office commercial/business park building on a one-acre (43,560 square feet) parcel would yield a building square footage of 43,560 (43,560 x 1.0 = 43,560). Again, if a lease project is submitted for District fee payment, an assumed gross acreage can be determined by talking the building's gross square footage and dividing it by 43,560, essentially one acre of commercial office development. The UDC identifies a 1:1 FAR for Business Park, a 1.25:1 FAR for Commercial Office, and a 0.75:1 FAR for Industrial Commercial. Thus, for the purposes of this analysis, a 1:1 FAR was used.

**Industrial**

$$\text{Total District Fee Obligation} = \frac{\text{gross building square footage}}{29,403} \times 3 \times \text{District Fee per FDU}$$

Using a FAR of 0.675:1, industrial construction on a one-acre parcel would yield a building square footage of 29,403 ( $43,560 \times 0.675 = 29,403$ ). Again, if a lease project is submitted for District fee payment, an assumed gross acreage can be determined by taking the building's gross square footage and dividing it by 29,403, essentially one acre of industrial development.

District fees for a lease building are not required if the underlying land paid District fees based on gross acreage, including the land on which the lease building is to be sited. It should be noted that if a project proposes an upgraded use from that which was paid for the underlying parcel the project would be subject to the difference in fees between that which was paid and the proposed use.

Under-utilized parcels, such as those that may accommodate a future lease structure, were not assumed in the development analysis, as these parcels are difficult to identify.

#### G. CONSTRUCTION OF DISTRICT IMPROVEMENTS IN LIEU OF PAYING FEES AND CREDIT/CASH REQUESTS

If a developer constructs District-identified improvements, that developer becomes eligible for District credit which can be used to offset District fee payments. If the cost of the completed and accepted improvements, along with the soft costs and 5% administrative/management fee, exceeds the District fee obligation, the developer would be given a credit which can be used to offset future District fee obligations within the District.

If adequate funds are available, the developer may receive a cash reimbursement.

A developer has the following options with regard to construction of District-identified improvements:

- Construct District-identified improvements for District credit.
- Construct District-identified improvements and receive cash reimbursement from the District.

To receive District credit or cash reimbursement from the District for constructed and accepted improvements, the proper documentation must be submitted to the County or City. Required documentation includes the "Bridge and Major Thoroughfare District Cash/Credit Request" form (included as Attachment E) and all applicable attachments documenting construction costs. No documentation for the 5% administrative/management fee is required.

Upon submittal of a request for a withdrawal from the District, review and determination by the City and/or County will be completed within 60 days. After the "Bridge and Major Thoroughfare District Cash/Credit Request" form has been submitted and approved, withdrawal of District funds will be authorized if the City and/or County deem that sufficient funds are available in the District account, based on a review of District priorities.

If a developer constructs improvements beyond its conditioned obligation, District credit and/or cash may be given subsequent to the improvement's completion and acceptance as long as the improvement has been described in this report as a District improvement.

The City and/or County will accept improvements for maintenance upon completion and field acceptance.

If a condition of project approval requires a landowner to dedicate property as right-of-way for a State improvement, then the landowner will receive credit at fair market value for the property dedicated. Additionally, if any local improvement requires land acquisition from a third party, the cost of the property will be added to the cost of the improvement. However, if right-of-way is required to be dedicated for a County or City improvement as a condition of project approval, the landowner receives no credit for the value of the dedicated property. Therefore, the cost estimates prepared for District improvements reflect costs for right-of-way as described above.

It may be permissible for developer/landowners to receive reimbursement for the construction of District-identified improvements from District funds as described in this report once improvements are completed and accepted by the City or County.

#### H. PROVISIONS FOR UPDATING COSTS AND UNIT INFORMATION

Projections for build-out development and the cost of the improvements located within the area of benefit may change over time. Project scope may change due to refinement and the need to comply with requirements imposed by other agencies, including, but not limited to, the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans). A reasonable amount of outside funding has been anticipated and formulated into the proposed District fees. Outside funding, not anticipated in the District formation analysis or update, may be received or funds anticipated may not be received. Therefore, in order to equitably assess future development as well as collect sufficient funds to complete the improvements, it will be necessary to periodically re-evaluate the net cost of the improvements, the remaining land to be developed, and the type of development being constructed within the District and to adjust the District fee accordingly.

Beginning July 1, 2002, and thereafter on each succeeding July 1<sup>st</sup>, the District fees shall be adjusted as follows: calculate the percentage movement for the previous year in the Los Angeles Regional Construction Cost Index (CCI) based on Engineering News Record data for that period. Then, if the percentage movement equals or exceeds a two percent increase, the District fee per FDU will be increased by two percent and rounded up to the nearest \$10. If the percentage movement increases less than two percent, the District Fee per FDU will be increased by the same percent as the percentage movement and rounded up to the nearest \$10. Notwithstanding the foregoing, no such adjustment shall decrease any District fee.

A separate biennial review to reassess development trends, construction costs, grant funding success, and refinement of project scope may also be conducted.

#### I. PROPOSAL FOR DISTRICT CLOSURE

In the event that District fees collected from developers exceed the cost of improvements, the surplus funds, less administrative costs, will be refunded at District closure by the City and/or County to current owners in proportion to District fees paid.

#### J. DISTRICT FUNDS

The City and County will each maintain a separate District fund. Money may be transferred from one fund to the other for District purposes.

##### **City of Santa Clarita**

Any District fees paid by development projects within the City portion of the District may be loaned to other Districts within the City Limits. The loans may be used provided that loans are properly recorded by no less than a resolution approved by the City Council. This provision ONLY applies to the City of Santa Clarita portion of the B&T funds within each District.

Pursuant to the above paragraph, the City shall make all funds or credits available to the District as necessary for the purpose of the City reimbursing or providing credit to developers/landowners as described in this report once improvements are completed and accepted. It will be the sole discretion of the City to determine whether developers/landowners will be provided a reimbursement or credit for improvements above B&T obligations.

##### **Los Angeles County**

For the County portion of the District, the County will not loan money out of the District as described above.

#### K. THE ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS

The City of Santa Clarita has determined that this District update does not constitute a "Project" as established by CEQA guideline 15378(4) and therefore is exempt from CEQA. The County of Los Angeles finds the proposed update is statutorily exempt under Public Resource Code Section 21080 B8(d).

FIGURE 1 DISTRICT BOUNDARY AND REGIONAL IMPROVEMENTS

**FIGURE 2 DISTRICT IMPROVEMENTS**

FIGURE 3 FILED MAPS AND VACANT LAND



# Attachment A

CODE PERTAINING TO B&T DISTRICTS

---

Board of Supervisors—Los Angeles County Code  
City of Santa Clarita, California—Municipal Code

COUNTY CODE:

**TITLE 58      Chapter 21.23      § 21.32.200**

**21.32.200 MAJOR THOROUGHFARE AND BRIDGE FEES.**

A. A subdivider, as a condition of approval of a final map for property within an area benefit, or a building permit applicant, as a condition of issuance of a building permit for property within an area of benefit, shall pay a fee as hereinafter established to defray the cost of constructing bridges over waterways, railways, freeways and canyons, and/or constructing major thoroughfares.

B. Definitions.

1. *Area of benefit* means a specified area wherein it has been determined that the real property located therein will benefit from the construction of a bridge and/or major thoroughfare.

2. *Bridge facility* means any crossing for a highway or local road, involving a railway, freeway, stream or canyon, which is required by the General Plan in order to accommodate new urban development within the area of benefit.

3. *Construction* means and includes preliminary studies, design, acquisition of right-of-way, administration of construction contracts, and actual construction.

4. *Major thoroughfare* means those roads designated in the transportation element of the General Plan, the primary purpose of which is to carry through traffic and provide a network connecting to the state highway system.

5. The singular number includes the plural, and the plural the singular.

C. The provisions herein for payment of a fee shall apply only if the bridge and/or major thoroughfare has been included in an element of the General Plan adopted by the Board of Supervisors at least 30 days prior to the filing of a map or application for a building permit on land located within the boundaries of the area of benefit.

D. Payment of fees shall not be required unless any major thoroughfares are in addition to or a widening or reconstruction of any existing major thoroughfares serving the area at the time of the adoption of the boundaries of the area of benefit.

E. Payment of Fees shall not be required unless any planned bridge facility is a new bridge serving the area or an addition to an existing bridge facility serving the area at the time of the adoption of the boundaries of the area of benefit.

F.

1. Action to establish an area of benefit may be initiated by the Board of Supervisors upon its own motion or upon the recommendation of the Road Commissioner.

2. The Board of Supervisors will set a public hearing for each proposed area benefited. Notice of the time and place of said hearing, including preliminary information related to the boundaries of the area of benefit, estimated costs and the method of fee apportionment shall be given pursuant to Section 65905 of the Government Code.

G.

1. At the public hearing, the Board of Supervisors will consider the testimony, written protests and other evidence. At the conclusion of the public hearing, the Board of Supervisors may, unless a majority written protest is filed and not withdrawn, determine to establish an area of benefit. If established, the Board of Supervisors shall adopt a resolution describing the boundaries of the area of benefit, setting forth the cost, whether actual or estimated, and the method of fee apportionment. A certified copy of such resolution shall be recorded with the County Recorder.

2. Such apportioned fees shall be applicable to all property within the area of benefit, and shall be payable as a condition of approval of a final map or as a condition of issuing a building permit for such property or portions thereof. Where the area of benefit includes lands not subject to the payment of fees pursuant to this section, the Board of Supervisors shall make provisions for payment of the share of improvement cost apportioned to such lands from other sources.

3. Written protest will be received by the Clerk of the Board of Supervisors at any time prior to the close of the public hearing. If written protests are filed by the owners of more than one-half of the area of the property to be benefited by the improvement, and sufficient protests are not withdrawn so as to reduce the area represented by the protests to less than one-half of the area to be benefited, then the proposed proceedings shall be abandoned and the Board of Supervisors shall not, for one year from the filing of said written protests, commence or carry on any proceedings for the same improvement under the provisions of this section. Any protest may be withdrawn by the owner making the same, in writing, at any time prior to the close of the public hearing.

4. If any majority protest is directed against only a portion of the improvement, then all further proceedings under the provisions of this section to construct that portion of the improvement so protested against shall be barred for a period of one year, but the Board of Supervisors shall not be barred from commencing new proceedings not including any part of the improvement so protested against. Such proceedings shall be commenced by a new notice and public hearing as set forth in Subsection F above.

5. Nothing in this section shall prohibit the Board of Supervisors, within such one-year period, from commencing and carrying on new proceedings for the construction of an improvement or portion of the improvement so protested against if it finds, by the affirmative vote of four-fifths of its members, that the owners of more than one-half of the area of the property to be benefited are in favor of going forward with such improvement or portion thereof.

H. Fees paid pursuant to this section shall be deposited in a planned bridge facility and/or major thoroughfare fund. A fund shall be established for each planned bridge facility project and/or each planned major thoroughfare project. If the benefit area is one in which more than one bridge and/or major thoroughfare is required to be constructed, a separate fund may be established covering all of the bridge projects and/or major thoroughfares in the benefit area. Moneys in such fund shall be expended solely for the construction or reimbursement for construction of the improvement serving the area to be benefited and from which the fees comprising the fund were collected, or to reimburse the County for the costs of constructing the improvement.

I. The Board of Supervisors may approve the acceptance of considerations in lieu of the payment of fees established herein.

J. The Board of Supervisors may approve the advancement of money from the General Fund or Road Fund to pay the costs of constructing the improvements covered herein and may reimburse the General Fund or Road Fund for such advances from planned bridge facility and/or major thoroughfare funds established pursuant to this section.

K. If a subdivider, as a condition of approval of a subdivision, is required or desires to construct a bridge and/or major thoroughfare, the Board of Supervisors may enter into a reimbursement agreement with the subdivider. Such agreement may provide for payments to the subdivider from the bridge facility and/or major thoroughfare fund covering that specific project to reimburse the subdivider for costs not allocated to the subdivider's property in the resolution establishing the area of benefit. If the bridge and/or major thoroughfare fund covers more than one project, reimbursements shall be made on a pro rata basis, reflecting the actual or estimated costs of the projects covered by the fund. (*Ord. 82-0240 Sec. 1, 1982; Ord. 82-0050 Sec. 1, 1982*)

**22.48.235. MAJOR BRIDGE AND THOROUGHFARE FEES.** Except as otherwise provided in Section 22.48.280, a building or structure shall not be used on any lot or parcel of land, any portion of which is located within a Bridge or Major Thoroughfare District established pursuant to Section 21.32.200, unless the required district fee has been paid as a condition of issuing a building permit. (*Ord. 85-0168, Sec. 34, 1985*)

**22.48.280. EXEMPTIONS - EXISTING BUILDINGS AND STRUCTURES.** This Part 4 does not apply to the use, alteration or enlargement of an existing building or structure or the erection of one or more buildings or structures accessory thereto, or both, on the same lot or parcel of land, if the total value of such alteration, enlargement, or construction does not exceed one-half of the current market value of all existing buildings or structures on such lot or parcel of land.

(*Ord. 1494 Ch. 4 Art. 4 & 497. 1927.*)

CITY CODE

16.21.190 MAJOR THOROUGHFARE AND BRIDGE FEES

- A. A subdivider, as a condition of approval of a final map for property within an area of benefit, or a building permit applicant, as a condition of issuance of a building permit for property within an area of benefit, shall pay a fee hereinafter established to defray the costs of constructing bridges over waterways, railways, freeways, and canyons, and/or constructing major thoroughfares.
- B. The provisions herein for payment of a fee shall apply only if the bridge and/or major thoroughfare has been included in an element of the General Plan adopted by the City Council at least 30 days prior to filing of a map or application for a building permit on land located within the boundaries of the area of benefit.
- C. Payment of fees shall not be required unless any major thoroughfares are in addition to, or a widening or reconstruction of, any existing major thoroughfares serving the area at the time of the adoption of the boundaries of the area of benefit.
- D. Payment of fees shall not be required unless any planned bridge facility is a new bridge serving the area or an addition to an existing bridge facility serving the area at the time of the adoption of the boundaries of the area of benefit.
- E.
  - 1. Action to establish an area of benefit may be initiated by the City Council upon its own motion or upon the recommendation of the City Engineer.
  - 2. The City Council will set a public hearing for each proposed area of benefit. Notice of the time and place of said hearing, including preliminary information related to the boundaries of the area of benefit, estimated costs and the method of fee apportionment shall be given pursuant to Section 65905 of the Government Code.
- F.
  - 1. At the public hearing, the City Council will consider the testimony, written protests and other evidence. At the conclusion of the public hearing, the City Council may, unless a majority written protest is filed and not withdrawn, determine to establish an area of benefit. If established, the City Council shall adopt a resolution describing the boundaries of the area of benefit, setting forth the cost, whether actual or estimated, and the method of fee apportionment. A certified copy of such resolution shall be recorded with the County Recorder.
  - 2. Such apportioned fees shall be applicable to all property within the area of benefit, and shall be payable as a condition of approval of a final map or as a condition of issuing a

building permit for such property or portions thereof. Where the area of benefit includes lands not subject to the payment of fees pursuant to this section, the City Council shall make provision for payment of the share of improvement cost apportioned to such lands from other sources.

3. Written protest will be received by the Clerk of the City Council at any time prior to the close of the public hearing. If written protests are filed by the owners of more than one-half of the area of the property to be benefited by the improvement, and sufficient protests are not withdrawn so as to reduce the area represented by the protests to less than one-half of the area to be benefited, then the proposed proceedings shall be abandoned and the City Council shall not, for one year from the filing of said written protests, commence or carry on any proceedings for the same improvement under the provisions of this section. Any protest may be withdrawn by the owner making the same, in writing, at any time prior to the close of the public hearing.
  4. If any majority protest is directed against only a portion of the improvement, then all further proceedings under the provisions of this section to construct that portion of the improvement so protested against shall be barred for a period of one year, but the City Council shall not be barred from commencing new proceedings not including any part of the improvement so protested against. Such proceedings shall be commenced by a new notice and public hearing as set forth in Section F above.
  5. Nothing in this section shall prohibit the City Council, which in such one-year period, from commencing and carrying on new proceedings for the construction of an improvement or portion of the improvement so protested against if it finds, by the affirmative vote of four-fifths of its members, that the owners of more than one-half of the area of the property to be benefited are in favor of going forward with such improvements or portion thereof.
- G. Fees paid pursuant to this section shall be deposited in a planned bridge facility and/or major thoroughfare fund. A fund shall be established for each planned bridge facility project and/or each planned major thoroughfare project. If the benefit area is one in which more than one bridge and/or major thoroughfare is required to be constructed, a separate fund may be established covering all the bridge projects and/or major thoroughfares in the benefit area. Moneys in such fund shall be expended solely for the construction of the improvement serving the area to be benefited and from which the fees comprising the fund were collected, or to reimburse the City for the costs of constructing the improvement.
- H. The City Council may approve the acceptance of considerations in lieu of the payment of fees established herein.
- I. The City Council may approve the advancement of money from the General Fund or Road Fund to pay the costs of constructing the improvements covered herein and may reimburse

the General Fund or Road Fund for such advances from planned bridge facility and/or major thoroughfare funds established pursuant to this section.

- J. If a subdivider, as a condition of approval of a subdivision, is required or desires to construct a bridge and/or major thoroughfare, the City Council may enter into a reimbursement agreement with the subdivider. Such agreement may provide for payments to the subdivider from the bridge facility and/or major thoroughfare fund covering that specific project to reimburse the subdivider for costs not allocated to the subdivider's property in the resolution establishing the area of benefit. If the bridge and/or major thoroughfare funds cover more than one project, reimbursements shall be made on a pro rata basis, reflecting the actual or estimated costs of the project covered by the fund.

*SUBDIVISION CODE  
City of Santa Clarita, California*

*11/24/92*

# Attachment B

## LEGAL DESCRIPTION

---



## LEGAL DESCRIPTION

### THE AREA OF BENEFIT KNOWN AS BOUQUET CANYON BRIDGE AND MAJOR THOROUGHFARE CONSTRUCTION FEE DISTRICT

THAT PORTION OF THE UNINCORPORATED TERRITORY OF THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, STATE OF CALIFORNIA, TOGETHER WITH THAT PORTION OF THE CITY OF SANTA CLARITA WITHIN THE FOLLOWING DESCRIBED BOUNDARIES:

BEGINNING AT THE NORTHWESTERLY CORNER OF SECTION 26, TOWNSHIP 5 NORTH, RANGE 16 WEST, SAN BERNARDINO MERIDIAN; THENCE EASTERLY ALONG THE NORTHERLY LINES OF SECTIONS 26 AND 25, SAID TOWNSHIP AND RANGE TO THE NORTHEASTERLY CORNER OF SAID SECTION 25; THENCE EASTERLY ALONG THE NORTHERLY LINES OF SECTIONS 30, 29, 28, AND 27, TOWNSHIP 5 NORTH, RANGE 15 WEST, SAN BERNARDINO MERIDIAN, TO THE EASTERLY LINE OF THE WEST HALF OF SAID SECTION 27; THENCE SOUTHERLY ALONG SAID EASTERLY LINE TO THE SOUTHERLY LINE OF SAID SECTION 27; THENCE WESTERLY ALONG SAID SOUTHERLY LINE TO THE NORTHEASTERLY CORNER OF SECTION 33 OF SAID LAST MENTIONED TOWNSHIP AND RANGE; THENCE SOUTHERLY ALONG THE EASTERLY LINE OF SAID SECTION 33 TO THE SOUTHEASTERLY CORNER OF SAID SECTION 33; THENCE SOUTHERLY ALONG THE EASTERLY LINES OF SECTIONS 4, 9, AND 16, TOWNSHIP 4 NORTH, RANGE 15 WEST SAN BERNARDINO MERIDIAN, TO THE SOUTHERLY LINE OF THE NORTH HALF OF SAID SECTION 16; THENCE WESTERLY ALONG SAID LAST MENTIONED SOUTHERLY LINE TO THE WESTERLY LINE OF THE NORTHWEST QUARTER OF THE SOUTHEAST QUARTER OF SAID LAST MENTIONED SECTION; THENCE SOUTHERLY ALONG SAID LAST MENTIONED WESTERLY LINE TO THE NORTHERLY LINE OF THE SOUTHWEST QUARTER OF SAID SOUTHEAST QUARTER; THENCE EASTERLY AND SOUTHERLY ALONG THE NORTHERLY AND EASTERLY LINES OF SAID SOUTHWEST QUARTER

TO THE SOUTHERLY LINE OF SAID SECTION 16; THENCE WESTERLY ALONG SAID LAST MENTIONED SOUTHERLY LINE TO THE NORTHWESTERLY CORNER OF LOT 1 IN SECTION 21 OF SAID LAST MENTIONED TOWNSHIP AND RANGE; THENCE SOUTHERLY ALONG THE WESTERLY LINE OF SAID LOT 1 AND THE WESTERLY LINE LOT 4 IN SAID LAST MENTIONED SECTION TO THE NORTHWESTERLY BOUNDARY OF SIERRA HIGHWAY, AS SAME EXISTED ON MARCH 4, 2002; THENCE SOUTHWESTERLY ALONG SAID NORTHWESTERLY BOUNDARY TO THE NORTHERLY BOUNDARY OF SOLEDAD CANYON ROAD, AS SAME EXISTED ON MARCH 4, 2002; THENCE WESTERLY AND NORTHWESTERLY ALONG THE NORTHERLY AND NORTHEASTERLY BOUNDARY OF SAID SOLEDAD CANYON ROAD TO A LINE 50 FEET EASTERLY OF AND PARALLEL WITH THE EASTERLY LINE OF TRACT NO. 23365 AS SHOWN ON MAP FILED IN BOOK 760 PAGES 29 AND 30, OF MAPS, IN THE OFFICE OF THE REGISTRAR-RECORDER OF SAID COUNTY; THENCE NORTHERLY ALONG SAID PARALLEL LINE TO THE MOST SOUTHERLY CORNER OF LOT 82 OF TRACT NO. 30317 AS SHOWN ON MAP FILED IN BOOK 740 PAGES 97 TO 100, INCLUSIVE, OF SAID MAPS; THENCE NORTHERLY, NORTHWESTERLY AND WESTERLY ALONG THE EASTERLY, NORTHEASTERLY AND NORTHERLY BOUNDARIES OF SAID LAST MENTIONED LOT AND FOLLOWING THE SAME IN ALL ITS VARIOUS COURSES AND CURVES TO THE NORTHEASTERLY CORNER OF LOT 57 OF TRACT NO. 30319 AS SHOWN ON MAP FILED IN BOOK 757 PAGES 43, 44, AND 45, OF SAID MAPS; THENCE WESTERLY AND SOUTHERLY ALONG THE NORTHERLY AND WESTERLY BOUNDARIES OF SAID LAST MENTIONED LOT TO THE NORTHWESTERLY CORNER OF LOT 56 OF SAID LAST MENTIONED TRACT; THENCE SOUTHERLY ALONG THE WESTERLY BOUNDARY OF SAID LAST MENTIONED TRACT TO THE NORTHEASTERLY CORNER OF TRACT NO. 8575 AS SHOWN ON MAP FILED IN BOOK 117 PAGES 64, 65 AND 66, OF SAID MAPS; THENCE WESTERLY AND SOUTHERLY ALONG THE NORTHERLY AND WESTERLY BOUNDARIES OF SAID LAST MENTIONED TRACT AND FOLLOWING THE SAME IN ALL ITS VARIOUS COURSES TO THE MOST WESTERLY NORTHWESTERLY CORNER OF SAID LAST MENTIONED TRACT; THENCE SOUTHERLY ALONG THE WESTERLY BOUNDARY OF SAID LAST MENTIONED

TRACT TO ITS INTERSECTION WITH THE NORTHERLY BOUNDARY OF LOT 2 AS SHOWN ON LICENSED SURVEYOR'S MAP RECORDED IN BOOK 27 PAGE 40, OF RECORDS OF SURVEYS, IN SAID OFFICE OF THE REGISTRAR-RECORDER; THENCE WESTERLY ALONG SAID LAST MENTIONED NORTHERLY BOUNDARY TO ITS INTERSECTION WITH THE NORTHEASTERLY PROLONGATION OF THE NORTHWESTERLY LINE OF PARCEL 4 OF PARCEL MAP NO. 6449 PER MAP FILED IN BOOK 69 PAGES 8 TO 10, INCLUSIVE, OF PARCEL MAPS, IN SAID OFFICE OF THE REGISTRAR-RECORDER; THENCE SOUTHWESTERLY ALONG SAID PROLONGATION TO THE NORTHEASTERLY CORNER OF SAID PARCEL 4; THENCE SOUTHWESTERLY, NORTHWESTERLY AND WESTERLY ALONG THE NORTHWESTERLY, NORTHEASTERLY AND NORTHERLY BOUNDARIES OF SAID PARCEL 4 TO THE NORTHWESTERLY CORNER OF SAID PARCEL 4; THENCE SOUTHERLY ALONG THE WESTERLY LINE OF SAID PARCEL 4 AND ITS SOUTHERLY PROLONGATION TO THE NORTHERLY BOUNDARY OF SOLEDAD CANYON ROAD, AS THE SAME EXISTED ON MARCH 4, 2002; THENCE WESTERLY ALONG SAID NORTHERLY BOUNDARY FOLLOWING THE SAME ALONG ALL ITS VARIOUS COURSES AND CURVES AND ITS WESTERLY PROLONGATION TO THE NORTHWESTERLY BOUNDARY OF BOUQUET CANYON ROAD, AS THE SAME EXISTED ON JULY 11, 1991; THENCE NORTHEASTERLY ALONG LAST SAID NORTHWESTERLY BOUNDARY, TO THE WESTERLY PROLONGATION OF THE NORTHERLY BOUNDARY OF LOT 1 AS SHOWN ON MAP FILED IN BOOK 27, PAGES 32 TO 39, INCLUSIVE, OF RECORD OF SURVEYS, IN OFFICE OF SAID REGISTRAR-RECORDER; THENCE ALONG SAID WESTERLY PROLONGATION TO THE EASTERLY BOUNDARY OF PARCEL 2, AS SHOWN ON MAP FILED IN BOOK 86, PAGES 43 TO 48, INCLUSIVE, OF SAID RECORD OF SURVEYS; THENCE NORTHERLY ALONG SAID EASTERLY BOUNDARY TO THE NORTHEASTERLY CORNER OF SAID PARCEL 2; THENCE NORTHERLY IN A DIRECT LINE TO THE SOUTHEASTERLY CORNER OF PARCEL 1, AS SHOWN ON SAID LAST MENTIONED MAP; THENCE NORTHERLY ALONG THE EASTERLY BOUNDARY OF SAID LAST MENTIONED PARCEL 1 TO THE NORTHERLY LINE OF PARCEL 4, AS SHOWN ON MAP FILED IN BOOK 27, PAGES 32 TO 39, INCLUSIVE, OF SAID RECORD OF SURVEYS; THENCE EASTERLY ALONG SAID

LAST MENTIONED NORTHERLY LINE TO THE WESTERLY BOUNDARY OF TRACT NO. 27541, AS SHOWN ON MAP FILED IN BOOK 878 PAGES 99 AND 100, OF SAID MAPS; THENCE NORTHERLY, NORTHEASTERLY, AND EASTERLY ALONG THE WESTERLY, NORTHWESTERLY AND NORTHERLY BOUNDARIES OF SAID LAST MENTIONED TRACT TO THE SOUTHERLY BOUNDARY OF TRACT NO. 44692 FILED IN BOOK 1132 PAGES 26 TO 35, INCLUSIVE, OF SAID MAPS; THENCE EASTERLY AND NORTHERLY ALONG THE GENERAL SOUTHERLY AND EASTERLY BOUNDARIES OF LAST SAID TRACT AND FOLLOWING THE SAME ALONG ITS VARIOUS COURSES AND CURVES TO THE EASTERLY LINE OF LOT 106 OF SAID TRACT NO. 44692; THENCE NORTHERLY ALONG LAST SAID EASTERLY LINE AND ITS NORTHERLY PROLONGATION TO THE CENTERLINE OF DECORO DRIVE AS SHOWN ON MAP OF SAID TRACT NO. 44692; THENCE EASTERLY ALONG LAST SAID LINE AND FOLLOWING THE SAME ALONG ITS VARIOUS COURSES AND CURVES TO THE SOUTHERLY PROLONGATION OF THE WESTERLY LINE OF THAT CERTAIN PARCEL OF LAND DESCRIBED IN DEED TO SAUGUS UNION SCHOOL DISTRICT, RECORDED AS DOCUMENT NO. 124, ON JULY 28, 1959, IN BOOK 3550, PAGE 215, OF SAID OFFICIAL RECORDS; THENCE NORTHERLY ALONG SAID LAST MENTIONED SOUTHERLY PROLONGATION AND SAID LAST MENTIONED WESTERLY LINE TO THE SOUTHWESTERLY CORNER OF THAT CERTAIN PARCEL OF LAND DESCRIBED IN DEED TO COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, RECORDED AS DOCUMENT NO. 1447, ON NOVEMBER 6, 1963, IN BOOK D2246, PAGE 597, OF SAID OFFICIAL RECORDS; THENCE NORTHERLY ALONG THE WESTERLY LINE OF SAID LAST MENTIONED CERTAIN PARCEL OF LAND TO THE SOUTHERLY BOUNDARY OF TRACT NO. 29958, AS SHOWN ON MAP FILED IN BOOK 816, PAGES 50 TO 59, INCLUSIVE, OF SAID MAPS; THENCE SOUTHWESTERLY ALONG THE SOUTHEASTERLY BOUNDARY OF SAID LAST MENTIONED TRACT TO THE MOST EASTERLY CORNER OF LOT 134, TRACT NO. 29766, AS SHOWN ON MAP FILED IN BOOK 835, PAGES 7 TO 15, INCLUSIVE, OF SAID MAPS; THENCE WESTERLY, NORTHWESTERLY, NORTHERLY AND NORTHEASTERLY ALONG THE SOUTHERLY, SOUTHWESTERLY, WESTERLY AND NORTHWESTERLY BOUNDARIES OF SAID LAST MENTIONED

TRACT AND FOLLOWING THE SAME ALONG ALL ITS VARIOUS COURSES TO THE MOST WESTERLY CORNER OF LOT 93 OF TRACT NO. 29852, AS SHOWN ON MAP FILED IN BOOK 871, PAGES 82 TO 89, INCLUSIVE, OF SAID MAPS; THENCE NORTHEASTERLY, NORTHERLY, NORTHWESTERLY AND EASTERLY ALONG THE NORTHWESTERLY, WESTERLY, SOUTHWESTERLY AND NORTHERLY BOUNDARIES OF SAID LAST MENTIONED TRACT AND FOLLOWING THE SAME ALONG ALL ITS VARIOUS COURSES TO THE WESTERLY BOUNDARY OF TRACT NO. 30321, AS SHOWN ON MAP FILED IN BOOK 893, PAGES 9 TO 16, INCLUSIVE, OF SAID MAPS; THENCE NORTHERLY AND NORTHWESTERLY ALONG THE WESTERLY AND SOUTHWESTERLY BOUNDARIES OF SAID LAST MENTIONED TRACT AND FOLLOWING THE SAME IN ALL ITS VARIOUS COURSES TO THE MOST SOUTHERLY CORNER OF LOT 66, TRACT NO. 29894, AS SHOWN ON MAP FILED IN BOOK 917, PAGES 61 TO 67, INCLUSIVE, OF SAID MAPS; THENCE NORTHERLY AND NORTHEASTERLY ALONG THE WESTERLY AND NORTHWESTERLY BOUNDARIES OF SAID LAST MENTIONED TRACT AND FOLLOWING THE SAME ALONG ALL ITS VARIOUS COURSES TO THE CENTERLINE OF THAT CERTAIN 60 FOOT STRIP OF LAND DESCRIBED IN DEED TO COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, KNOWN AS SAN FRANCISQUITO CANYON ROAD, RECORDED ON MARCH 16, 1926 IN BOOK 5628 PAGE 173, OF SAID OFFICIAL RECORDS; THENCE NORTHWESTERLY, NORTHERLY AND WESTERLY ALONG SAID LAST MENTIONED CENTERLINE AND FOLLOWING THE SAME ALONG ALL ITS VARIOUS COURSES AND CURVES TO THE WESTERLY TERMINUS OF THAT CERTAIN 120 FOOT RADIUS CURVE IN SAID LAST MENTIONED CENTERLINE; THENCE NORTHERLY ALONG A PROLONGED RADIAL OF SAID LAST MENTIONED CERTAIN CURVE TO THE NORTHERLY BOUNDARY OF RANCHO SAN FRANCISCO AS SHOWN ON MAP RECORDED IN BOOK 1, PAGES 521 AND 522, OF PATENTS, IN THE OFFICE OF SAID REGISTRAR-RECORDER; THENCE EASTERLY ALONG SAID LAST MENTIONED NORTHERLY BOUNDARY TO THE SOUTHERLY BOUNDARY OF LOT 4 IN FRACTIONAL SECTION 34, TOWNSHIP 5 NORTH, RANGE 16 WEST, SAN BERNARDINO MERIDIAN; THENCE EASTERLY ALONG SAID LAST MENTIONED SOUTHERLY BOUNDARY TO THE SOUTHWESTERLY CORNER OF SECTION 35, OF

SAID LAST MENTIONED TOWNSHIP AND RANGE; THENCE NORTHERLY ALONG  
THE WESTERLY LINES OF SAID SECTIONS 35 AND 26 TO THE POINT OF  
BEGINNING.

# Attachment C

## DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSED IMPROVEMENTS AND ESTIMATED COSTS

---

TABLE 6A BRIDGE AND MAJOR THOROUGHFARE IMPROVEMENTS

Highway	Limits of Proposed Improvements	Estimated Cost
Golden Valley Road	Southerly District Boundary to Plum Canyon Road	\$29,349,110
Bouquet Canyon Road	Soledad Canyon Road to Northerly District Boundary	\$35,723,770
Newhall Ranch Road	Bouquet Canyon Road to Golden Valley Road	\$15,916,500
Santa Clarita Parkway	Southerly District Boundary to Bouquet Canyon Road	\$25,612,850
Whites Canyon Road	Plum Canyon Road to Soledad Canyon Road and Plum Canyon Road to Easterly District Boundary	\$8,517,890
Vasquez Canyon Road	Bouquet Canyon Road to Easterly District Boundary	\$6,543,670
Seco Canyon Road	Bouquet Canyon Road to Copper Hill Drive	\$113,600
Haskell Canyon Road	Bouquet Canyon Road to Copper Hill Drive	\$1,326,960
Copper Hill Drive	Seco Canyon Road to Bouquet Canyon Road	\$6,044,880
Plum Canyon Road	Bouquet Canyon Road to Whites Canyon Road	\$1,902,340
<b>TOTAL:</b>		<b>\$131,051,570</b>



TABLE 6B DETAILED DESCRIPTION OF BRIDGE AND MAJOR  
THOROUGHFARE IMPROVEMENTS

ID	Highway/Location	Description Of Improvements
<b><i>Golden Valley Road</i></b>		
B-0100	Southerly District Boundary to Newhall Ranch Road	Grading 6 Lane Street Construction
B-0100B	Bridge over Santa Clara River	Construct Bridge
B-0101	Newhall Ranch Road to Plum Canyon Road	Grading 4 Lane Street Construction
<b><i>Bouquet Canyon Road</i></b>		
B-0200	Soledad Canyon Road to Newhall Ranch Road	Grading Street Widening to 8 lanes Bus Turnouts Street Lights Levee Lining for easterly sidewalk
B-0200B	Bridge over Santa Clara River	Widen
B-0201	Newhall Ranch Road to Espuella Drive	Bus Turnouts
B-0202	Espuella Drive to Seco Canyon Road	Bus Turnouts
B-0203	Seco Canyon Road to Santa Clarita Parkway	Bus Turnouts
B-0204	Santa Clarita Parkway to Central Park	Bus Turnouts
B-0205	Central Park to Centurion Way	Bus Turnouts
B-0206	Centurion Way to Haskell Canyon Road	Bus Turnouts
B-0207	Haskell Canyon Road and Urbandale Avenue	Bus Turnouts
B-0208	Urbandale Avenue to Plum Canyon Road	Bus Turnouts Median
B-0208B	Bridge over Plum Canyon Channel	Median
B-0209	Plum Canyon Road to 1000 feet north of Plum Canyon Road	Street Widening to 6 lanes Median Street Lights Bus Turnouts
B-0209B	Bridge over Bouquet Creek	Construct Bridge
B-0210	1000 feet north of Plum Canyon Road to Copper Hill Drive	Right-of-way acquisition 6 Lane Street Construction
B-0211	Copper Hill Drive to Vasquez Canyon Road (County)	Right-of-way acquisition Grading 6 Lane Street Construction
B-0212	Vasquez Canyon Road to Northerly District Boundary (County)	Right-of-way acquisition Grading 4 Lane Street Construction

TABLE 6B DETAILED DESCRIPTION OF BRIDGE AND MAJOR  
THOROUGHFARE IMPROVEMENTS

ID	Highway/Location	Description Of Improvements
<b><i>Newhall Ranch Road</i></b>		
B-0300	Bouquet Canyon Road to 700 feet east of Bouquet Canyon Road	Street Widening to 8 lanes Sidewalk-one side Street Lights Catch basin and laterals Bus Turnouts
B-0301	700 feet east of Bouquet Canyon Road to Santa Clarita Parkway	6 Lane Street Construction
B-0302	Santa Clarita Parkway to Golden Valley Road	6 Lane Street Construction
<b><i>Santa Clarita Parkway</i></b>		
B-0400	Southerly District Boundary to Newhall Ranch Road	Grading 6 Lane Street Construction
B-0400B	Bridge over Santa Clara River (Flyover)	Construct Bridge
B-0401	Newhall Ranch Road to Bouquet Canyon Road	Grading 6 Lane Street Construction
<b><i>Whites Canyon Road</i></b>		
B-0500	Plum Canyon Road to Steinway Street (County)	Grading Street Widening to 6 lanes Bus Turnouts Street Lights Sidewalk-two sides
B-0501	Steinway Street to Canyon Crest (City)	Bus Turnouts
B-0502	Canyon Crest to Nadal Street	Bus Turnouts
B-0503	Nadal Street to Ranier Street	Bus Turnouts Median
B-0504	Ranier Street to Delight Street	Bus Turnouts Median
B-0505	Delight Street to Pleasantdale Street	Bus Turnouts Median
B-0506	Pleasantdale Street to Stillmore Street	Bus Turnouts Median
B-0507	Stillmore Street to Soledad Canyon Road	Bus Turnouts Median
B-0508	Plum Canyon Road to Easterly District Boundary (County)	Grading 4 Lane Street Construction
<b><i>Vasquez Canyon Road</i></b>		
B-0600	Bouquet Canyon Road to approximately 3400 feet east of Bouquet Canyon Road (County)	4 Lane Street Construction
B-0600B	Bridge over Bouquet Creek near Bouquet Canyon Road (County)	Widen
B-0601	Approximately 3400 feet east of Bouquet Canyon Road to Easterly District Boundary (County)	Right-of-way acquisition Grading 4 Lane Street Construction
B-0601B	Bridge over Bouquet Creek near Lost Creek Road (County)	Widen

TABLE 6B DETAILED DESCRIPTION OF BRIDGE AND MAJOR  
THOROUGHFARE IMPROVEMENTS

ID	Highway/Location	Description Of Improvements
<b><i>Seco Canyon Road</i></b>		
B-0800	Bouquet Canyon Road to Garzota Drive	Bus Turnouts
B-0801	Garzota Drive to Decoro Drive	Bus Turnouts
B-0802	Decoro Drive to Guadilamar Drive	no work required
B-0803	Guadilamar Drive to Pamplico Drive	Bus Turnouts
B-0804	Pamplico Drive to Copper Hill Drive	Bus Turnouts
<b><i>Haskell Canyon Road</i></b>		
B-0900	Bouquet Canyon Road to Grove Park	Street Widening to 4 lanes Sidewalk-one side Street Lights Catch basin and laterals Signing and Striping Bus Turnouts
B-0900B	Bridge over Bouquet Canyon Channel	Construct Bridge (westerly half)
B-0901	Grove Park to Copper Hill Drive	Bus Turnouts
<b><i>Copper Hill Drive</i></b>		
B-1000	Seco Canyon Road to Haskell Canyon Road	Signing and Striping Bus Turnouts
B-1001	Haskell Canyon Road to Bouquet Canyon Road	Grading 4 Lane Street Construction Bus Turnouts
B-1001B	Bridge over Haskell Canyon	Double Reinforced Conc. Box
<b><i>Plum Canyon Road</i></b>		
B-1100	Bouquet Canyon Road to Rodgers Drive	Bus Turnouts Median
B-1101	Rodgers Drive to Golden Valley Road	Bus Turnouts
B-1102	Golden Valley Road to Whites Canyon Road	Street Widening to 6 lanes Sidewalk-two sides Street Lights Bus Turnouts Median

TABLE 7 INTERSECTION IMPROVEMENTS

ID	Location	Description of Improvements	Estimated Cost
BI-1	Newhall Ranch Road and Santa Clarita Parkway	New 4-way signal, augmented intersection	\$264,190
BI-2	Newhall Ranch Road and Golden Valley Road	New 3-way signal, augmented intersection	\$322,500
BI-4	Bouquet Canyon Road and Seco Canyon Road	Intersection augmentation, Right of way acquisition	\$248,580
BI-5	Bouquet Canyon Road and Santa Clarita Parkway	New 3-way signal, augmented intersection	\$175,700
BI-8	Bouquet Canyon Road and Haskell Canyon Road	New 4-way signal	\$180,600
BI-10	Bouquet Canyon Road and Plum Road	Intersection augmentation, Right of way acquisition	\$197,120
BI-11	Bouquet Canyon Road and Copper Hill Drive	New 3-way signal	\$154,800
BI-13	Plum Canyon Road and Golden Valley Road	New 3-way signal	\$154,800
BI-14	Plum Canyon Road and Whites Canyon Road	New 3-way signal	\$154,800
BI-28	Haskell Canyon Road and Copper Hill Drive	New 4-way signal	\$180,600
BI-29	Bouquet Canyon Road and Vasquez Canyon Road	New 3-way signal	\$154,800
BI-31	Seco Canyon Road and Copper Hill Drive	New 4-way signal, augmented intersection	\$1,012,810
<b>TOTAL:</b>			<b>\$3,201,300</b>

NOTE: The construction of additional signals at highway locations within the District which are not listed above will be considered to be District projects and are eligible for credit.

TABLE B DISTRICT SHARE OF REGIONAL IMPROVEMENTS

ID	Location	Description of Improvements	Percent Share According to District				Total Estimated Cost	Estimated Cost to District
			Bouquet	Eastside	Via Princessa	Castaic		
VP-0307R	Lyons Avenue and San Fernando Road	Bridge, Signals, Right-of-way acquisition	9.8%	15.6%	72.8%	1.9%	\$14,611,340	\$1,424,940
VP-0401R	Santa Clarita Parkway and Soledad Canyon Road	Bridge, interchange, Signals	26.7%	24.7%	47.5%	1.1%	\$27,265,000	\$7,282,870
VP-0500R	Wiley Canyon Road/Via Princessa and San Fernando Road	Bridge widening, interchanges	11.2%	13.0%	75.6%	0.2%	\$23,940,000	\$2,672,910
VP-0811R	San Fernando Road and SR-14	Signals	3.6%	21.2%	75.2%	0.0%	\$1,198,170	\$43,070
VP-0900R	Calgrove and I-5	Widen under crossing, Flood control channel, retaining wall, Signals, Right-of-way acquisition	3.2%	8.4%	79.3%	9.2%	\$8,528,300	\$271,820
VP-1500R	Magic Mountain Parkway and San Fernando Road	Bridge, Right-of-way acquisition	17.4%	15.9%	64.5%	2.3%	\$23,648,730	\$4,104,330
C-0501R	Parker Road and I-5	Bridge widening, ramps, Signals	3.4%	4.5%	7.0%	85.1%	\$4,047,820	\$137,830
C-0700R	Lake Hughes and I-5	Widen under crossing, Signals	1.2%	1.2%	3.2%	94.3%	\$4,452,570	\$54,550
E-0100R	Golden Valley Road and SR-14	Bridge widening, Signals	21.9%	54.7%	19.8%	3.6%	\$2,617,440	\$571,970
E-0104R	Golden Valley Road and Soledad Canyon Road	Interchange	21.9%	54.7%	19.8%	3.6%	\$33,290,690	\$7,274,810
E-0505R	Via Princessa and SR-14	Widen under crossing, Signals	4.9%	83.6%	11.3%	0.1%	\$4,022,300	\$196,970
E-1002R	Sand Canyon and SR-14	Signals	5.8%	82.9%	10.4%	0.9%	\$787,670	\$45,580
E-1100R	Placerita Canyon and SR-14	Signals, Right-of-way acquisition	14.3%	47.6%	37.5%	0.6%	\$2,004,410	\$286,340
C-0300	Hasley Road and I-5	Ramps, right of way acquisition	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	\$24,136,700	\$0
<b>TOTAL:</b>							\$174,551,140	\$24,367,990

# Attachment D

## DEVELOPMENT ANALYSIS

---

TABLE 9A FDU ESTIMATE (FILED MAPS WITHIN THE DISTRICT)

Map Number	Multi Family		Condominium/ Townhouse		Single Family		Commercial/ Business Park		Industrial		Total FDUs	Conditioned Fees
	Units	FDUs @ 0.7/Unit	Units	FDUs @ 0.8/Unit	Units	FDUs @ 1/Unit	Acres	FDUs @ 5/Acre	Acres	FDUs @ 3/Acre		
<b>Pending Maps</b>												
TPM 19714					3	3					3	Not Conditioned
TPM 20938					2	2					2	
TTM 42354											0	\$100,700
TTM 46648					73	73					73	
TTM 47760					160	160					160	
TTM 49079					78	78					78	
TTM 50467					12	12					12	
TTM 52192					140	140					140	
TTM 52193					62	62					62	
TTM 52194					126	126					126	
<b>Approved Maps</b>												
TTM 31803	630	441			178	178					619	
TTM 46018											0	\$5,251,240
TTM 47657			115	92	421	421					513	
<b>Recorded/Not Built Maps</b>												
TTM 46626												\$731,400
<b>Totals</b>	<b>630.0</b>	<b>441.0</b>	<b>115.0</b>	<b>92.0</b>	<b>1255.0</b>	<b>1255.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>1788</b>	<b>\$6,083,340</b>

TABLE 9B FDU ESTIMATE (VACANT LAND-CITY-NO FILED MAP)

Zoning Category	Zoning Code	Area (ac)	Midpoint Density (units/ac)	Development Units	Multiplier	FDUs
Single Family	RE		0.5	0	1	0
Single Family	RE(MOCA)		0.5	0	1	0
Single Family	RH			0	1	0
Single Family	RL	100.2	2.2	220	1	220
Single Family	RL(MOCA)		2.2	0	1	0
Single Family	RS	151.1	5	756	1	756
Single Family	RVL	324.7	1	325	1	325
Single Family	RVL(MOCA)		1	0	1	0
Single Family	RVL(PD)		1	0	1	0
	<i>SubTotal</i>	576.0		1301		1301
Condominium / Townhouse	MHP	37.8	11	416	0.8	332.8
Condominium / Townhouse	RM	286.5	11	3152	0.8	2521.6
Condominium / Townhouse	RM(MOCA)		11	0	0.8	0
Condominium / Townhouse	RM(PD)		11	0	0.8	0
	<i>SubTotal</i>	324.3		3568		2854
Multi Family (apartment)	RMH		20	0	0.7	0
Multi Family (apartment)	RMH(PD)		20	0	0.7	0
	<i>SubTotal</i>	0.0		0		0
Commercial	BP		N/A	N/A	5	0
Commercial	BP(PD)		N/A	N/A	5	0
Commercial	BP(PD)(MOCA)		N/A	N/A	5	0
Commercial	CC	8.5	N/A	N/A	5	42.5
Commercial	CC(PD)	150.6	N/A	N/A	5	753
Commercial	CN	25.9	N/A	N/A	5	129.5
Commercial	CN(PD)	5.7	N/A	N/A	5	28.5
Commercial	CO		N/A	N/A	5	0
Commercial	CO(PD)	229.7	N/A	N/A	5	1148.5
	<i>SubTotal</i>	420.4		0		2102
Industrial	I		N/A	N/A	3	0
Industrial	IC	42.0	N/A	N/A	3	126
Industrial	IC(PD)		N/A	N/A	3	0
	<i>SubTotal</i>	42.0		0		126
	<b>Total</b>	1363		4869		6383



TABLE 9C FDU ESTIMATE (VACANT LAND-COUNTY-NO FILED MAP)

Land Use Category	Land Use Code	Slope Range	Slope Note	Area (ac)	Midpoint Density (units/ac)	Development Units	Multiplier	FDUs
Single Family	HM	0-50%	10% of Total	217.0	0.5	108.5	1	108.5
Single Family	HM	> 50%	90% of Total	1953.1	0.05	97.7	1	97.7
Single Family	N2	0-50%	10% of Total	57.0	0.5	28.5	1	28.5
Single Family	N2	> 50%	90% of Total	512.8	0.05	25.6	1	25.6
Single Family	N1	0-50%	40% of Total	261.6	0.5	130.8	1	130.8
Single Family	N1	> 50%	60% of Total	392.4	0.05	19.6	1	19.6
Single Family	U1	N/A		4.2	2.2	9.2	1	9.2
Single Family	U2	N/A		19.4	5	97	1	97
<i>SubTotal</i>				3418		517		517
Industrial	I	N/A		0.0	N/A	N/A	3	0
<i>SubTotal</i>				0				0
<b>Total</b>				3418		517		517

**Notes:**

- HM Hillside Management: 90% of acreage = 50%+slope (.05 du/ac); 10% of acreage = 0-50% slope (.5 du/ac).
- N2 Nonurban: 90% of acreage = 50%+slope (.05 du/ac); 10% of acreage = 0-50% slope (.5 du/ac).
- N1 Nonurban: 60% of acreage = 50%+ slope (.05 du/ac); 40% of acreage = 0-50% slope (.5 du/ac).
- U2 Urban: 5 du/ac

TABLE 10 SUMMARY OF DEVELOPMENT ANALYSIS

Residential Land Use	Development Units				Multiplier	FDUs	Percent of Total Units
	Filed Maps	County	City	Total			
Single Family	1255	517	1301	3073	1	3073	42%
Condominium / Townhouse	115		3568	3683	0.8	2946	50%
Multi Family (apartment)	630		0	630	0.7	441	9%
<b>Total Residential</b>	2000	517	4869	7386		6460	100%
Non-Residential Land Use	Area (ac)				Multiplier	FDUs	Percent of Total Acres
	Filed Maps	County	City	Total			
Commercial	0.0		420.4	420.4	5	2102	91%
Industrial	0.0	0	42	42.0	3	126	9%
<b>Total Non-Residential</b>	0.0	0.0	462.4	462.4		2228	100%
<b>Total</b>						8688	

# Attachment E

## BRIDGE AND MAJOR THOROUGHFARE DISTRICT CASH/CREDIT REQUEST FORM

---

**BRIDGE & MAJOR THOROUGHFARE DISTRICT  
CASH/CREDIT REQUEST FORM**

**District Percentages:**

Valencia	_____ %	Amount: \$ _____	<input type="checkbox"/> Cash	<input type="checkbox"/> Credit
Bouquet Canyon	_____ %	Amount: \$ _____	<input type="checkbox"/> Cash	<input type="checkbox"/> Credit
Eastside	_____ %	Amount: \$ _____	<input type="checkbox"/> Cash	<input type="checkbox"/> Credit
Castaic	_____ %	Amount: \$ _____	<input type="checkbox"/> Cash	<input type="checkbox"/> Credit
Via Princessa	_____ %	Amount: \$ _____	<input type="checkbox"/> Cash	<input type="checkbox"/> Credit
Lyons Avenue/McBean Parkway	_____ %	Amount: \$ _____	<input type="checkbox"/> Cash	<input type="checkbox"/> Credit

**Area Identification:**

Link#(s): \_\_\_\_\_ Intersection #(s): \_\_\_\_\_ Interchange #(s): \_\_\_\_\_

**Project Description:** \_\_\_\_\_

**ATTACHMENTS**

	Yes	No	Not Applicable
Signature Page			
Project Acceptance Letter			
Site Location Map			
Contract & Change Orders			
Credit Summary			
Expense Summary			
Cancelled Checks & Supporting Documentation			
Additional Documentation			
Plans			

Completed by: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Name \_\_\_\_\_ Title - Company \_\_\_\_\_

Submitted to: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Name \_\_\_\_\_ Title - County/City \_\_\_\_\_

**FOR CITY OR COUNTY USE ONLY**

Assigned to: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Name \_\_\_\_\_ Title \_\_\_\_\_

Approved by: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Name \_\_\_\_\_ Title \_\_\_\_\_

Sent to Fiscal by: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Name \_\_\_\_\_ Title \_\_\_\_\_

# FINAL REVIEW COPY

Revised: March 20, 2002

Revised: April 30, 2002

## EASTSIDE BRIDGE AND MAJOR THOROUGHFARE CONSTRUCTION FEE DISTRICT UPDATE REPORT

Prepared for:

---

LOS ANGELES COUNTY DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS

---



and

---

CITY OF SANTA CLARITA TRANSPORTATION and ENGINEERING SERVICES

---



APRIL, 2002

---

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

I. SUMMARY ..... 1

II. THE BRIDGE AND MAJOR THOROUGHFARE CONSTRUCTION FEE DISTRICT..... 4

    A. AUTHORITY ..... 4

    B. PURPOSE..... 5

    C. CONCEPT ..... 5

    D. DISTRICT FORMATION AND STATUS ..... 5

III. EASTSIDE AREA ACCESS ..... 10

    A. BACKGROUND ..... 10

    B. EXISTING CIRCULATION AND PROPOSED DISTRICT IMPROVEMENTS ..... 10

IV. THE EASTSIDE BRIDGE AND MAJOR THOROUGHFARE CONSTRUCTION FEE DISTRICT ..... 12

    A. THE DISTRICT BOUNDARY ..... 12

    B. PROPOSED IMPROVEMENTS AND ESTIMATED COSTS ..... 12

    C. IMPROVEMENT PHASING..... 14

    D. DEVELOPMENT ANALYSIS ..... 14

    E. TRAFFIC AND LAND USE ANALYSIS ..... 14

    F. THE DISTRICT FEE ..... 15

    G. CONSTRUCTION OF DISTRICT IMPROVEMENTS IN LIEU OF PAYING FEES AND CREDIT/CASH REQUESTS..... 18

    H. PROVISIONS FOR UPDATING COSTS AND UNIT INFORMATION ..... 19

    I. PROPOSAL FOR DISTRICT CLOSURE ..... 20

    J. DISTRICT FUNDS ..... 20

    K. THE ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS..... 21

**FIGURES**

FIGURE 1	DISTRICT BOUNDARY AND REGIONAL IMPROVEMENTS .....	22
FIGURE 2	DISTRICT IMPROVEMENTS.....	23
FIGURE 3	FILED MAPS AND VACANT LAND .....	24

**TABLES**

TABLE 1	CURRENT DISTRICT FEES .....	2
TABLE 2	PROPOSED DISTRICT FEES.....	3
TABLE 3	DESCRIPTION OF ORIGINAL ROADWAY AND BRIDGE IMPROVEMENTS .....	6
TABLE 4	ANALYSIS OF DISTRICT FUNDS .....	9
TABLE 5	SOFT COST PERCENTAGES .....	13
TABLE 6A	BRIDGE AND MAJOR THOROUGHFARE IMPROVEMENTS .....	C-2
TABLE 6B	DETAILED DESCRIPTION OF BRIDGE AND MAJOR THOROUGHFARE IMPROVEMENTS ..	C-3
TABLE 7	INTERSECTION IMPROVEMENTS .....	C-8
TABLE 8	DISTRICT SHARE OF REGIONAL IMPROVEMENTS.....	C-9
TABLE 9A	FDU ESTIMATE (FILED MAPS WITHIN THE DISTRICT) .....	D-2
TABLE 9B	FDU ESTIMATE (VACANT LAND-CITY-NO FILED MAP).....	D-3
TABLE 9C	FDU ESTIMATE (VACANT LAND-COUNTY-NO FILED MAP) .....	D-4
TABLE 10	SUMMARY OF DEVELOPMENT ANALYSIS .....	D-4

**ATTACHMENTS**

ATTACHMENT A	CODE PERTAINING TO B&T DISTRICTS .....	A-1
ATTACHMENT B	LEGAL DESCRIPTION.....	B-1
ATTACHMENT C	DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSED IMPROVEMENTS AND ESTIMATED COSTS .....	C-1
ATTACHMENT D	DEVELOPMENT ANALYSIS .....	D-1
ATTACHMENT E	BRIDGE AND MAJOR THOROUGHFARE DISTRICT CASH/CREDIT REQUEST FORM.....	E-1

## I. Summary

The Eastside Bridge and Major Thoroughfare Construction Fee District Update Report presents to the Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors and the City of Santa Clarita City Council an update for their approval to an existing area of benefit for financing specific improvements in the Eastside area of the Santa Clarita Valley, within Los Angeles County and City of Santa Clarita jurisdictions. Improvements include, but are not limited to, new and improved roadways, bridges, intersections, and interchanges.

Updating the Eastside Bridge and Major Thoroughfare Construction Fee District, hereinafter referred to as “District”, will provide an equitable financing mechanism by which new development within an identified area will share the costs of providing full mitigation improvements, as discussed in this summary.

State Subdivision Law and both the Los Angeles County and City of Santa Clarita codes authorize the use of bridge and major thoroughfare construction fee districts for the funding and construction of improvements, provided these facilities are identified on the local agency's adopted transportation element of its General Plan. Based on the transportation needs in this area of the Santa Clarita Valley, and the limitations of other funding sources, this funding method has been determined to be the best alternative to provide needed transportation related improvements.

This report describes the concept and mechanics of the District. Information included in this report will enable subject property owners to determine the District fee to be assessed against their property if and when it is developed.

### BRIDGE AND MAJOR THOROUGHFARE CONSTRUCTION FEE DISTRICTS IN THE SANTA CLARITA VALLEY

Certain areas of Los Angeles County and the City of Santa Clarita have topographical features that limit the ability to provide access. Prior to the 1980's, the County was able to assist developers in the funding and construction of needed highway improvements. However, gas tax revenue, formerly the traditional source of funding for new highway and bridge improvements, has not provided sufficient funding towards improvements in the Santa Clarita Valley. Due to the regional nature of many of the District improvements, the District shall pursue funding for eligible improvements from City, County, State, and Federal agencies, to supplement the adopted District fee.

The current highway system in the Santa Clarita Valley is considered adequate for existing development. However, at this time public funding is not available to adequately provide highway improvements for the future anticipated development in the Santa Clarita Valley. The Santa Clarita Valley Bridge and Major Thoroughfare Districts are designed to accommodate the needs of future development anticipated by both the Los Angeles County and City of Santa Clarita General Plans. A map showing the district is included as Figure 1.

NEED FOR DISTRICT UPDATING

The District was originally approved by the Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors on July 21, 1987 as the “Route 126 Bridge and Major Thoroughfare Construction Fee District”. After its incorporation, the City of Santa Clarita adopted the District on November 28, 1989. The current District fee in the City of \$10,000 was approved by the City Council on September 14, 1999 and the Board of Supervisors approved the current District fee in the County on May 9, 1991. The District was renamed the “Eastside Bridge and Major Thoroughfare Construction Fee District” under the City of Santa Clarita’s Resolution 93-4 on January 12, 1993. The current District fees are shown in Table 1.

TABLE 1 CURRENT DISTRICT FEES

Land Use Category	Current District Fee	
	County	City
Residential:		
Single Family (per unit)	\$4,800	\$10,000
Townhome/Condo (per unit)	\$3,840	\$8,000
Apartment (per unit)	\$3,360	\$7,000
Non-Residential:		
Commercial (per gross acre)	\$24,000	\$50,000
Industrial (per gross acre)	\$14,400	\$30,000

The District was originally established for the purpose of funding much-needed improvements to serve the circulation needs created by new developments within this District, originally estimated as \$81.70 million.

This District update is different from updates in the past where the District fee has been revised due only to changes in improvement costs and in the amount of proposed future development. This update re-analyzes build-out development of the District and expands on the scope of District improvements. Instead of including only nine improvement projects, the updated District proposes to fully improve all roadways identified on the City and County circulation elements, including intersections and interchanges. Full mitigation improvements will include full-width grading, base, pavement, curb, gutter, sidewalk, medians, striping for capacity enhancement, bus turnouts or bus pads (where applicable), bike lanes (where applicable), fully improved and signalized intersections, signal interconnect (where applicable), street lighting, roadway-related utility relocation, drainage structures within road right-of-way, and full improvements for bridges and interchanges. Right of-way is assumed



to be dedicated by individual development projects, except for State highway projects and roadway widenings that are unrelated to private development projects.

**UPDATED DISTRICT FEE RATES**

A development analysis, based on filed tentative maps, mid-point densities of the Santa Clarita Valley Area Plan, and mid-point densities of the City of Santa Clarita Zoning map, indicates that an estimated 12,598 residential units, 487 commercial land use acres, and 157 industrial land use acres are expected to be built within the District boundary. Remaining District improvements to roadways, bridges, intersections, and interchanges total an estimated \$236.94 million. The analysis concludes that a District fee increase is necessary to fully fund these improvements. The proposed District fees are shown in Table 2.

**TABLE 2 PROPOSED DISTRICT FEES**

<b>Land Use Category</b>	<b>Proposed District Fee</b>
	<b>(City and County)</b>
Residential:	
Single Family (per unit)	\$14,700
Townhome/Condo (per unit)	\$11,760
Apartment (per unit)	\$10,290
Non-Residential:	
Commercial (per gross acre)	\$73,500
Industrial (per gross acre)	\$44,100

## II. The Bridge and Major Thoroughfare Construction Fee District

### A. AUTHORITY

The State of California Government Code Section 66484, regarding Subdivisions, gives local agencies the authority to adopt local ordinances that "may require the payment of a fee as a condition of approval of a final map or as a condition of issuing a building permit for purposes of defraying the actual or estimated cost of constructing bridges over waterways, railways, freeways, and canyons, or constructing major thoroughfares." The local adopted ordinance must refer to the circulation element of its general plan, provide for a public hearing, provide for the establishment of boundaries of an area of benefit, and provide for the identification of the costs, a fair method of allocation of costs to the area of benefit and a fair fee apportionment (to be disclosed at the public hearing). Further, the local ordinance must provide that the payment of fees shall not be required unless the major thoroughfares are in addition to or a reconstruction of any existing thoroughfares serving the area at the time of district adoption, and that the planned bridge facility is an original bridge serving the area, or an addition to any existing bridge facility serving the area, at the time of district adoption. It must further provide that if owners of more than one-half of the area of property to be benefited by the improvement(s) file proper written protests, the district proceedings as proposed shall be abandoned for at least one year. The local ordinance allows acceptance of considerations in lieu of the payment of fees, permits a local agency to advance money from its general fund or road fund to be reimbursed from bridge and major thoroughfare funds, permits a local agency to incur an interest bearing indebtedness for the construction of bridge or major thoroughfare facilities, and does not preclude an agency from providing funds for the construction of bridge or major thoroughfare facilities to defray costs not allocated to the District.

The Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors adopted Ordinance No. 82-0050 on March 2, 1982, adding Section 21.32.200 to the Los Angeles County Code, providing for the establishment of bridge and major thoroughfare construction fees to be paid by subdivider or building permit applicants. Within the City of Santa Clarita, payment of such fees is established by City of Santa Clarita Subdivision Code Section 16.21.190 established on November 24, 1992. These codes are consistent with the requirements and provisions of the State law (County Code Section 21.32.200 and City Code Section 16.21.190 are included in Attachment A).

## B. PURPOSE

The District has been designed to accommodate the needs of future development anticipated by the City of Santa Clarita General Plan and the Los Angeles County Area Wide General Plan. Updating the District will provide local and regional benefits. Many of the District improvements will be eligible for local, state, and federal funding. The District intends to pursue all potential sources of out-of-district funding for these improvements including, but not limited to, State and Federal Gas Taxes, Propositions A and C Sales Tax, Transportation Planning and Development Sales Tax on Gasoline, County Transportation Tax, State Transportation Improvement Program funding, Federal Transportation Efficiency Act for the 21<sup>st</sup> Century funds, State and Federal Highway Trust Funds, special grants, and other sources that may be available. The District will provide the matching funds necessary to pursue greater funding from the aforementioned sources. A reasonable amount of outside funding has been anticipated and formulated into the proposed District fees. If outside funding, not anticipated in the District formation analysis or update, is received; or if funds anticipated are not received, the District costs will be revised, and the District fee may be adjusted accordingly.

## C. CONCEPT

As authorized by statutes cited above, the adoption of a specific area of benefit permits the County and City to levy a fee against future development located within the area of benefit. This funding method appropriately assesses developments, which create the need for additional improvements, for the additional public facility costs. The charge is levied in proportion to the estimated number of trips generated by the development, which is translated into Factored Development Units (FDUs). FDUs are described in more detail in the "Development Analysis" section of this report.

The adoption of this type of funding district does not charge existing development. The District fee is collected at the time of recordation of a final map or just prior to the issuance of a building permit.

## D. DISTRICT FORMATION AND STATUS

The District was originally approved by the Los Angeles Board of Supervisor's on July 21, 1987 for the purpose of financing highway and bridge improvements in the Eastside area of the Santa Clarita Valley. After incorporation, the City of Santa Clarita adopted the District on November 28, 1989. Nine projects were proposed for construction within the original District including Golden Valley Road, Lost Canyon Road, Newhall Ranch Road, Oak Springs Canyon, Sand Canyon Road, Shadow Pines Boulevard, Soledad Canyon Road, Via Princessa, and Whites Canyon Road for a total cost originally estimated at \$81.70 million.

These original roadway and bridge improvements are listed and described in Table 3. Due to inflation, the estimated project costs have been increased substantially. The original improvements proposed to be funded by the District were derived from determination of the traffic needs of the then anticipated 32,919 residential units, 635 acres of industrial development and 644 acres of commercial development expected within the area of benefit and an analysis of highways (including bridges) designated on the Highway Plan of the adopted County General Plan. The District has funded the completion of several of the original improvements. Completed improvements are identified in Table 3.

The amount of District fees collected and expended in the District, along with accrued interest is summarized in Table 4.

TABLE 3 DESCRIPTION OF ORIGINAL ROADWAY AND BRIDGE IMPROVEMENTS

Completed	Improvement Description	Project Cost
	<b>Golden Valley Road: Soledad Canyon Road to Green Mountain Drive</b>	
	Soledad Canyon Road to Via Princessa Grading Drainage Base and pavement New signal Preliminary and construction engineering	\$1,885,000
	Via Princessa to Sierra Highway R/W acquisition Grading Drainage Base and pavement New signal Preliminary and construction engineering	\$5,535,000
	Sierra Highway to Green Mountain Drive R/W acquisition Grading Drainage Base and pavement Preliminary and construction engineering	\$3,180,000
	<b>Lost Canyon: Via Princessa to Sand Canyon Road</b>	
Partial	Via Princessa to Canyon Park Boulevard Grading Drainage Base and pavement Bridge construction over Southern Pacific Railroad Preliminary and construction engineering	\$3,320,000

TABLE 3 DESCRIPTION OF ORIGINAL ROADWAY AND BRIDGE IMPROVEMENTS

Completed	Improvement Description	Project Cost
	Canyon Park Boulevard to Sand Canyon Road R/W acquisition Levee construction Grading Drainage Base and pavement Full-width bridge construction over Sand Canyon Wash New signal Preliminary and construction engineering	\$4,830,000
	<b>Oak Springs Canyon: Lost Canyon Road to Soledad Canyon Road</b>	
	Lost Canyon Road to Soledad Canyon Road Grading Base and pavement Bridge construction over Santa Clara River Drainage New signal Preliminary and construction engineering	\$1,470,000
	<b>Route 126: Golden Valley Road to SR-14</b>	
	Golden Valley Road to Soledad Canyon Road R/W acquisition Grading Drainage Base and pavement Bridge construction over the Santa Clara River Levee improvement work Preliminary and construction engineering	\$23,847,000
	Soledad Canyon Road to Sierra Highway R/W acquisition Grading Drainage Base and pavement Bridge construction over Southern Pacific Railroad Preliminary and construction engineering	\$18,824,000
	Sierra Highway to SR-14 Full-width bridge at Sierra Highway Interchange improvements with connecting ramps from Route 126 to SR-14	\$7,775,000
	<b>Sand Canyon Road: at SR-14 and at Santa Clara River</b>	
Yes	At SR-14 Widen existing Sand Canyon Bridge over SR-14 Widen the existing ramp from SR-14 northbound to Sand Canyon Road from one lane to two lanes Widen existing bridge approached on Sand Canyon Road Drainage Signal modification Preliminary and construction engineering	\$880,000

TABLE 3 DESCRIPTION OF ORIGINAL ROADWAY AND BRIDGE IMPROVEMENTS

Completed	Improvement Description	Project Cost
	At Santa Clara River Widen bridge over Santa Clara River Widen highway approaches Preliminary and construction engineering	\$920,000
	<b>Shadow Pines Boulevard: Grandifloras Drive to Begonias Lane</b>	
	Grandifloras Drive to Begonias Lane Base and pavement Curb and gutter	\$230,000
	<b>Soledad Canyon Road: Sand Canyon Road to Oak Springs Canyon Road and from Shadow Pines Boulevard to SR-14</b>	
Yes	Sand Canyon Road to Oak Springs Canyon Road R/W acquisition Grading Drainage Full-width roadway improvements New signal Preliminary and construction engineering	\$1,830,000
Yes	Shadow Pines Boulevard to SR-14 Grading Drainage Base and pavement New signals Preliminary and construction engineering	\$750,000
	<b>Via Princessa: Tract No. 38519 to Whites Canyon Road</b>	
Yes	Tract 38519 to Whites Canyon Road R/W acquisition Grading Drainage Full-width roadway improvements Base and pavement Curb and gutter Full-width bridge at the Southern Pacific Railroad and Route 126 Preliminary and construction engineering	\$3,060,000
	<b>Whites Canyon Road: Via Princessa to Sierra Highway (this portion now referred to as Via Princessa)</b>	
Yes	Via Princessa to Sierra Highway R/W acquisition Grading Drainage Half-width roadway improvements Half-width bridge at the Southern Pacific Railroad and wash Preliminary and construction engineering	\$3,360,000
<b>Total:</b>		<b>\$81,696,000</b>

TABLE 4 ANALYSIS OF DISTRICT FUNDS

<b>District Fees</b>	<b>County</b>	<b>City</b>	<b>Total</b>
Collections	\$21,924,447	\$11,527,117	\$33,451,564
Expenditures	\$21,301,254	\$13,524,358	\$34,825,612
Interest			\$1,049,830
Funds Available			-\$324,220

### III. Eastside Area Access

#### A. BACKGROUND

Historically, access to new development has been provided cooperatively by the County and land developers. The County funded its share with Gas Tax Funds. Land development was primarily concentrated in flatter areas, expanding away from urban centers. Public facilities were constructed to accommodate this expansion.

Much of the development in recent years and that which is expected to occur in the future is and will be in outlying areas where topography is more rugged and restrictive. As a result, the cost of providing necessary public facilities, including roadways will continue to increase.

#### B. EXISTING CIRCULATION AND PROPOSED DISTRICT IMPROVEMENTS

The primary road network for the District consists of State Route 14 (Antelope Valley Freeway), five interchanges with SR-14, and twelve arterials which are classified as Major, Secondary, or Limited Secondary Highways on the City of Santa Clarita Circulation Element and the Los Angeles County Santa Clarita Valley Area Wide Circulation Plan.

In the past, updates have been prepared to specifically reflect changes in improvement costs of anticipated future development. This update differs from previous updates in that it re-analyzes build-out development of the District and expands the scope of District improvements. Instead of including only nine improvement projects, the updated District proposes to provide full mitigation for all roadways identified on the City and County circulation elements, including intersections and interchanges.

Full mitigation improvements will include full-width grading, base, pavement, curb, gutter, sidewalk, medians, striping for capacity enhancement, bus turnouts or bus pads (where applicable), bike lanes (where applicable), fully improved and signalized intersections, signal interconnect (where applicable), street lighting, roadway-related utility relocation, drainage structures within road right-of-way, and full improvements for bridges and interchanges. Right of-way is assumed to be dedicated by individual development projects, except for State highway projects and roadway widenings or roadway construction that are unrelated to private development projects.

The arterials for the District are described below. Intersection improvements along the arterials and regional improvements are described in the Proposed Improvements and Estimated Costs Section of this Report.

1. VIA PRINCESSA ROAD: (major highway) varies from 5 to 6 lanes from Jason Drive to 0.7 mile west of Whites Canyon Road. Via Princessa will be improved to 6 lanes from the northerly boundary of Golden Valley Ranch to the westerly District boundary.



2. WHITES CANYON ROAD: (major highway) is 4 lanes from Via Princessa to the northerly District boundary. Roadway improvements include striping to 6 lanes. Whites Canyon Road will be improved to 4 lanes from the Bouquet Canyon District boundary to Vasquez Canyon Road.
3. GOLDEN VALLEY ROAD: (major highway) varies from 2 to 4 lanes between Green Mountain Drive and SR-14 and from Golden Triangle to Hope Canyon Road. Golden Valley Road will be improved to 6 lanes from SR-14 to the northerly District boundary.
4. LOST CANYON ROAD: (major/limited secondary highway) is 2 lanes from Sand Canyon Road to the City Limit and is partially constructed from Via Princessa to Canyon Park Boulevard. Lost Canyon Road will be improved to 6 lanes from Via Princessa to Sand Canyon Road.
5. SIERRA HIGHWAY: (major highway) varies from 2 to 6 lanes from the northerly District boundary to Dockweiler Drive. Sierra Highway will be improved to 6 lanes from the Via Princessa District boundary to the northerly District boundary.
6. SAND CANYON ROAD: (secondary/limited secondary highway) varies from 2 to 3 lanes between Sierra Highway and Placerita Canyon Road. Sand Canyon Road will be improved to 6 lanes from Lost Canyon Road to Soledad Canyon Road, including a 6-lane bridge over the Santa Clara River. Sand Canyon Road will be improved to 4 lanes from Soledad Canyon Road to Sierra Highway. Sand Canyon Road will remain 2 lanes with minor drainage improvements from the easterly District boundary to Lost Canyon Road. However, right-of-way will be reserved for 6 lanes.
7. SOLEDAD CANYON ROAD: (major highway) varies from 4 to 6 lanes from the westerly District boundary to the Soledad Canyon Road/SR-14 interchange. Soledad Canyon Road is 2 lanes from Soledad Canyon Road/SR-14 interchange to the easterly District boundary. The District will fund 4 of the 6 (2 additional) lanes from Soledad Canyon Road/SR-14 ramps to the easterly District boundary.
8. SHADOW PINES BOULEVARD: (secondary highway) is 4 lanes from Soledad Canyon Road to Begonias Lane and is 2 lanes from Begonias Lane to the City Limit. Shadow Pines will be improved to 4 lanes from Begonias Lane to Davenport Road.
9. CANYON PARK BOULEVARD/JAKES WAY: (secondary highway) is 2 lanes from the Union Pacific Railroad tracks to SR-14. Canyon Park will be improved to 4 lanes from Sierra Highway to Lost Canyon Road.
10. VASQUEZ CANYON ROAD: (secondary highway) is 2 lanes from the Bouquet Canyon District Boundary to Sierra Highway. Vasquez Canyon Road will be improved to 4 lanes from the Bouquet Canyon District boundary to Sierra Highway.
11. DAVENPORT ROAD: is 2 lanes from Sierra Highway to the easterly District boundary. Davenport Road will be improved to 4 lanes from Sierra Highway to the easterly District boundary.
12. SANTA CLARITA PARKWAY: is proposed as a 6-lane major highway from the westerly District boundary to Sierra Highway.

## IV. The Eastside Bridge and Major Thoroughfare Construction Fee District

### A. THE DISTRICT BOUNDARY

The legal description of the District (Area of Benefit) is included as Attachment B. It encompasses those properties, which have yet to be developed, and which will receive benefit from the improvements funded by the District. A map showing the location of the District is included as Figure 1. The boundaries were determined by the topographical features in the Eastside area, ownership/parcel lines, national forest land boundaries, and existing and future access.

#### GENERAL BOUNDARY DESCRIPTION

The District includes the existing Canyon Country community and lies generally within the Friendly Valley, Mint Canyon, Sand Canyon, and Vasquez Canyon areas of the Santa Clarita Valley. Generally, the District's northern, eastern, and southern boundary lines follow the Angeles National Forest and private ownership boundary lines. The westerly District boundary is shared with the Via Princessa and Bouquet Canyon Bridge and Major Thoroughfare Districts along a north-south ridgeline approximately through and northerly of the intersection of Sierra Highway with Soledad Canyon Road and along the first and second Los Angeles Aqueducts.

### B. PROPOSED IMPROVEMENTS AND ESTIMATED COSTS

Improvements to be funded by the District are based on a determination of the traffic needs of future development anticipated by the City and County General Plans and an analysis of the improvements designated on the highway plans of the adopted City of Santa Clarita Circulation Element and the County Highway Plan. Improvements and associated costs have been estimated for purposes of determining the District fee rates. Actual scope of work and costs may change as the improvements approach the final design stage.

Estimated costs of District improvements include construction costs based on "prevailing wage" and cost of materials; design costs and permitting fees, considered "soft costs" and included in Table 5; and an administrative/management fee equal to 5% of the wage, materials, and soft costs.

TABLE 5      SOFT COST PERCENTAGES

	Intersection	Storm Drain	Road	Bridge	State Highways	
					Road	Interchange
Engineering-Design	10%	8%	6%	5%	8%	8.5%
Plan Check	3%	2.5%	2%	2%	3%	3%
Engineering-Field	3%	2%	5%	4%	7%	3%
Survey	3%	4%	5%	5%	8%	3%
Soils	1%	2%	5%	3%	7%	1%
Geology	0%	0%	0.5%	0.5%	0.5%	0%
Bonds/Fees	1%	8%	10%	4%	10%	1%
Erosion Control (SWPPP)	0.5%	0%	0.5%	0%	0.5%	0.5%
Army Corps/Fish & Game – Environmental Inspections	0%	0%	0%	1%	0%	0%
<b>TOTAL:</b>	21.5%	26.5%	34.0%	24.5%	44.0%	20%

The bridge and major thoroughfare improvements for highway segments and bridges are listed in Table 6A (Attachment C). Table 6A also includes limits of the proposed improvements and an estimated cost. A detailed listing of work items required for each highway segment and bridge is included in Table 6B (Attachment C).

Intersection improvements, along with a description and estimated cost, are included in Table 7 (Attachment C). Several interchanges have been identified as “regional” improvements. Therefore, each District being updated at this time will pay its “fair share” for each regional improvement based on the respective District’s percent share of projected vehicle trips that encounter the improvement.

Regional improvements; along with a description, percent share according to District, total estimated cost, and estimated cost to the District; are included in Table 8 (Attachment C). Regional improvements are shown in Figure 1.

All District improvements to roadways, bridges, intersections, and interchanges are shown in Figure 2 and described, with estimated costs, in Attachment C. Total costs for the remaining District-identified improvements total an estimated \$237.37 million as summarized below.

- ♦ Highway Segments and Bridges.....\$188.87 million
- ♦ Intersections .....\$6.80 million
- ♦ District Share of Regional Improvements .....\$41.70 million
- ♦ Estimated Cost of Improvements.....\$237.37 million

### C. IMPROVEMENT PHASING

Generally, the timing and phasing of construction of District improvements will be determined by when and where development occurs, as well as how many units. The amount of funds received may also determine the timing of improvements.

### D. DEVELOPMENT ANALYSIS

Future development is expected within the District and can be measured in terms of FDUs. The Quantity of FDUs was estimated for all vacant land within the District. Where a map has been filed (pending, approved, or recorded but not built) to develop vacant land, the FDUs were calculated from the residential development units and non-residential acreage specified in the filed map. Table 9A (Attachment D) includes a list of filed maps; along with the residential units, non-residential acres, and estimated FDUs. Conditioned fees associated with filed maps are also included in Table 9A (Attachment D) were applicable. The location and status of filed maps are shown in Figure 3.

The Quantity of FDUs for the remaining vacant land, within the City of Santa Clarita, was estimated based on the City of Santa Clarita zoning map and mid-point densities. Table 9B (Attachment D) includes a summary of vacant land within the City of Santa Clarita, zoning designations, and estimated FDUs. The Quantity of FDUs for the remaining vacant land, within Los Angeles County, was estimated based on the land use categories and mid-point densities designated in the Santa Clarita Valley Area Plan. Table 9C (Attachment D) includes a summary of vacant land within Los Angeles County, county land use designations, and estimated FDUs. Table 10 (Attachment D) summarizes the development units for residential land uses, the acres for non-residential land uses, and the estimated FDUs for residential and non-residential land uses. The location of vacant land, where no map has been filed, is also shown in Figure 3.

This analysis shows expected future development estimated at 14,238 FDUs, consisting of 12,598 residential units, 487 commercial acres, and 157 industrial use acres.

### E. TRAFFIC AND LAND USE ANALYSIS

The existing highway system adequately handles the traffic generated by existing development located within the District. As such, existing development would not require the additional highway improvements if additional development did not occur. Therefore, the improvements identified in this report are intended to accommodate the circulation needs of future development within the District and are expected to improve circulation for future development within the District. Regional improvements within, or funded by, this District are expected to improve circulation for future development on a Valley-wide basis.

Based on average mid-point densities and filed tentative maps, 58% of the future units will be single-family; 25% of the future units will be townhouse-type; and the remaining 17% of the future units will be apartments. Non-residential uses are projected as 76% commercial and 24% industrial. The anticipated development quantified in the Development Analysis section and categorized above will require an improved circulation system.

#### F. THE DISTRICT FEE

The District fee is calculated by dividing the estimated net cost of the remaining improvements by the estimated number of FDUs. The tables in Attachment D include an analysis of the estimated number of FDUs in the District. The net cost is the total estimated cost of improvements (included in Attachment A) minus anticipated grant funding, funds available as shown in Table 4, and District fees committed through developer agreements (See Table 9A). The total estimated cost of improvements, net cost of improvements, remaining development measured in FDUs, and the calculated District fee is shown below:

♦ Estimated Cost of Improvements.....	\$237.37 million
♦ Anticipated Grant Funding .....	\$24.39 million
♦ Funds available in District.....	-\$0.32 million
♦ Fees committed in Developer Agreements.....	\$3.46 million
♦ Net Cost of Improvements .....	\$209.84 million
♦ Remaining Development .....	14,238 FDUs
♦ District Fee per FDU .....	\$14,700 / FDU

To ensure equity of District fee assignment, the proposed District fee is proportionate to the degree to which future developments benefit from the proposed improvements. Therefore, the proportionate shares take into account the impacts of peak-hour vehicle trips on the system as identified in the City of Santa Clarita and Los Angeles County Circulation Plans. Each of the five major land use categories have assigned FDUs based on the average impact for that category relative to a single-family residence as shown below:

♦ Single Family .....	1.0 FDU
♦ Condominium/Townhouse .....	0.8 FDU
♦ Apartment .....	0.7 FDU
♦ Commercial (per gross acre) .....	5.0 FDUs
♦ Industrial (per gross acre).....	3.0 FDUs

Future development's units and/or acres are multiplied by the assigned FDUs and multiplied by the District's adopted District fee per FDU resulting in a project's proportionate share of District fees. The District fees for each of the five major land use categories are included in Table 2.

The adoption of this type of funding district does not levy any fees against existing development. FDUs for recorded subdivisions, which are located within the District, were not included in the District fee calculation, as it has been assumed that District fees were paid at recordation. If District fees were not paid at recordation for non-residential land uses in the County area, then District fees may be collected for the issuance of a building permit. Because the City of Santa Clarita allows some projects to pay District fees after recordation at the building permit stage, some recorded maps were included in the development analysis.

## SPECIAL CASES

### Governmental Uses

Governmental improvements, such as those for schools, police, fire protection, and libraries, specifically needed to support benefited development, have been excluded from the development analysis as these uses are assumed to be exempt from District fee payment.

### Lands with Physical Development Constraints

The County General Plan includes designations for floodways, Significant Ecological Areas (SEA), and public service related lands. The City assigns such areas urban zoning designations. The updated District fee reflects potential development for all vacant lands with urban only zoning designation. Typically, very few FDUs are assigned to these areas.

Additionally, lands with physical development constraints such as landslides, faults, or other restricted use areas were considered for future development according to their County-assigned land use or City zoning designation. This assumption was made since, in many cases, these types of constraints can be mitigated. Furthermore, these restricted use-type areas can often be used to accommodate development features such as parking lots and setbacks; and residential densities or non-residential square footage can often be transferred from landslide areas to other developable portions of a site.

### Non-Typical Cases

The City and/or County may develop and have on file a rate sheet for non-typical land uses that do not fit the generally adopted fee rate categories. Special calculations for non-typical land uses may also be considered at the discretion of either the City or the County.

### Non-Residential Land Development not including a Land Division

The City and County codes regarding bridge and major thoroughfare fee payment allow for the collection of District fees at either the map recordation or building permit phases of a

project. It is the County's policy to collect only at map recordation unless no land division is proposed. District fees for land development not including a land division shall be paid prior to the issuance of a building permit.

District fees for non-residential uses that are part of a land division will be calculated based on the gross acreage within the map's boundaries.

District fees for non-residential uses on a vacant parcel that does not include a land division will be calculated based on the gross acreage within the vacant parcel boundary.

District fees for non-residential uses on an under-utilized parcel that does not include a land division will be calculated, at the discretion of the County or City, based on one of the following calculations:

**Retail Commercial**

$$\text{Total District Fee Obligation} = \frac{\text{gross building square footage}}{16,335} \times 5 \times \text{District Fee per FDU}$$

A typical District fee calculation for a retail commercial development involving a land division would assume gross project acreage (all area within a map or lot's boundaries) times 5 FDUs times the District fee per FDU. However, the above calculation determines the District fee obligation by estimating the gross project acreage based on a proposed building's gross square footage and an assumed Floor Area Ratio (FAR). For example, using an FAR of 0.375:1 (as outlined in the City of Santa Clarita's Unified Development Code for retail commercial uses), a retail commercial building on a one-acre (43,560 square feet) parcel would yield a building square footage of 16,335 ( $43,560 \times 0.375 = 16,335$ ). Conversely, if a lease project is submitted for District fee payment, an assumed gross acreage can be determined by taking the building's gross square footage and dividing it by 16,335, the equivalent of one acre of retail development.

**Office Commercial/Business Park**

$$\text{Total District Fee Obligation} = \frac{\text{gross building square footage}}{43,560} \times 5 \times \text{District Fee per FDU}$$

Using an FAR of 1.0:1, an office commercial/business park building on a one-acre (43,560 square feet) parcel would yield a building square footage of 43,560 ( $43,560 \times 1.0 = 43,560$ ). Again, if a lease project is submitted for District fee payment, an assumed gross acreage can be determined by talking the building's gross square footage and dividing it by 43,560, essentially one acre of commercial office development. The UDC identifies a 1:1 FAR for Business Park, a 1.25:1 FAR for Commercial Office, and a 0.75:1 FAR for Industrial Commercial. Thus, for the purposes of this analysis, a 1:1 FAR was used.

**Industrial**

$$\text{Total District Fee Obligation} = \frac{\text{gross building square footage}}{29,403} \times 3 \times \text{District Fee per FDU}$$

Using a FAR of 0.675:1, industrial construction on a one-acre parcel would yield a building square footage of 29,403 (43,560 x 0.675 =29,403). Again, if a lease project is submitted for District fee payment, an assumed gross acreage can be determined by taking the building's gross square footage and dividing it by 29,403, essentially one acre of industrial development.

District fees for a lease building are not required if the underlying land paid District fees based on gross acreage, including the land on which the lease building is to be sited. It should be noted that if a project proposes an upgraded use from that which was paid for the underlying parcel the project would be subject to the difference in fees between that which was paid and the proposed use.

Under-utilized parcels, such as those that may accommodate a future lease structure, were not assumed in the development analysis, as these parcels are difficult to identify.

**G. CONSTRUCTION OF DISTRICT IMPROVEMENTS IN LIEU OF PAYING FEES AND CREDIT/CASH REQUESTS**

If a developer constructs District-identified improvements, that developer becomes eligible for District credit which can be used to offset District fee payments. If the cost of the completed and accepted improvements, along with the soft costs and 5% administrative/management fee, exceeds the District fee obligation, the developer would be given a credit which can be used to offset future District fee obligations within the District.

If adequate funds are available, the developer may receive a cash reimbursement.

A developer has the following options with regard to construction of District-identified improvements:

- Construct District-identified improvements for District credit.
- Construct District-identified improvements and receive cash reimbursement from the District.

To receive District credit or cash reimbursement from the District for constructed and accepted improvements, the proper documentation must be submitted to the County or City. Required documentation includes the "Bridge and Major Thoroughfare District Cash/Credit Request" form (included as Attachment E) and all applicable attachments documenting construction costs. No documentation for the 5% administrative/management fee is required.



Upon submittal of a request for a withdrawal from the District, review and determination by the City and/or County will be completed within 60 days. After the "Bridge and Major Thoroughfare District Cash/Credit Request" form has been submitted and approved, withdrawal of District funds will be authorized if the City and/or County deem that sufficient funds are available in the District account, based on a review of District priorities.

If a developer constructs improvements beyond its conditioned obligation, District credit and/or cash may be given subsequent to the improvement's completion and acceptance as long as the improvement has been described in this report as a District improvement.

The City and/or County will accept improvements for maintenance upon completion and field acceptance.

If a condition of project approval requires a landowner to dedicate property as right-of-way for a State improvement, then the landowner will receive credit at fair market value for the property dedicated. Additionally, if any local improvement requires land acquisition from a third party, the cost of the property will be added to the cost of the improvement. However, if right-of-way is required to be dedicated for a County or City improvement as a condition of project approval, the landowner receives no credit for the value of the dedicated property. Therefore, the cost estimates prepared for District improvements reflect costs for right-of-way as described above.

It may be permissible for developer/landowners to receive reimbursement for the construction of District-identified improvements from District funds as described in this report once improvements are completed and accepted by the City or County.

## H. PROVISIONS FOR UPDATING COSTS AND UNIT INFORMATION

Projections for build-out development and the cost of the improvements located within the area of benefit may change over time. Project scope may change due to refinement and the need to comply with requirements imposed by other agencies, including, but not limited to, the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans). A reasonable amount of outside funding has been anticipated and formulated into the proposed District fees. Outside funding, not anticipated in the District formation analysis or update, may be received or funds anticipated may not be received. Therefore, in order to equitably assess future development as well as collect sufficient funds to complete the improvements, it will be necessary to periodically re-evaluate the net cost of the improvements, the remaining land to be developed, and the type of development being constructed within the District and to adjust the District fee accordingly.

Beginning July 1, 2002, and thereafter on each succeeding July 1<sup>st</sup>, the District fees shall be adjusted as follows: calculate the percentage movement for the previous year in the Los Angeles Regional Construction Cost Index (CCI) based on Engineering News Record data for that period. Then, if the percentage movement equals or exceeds a two percent

increase, the District fee per FDU will be increased by two percent and rounded up to the nearest \$10. If the percentage movement increases less than two percent, the District Fee per FDU will be increased by the same percent as the percentage movement and rounded up to the nearest \$10. Notwithstanding the foregoing, no such adjustment shall decrease any District fee.

A separate biennial review to reassess development trends, construction costs, grant funding success, and refinement of project scope may also be conducted.

#### I. PROPOSAL FOR DISTRICT CLOSURE

In the event that District fees collected from developers exceed the cost of improvements, the surplus funds, less administrative costs, will be refunded at District closure by the City and/or County to current owners in proportion to District fees paid.

#### J. DISTRICT FUNDS

The City and County will each maintain a separate District fund. Money may be transferred from one fund to the other for District purposes.

##### **City of Santa Clarita**

Any District fees paid by development projects within the City portion of the District may be loaned to other Districts within the City Limits. The loans may be used provided that loans are properly recorded by no less than a resolution approved by the City Council. This provision ONLY applies to the City of Santa Clarita portion of the B&T funds within each District.

Pursuant to the above paragraph, the City shall make all funds or credits available to the District as necessary for the purpose of the City reimbursing or providing credit to developers/landowners as described in this report once improvements are completed and accepted. It will be the sole discretion of the City to determine whether developers/landowners will be provided a reimbursement or credit for improvements above B&T obligations.

##### **Los Angeles County**

For the County portion of the District, the County will not loan money out of the District as described above.

## K. THE ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS

The City of Santa Clarita has determined that this District update does not constitute a "Project" as established by CEQA guideline 15378(4) and therefore is exempt from CEQA. The County of Los Angeles finds the proposed update is statutorily exempt under Public Resource Code Section 21080 B8(d).

FIGURE 1 DISTRICT BOUNDARY AND REGIONAL IMPROVEMENTS

**FIGURE 2 DISTRICT IMPROVEMENTS**

FIGURE 3 FILED MAPS AND VACANT LAND

# Attachment A

CODE PERTAINING TO B&T DISTRICTS

---

Board of Supervisors—Los Angeles County Code  
City of Santa Clarita, California—Municipal Code

COUNTY CODE:

**TITLE 58      Chapter 21.23      § 21.32.200**

**21.32.200 MAJOR THOROUGHFARE AND BRIDGE FEES.**

A. A subdivider, as a condition of approval of a final map for property within an area benefit, or a building permit applicant, as a condition of issuance of a building permit for property within an area of benefit, shall pay a fee as hereinafter established to defray the cost of constructing bridges over waterways, railways, freeways and canyons, and/or constructing major thoroughfares.

B. Definitions.

1. *Area of benefit* means a specified area wherein it has been determined that the real property located therein will benefit from the construction of a bridge and/or major thoroughfare.

2. *Bridge facility* means any crossing for a highway or local road, involving a railway, freeway, stream or canyon, which is required by the General Plan in order to accommodate new urban development within the area of benefit.

3. *Construction* means and includes preliminary studies, design, acquisition of right-of-way, administration of construction contracts, and actual construction.

4. *Major thoroughfare* means those roads designated in the transportation element of the General Plan, the primary purpose of which is to carry through traffic and provide a network connecting to the state highway system.

5. The singular number includes the plural, and the plural the singular.

C. The provisions herein for payment of a fee shall apply only if the bridge and/or major thoroughfare has been included in an element of the General Plan adopted by the Board of Supervisors at least 30 days prior to the filing of a map or application for a building permit on land located within the boundaries of the area of benefit.

D. Payment of fees shall not be required unless any major thoroughfares are in addition to or a widening or reconstruction of any existing major thoroughfares serving the area at the time of the adoption of the boundaries of the area of benefit.

E. Payment of Fees shall not be required unless any planned bridge facility is a new bridge serving the area or an addition to an existing bridge facility serving the area at the time of the adoption of the boundaries of the area of benefit.

F.

1. Action to establish an area of benefit may be initiated by the Board of Supervisors upon its own motion or upon the recommendation of the Road Commissioner.



2. The Board of Supervisors will set a public hearing for each proposed area benefited. Notice of the time and place of said hearing, including preliminary information related to the boundaries of the area of benefit, estimated costs and the method of fee apportionment shall be given pursuant to Section 65905 of the Government Code.

G.

1. At the public hearing, the Board of Supervisors will consider the testimony, written protests and other evidence. At the conclusion of the public hearing, the Board of Supervisors may, unless a majority written protest is filed and not withdrawn, determine to establish an area of benefit. If established, the Board of Supervisors shall adopt a resolution describing the boundaries of the area of benefit, setting forth the cost, whether actual or estimated, and the method of fee apportionment. A certified copy of such resolution shall be recorded with the County Recorder.

2. Such apportioned fees shall be applicable to all property within the area of benefit, and shall be payable as a condition of approval of a final map or as a condition of issuing a building permit for such property or portions thereof. Where the area of benefit includes lands not subject to the payment of fees pursuant to this section, the Board of Supervisors shall make provisions for payment of the share of improvement cost apportioned to such lands from other sources.

3. Written protest will be received by the Clerk of the Board of Supervisors at any time prior to the close of the public hearing. If written protests are filed by the owners of more than one-half of the area of the property to be benefited by the improvement, and sufficient protests are not withdrawn so as to reduce the area represented by the protests to less than one-half of the area to be benefited, then the proposed proceedings shall be abandoned and the Board of Supervisors shall not, for one year from the filing of said written protests, commence or carry on any proceedings for the same improvement under the provisions of this section. Any protest may be withdrawn by the owner making the same, in writing, at any time prior to the close of the public hearing.

4. If any majority protest is directed against only a portion of the improvement, then all further proceedings under the provisions of this section to construct that portion of the improvement so protested against shall be barred for a period of one year, but the Board of Supervisors shall not be barred from commencing new proceedings not including any part of the improvement so protested against. Such proceedings shall be commenced by a new notice and public hearing as set forth in Subsection F above.

5. Nothing in this section shall prohibit the Board of Supervisors, within such one-year period, from commencing and carrying on new proceedings for the construction of an improvement or portion of the improvement so protested against if it finds, by the affirmative vote of four-fifths of its members, that the owners of more than one-half of the area of the property to be benefited are in favor of going forward with such improvement or portion thereof.

H. Fees paid pursuant to this section shall be deposited in a planned bridge facility and/or major thoroughfare fund. A fund shall be established for each planned bridge facility project and/or each planned major thoroughfare project. If the benefit area is one in which more than one bridge and/or major thoroughfare is required to be constructed, a separate fund may be established covering all of the bridge projects and/or major thoroughfares in the benefit area. Moneys in such fund shall be expended solely for the construction or reimbursement for construction of the improvement serving the area to be benefited and from which the fees comprising the fund were collected, or to reimburse the County for the costs of constructing the improvement.

I. The Board of Supervisors may approve the acceptance of considerations in lieu of the payment of fees established herein.

J. The Board of Supervisors may approve the advancement of money from the General Fund or Road Fund to pay the costs of constructing the improvements covered herein and may reimburse the General Fund or Road Fund for such advances from planned bridge facility and/or major thoroughfare funds established pursuant to this section.

K. If a subdivider, as a condition of approval of a subdivision, is required or desires to construct a bridge and/or major thoroughfare, the Board of Supervisors may enter into a reimbursement agreement with the subdivider. Such agreement may provide for payments to the subdivider from the bridge facility and/or major thoroughfare fund covering that specific project to reimburse the subdivider for costs not allocated to the subdivider's property in the resolution establishing the area of benefit. If the bridge and/or major thoroughfare fund covers more than one project, reimbursements shall be made on a pro rata basis, reflecting the actual or estimated costs of the projects covered by the fund. (*Ord. 82-0240 Sec. 1, 1982; Ord. 82-0050 Sec. 1, 1982*)

**22.48.235. MAJOR BRIDGE AND THOROUGHFARE FEES.** Except as otherwise provided in Section 22.48.280, a building or structure shall not be used on any lot or parcel of land, any portion of which is located within a Bridge or Major Thoroughfare District established pursuant to Section 21.32.200, unless the required district fee has been paid as a condition of issuing a building permit. (*Ord. 85-0168, Sec. 34, 1985*)

**22.48.280. EXEMPTIONS - EXISTING BUILDINGS AND STRUCTURES.** This Part 4 does not apply to the use, alteration or enlargement of an existing building or structure or the erection of one or more buildings or structures accessory thereto, or both, on the same lot or parcel of land, if the total value of such alteration, enlargement, or construction does not exceed one-half of the current market value of all existing buildings or structures on such lot or parcel of land.

(*Ord. 1494 Ch. 4 Art. 4 & 497. 1927.*)

CITY CODE

16.21.190 MAJOR THOROUGHFARE AND BRIDGE FEES

- A. A subdivider, as a condition of approval of a final map for property within an area of benefit, or a building permit applicant, as a condition of issuance of a building permit for property within an area of benefit, shall pay a fee hereinafter established to defray the costs of constructing bridges over waterways, railways, freeways, and canyons, and/or constructing major thoroughfares.
- B. The provisions herein for payment of a fee shall apply only if the bridge and/or major thoroughfare has been included in an element of the General Plan adopted by the City Council at least 30 days prior to filing of a map or application for a building permit on land located within the boundaries of the area of benefit.
- C. Payment of fees shall not be required unless any major thoroughfares are in addition to, or a widening or reconstruction of, any existing major thoroughfares serving the area at the time of the adoption of the boundaries of the area of benefit.
- D. Payment of fees shall not be required unless any planned bridge facility is a new bridge serving the area or an addition to an existing bridge facility serving the area at the time of the adoption of the boundaries of the area of benefit.
- E.
  - 1. Action to establish an area of benefit may be initiated by the City Council upon its own motion or upon the recommendation of the City Engineer.
  - 2. The City Council will set a public hearing for each proposed area of benefit. Notice of the time and place of said hearing, including preliminary information related to the boundaries of the area of benefit, estimated costs and the method of fee apportionment shall be given pursuant to Section 65905 of the Government Code.
- F.
  - 1. At the public hearing, the City Council will consider the testimony, written protests and other evidence. At the conclusion of the public hearing, the City Council may, unless a majority written protest is filed and not withdrawn, determine to establish an area of benefit. If established, the City Council shall adopt a resolution describing the boundaries of the area of benefit, setting forth the cost, whether actual or estimated, and the method of fee apportionment. A certified copy of such resolution shall be recorded with the County Recorder.
  - 2. Such apportioned fees shall be applicable to all property within the area of benefit, and shall be payable as a condition of approval of a final map or as a condition of issuing a

- building permit for such property or portions thereof. Where the area of benefit includes lands not subject to the payment of fees pursuant to this section, the City Council shall make provision for payment of the share of improvement cost apportioned to such lands from other sources.
3. Written protest will be received by the Clerk of the City Council at any time prior to the close of the public hearing. If written protests are filed by the owners of more than one-half of the area of the property to be benefited by the improvement, and sufficient protests are not withdrawn so as to reduce the area represented by the protests to less than one-half of the area to be benefited, then the proposed proceedings shall be abandoned and the City Council shall not, for one year from the filing of said written protests, commence or carry on any proceedings for the same improvement under the provisions of this section. Any protest may be withdrawn by the owner making the same, in writing, at any time prior to the close of the public hearing.
  4. If any majority protest is directed against only a portion of the improvement, then all further proceedings under the provisions of this section to construct that portion of the improvement so protested against shall be barred for a period of one year, but the City Council shall not be barred from commencing new proceedings not including any part of the improvement so protested against. Such proceedings shall be commenced by a new notice and public hearing as set forth in Section F above.
  5. Nothing in this section shall prohibit the City Council, which in such one-year period, from commencing and carrying on new proceedings for the construction of an improvement or portion of the improvement so protested against if it finds, by the affirmative vote of four-fifths of its members, that the owners of more than one-half of the area of the property to be benefited are in favor of going forward with such improvements or portion thereof.
- G. Fees paid pursuant to this section shall be deposited in a planned bridge facility and/or major thoroughfare fund. A fund shall be established for each planned bridge facility project and/or each planned major thoroughfare project. If the benefit area is one in which more than one bridge and/or major thoroughfare is required to be constructed, a separate fund may be established covering all the bridge projects and/or major thoroughfares in the benefit area. Moneys in such fund shall be expended solely for the construction of the improvement serving the area to be benefited and from which the fees comprising the fund were collected, or to reimburse the City for the costs of constructing the improvement.
- H. The City Council may approve the acceptance of considerations in lieu of the payment of fees established herein.
- I. The City Council may approve the advancement of money from the General Fund or Road Fund to pay the costs of constructing the improvements covered herein and may reimburse

the General Fund or Road Fund for such advances from planned bridge facility and/or major thoroughfare funds established pursuant to this section.

- J. If a subdivider, as a condition of approval of a subdivision, is required or desires to construct a bridge and/or major thoroughfare, the City Council may enter into a reimbursement agreement with the subdivider. Such agreement may provide for payments to the subdivider from the bridge facility and/or major thoroughfare fund covering that specific project to reimburse the subdivider for costs not allocated to the subdivider's property in the resolution establishing the area of benefit. If the bridge and/or major thoroughfare funds cover more than one project, reimbursements shall be made on a pro rata basis, reflecting the actual or estimated costs of the project covered by the fund.

*SUBDIVISION CODE  
City of Santa Clarita, California*

*11/24/92*

# Attachment B

## LEGAL DESCRIPTION

---

## LEGAL DESCRIPTION

### THE AREA OF BENEFIT KNOWN AS

### EASTSIDE BRIDGE AND MAJOR

### THOROUGHFARE CONSTRUCTION FEE DISTRICT

THAT PORTION OF THE UNINCORPORATED TERRITORY OF THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, STATE OF CALIFORNIA AND THAT PORTION OF THE CITY OF SANTA CLARITA WITHIN THE FOLLOWING DESCRIBED BOUNDARIES:

BEGINNING AT THE NORTHEASTERLY CORNER OF SECTION 16, TOWNSHIP 4 NORTH, RANGE 15 WEST, SAN BERNARDINO MERIDIAN; THENCE SOUTHERLY ALONG THE EASTERLY LINE OF SAID SECTION 16 TO THE SOUTHERLY LINE OF THE NORTH HALF OF SAID SECTION 16; THENCE WESTERLY ALONG SAID SOUTHERLY LINE TO THE WESTERLY LINE OF THE NORTHWEST QUARTER OF THE SOUTHEAST QUARTER OF SAID SECTION; THENCE SOUTHERLY ALONG SAID WESTERLY LINE TO THE NORTHERLY LINE OF THE SOUTHWEST QUARTER OF SAID SOUTHEAST QUARTER; THENCE EASTERLY AND SOUTHERLY ALONG THE NORTHERLY AND EASTERLY LINES OF SAID SOUTHWEST QUARTER TO THE SOUTHERLY LINE OF SAID SECTION 16; THENCE WESTERLY ALONG SAID LAST MENTIONED SOUTHERLY LINE TO THE NORTHWESTERLY CORNER OF LOT 1 IN SECTION 21, SAID LAST MENTIONED TOWNSHIP AND RANGE; THENCE SOUTHERLY ALONG THE WESTERLY LINE OF SAID LOT 1 AND THE WESTERLY LINE OF LOT 4 IN SAID LAST MENTIONED SECTION TO THE NORTHWESTERLY BOUNDARY OF SIERRA HIGHWAY, 120 FEET WIDE, AS SAME EXISTED ON MARCH 4, 2002; THENCE SOUTHWESTERLY ALONG SAID NORTHWESTERLY BOUNDARY TO THE NORTHERLY BOUNDARY OF SOLEDAD CANYON ROAD, AS SAME EXISTED ON SAID DATE; THENCE WESTERLY AND NORTHWESTERLY ALONG THE NORTHERLY AND NORTHEASTERLY BOUNDARY OF SOLEDAD CANYON ROAD TO A LINE 50 FEET EASTERLY OF AND PARALLEL WITH, MEASURED AT RIGHT ANGLE TO, THE EASTERLY BOUNDARY OF TRACT NO. 23365, AS SHOWN ON MAP FILED IN BOOK 760 PAGES 29 AND 30, OF MAPS, IN THE OFFICE OF THE REGISTRAR-RECORDER OF SAID COUNTY; THENCE NORTHERLY ALONG SAID LAST MENTIONED PARALLEL LINE TO THE MOST SOUTHERLY CORNER OF LOT 82 OF

TRACT NO. 30317 AS SHOWN ON MAP FILED IN BOOK 740, PAGES 97 TO 100, INCLUSIVE, OF SAID MAPS; THENCE NORTHERLY, NORTHWESTERLY AND WESTERLY ALONG THE EASTERLY, NORTHEASTERLY AND NORTHERLY BOUNDARIES OF SAID LAST MENTIONED LOT AND FOLLOWING THE SAME ALONG ALL ITS VARIOUS COURSES AND CURVES TO THE NORTHEASTERLY CORNER OF LOT 57 OF TRACT NO. 30319 AS SHOWN ON MAP FILED IN BOOK 757 PAGES 43, 44 AND 45, OF SAID MAPS; THENCE WESTERLY AND SOUTHERLY ALONG THE NORTHERLY AND WESTERLY LINES OF SAID LAST MENTIONED LOT TO THE NORTHWESTERLY CORNER OF LOT 55 OF SAID LAST MENTIONED TRACT; THENCE SOUTHERLY ALONG THE WESTERLY BOUNDARY OF SAID LAST MENTIONED TRACT TO THE NORTHEASTERLY CORNER OF TRACT NO. 8575 AS SHOWN ON MAP FILED IN BOOK 117 PAGES 64, 65 AND 66, OF SAID MAPS; THENCE WESTERLY AND SOUTHERLY ALONG THE NORTHERLY AND WESTERLY BOUNDARIES OF SAID LAST MENTIONED TRACT AND FOLLOWING THE SAME ALONG ALL ITS VARIOUS COURSES TO THE MOST WESTERLY, NORTHWESTERLY CORNER OF SAID LAST MENTIONED TRACT; THENCE SOUTHERLY ALONG THE WESTERLY BOUNDARY OF SAID LAST MENTIONED TRACT TO ITS INTERSECTION WITH THE NORTHERLY BOUNDARY OF LOT 2 AS SHOWN ON LICENSED SURVEYOR'S MAP RECORDED IN BOOK 27 PAGE 40, OF RECORDS OF SURVEYS, IN SAID OFFICE OF THE REGISTRAR-RECORDER; THENCE WESTERLY ALONG SAID LAST MENTIONED NORTHERLY BOUNDARY TO ITS INTERSECTION WITH THE NORTHEASTERLY PROLONGATION OF THE NORTHWESTERLY BOUNDARY OF PARCEL 4 OF PARCEL MAP NO. 6449 PER MAP FILED IN BOOK 69 PAGES 8 TO 10, INCLUSIVE, OF PARCEL MAPS, IN SAID OFFICE OF THE REGISTRAR-RECORDER; THENCE SOUTHWESTERLY ALONG SAID LAST MENTIONED NORTHEASTERLY PROLONGATION TO THE NORTHEASTERLY CORNER OF SAID PARCEL 4; THENCE SOUTHWESTERLY, NORTHWESTERLY AND WESTERLY ALONG THE NORTHWESTERLY, NORTHEASTERLY AND NORTHERLY LINES OF SAID PARCEL 4 TO THE NORTHWESTERLY CORNER OF SAID PARCEL 4; THENCE SOUTHERLY ALONG SAID WESTERLY LINE AND ITS SOUTHERLY PROLONGATION, AND ALONG THE CENTERLINE OF THE FIRST LOS ANGELES AQUEDUCT AS SHOWN ON SAID PARCEL MAP NO. 6449 FOLLOWING THE SAME IN ALL ITS VARIOUS COURSES TO THE NORTHERLY LINE OF LOT 62 OF ST. JOHN SUBDIVISION PER MAP RECORDED IN BOOK 196 PAGES 306 TO 309, INCLUSIVE, OF MISCELLANEOUS RECORDS, IN THE OFFICE OF SAID REGISTRAR-RECORDER; THENCE EASTERLY ALONG SAID NORTHERLY LINE TO THE WESTERLY BOUNDARY OF



THE LAND DESCRIBED IN DEED RECORDED JUNE 9, 1997, AS INSTRUMENT NO. 97-855038 OF OFFICIAL RECORDS, IN THE OFFICE OF SAID REGISTRAR-RECORDER; THENCE SOUTHERLY AND EASTERLY ALONG THE WESTERLY AND SOUTHERLY LINES OF SAID LAND TO THE EASTERLY LINE OF SAID LOT 62; THENCE SOUTHERLY ALONG SAID EASTERLY LINE TO THE SOUTHERLY LINE OF FRACTIONAL SECTION 25, TOWNSHIP 4 NORTH, RANGE 16 WEST, SAN BERNARDINO MERIDIAN; THENCE EASTERLY ALONG LAST SAID SOUTHERLY LINE AND THE SOUTHERLY LINE OF SECTION 30, TOWNSHIP 4 NORTH, RANGE 15 WEST, SAN BERNARDINO MERIDIAN TO THE WESTERLY BOUNDARY OF THE SECOND LOS ANGELES AQUEDUCT; THENCE SOUTHERLY ALONG SAID WESTERLY BOUNDARY TO THE NORTHEASTERLY PROLONGATION OF THE SOUTHEASTERLY BOUNDARY OF THE FIRST LOS ANGELES AQUEDUCT WITHIN SECTION 6, TOWNSHIP 3 NORTH, RANGE 15 WEST, SAN BERNARDINO MERIDIAN; THENCE SOUTHWESTERLY ALONG LAST SAID PROLONGATION AND LAST SAID SOUTHEASTERLY BOUNDARY TO THE EAST-WEST CENTER LINE OF SECTION 6, TOWNSHIP 3 NORTH, RANGE 15 WEST, SAN BERNARDINO MERIDIAN; THENCE EASTERLY ALONG SAID EAST-WEST CENTER LINE TO THE WEST QUARTER CORNER OF SECTION 5, TOWNSHIP 3 NORTH, RANGE 15 WEST; THENCE EASTERLY ALONG THE SOUTHERLY LINE OF THE NORTHWEST QUARTER OF SAID SECTION 5 TO THE SOUTHEAST CORNER THEREOF; THENCE NORTHERLY ALONG THE WESTERLY LINE OF THE SOUTHWEST QUARTER OF THE NORTHEAST QUARTER OF SAID SECTION 5 TO THE SOUTHERLY LINE OF THE NORTH HALF OF THE SOUTHWEST QUARTER OF THE NORTHEAST QUARTER OF SAID SECTION 5; THENCE EASTERLY ALONG SAID SOUTHERLY LINE TO THE EAST LINE OF THE WEST 15 ACRES OF THE NORTH HALF OF THE SOUTHWEST QUARTER OF THE NORTHEAST QUARTER OF SAID SECTION 5; THENCE NORTHERLY ALONG SAID EAST LINE TO THE SOUTHERLY LINE OF LOT 2 OF SAID SECTION 5; THENCE EASTERLY ALONG SAID SOUTHERLY LINE TO THE SOUTHEAST CORNER OF LOT 2; THENCE NORTHERLY ALONG THE EASTERLY LINE OF SAID LOT 2 TO THE NORTHERLY LINE OF SAID SECTION 5; THENCE EASTERLY ALONG SAID NORTHERLY LINE TO THE NORTHWEST CORNER OF SECTION 4, TOWNSHIP 3 NORTH, RANGE 15 WEST, SAN BERNARDINO MERIDIAN; THENCE EASTERLY ALONG THE NORTHERLY LINE OF SAID SECTION 4 TO THE NORTHWEST CORNER OF SECTION 3, TOWNSHIP 3 NORTH, RANGE 15 WEST, SAN BERNARDINO MERIDIAN; THENCE EASTERLY ALONG THE NORTHERLY LINE OF SAID SECTION 3 TO THE NORTHWEST CORNER OF LOT 3 OF

SAID SECTION 3; THENCE SOUTHERLY ALONG THE WESTERLY LINE OF SAID LOT 3 TO THE SOUTHWEST CORNER THEREOF; THENCE EASTERLY ALONG THE SOUTHERLY LINE OF SAID LOT 3 TO THE WEST LINE OF THE EAST HALF OF THE SOUTHEAST QUARTER OF THE NORTHWEST QUARTER OF SAID SECTION 3; THENCE SOUTHERLY ALONG SAID WEST LINE TO THE SOUTHERLY LINE OF THE NORTHWEST QUARTER OF SAID SECTION 3; THENCE EASTERLY ALONG SAID SOUTHERLY LINE TO THE SOUTHEAST CORNER OF THE NORTHWEST QUARTER OF SAID SECTION 3; THENCE NORTHERLY ALONG THE EASTERLY LINE OF THE NORTHWEST QUARTER OF SAID SECTION 3 A DISTANCE OF 15.00 CHAINS; THENCE EAST 15.00 CHAINS; THENCE SOUTH 5.00 CHAINS; THENCE EAST 10.00 CHAINS; THENCE SOUTH 5.00 CHAINS; THENCE EAST 5.00 CHAINS; THENCE SOUTH 5.00 CHAINS TO THE SOUTHERLY LINE OF THE NORTHEAST QUARTER OF SAID SECTION 3; THENCE EASTERLY ALONG SAID SOUTHERLY LINE 10.00 CHAINS MORE OR LESS TO THE SOUTHEAST CORNER OF THE NORTHEAST QUARTER OF SAID SECTION 3; THENCE SOUTHERLY ALONG THE EASTERLY LINE OF SAID SECTION 3 TO THE SOUTHWEST CORNER OF SECTION 2, TOWNSHIP 3 NORTH, RANGE 15 WEST, SAN BERNARDINO MERIDIAN; THENCE EASTERLY ALONG THE SOUTHERLY LINE OF SAID SECTION 2 TO THE SOUTHWEST CORNER OF THE SOUTHEAST QUARTER OF THE SOUTHWEST QUARTER OF SAID SECTION 2; THENCE NORTHERLY AND EASTERLY ALONG THE WESTERLY AND NORTHERLY LINES OF THE SOUTHEAST QUARTER OF THE SOUTHWEST QUARTER OF SAID SECTION 2 TO THE NORTHWEST CORNER OF THE SOUTHWEST QUARTER OF THE SOUTHEAST QUARTER OF SAID SECTION 2; THENCE EASTERLY ALONG THE NORTHERLY LINE OF THE SOUTHWEST QUARTER OF THE SOUTHEAST QUARTER OF SAID SECTION 2 TO THE NORTHWEST CORNER OF THE EAST-HALF OF THE EAST-HALF OF THE SOUTHWEST QUARTER OF THE SOUTHEAST QUARTER OF SAID SECTION 2; THENCE SOUTHERLY ALONG THE WESTERLY LINE OF THE EAST-HALF OF THE EAST-HALF OF THE SOUTHWEST QUARTER OF THE SOUTHEAST QUARTER OF SAID SECTION 2 TO THE SOUTHERLY LINE OF SAID SECTION 2; THENCE EASTERLY ALONG SAID SOUTHERLY LINE TO THE SOUTHWEST CORNER OF SECTION 1, TOWNSHIP 3 NORTH, RANGE 15 WEST, SAN BERNARDINO MERIDIAN; THENCE NORTHERLY ALONG THE WESTERLY LINE OF SAID SECTION 1 TO THE NORTHWEST CORNER OF THE SOUTHWEST QUARTER OF THE SOUTHWEST QUARTER OF SAID SECTION 1; THENCE EASTERLY AND SOUTHERLY ALONG THE NORTHERLY AND EASTERLY LINES OF THE SOUTHWEST QUARTER OF THE SOUTHWEST QUARTER OF

SAID SECTION 1 TO THE SOUTHERLY LINE OF SAID SECTION 1; THENCE EASTERLY ALONG SAID SOUTHERLY LINE TO THE SOUTH-QUARTER CORNER OF SAID SECTION 1; THENCE NORTHERLY ALONG THE NORTH-SOUTH CENTER LINE OF SAID SECTION 1 TO THE NORTHWEST CORNER OF LOT 2 OF SAID SECTION 1; THENCE EASTERLY ALONG THE NORTHERLY LINE OF SAID SECTION 1 TO THE SOUTHWEST CORNER OF SECTION 31, TOWNSHIP 4 NORTH, RANGE 14 WEST, SAN BERNARDINO MERIDIAN; THENCE NORTHERLY ALONG THE WESTERLY LINES OF SECTIONS 31, 30 AND 19 OF TOWNSHIP 4 NORTH, RANGE 14 WEST, SAN BERNARDINO MERIDIAN TO THE NORTHWEST CORNER OF SAID SECTION 19; THENCE EASTERLY ALONG THE NORTHERLY LINE OF SAID SECTION 19 TO THE SOUTHWEST CORNER OF SECTION 17, TOWNSHIP 4 NORTH, RANGE 14 WEST, SAN BERNARDINO MERIDIAN; THENCE NORTHERLY ALONG THE WESTERLY LINE OF SAID SECTION 17 TO THE WEST-QUARTER CORNER THEREOF; THENCE EASTERLY ALONG THE SOUTHERLY LINE OF THE NORTH-HALF OF SAID SECTION 17 TO THE EAST-QUARTER CORNER THEREOF; THENCE NORTHERLY ALONG THE EASTERLY LINE OF SAID SECTION 17 TO THE SOUTHEAST CORNER OF SECTION 8, TOWNSHIP 4 NORTH, RANGE 14 WEST; SAN BERNARDINO MERIDIAN; THENCE NORTHERLY ALONG THE EASTERLY LINES OF SECTIONS 8 AND 5 OF TOWNSHIP 4 NORTH, RANGE 14 WEST, SAN BERNARDINO MERIDIAN TO THE NORTHEAST CORNER OF SAID SECTION 5 AND THE SOUTHEAST CORNER OF SECTION 32, TOWNSHIP 5 NORTH, RANGE 14 WEST, SAN BERNARDINO MERIDIAN; THENCE NORTHERLY ALONG THE EASTERLY LINE OF SAID SECTION 32 TO THE SOUTHEAST CORNER OF SECTION 29, TOWNSHIP 5 NORTH, RANGE 14 WEST, SAN BERNARDINO MERIDIAN; THENCE NORTHERLY AND WESTERLY ALONG THE EASTERLY AND NORTHERLY LINES OF SAID SECTION 29 TO THE NORTHEAST CORNER OF SECTION 30, TOWNSHIP 5 NORTH, RANGE 14 WEST, SAN BERNARDINO MERIDIAN; THENCE EASTERLY ALONG THE NORTHERLY LINE OF SAID SECTION 30 TO THE NORTH-QUARTER CORNER THEREOF; THENCE SOUTHERLY ALONG THE NORTH-SOUTH CENTER LINE OF SAID SECTION 30 TO THE SOUTH-QUARTER CORNER THEREOF; THENCE WESTERLY ALONG THE SOUTHERLY LINE OF SAID SECTION 30 TO THE NORTHEAST CORNER OF SECTION 36, TOWNSHIP 5 NORTH, RANGE 15 WEST, SAN BERNARDINO MERIDIAN; THENCE WESTERLY ALONG THE NORTHERLY LINES SECTION 36, 35 AND 34 OF TOWNSHIP 5 NORTH, RANGE 15 WEST, SAN BERNARDINO MERIDIAN TO THE NORTHWEST CORNER OF SAID SECTION 34; THENCE SOUTHERLY ALONG THE WESTERLY LINE OF SAID SECTION 34 TO THE NORTHWEST

CORNER OF SECTION 3, TOWNSHIP 4 NORTH, RANGE 15 WEST, SAN BERNARDINO MERIDIAN; THENCE SOUTHERLY ALONG WESTERLY LINES OF SECTIONS 3 AND 10 OF TOWNSHIP NORTH, RANGE 15 WEST, SAN BERNARDINO MERIDIAN TO THE POINT OF BEGINNING.

# Attachment C

## DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSED IMPROVEMENTS AND ESTIMATED COSTS

---

TABLE 6A BRIDGE AND MAJOR THOROUGHFARE IMPROVEMENTS

Highway	Limits of Proposed Improvements	Estimated Cost
Golden Valley Road	SR-14 to the northerly District boundary	\$28,958,320
Whites Canyon Road	District boundary to Vasquez Canyon Road	\$5,545,380
Vasquez Canyon Road	District Boundary to Sierra Highway	\$21,876,580
Santa Clarita Parkway	District Boundary to Sierra Highway	\$1,270,380
Via Princessa Road	Northerly boundary of Golden Valley Ranch to the westerly District boundary	\$25,928,390
Soledad Canyon Road	Westerly District boundary to the easterly District boundary	\$9,263,790
Sierra Highway	Southerly District boundary to the northerly District boundary	\$19,795,060
Davenport Road	Sierra Highway to the easterly District boundary	\$8,809,160
Shadow Pines Blvd	Begonias Lane to Davenport Road	\$13,243,320
Sand Canyon Road	Soledad Canyon Road to easterly District boundary and Soledad Canyon Road to Sierra Highway	\$32,028,670
Lost Canyon Road	Via Princessa to Sand Canyon Road	\$21,807,390
Canyon Park Boulevard	Sierra Highway to Lost Canyon Road	\$345,200
<b>TOTAL:</b>		<b>\$188,871,640</b>

TABLE 6B DETAILED DESCRIPTION OF BRIDGE AND MAJOR  
THOROUGHFARE IMPROVEMENTS

ID	Highway/Location	Description Of Improvements
<b><i>Golden Valley Road</i></b>		
E-0100	Via Princessa to South End of Bridge over SR-14	6 Lane Street Construction
E-0101	N. End of Bridge over SR-14 to Green Mountain	Signing and striping
E-0102	Green Mountain to Sierra Hwy	Grading 6 Lane Street Construction Landslide Mitigation
E-0103	Sierra Hwy to via Princessa	Bus Turnouts Sidewalk-two sides Street Lights
E-0104	Via Princessa to Interchange	Grading 6 Lane Street Construction
E-0105	Interchange at Soledad Canyon Road to Northerly District boundary	Grading 6 Lane Street Construction
<b><i>Whites Canyon Road</i></b>		
E-0202	Westerly District boundary to Vasquez Canyon Road	Grading 4 Lane Street Construction
<b><i>Vasquez Canyon Road</i></b>		
E-0300	Westerly District boundary to Whites Canyon Road	Grading 4 Lane Street Construction Right-of-way acquisition
E-0301	Whites Canyon To Sierra Hwy	Grading 4 Lane Street Construction Right-of-way acquisition
<b><i>Santa Clarita Parkway</i></b>		
E-0402	Westerly District Boundary to Sierra Hwy	Grading 6 Lane Street Construction
<b><i>Via Princessa Road</i></b>		
E-0501	Santa Clarita Pkwy to Golden Valley Road	Grading 6 Lane Street Construction
E-0502	Golden Valley Road to Rainbow Glen	Grading 6 Lane Street Construction
E-0503	Rainbow Glen to May Way	Street Widening to 6 lanes Right-of-way acquisition Bus Turnouts Street Lights Sidewalk-two sides Signing and striping
E-0504	May Way to Whites Canyon	Signing and striping Bus Turnouts
E-0505	Whites Canyon to Weyerhaeuser Way	Signing and Striping Median Bus turnouts
E-0506	Weyerhaeuser Way to Sierra Highway	Bus Turnouts Signing and Striping
E-0507	Sierra Hwy to Antelope Valley Freeway	Bus Turnouts

TABLE 6B DETAILED DESCRIPTION OF BRIDGE AND MAJOR  
THOROUGHFARE IMPROVEMENTS

ID	Highway/Location	Description Of Improvements
E-0508	Lost Canyon Road to the northerly boundary of Golden Valley Ranch	Median Signing and striping Bus Pads
<b>Soledad Canyon Road</b>		
E-0600	Westerly District Boundary to Ruether	Bus Turnouts
E-0601	Ruether Avenue to Rainbow Glen	Bus Turnouts
E-0602	Rainbow Glen to Langside Avenue	Bus Turnouts
E-0603	Langside Avenue to Camp Plenty Road	Bus Turnouts
E-0604	Camp Plenty Road to Whites Canyon	Bus Turnouts
E-0605	Whites Canyon to Crossglade Avenue	Median Bus Turnouts
E-0606	Crossglade Avenue to Luther Drive	Partial Median Bus Turnouts
E-0607	Luther Drive to Shangri-la Drive	Bus Turnouts
E-0608	Shangri-la Drive to Sierra Highway	Median Bus turnouts
E-0609	Sierra Highway to Solemint Road	Bus Turnouts Signing and striping
E-0610	Solemint Road to Galeton Road	Median Bus turnouts Signing and striping
E-0611	Galeton Road to Anne Freda Street	Bus Turnouts Interconnect Signing and striping
E-0612	Anne Freda Street to Kenroy Avenue	Bus Turnouts Signing and Striping
E-0613	Kenroy Avenue to Sand Canyon Road	Bus Turnouts Signing and Striping
E-0614	Sand Canyon Road to SR-14 Westbound Ramps	Signing and Striping
E-0615	SR-14 Westbound Ramps to Oak Spring Canyon	Bus Turnouts Signing and striping
E-0616	Oak Spring Canyon to Flowerpark Drive	Bus Turnouts Signing and striping
E-0617	Flowerpark Drive to Poppy Meadow Street	Bus Turnouts Signing and striping
E-0618	Poppy Meadow Street to Shadow Pines Boulevard	Bus Turnouts Signing and Striping
E-0619	Shadow Pines Boulevard to SR-14 Ramps (County)	Bus Pads Signing and striping
E-0620	SR-14 Ramps to Easterly District Boundary	Street Widening to 4 lanes Grading Signing and Striping Sidewalk-two sides Street lights Bus Pads Right-of-way acquisition
E-620B	Bridge over Creek	Widen



TABLE 6B DETAILED DESCRIPTION OF BRIDGE AND MAJOR  
THOROUGHFARE IMPROVEMENTS

ID	Highway/Location	Description Of Improvements
<b>Sierra Highway</b>		
E-0700	Southerly District Boundary to Placerita Canyon Road	Bus Turnouts Signing and striping
E-0701	Placerita Canyon Road To Golden Valley Road	Bus Turnouts Signing and striping
E-0702	Golden Valley Road to Rainbow Glen Drive	Bus Turnouts Signing and striping
E-0703	Rainbow Glen Drive to Friendly Valley Parkway	Bus Turnouts Signing and striping
E-0704	Friendly Valley Parkway to Whispering Leaves Drive	Bus Turnouts Signing and striping
E-0705	Whispering Leaves Drive to Via Princess	Bus Turnouts Signing and striping
E-0708	SR-14 off ramps to Canyon Park Drive	Bus Turnouts
E-0709	Canyon Park Drive to Jakes Way	Bus Turnouts
E-0710	Jakes Way to Soledad Canyon Road	Bus Turnouts
E-0711	Soledad Canyon Road to Scherzinger Lane	Median Bus Turnouts Signing and striping Interconnect
E-0712	Scherzinger Lane to Sierra Cross Road	Street Widening to 6 lanes Median Sidewalk-two sides Bus Turnouts Signing and striping Interconnect
E-0713	Sierra Cross Road to City Limit	Street Widening to 6 lanes Median Sidewalk-two sides Bus Turnouts Signing and striping Street Lights Interconnect Right-of-way acquisition
E-0714	City Limit to Sand Canyon Road (County)	Street Widening to 6 lanes Median Sidewalk-two sides Street Lights Bus pads Signing and striping Interconnect
E-0715	Sand Canyon Road to Vasquez Canyon Road (County)	Street Widening to 6 lanes Median Sidewalk-two sides Street Lights Bus pads Signing and striping Interconnect Right-of-way acquisition
E-715B	Bridge over creek	Widen

TABLE 6B DETAILED DESCRIPTION OF BRIDGE AND MAJOR  
THOROUGHFARE IMPROVEMENTS

ID	Highway/Location	Description Of Improvements
E-0716	Vasquez Canyon Road to Davenport Road (County)	Street Widening to 6 lanes Median Sidewalk-two sides Street Lights Bus pads Signing and striping Interconnect Right-of-way acquisition
E-0717	Davenport Road to Northerly District Boundary (County)	Street Widening to 6 lanes Median Sidewalk-two sides Street Lights Bus pads Signing and striping Interconnect
<b>Davenport Road</b>		
E-0800	Sierra Highway to Shadow Pines Boulevard (County)	Grading 4 Lane Street Construction Right-of-way acquisition
E-801	Shadow Pines Boulevard to Easterly District Boundary (County)	Grading 4 Lane Street Construction Right-of-way acquisition
<b>Shadow Pines Blvd</b>		
E-0900	Soledad Canyon Road to Begonias Lane (City)	Signing and striping Interconnect
E-0901	Begonias Lane to Grandifloras Road (City)	Street Widening to 4 lanes Median Sidewalk-two sides Signing and Striping Street Lights Right-of-way acquisition
E-0902	Grandifloras Road to Davenport Road (County)	Grading 4 Lane Street Construction
E-902B	Bridge over creek	Construct Bridge
<b>Sand Canyon Road</b>		
E-1001	Soledad Canyon Road to SR-14 Eastbound Ramps	Median Signing and striping Interconnect
E-1002	SR-14 Eastbound Ramps to Lost Canyon Road	Street Widening to 6 lanes Median Sidewalk-two sides Street Lights Bus turnouts Signing and Striping Interconnect
E-1002B	Bridge over Santa Clara River	Widen
E-1003	Lost Canyon Road to Placerita Canyon Road	Street Widening to 2 lanes Construct storm drain Interconnect Right-of-way acquisition (for 6 lanes)

TABLE 6B DETAILED DESCRIPTION OF BRIDGE AND MAJOR  
THOROUGHFARE IMPROVEMENTS

ID	Highway/Location	Description Of Improvements
E-1003B	Bridge over Iron Canyon Creek	Widen
E-1004	Placerita Canyon Road to Easterly District Boundary	Street Widening to 2 lanes Interconnect
E-1005	Soledad Canyon Road to City Limit	Street Widening to 4 lanes Grading Median Street Lights Sidewalk-one side Interconnect Signing and striping
E-1006	City Limit to Sierra Highway (County)	4 Lane Street Construction Grading Right-of-way acquisition
<b><i>Lost Canyon Road</i></b>		
E-1200	Canyon Park Boulevard to City Limit (County)	Grading 6 Lane Street Construction Levee R.C. Box
E-1200B	Railroad crossing (County)	Construct Bridge
E-1201	City Limit to Sand Canyon Road	Street Widening to 6 lanes Median Sidewalk-one side Street lights Interconnect Signing and striping Bus Turnouts Right-of-way acquisition
E-1202	Sand Canyon to end of existing (City)	Street Widening to 2 lanes Signing and striping
<b><i>Canyon Park Boulevard</i></b>		
E-1300	Railroad Tracks to Lost Canyon Road (County)	4 Lane Street Construction

TABLE 7 INTERSECTION IMPROVEMENTS

ID	Location	Description of Improvements	Estimated Cost
EI-5	Soledad Canyon Road and Whites Canyon Road	Intersection augmentation, Signal modification, Right-of-way acquisition	\$1,215,500
EI-9	Soledad Canyon Road and Sierra Highway	Intersection augmentation, Signal modification, Right of way acquisition	\$624,170
EI-19	Soledad Canyon Road and Shadow Pines Boulevard	Intersection augmentation, Signal modification, Right of way acquisition	\$771,150
EI-21	Sierra Highway and Golden Valley Road	New 4-way signal	\$180,600
EI-29	Sierra Highway and Sand Canyon Road	Intersection augmentation, Signal modification, Right of way acquisition	\$709,500
EI-30	Sierra Highway and Vasquez Canyon Road	Intersection augmentation, Signal modification, Right of way acquisition	\$709,500
EI-31	Sierra Highway and Davenport Road	New 3-way signal	\$154,800
EI-33	Via Princessa and Golden Valley Road	New 4-way signal	\$180,600
EI-38	Whites Canyon Road and Vasquez Canyon Road	New 3-way signal	\$154,800
EI-39	Davenport Road and Shadow Pines Boulevard	New 3-way signal	\$154,800
EI-41	Sand Canyon Road and Lost Canyon Road	Intersection augmentation, Signal modification, Right of way acquisition	\$923,640
EI-42	Sand Canyon Road and Placerita Canyon Road	New 3-way signal	\$154,800
EI-46	Via Princessa and Sierra Highway	Intersection augmentation, Signal modification, Right of way acquisition	\$224,980
EI-49	Via Princessa and Lost Canyon Road	New 3-way signal	\$154,800
EI-50	Lost Canyon Road and Canyon Park	New 3-way signal	\$154,800
EI-53	Golden Valley Road and Green Mountain Road	New 4-way signal	\$180,600
EI-54	Lost Canyon Road and Jakes Way	New 3-way signal	\$154,800
<b>TOTAL:</b>			<b>\$6,803,840</b>

NOTE: The construction of additional signals at highway locations within the District which are not listed above will be considered to be District projects and are eligible for credit.

TABLE B DISTRICT SHARE OF REGIONAL IMPROVEMENTS

ID	Location	Description of Improvements	Percent Share According to District				Total Estimated Cost	Estimated Cost to District
			Bouquet	Eastside	Via Princessa	Castaic		
VP-0307R	Lyons Avenue and San Fernando Road	Bridge, Signals, Right-of-way acquisition	9.8%	15.6%	72.8%	1.9%	\$14,611,340	\$2,284,440
VP-0401R	Santa Clarita Parkway and Soledad Canyon Road	Bridge, interchange, Signals	26.7%	24.7%	47.5%	1.1%	\$27,265,000	\$6,733,910
VP-0500R	Wiley Canyon Road/Via Princessa and San Fernando Road	Bridge widening, interchanges	11.2%	13.0%	75.6%	0.2%	\$23,940,000	\$3,108,710
VP-0811R	San Fernando Road and SR-14	Signals	3.6%	21.2%	75.2%	0.0%	\$1,198,170	\$254,510
VP-0900R	Calgrove and I-5	Widen under crossing, Flood control channel, retaining wall, Signals, Right-of-way acquisition	3.2%	8.4%	79.3%	9.2%	\$8,528,300	\$713,520
VP-1500R	Magic Mountain Parkway and San Fernando Road	Bridge, Right-of-way acquisition	17.4%	15.9%	64.5%	2.3%	\$23,648,730	\$3,752,530
C-0501R	Parker Road and I-5	Bridge widening, ramps, Signals	3.4%	4.5%	7.0%	85.1%	\$4,047,820	\$181,350
C-0700R	Lake Hughes and I-5	Widen under crossing, Signals	1.2%	1.2%	3.2%	94.3%	\$4,452,570	\$54,550
E-0100R	Golden Valley Road and SR-14	Bridge widening, Signals	21.9%	54.7%	19.8%	3.6%	\$2,617,440	\$1,431,830
E-0104R	Golden Valley Road and Soledad Canyon Road	Interchange	21.9%	54.7%	19.8%	3.6%	\$33,290,690	\$18,211,120
E-0505R	Via Princessa and SR-14	Widen under crossing, Signals	4.9%	83.6%	11.3%	0.1%	\$4,022,300	\$3,364,010
E-1002R	Sand Canyon and SR-14	Signals	5.8%	82.9%	10.4%	0.9%	\$787,670	\$653,280
E-1100R	Placerita Canyon and SR-14	Signals, Right-of-way acquisition	14.3%	47.6%	37.5%	0.6%	\$2,004,410	\$954,480
C-0300	Hasley Road and I-5	Ramps, right of way acquisition	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	\$24,136,700	\$0
<b>TOTAL:</b>							\$174,551,140	\$41,698,240

# Attachment D

## DEVELOPMENT ANALYSIS

---

TABLE 9A FDU ESTIMATE (FILED MAPS WITHIN THE DISTRICT)

Map Number	Multi Family		Condominium/ Townhouse		Single Family		Commercial/ Business Park		Industrial		Total FDUs	Conditioned Fees
	Units	FDUs @ 0.7/Unit	Units	FDUs @ 0.8/Unit	Units	FDUs @ 1/Unit	Acres	FDUs @ 5/Acre	Acres	FDUs @ 3/Acre		
<b>Pending Maps</b>												
PM 16658					2	2					2	
PM 20799					2	2					2	
PM 21643					4	4					4	
PM 22530					2	2					2	
TR 45123					36	36					36	
TR 46760					8	8					8	
TR 47573					174	174					174	
TR 47574					152	152					152	
TR 48086					546	546					546	
TR 49024					84	84					84	
TR 50262					20	20					20	
TR 50467					172	172					172	
TR 50514					0	0			21	64	64	
TR 50592					94	94			14	42	136	
TR 50846					56	56					56	
TR 52833 (Fair Oaks)			293	234	747	747					981	
TR 52938			192	154							154	
TR 49621 (Wes Thompson Ranch)					350	350					350	
TR 52385	44	31									31	
TR 52355					28	28					28	
TR 52414					866	866	50	250			1,116	
TR 53074					24	24	10.2	51			75	
<b>Approved Maps</b>												
PM 14582					2	2					2	
PM 16541					2	2					2	
PM 21477					3	3					3	
PM 22667					2	2					2	
TR 32571					136	136					136	
TR 37038					45	45					45	
TR 43147					26	26					26	
TR 43729			544	435		0					435	
TR 45023			752	602		0					602	
PM 20435					4	4					4	
PM 20652					2	2					2	
PM 20873					2	2					2	
PM 21827					4	4					4	
PM 21953					2	2					2	
PM 22004					2	2					2	
PM 22851					3	3					3	
TR 25740					3	3					3	
TR 34466												
TR 42670 (Santa Clarita Bus. Park)												\$3,461,360
TR 43145	82	57									57	
TR 46353			110	88							88	
TR 47324					70	70					70	
TR 47785					12	12					12	
TR 48379			35	28							28	
TR 48480			46	37							37	
TR 48892					101	101					101	
TR 48893					163	163					163	
TR 49771			28	22							22	
TR 52608			63	50							50	
<b>Recorded/Not Built Maps</b>												
PM 21110					3	3					3	
TR 45416					253	253					253	
TR 52812					8	8					8	
<b>Totals</b>	126	88.0	2063.0	1649.8	4215.0	4215.0	60.2	301.0	35.2	105.7	6360	\$3,461,360

TABLE 9B FDU ESTIMATE (VACANT LAND-CITY-NO FILED MAP)

Zoning Category	Zoning Code	Area (ac)	Midpoint Density (units/ac)	Development Units	Multiplier	FDUs
Single Family	RE	158.5	0.5	79	1	79
Single Family	RE(MOCA)	223.1	0.5	112	1	112
Single Family	RH			0	1	0
Single Family	RL	188.6	2.2	415	1	415
Single Family	RL(MOCA)	79.9	2.2	176	1	176
Single Family	RS	129.0	5	645	1	645
Single Family	RVL	56.2	1	56	1	56
Single Family	RVL(MOCA)	52.0	1	52	1	52
Single Family	RVL(PD)	270.4	1	270	1	270
	<i>SubTotal</i>	<i>1157.7</i>		<i>1805</i>		<i>1805</i>
Condominium / Townhouse	MHP	0.0	11	0	0.8	0
Condominium / Townhouse	RM	57.3	11	630	0.8	504
Condominium / Townhouse	RM(MOCA)		11	0	0.8	0
Condominium / Townhouse	RM(PD)	36.0	11	396	0.8	316.8
	<i>SubTotal</i>	<i>93.3</i>		<i>1026</i>		<i>821</i>
Multi Family (apartment)	RMH		20	0	0.7	0
Multi Family (apartment)	RMH(PD)	101.8	20	2036	0.7	1425.2
	<i>SubTotal</i>	<i>101.8</i>		<i>2036</i>		<i>1425</i>
Commercial	BP	111.5	N/A	N/A	5	557.5
Commercial	BP(PD)	167.1	N/A	N/A	5	835.5
Commercial	BP(PD)(MOCA)	28.9	N/A	N/A	5	144.5
Commercial	CC	48.3	N/A	N/A	5	241.5
Commercial	CC(PD)	35.8	N/A	N/A	5	179
Commercial	CN	0.9	N/A	N/A	5	4.5
Commercial	CN(PD)	28.1	N/A	N/A	5	140.5
Commercial	CO	6.3	N/A	N/A	5	31.5
Commercial	CO(PD)	0.0	N/A	N/A	5	0
	<i>SubTotal</i>	<i>426.9</i>		<i>0</i>		<i>2135</i>
Industrial	I		N/A	N/A	3	0
Industrial	IC	25.5	N/A	N/A	3	76.5
Industrial	IC(PD)		N/A	N/A	3	0
	<i>SubTotal</i>	<i>25.5</i>		<i>0</i>		<i>77</i>
<b>Total</b>		<b>1805</b>		<b>4867</b>		<b>6263</b>



TABLE 9C FDU ESTIMATE (VACANT LAND-COUNTY-NO FILED MAP)

Land Use Category	Land Use Code	Slope Range	Slope Note	Area (ac)	Midpoint Density (units/ac)	Development Units	Multiplier	FDUs
Single Family	HM	0-50%	10% of Total	573.0	0.5	286.5	1	286.5
Single Family	HM	> 50%	90% of Total	5157.0	0.05	257.9	1	257.9
Single Family	N2	0-50%	10% of Total	33.7	0.5	16.8	1	16.8
Single Family	N2	> 50%	90% of Total	303.1	0.05	15.2	1	15.2
Single Family	N1	0-50%	40% of Total	43.4	0.5	21.7	1	21.7
Single Family	N1	> 50%	60% of Total	65.2	0.05	3.3	1	3.3
Single Family	U1	N/A		256.5	2.2	564.3	1	564.3
Single Family	U2	N/A		32.3	5	161.5	1	161.5
<i>SubTotal</i>				6464		1327		1327
Industrial	I	N/A		96.5	N/A	N/A	3	289.5
<i>SubTotal</i>				97				290
<b>Total</b>				6561		1327		1617

**Notes:**

- HM Hillside Management: 90% of acreage = 50%+slope (.05 du/ac); 10% of acreage = 0-50% slope (.5 du/ac.)
- N2 Nonurban: 90% of acreage = 50%+slope (.05 du/ac); 10% of acreage = 0-50% slope (.5 du/ac.)
- N1 Nonurban: 60% of acreage = 50%+slope (.05 du/ac); 40% of acreage = 0-50% slope (.5 du/ac.)
- U2 Urban: 5 du/ac

TABLE 10 SUMMARY OF DEVELOPMENT ANALYSIS

Residential Land Use	Development Units				Multiplier	FDUs	Percent of Total Units
	Filed Maps	County	City	Total			
Single Family	4215	1327	1805	7347	1	7347	58%
Condominium / Townhouse	2063		1026	3089	0.8	2471	25%
Multi Family (apartment)	126		2036	2162	0.7	1513	17%
<b>Total Residential</b>	6404	1327	4867	12598		11331	100%
Non-Residential Land Use	Area (ac)				Multiplier	FDUs	Percent of Total Acres
	Filed Maps	County	City	Total			
Commercial	60.2		426.9	487.1	5	2435	76%
Industrial	35.2	97	25.5	157.2	3	472	24%
<b>Total Non-Residential</b>	95.4	96.5	452.4	644.3		2907	100%
<b>Total</b>						14238	

# Attachment E

BRIDGE AND MAJOR THOROUGHFARE DISTRICT CASH/CREDIT  
REQUEST FORM

---

**BRIDGE & MAJOR THOROUGHFARE DISTRICT  
CASH/CREDIT REQUEST FORM**

**District Percentages:**

Valencia	_____ %	Amount: \$ _____	<input type="checkbox"/> Cash	<input type="checkbox"/> Credit
Bouquet Canyon	_____ %	Amount: \$ _____	<input type="checkbox"/> Cash	<input type="checkbox"/> Credit
Eastside	_____ %	Amount: \$ _____	<input type="checkbox"/> Cash	<input type="checkbox"/> Credit
Castaic	_____ %	Amount: \$ _____	<input type="checkbox"/> Cash	<input type="checkbox"/> Credit
Via Princessa	_____ %	Amount: \$ _____	<input type="checkbox"/> Cash	<input type="checkbox"/> Credit
Lyons Avenue/McBean Parkway	_____ %	Amount: \$ _____	<input type="checkbox"/> Cash	<input type="checkbox"/> Credit

**Area Identification:**

Link#(s): \_\_\_\_\_ Intersection #(s): \_\_\_\_\_ Interchange #(s): \_\_\_\_\_

**Project Description:** \_\_\_\_\_

**ATTACHMENTS**

	Yes	No	Not Applicable
Signature Page			
Project Acceptance Letter			
Site Location Map			
Contract & Change Orders			
Credit Summary			
Expense Summary			
Cancelled Checks & Supporting Documentation			
Additional Documentation			
Plans			

Completed by: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Name \_\_\_\_\_ Title - Company \_\_\_\_\_

Submitted to: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Name \_\_\_\_\_ Title - County/City \_\_\_\_\_

**FOR CITY OR COUNTY USE ONLY**

Assigned to: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Name \_\_\_\_\_ Title \_\_\_\_\_

Approved by: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Name \_\_\_\_\_ Title \_\_\_\_\_

Sent to Fiscal by: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Name \_\_\_\_\_ Title \_\_\_\_\_