

## REGIONAL REVIEW NOTIFICATION

Atlanta Regional Commission • 40 Courtland Street NE, Atlanta, Georgia 30303 • ph: 404.463.3100 • fax:404.463.3105 • www.atlantaregional.com

**DATE**: 6/21/2006 **ARC REVIEW CODE**: P506211

TO: Chairman Roy J. Middlebrooks ATTN TO: Lawrence Kaiser, General Manager

FROM: Charles Krautler, Director

NOTE: This is digital signature. Original on file

The Atlanta Regional Commission (ARC) has received the following proposal and is initiating a regional review to seek comments from potentially impacted jurisdictions and agencies. The ARC requests your comments regarding related to the proposal not addressed by the Commission's regional plans and policies.

Name of Proposal: Rockdale County Capital Improvements Element

Review Type: Local Comprehensive Plan

**Description:** Rockdale County's Capital Improvements Element as an amendment to the Rockdale County

Comprehensive Plan

Submitting Local Government: Rockdale County

Action Under Consideration: Approval

**Date Opened:** 6/21/2006

**Deadline for Comments:** 7/5/2005

Earliest the Regional Review can be Completed: 8/19/2005

#### THE FOLLOWING LOCAL GOVERNMENTS AND AGENCIES ARE RECEIVING NOTICE OF THIS REVIEW:

ARC LAND USE PLANNING
ARC DATA RESEARCH
GEORGIA DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES
ROCKDALE COUNTY SCHOOLS
NEWTON COUNTY

ARC Transportation Planning Georgia Regional Transportation Authority Georgia Department of Transportation DEKALB COUNTY GWINNETT COUNTY ARC ENVIRONMENTAL PLANNING
GEORGIA DEPARTMENT OF COMMUNITY AFFAIRS
CITY OF CONYERS
HENRY COUNTY
WALTON COUNTY

## Attached is information concerning this review.

If you have any questions regarding this review, Please call Mike Alexander, Review Coordinator, at (404) 463-3302. If the ARC staff does not receive comments from you by 7/5/2005, we will assume that your agency has no additional comments and we will close the review. Comments by email are strongly encouraged.

The ARC review website is located at: http://www.atlantaregional.com/qualitygrowth/reviews.html.



# REGIONAL REVIEW NOTIFICATION

Atlanta Regional Commission • 40 Courtland Street NE, Atlanta, Georgia 30303 • ph: 404.463.3100 • fax:404.463.3105 • www.atlantaregional.com

### NOTICE OF LOCAL PLAN SUBMITTAL AND HEARING/COMMENT OPPORTUNITY

Submitting Local Government	Rockdale County	Date Received:	6/21/2006			
Local Contact:	Lawrence Kaiser, General Manager Rockdale County Capital & Community Improvements	Public Hearing Date and Time:	7/5/2005 9:00am			
Phone:	770-785-5919	E-Mail:	larry.kaiser@rockdalecounty.org			
Fax:	770-483-4376	Website:	http:\\www.rockdalecounty.org			
Street	962 Milstead Avenue	City State, Zip:	Conyers, Georgia 30012			
	Department of Commu		Review Required			
Review Title:	Rockdale County Capital Im	provements El	ement			
Description	: Rockdale County's Capital In Rockdale County Comprehen	-	Element as an amendment to the			
	Document can be viewed on <a href="http://www.atlantaregional.">http://www.atlantaregional.</a> Click on the Regional Review	<u>com/qualitygr</u>	owth/compplanreviews.html			
The submit	ted documents are available	for review a	t the City and at ARC.			
Reviewing I	Regional Development Cente	er:				
40 Courtland	nal Commission Street, NE Atlanta, GA. 30303 33.3302 FAX 404.463.3254					
Contact M Person:	Mike Alexander, Review Coordin	ator				
	alexander@atlantaregional.com					

## **Transmittal Resolution**

## Capital Improvements Element

## Rockdale County, Georgia

WHEREAS, Rockdale County has prepared a Capital Improvements Element as an amendment to the *Rockdale County Comprehensive Plan*; and

WHEREAS, the Capital Improvements Element was prepared in accordance with the "Development Impact Fee Compliance Requirements" and the "Minimum Planning Standards and Procedures for Local Comprehensive Planning" adopted by the Board of Community Affairs pursuant to the Georgia Planning Act of 1989, and duly advertised Public Hearings were held on August 5, 2004, at 6:30 P.M. and May 26, 2005, at 5:00 P.M. in the County Commission meeting room at 901 Main Street, Conyers.

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the Board of Commissioners of Rockdale County, Georgia does hereby submit the Capital Improvements Element to the Atlanta Regional Commission for Regional and State review, as per the requirements of the Development Impact Fee Compliance Requirements.

Adopted this 26<sup>th</sup> day of May, 2005.

Rockdale County, Georgia Board of Commissioners

Poly G m

By: \_\_/-

lason A Hill

Glenn D. Sears

Attest:

Jennifer Rutledge, County Clerk

## Capital Improvements Element

#### An Amendment to Chapter Five of the Comprehensive Plan

#### Introduction

The purpose of a Capital Improvements Element (CIE) is to establish where and when certain new capital facilities will be provided within a jurisdiction and how they may be financed through an impact fee program. As required by the Development Impact Fee Act, and defined by the Department of Community Affairs in its *Development Impact Fee Compliance Requirements*, the CIE must include the following for each category of capital facility for which an impact fee will be charged:

- the designation of **service areas** the geographic area in which a defined set of public facilities provide service to development within the area;
- a projection of needs for the planning period of the adopted Comprehensive Plan;
- the designation of levels of service (LOS) the service level that will be provided;
- a schedule of improvements listing impact fee related projects and costs for the first five years after plan adoption; and
- a description of funding sources proposed for each project during the first five years of scheduled system improvements.

System improvements expected to commence or be completed over the coming five years are also shown in the attached Short-Term Work Program (STWP) amendment. The STWP amendment affects new and previously planned capital projects for the upcoming five-year period, beginning with the current year.

## Categories for Assessment of Impact Fees

To assist in paying for the high costs of expanding public facilities and services to meet the needs of projected growth and to ensure that new development pays a reasonable share of the costs of public facilities, Rockdale County has adopted impact fees for parks, libraries, public safety, and road facilities.

## Components of the Impact Fee System

The Rockdale County Impact Fee System consists of several components:

- This Comprehensive Plan, including future land use assumptions and projected future demands;
- Service area definition and designation;
- Appropriate level of service standards for each impact fee eligible facility category;
- A methodology report, which establishes the impact cost of new growth and development and thus the maximum impact fees that can be assessed;
- This Capital Improvements Element to implement the County's proposed improvements; and
- A Development Impact Fee Ordinance, including an impact fee schedule by land use category.

## **Library Facilities**

#### Service Area

The entire county is considered a single service district for library services. Demand for library facilities is almost exclusively related to the county's residential population. Businesses make some use of public libraries for research purposes, but the use is minimal and considered incidental compared to that of the families and individuals who live in the country. Thus, a libraries system impact fee is limited to future residential growth. An improvement in any portion of the county increases service to all parts of the county to some extent.

#### Projection of Needs

Between 2005 and 2020, the number of dwelling units in the library facilities service area will grow from 28,783 to 39,733, an increase of 10,950 dwelling units.

#### Level of Service

The Rockdale County Library System has adopted LOS standards based on the completion of a future expansion project, and the desired total of 200,000 collection volumes on hand in 2020. In **Table L-1** the resulting level of service standards are shown for library facility space and collection volumes, and are used to calculate future demand. Based on this LOS there is an existing deficiency in facility space (4,006 square feet) and an existing deficiency in collection materials (39,323 volumes). The cost to remedy these deficiencies is not impact fee eligible and is expected to be funded through general fund, SPLOST or grant expenditures.

Table L-1
Future Demand Calculation

	Number of	SF	
SF/dwelling unit	New Dwelling Units (2005-20)		
1.4606	10,950	15,994	

Collection	Number of	Collection
Materials/	New Dwelling	Materials
dwelling unit	Units (2005-20)	Demanded
5.0336	10,950	55,118

## Capacity to Serve New Growth

In a well-planned library system such as that of Rockdale County, library expansions are timed for construction, and volumes purchased, as areas grow and population increases, in order to maintain the adopted LOS. The location of new facility space is planned to provide adequate coverage and access to all areas of the county. The following tables present the required square footage of future facility space and number of volumes necessary in order to meet the needs of the county's growing population. **Table L-2** includes a project listing that will meet future demand for library square footage.

Table L-2
Future Library Facility Projects

Net New Square Footage*	Project	Running Total: SF Demanded*	SF Demanded (annual)	New Dwelling Units	Year
	1000 m 2000				
(4,006)		4,006	0	0	2005
		5,104	1,098	752	2006
		6,232	1,127	772	2007
		7,388	1,156	792	2008
		8,574	1,187	812	2009
		9,794	1,220	835	2010
		10,647	853	584	2011
		11,516	868	594	2012
		12,399	883	605	2013
		13,298	899	615	2014
		14,212	914	626	2015
20,000	Future branch facility	15,321	1,109	759	2016
ŕ	•	16,454	1,133	776	2017
		17,612	1,158	793	2018
		18,794	1,182	809	2019
		20,000	1,206	826	2020
15,994	Net New Growth Total:				

\*Reflects current deficiency.

In **Table L-3** the future demand for collection materials is calculated. The library system's anticipated discard rate of 4.40% is included in these calculations so that enough volumes are acquired to leave the correct amount after "weeding" of materials. This "weeding" is done to replace out-of-date scientific and research materials, and worn out general volumes. A total of 98,596 volumes will be needed by 2020 to remedy the existing deficiency (39,323 volumes), accommodate new growth (55,118 volumes), and account for discarded volumes (4,155 volumes). Volumes purchased to replace discarded volumes are not impact fee eligible.

Table L-3
Future Collection Materials Demanded

	Ne	w Growth Dem	and		Total
	New	Materials		Plus	Materials
	Dwelling	Demanded	Running	Discarded	Needed
Year	Units	(annual)	Total*	Materials	(annual)
2005	0	0	39,323	1,730	41,053
2006	752	3,785	43,108	167	3,951
2007	772	3,885	46,992	171	4,055
2008	792	3,984	50,976	175	4,160
2009	812	4,089	55,066	180	4,269
2010	835	4,205	59,270	185	4,390
2011	584	2,940	62,210	129	3,069
2012	594	2,992	65,202	132	3,124
2013	605	3,045	68,247	134	3,179
2014	615	3,097	71,344	136	3,233
2015	626	3,150	74,493	139	3,288
2016	759	3,822	78,315	168	3,990
2017	776	3,906	82,221	172	4,077
2018	793	3,990	86,210	176	4,165
2019	809	4,073	90,284	179	4,253
2020	826	4,157	94,441	183	4,340
		55,118		4,155	98,596
			Total	for New Growth	57,543

## Capital Projects Costs

**Table L-4** presents a listing of the cost of the capital project from Table L-2 including the portion of project cost that is impact fee eligible.

Table L-4
Facility Costs to Meet Future Demand

Year	Project	Square Footage	Cost*	% for New Growth	New Growth Cost
2016	Future branch facility	20,000	\$3,300,000	79.97%	\$2,638,993

<sup>\*</sup>Project costs based on an average of \$165 per square foot construction cost.

**Table L-5** presents the cost necessary to meet the demand for collection materials. The State of Georgia participates in the capital investment of library facilities, including the purchase of collection materials. The amount of participation, as well as a library's system eligibility, may vary from year to year. Based on historic participation, Table L-5 calculates the share of collection volume costs that may be provided by the State through a matching fund program. The "% for new growth" figure reflects a calculation that accounts for the discard rate.

Table L-5
Collection Material Costs to Meet Future Demand

	Materials Needed				% for New	New Growth
Year	(annual)	Gross Cost*	State Aid**	Net Total Cost	Growth	Cost
2005***	41.053	\$1,228,308.66	\$0.00	\$1,228,308.66	0.00%	\$1,228,308.66
2006	3,951	\$118,223.11	(\$28,767.78)	\$89,455.32	95.8%	\$85,685.18
2007	4,055	\$121,338.56	(\$29,477.63)	\$91,860.93	95.8%	\$87,989.40
2008	4,160	\$124,454.01	(\$30,205.15)	\$94,248.86	95.8%	\$90,276.68
2009	4,269	\$127,733.43	(\$30,950.70)	\$96,782.73	95.8%	\$92,703.77
2010	4,390	\$131,340.79	(\$31,714.26)	\$99,626.53	95.8%	\$95,427.71
2011	3,069	\$91,823.77	(\$32,417.18)	\$59,406.60	95.8%	\$56,902.87
2012	3,124	\$93,463.48	(\$33,135.69)	\$60,327.80	95.8%	\$57,785.25
2013	3,179	\$95,103.19	(\$33,870.14)	\$61,233.05	95.8%	\$58,652.35
2014	3,233	\$96,742.90	(\$34,620.88)	\$62,122.02	95.8%	\$59,503.85
2015	3,288	\$98,382.61	(\$35,388.27)	\$62,994.35	95.8%	\$60,339.41
2016	3,990	\$119,370.91	(\$36,113.36)	\$83,257.54	95.8%	\$79,748.60
2017	4,077	\$121,994.44	(\$36,853.36)	\$85,141.08	95.8%	\$81,552.76
2018	4,165	\$124,617.98	(\$37,608.61)	\$87,009.37	95.8%	\$83,342.31
2019	4,253	\$127,241.51	(\$38,379.46)	\$88,862.06	95.8%	\$85,116.91
2020	4,340	\$129,865.05	(\$39,166.25)	\$90,698.80	95.8%	\$86,876.25
		\$2,950,004.41	(\$508,668.72)	\$2,441,335.69	-	\$2,390,211.94

<sup>\*</sup>Cost is based on average unit cost of \$29.92 per volume.

<sup>\*\*</sup>State aid is based on the average annual contribution of \$0.35 per capita.

<sup>\*\*\*</sup>Existing eficiency. Figures shown in 2005 for simplicy in calculation; all volumes are not expected to be purchased in a single year.

#### **Fire Protection Facilities**

#### Service Area

Fire services in Rockdale County are provided on a system-wide basis, rather than on a rigidly defined service area basis, with all stations and companies covering one another. The Fire Department provides primary fire protection to the entire county; the entire county is therefore considered a single service district for fire services. An improvement in any part of the county increases service to all parts of the county to some extent.

## **Projection of Needs**

Between 2005 and 2020, the functional population (a combination of residents and employees) in the fire protection facilities service area will grow from 124,119 to 174,377, an increase of 50,258 persons.

#### Level of Service

The adopted level of service is based on the addition of five new fire stations, a training facility, and eight heavy vehicles to the current inventory of facilities and trucks. **Table F-1** presents a calculation of the total future demand in square feet and heavy vehicles, based on the adopted LOS standards. Currently there is an existing deficiency in facility space (14,341 square feet) and an existing deficiency of 1 heavy vehicle. The cost to remedy these deficiencies is not impact fee eligible and is expected to be funded through general fund, SPLOST or grant expenditures.

Table F-1
Future Demand Calculation

SF/functional population	Functional Pop Increase (2005- 20)	SF Demanded by New Growth
0.4310	50,258	21,659

Heavy	Functional Pop	New Heavy
Vehicles/func-	Increase (2005-	Vehicles
tional pop	20)	Demanded
0.000132	50,258	7

## Capacity to Serve New Growth

As new demand is calculated, fire service capacity is developed to meet the estimated demand. In a well-planned fire system such as that in Rockdale County, stations are timed for construction and built as areas grow and population increases, and heavy vehicles added to the fleet, in order to maintain the County's adopted LOS. The location of new facilities are planned to provide adequate coverage and access to all areas of the county. **Tables F-2** and **F-3** present a schedule of capital projects that will meet future demand. In both tables the calculated existing deficiency is reflected in the running total of new demand.

Table F-2
Future Fire Protection Facility Projects

Year	Functional Pop Increase	SF Demanded	Running Total: SF Demanded*	Project	Net New Square Footage*
<u>rear</u>	increase	(annual)	Demanded	Project	1 ootage
2005	0	0	14,341		(14,341)
2006	3,099	1,336	15,676	Klondike @ Starr Road Station	6,000
2007	3,176	1,369	17,045	•	
2008	3,256	1,403	18,448	Smma Rd @ Hwy 212 Station	6,000
2009	3,337	1,438	19,886		
2010	3,419	1,473	21,360		
2011	3,189	1,374	22,734	Training Facility	6,000
2012	3,262	1,406	24,140	,	·
2013	3,336	1,438	25,578		
2013	3,412	1,470	27,048	Future Station C	6,000
2015	3,489	1,504	28,552	r didre otation o	0,000
2016	3,313	1,428	29,979		
2010	3,383	1,420	31,437	Future Station D	6,000
		•	•	Future Station D	0,000
2018	3,455	1,489	32,926		
2019	3,528	1,520	34,447	Fotos Otalias F	0.000
2020	3,604	1,553	36,000	Future Station E	6,000
				Net New Growth Total:	21,659

<sup>\*</sup>Figure reflects existing deficiency.

Table F-3
Future Heavy Vehicles Demanded

		Vehicles to	
	<b>Functional</b>	be	
	Pop	Purchased	Net New
Year	Increase	(annual)*	Vehicles*
2005	0	1.37	(1)
2006	3,099	1.78	0
2007	3,176	0.42	1
2008	3,256	0.43	1
2009	3,337	0.44	2
2010	3,419	0.45	2
2011	3,189	0.42	3
2012	3,262	0.43	3
2013	3,336	0.44	3
2014	3,412	0.45	4
2015	3,489	0.46	4
2016	3,313	0.44	5
2017	3,383	0.45	5
2018	3,455	0.46	6
2019	3,528	0.47	6
2020	3,604	0.48	7

<sup>\*</sup>Figure reflects existing deficiency.

## Capital Project Costs

The projects from the two preceding tables are used to calculate the total cost of capital improvements; these figures are shown in the next two tables. Each table is a schedule of improvements that would meet the demand in Rockdale County to the year 2020. In each table the amount of funding expected from impact fees is shown, along with the total project costs. Note that in Table F-4 the square feet added by construction of the first two stations is not impact fee eligible, since it is required to remedy the existing deficiency. Likewise, 39% of the third project is required to meet that same deficiency. In Table F-5 the existing deficiency in heavy vehicles (1) is reflected in the fact that the cost for one of the vehicles is not impact fee eligible. (Eight new vehicles, less the current deficiency of one vehicle, provides the seven vehicles demanded by new growth.)

Table F-4
Facility Costs to Meet Future Demand

Year	Project	Square Footage	Cost*	% for New Growth	New Growth Cost
2006	Klondike @ Starr Road Station	6,000	\$1,050,000	0.00%	\$0
2008	Smrna Rd @ Hwy 212 Station	6,000	\$1,050,000	0.00%	\$0
2011	Training Facility	6,000	\$1,050,000	60.99%	\$640,382
2014	Future Station C	6,000	\$1,050,000	100.00%	\$1,050,000
2017	Future Station D	6,000	\$1,050,000	100.00%	\$1,050,000
2020	Future Station E	6,000	\$1,050,000	100.00%	\$1,050,000
		_	\$6,300,000	:	\$3,790,382

<sup>\*</sup>Estimated construction costs based on an average of \$175 per square foot construction cost.

Table F-5
Heavy Vehicle Costs to Meet Future Demand

Year	New Vehicles	Cost*	% for New Growth	New Growth Cost
2006	1	\$350,000	0.00%	\$0
2007	1	\$350,000	100.00%	\$350,000
2009	1	\$350,000	100.00%	\$350,000
2011	1	\$350,000	100.00%	\$350,000
2014	1	\$350,000	100.00%	\$350,000
2016	1	\$350,000	100.00%	\$350,000
2018	1	\$350,000	100.00%	\$350,000
2020	1	\$350,000	100.00%	\$350,000
	8	\$2,800,000	-	\$2,450,000

<sup>\*</sup>Estimated costs based on an average value of \$350,000 per vehicle.

## **Sheriff's Department Facilities**

#### Service Area

The Sheriff's Department provides primary response and patrol services to the entire county. The Department provides backup to city police within the county, and provides investigatory services throughout the county. In addition, the Department provides custodial and court responsibilities for the county. The entire county is therefore considered a single service district for services provided by the Sheriff's Department because all residents and employees have equal access to the benefits of those services.

#### **Projection of Needs**

Between 2005 and 2020, the functional population (a combination of residents and employees) in the Sheriff's Department facilities service area will grow from 124,119 to 174,377, an increase of 50,258 persons.

#### Level of Service

The current (2005) level of service is adopted as the County's LOS standard for Sheriff's Department facilities. The future demand in facility space, based on the adopted LOS, is shown in **Table S-1**. There is no existing deficiency.

Table S-1
Future Demand Calculation

SF/functional population	Functional Pop Increase (2005- 20)	New Square Feet Demanded
0.2900	50,258	14,577

## Capacity to Serve New Growth

In **Table S-2** a single capital project is shown that will meet the future demand for Sheriff's Department facility space. Listed as "expansion," this project could take the form of an expansion of the existing facility space, or some other facility space provided at another site.

Table S-2
Future Sheriff's Office Facility Projects

Year	Functional Pop Increase	SF Demanded (annual)	Running Total: SF Demanded	Project	Square Feet
2005 2006 2007 2008 2009 2010 2011 2012 2013 2014 2015 2016 2017 2018 2019 2020	0 3,099 3,176 3,256 3,337 3,419 3,189 3,262 3,336 3,412 3,489 3,313 3,383 3,455 3,528 3,604	0 899 921 944 968 992 925 946 968 990 1,012 961 981 1,002 1,023 1,045	0 899 1,820 2,764 3,732 4,724 5,649 6,595 7,563 8,552 9,564 10,525 11,506 12,508 13,532 14,577	Expansion	15,000
					15,000

## Capital Project Costs

**Table S-3** presents the capital project cost related to the project in the previous table, as well as an identification of the impact fee eligible portions of the project. Since the project is slightly larger than required a small portion of the project is not currently impact fee eligible. This portion will serve new growth beyond 2020, and the currently non-eligible portion of the project cost can be recouped as an impact fee from that growth.

Table S-3
Project Costs to Meet Future Demand

Year	Project	Square Feet	Cost*	% for New Growth	New Growth Cost
2012	Expansion	15,000	\$2,760,000	97.18%	\$2,682,176

<sup>\*</sup>Based on an average construction cost of \$184 per square foot.

#### **Parks and Recreation Facilities**

#### Service Area

Demand for recreational facilities is almost exclusively related to the county's resident population. Businesses make some use of public parks for office events, company softball leagues, etc., but the use is minimal and considered incidental compared to that of the families and individuals who live in the county. Thus, a parks and recreation impact fee is limited to future residential growth. Park and recreation access within the city and/or county is not restricted to only "city" residents or only "county" residents, and so for parks and recreation services a service district is established county-wide.

#### **Projection of Needs**

Between 2005 and 2020, the number of dwelling units in the park facilities service area will grow from 28,783 to 39,733, an increase of 10,950 dwelling units.

#### Level of Service

The County has adopted a parks acreage level of service standard based on a desired LOS of 12 acres per 1,000 dwelling units. This adopted LOS for parks acreage is well below the current LOS (44.2 acres per 1,000 dwelling units), which is at least four times that of neighboring counties. Of the total existing acres of park land (1,272.3) only 345.4 is required to meet current needs at the adopted LOS. As a result there is a resulting excess capacity of 926.9 acres of park land. No new acres will need to be added to serve new growth and development.

Table PR-1 Future Demand Calculation

	Number of New	93
AC/1,000	Dwelling Units	
Dwelling Units	(2005-20)	Acres Demanded
12.0000	10,950	131.40

Adopted LOS per 1,000 Dwelling Units	New Components Demanded (2005-2020)		
0.654	7.2	Ball Fields	
0.069	1.0	Football Fields	
0.151	1.7	Gyms/Centers	
0.208	2.0	Basketball Courts	
0.302	3.3	Trails*	
0.025	0.3	Water Parks	

<sup>\*</sup>Includes multi-purpose, walking, and jogging trails.

The County has also adopted a developed component LOS based on a certain set of projects to be added to the system. Three ball fields, 1 football field, 2 gyms, 9 trails and 1 water park will be added to serve new growth to 2020. This results in an excess capacity of 4.2 ball fields and an existing deficiency in three developed component categories—gyms (0.3), trails (5.7), and water parks (0.7).

Table PR-1 shows the adopted LOS standards, as well as the calculation of future demand for park land and components. The cost to remedy the identified deficiencies is not impact fee eligible and is expected to be funded through general fund or SPLOST expenditures. The County is not presently including a recoupment of the capital investment associated with current excess capacity in its impact fee program.

## Capital Project Costs

Future developed component demand, and the costs associated with those projects, is shown in **Table PR-3**. (No park acreage has to be added to the current inventory since the future demand is met by the current excess capacity in the system.) In addition to cost estimates, this table reflects the existing deficiencies and identifies the portion of capital project costs that are impact fee eligible. No additional developed components are anticipated within the next five years; these facilities will be scheduled as appropriate to serve new growth as it occurs.

Table PR-3
Future Park Facility Costs

	Units to be Added (2005-			Existing	Net Demand for New	Net Cost to
Facility Type	2020)	Cost per Unit*	<b>Gross Cost</b>	Deficiency	Growth	New Growth
Ball Fields	3.0	\$341,000	\$1,023,000	0.0	3.0	\$1,023,000
Football Fields	1.0	\$462,000	\$462,000	0.0	1.0	\$462,000
Gyms/Centers	2.0	\$1,000,000	\$2,000,000	(0.3)	1.7	\$1,653,543
Basketball Courts	2.0	\$42,000	\$84,000	0.0	2.0	\$84,000
Trails	9.0	\$750,000	\$6,750,000	(5.7)	3.3	\$2,480,315
Water Parks	1.0	\$5,200,000	\$5,200,000	(0.7)	0.3	\$1,433,071
			\$15,519,000		•	\$7,135,929

<sup>\*</sup>Where available County cost estimates are shown; otherwise costs estimates are based on comparable facility costs.

## **Road Improvements**

#### Service Area

The road network of Rockdale County is considered in its entirety by the transportation model used to generate capacity data. Improvements in any part of the network improve capacity, to some measurable extent, throughout the network. For this reason, the entire county is considered a single service area for the purposes of impact fee calculations.

#### **Projection of Needs**

As the county continues to develop—converting vacant land into new development and redeveloping existing land uses—there will be a continuing need to maintain and upgrade the transportation network within the county. As part of this effort projects will be undertaken that provide new trip capacity on the road network that is intended to serve new growth. Future demand for road capacity is derived from, or taken directly from, the *Rockdale County Thoroughfares Plan* as modified and refined by the County; level of service calculations, as well as determination of need, are based on the County's transportation consultant's computer modeling process.

#### Level of Service

Level of service for roadways and intersections is measured on a 'letter grade' system that rates a road within a range of service from A to F. Level of service A is the best rating, representing unencumbered travel; level of service F is the worst rating, representing heavy congestion and long delays. This system is a means of relating the connection between speed and travel time, freedom to maneuver, traffic interruption, comfort, convenience and safety to the capacity that exists in a roadway. This refers to both a quantitative measure expressed as a service flow rate and an assigned qualitative measure describing parameters. The Highway Capacity Manual, Special Report 209, Transportation Research Board (1985), defines level of service A through F as having the following characteristics:

- LOS A: free flow, excellent level of freedom and comfort;
- 2. LOS B: stable flow, decline in freedom to maneuver, desired speed is relatively unaffected;
- 3. LOS C: stable flow, but marks the beginning of users becoming affected by others, selection of speed and maneuvering becomes difficult, comfort declines at this level;
- 4. LOS D: high density, but stable flow, speed and freedom to maneuver are severely restricted, poor level of comfort, small increases in traffic flow will cause operational problems;
- 5. LOS E: at or near capacity level, speeds reduced to low but uniform level, maneuvering is extremely difficult, comfort level poor, frustration high, level unstable; and
- 6. LOS F: forced/breakdown of flow. The amount of traffic approaching a point exceeds the amount that can transverse the point. Queues form, stop & go. Arrival flow exceeds discharge flow.

The traffic volume that produces different level of service grades differs according to road type, size, signalization, topography, condition and access. Post-improvement LOS conditions are based on the County's transportation consultant's computer modeling process.

The County's adopted level of service is based on Level of Service "D" for arterials and major collector roads. This level of service is used to calculate existing deficiencies through the transportation modeling process, and is reflected in projects that are less than 100% impact fee eligible. Impact cost calculation is based upon a list of road projects, themselves drawn from the *Rockdale County Thoroughfares Plan* and modified by the County.

## Capacity to Serve New Growth

Projects that provide road capacity intended to serve new growth to the year 2020 by road widening, new road construction or other capacity improvements have been identified by the County. Of these projects a sub-set of eight specific projects has been selected for impact fee funding. These projects are shown in **Table R-1**. Data on these projects is derived from the *Thoroughfares Plan*; total and local share project costs are shown.

Table R-1
Future Road Projects and Estimated Costs

Project ID	Project	Project Type	Total Cost	Local Cost
R-1 R-7 R-14	Abbott Road Ext. (Turner Rd to McDaniel) Dogwood Dr. Connector - Old Coving.) Old Coving.Hwy (Dekalb CL-Sigman)	New Road New Road Widening	\$5,364,787 \$2,660,000 \$3,195,000	\$2,000,000 \$1,580,000 \$700,000
R-18	E. Freeway Dr.E.(Old McD - Parker)	New Road	\$900,000	\$900,000
R-20 O-3 O-4	Sigman Road Ext.(I-20 to Turner Hill Rd) Klondike Rd. (Smyrna to Johnson) Smyrna Rd (Klondike to Iris)	New Road Widening Widening	\$6,050,000 \$3,131,000 \$3,190,000	\$1,825,000 \$925,000 \$1,900,000
0-11	Old Salem Connector	New Road	\$26,661,000	\$1,261,000
			\$51,151,787	\$11,091,000

Source: Rockdale County Thoroughfares Plan; additional data from Rockdale County Engineering Department.

In **Table R-2** figures are given for the current volumes and capacities of each of the road projects from Table R-1. These figures are derived from the transportation model used to create the *Thoroughfares Plan*, with further road count (current volume figure) refinements made by the County. The excess capacity represents the available road capacity, in terms of daily trips, not used by the current volume of traffic (average annual daily traffic). The existing deficiency figures shown here represent any situation where the current road is operating over capacity. For the majority of projects there is no current volume or capacity since these are new road projects.

Table R-2
Current Road Capacity and Deficiencies

Project ID	Current Volume	Current Capacity	Excess Capacity	Existing Deficiency
R-1	0	0	0	0
R-7	0	0	0	0
R-14	8,501	7,497	0	(1,004)
R-18	0	0	0	0
R-20	0	0	0	0
O-3	5,962	7,497	1,535	0
0-4	6,253	7,081	828	0
0-11	0	0	0	0

Source: The County's transportation consultant and the Atlanta Regional Commission, and further refined by the County.

The next step in these calculations is to identify the net added capacity after the road improvement project is completed. This post-improvement capacity is the added capacity for each project, less any existing deficiency. The future excess capacity—the added capacity—represents the portion of the project that serves new growth and is thus impact fee eligible. The net added capacity calculations are carried out in **Table R-3**. Since the County is not calculating a recoupment for existing excess capacity at this time, the added capacity figure is the only portion of the project that will be used to calculate the impact fee.

Table R-3
Post-Improvement Statistics

Project ID	Post- Improvement Capacity	Total New Capacity	Post- Improvement Deficiency	Post- Improvement ADDED Capacity	Added Capacity as % of Total New Capacity
R-1	7,497	7,497	0	7,497	100.00%
R-7	6,248	6,248	0	6,248	100.00%
R-14	14,161	6,664	0	5,660	84.93%
R-18	12,495	12,495	0	12,495	100.00%
R-20	14,161	14,161	0	14,161	100.00%
O-3	14,161	6,664	0	6,664	100.00%
0-4	13,328	6,248	0	6,248	100.00%
O-11	9,996	9,996	0	9,996	100.00%

## **Capital Project Costs**

In **Table R-4** the percentage figures from table R-3 are used to identify the impact fee eligible portion of the local project costs. Of the estimated total \$11.1 million in local costs for these projects, approximately \$11 million is impact fee eligible, out of a total of \$51.2 million.

Table R-4
Impact Fee Eligible Project Costs

Project ID	Total Cost	Local Cost	% Impact Fee Eligible	Impact Fee Eligible Local Cost	Non-eligible Local Cost
R-1	\$5,364,787	\$2,000,000	100.00%	\$2,000,000	\$0
R-7	\$2,660,000	\$1,580,000	100.00%	\$1,580,000	\$0
R-14	\$3,195,000	\$700,000	84.93%	\$594,538	\$105,462
R-18	\$900,000	\$900,000	100.00%	\$900,000	\$0
R-20	\$6,050,000	\$1,825,000	100.00%	\$1,825,000	\$0
O-3	\$3,131,000	\$925,000	100.00%	\$925,000	\$0
0-4	\$3,190,000	\$1,900,000	100.00%	\$1,900,000	\$0
O-11	\$26,661,000	\$1,261,000	100.00%	\$1,261,000	\$0
_	\$51,151,787	\$11,091,000		\$10,985,538	\$105,462

## **Exemption Policy**

Rockdale County recognizes that certain office, retail trade and industrial development projects provide extraordinary benefit in support of the economic advancement of the county's citizens over and above the access to jobs, goods and services that such uses offer in general. To encourage such development projects, the Board of Commissioners may consider granting a reduction in the impact fee for such a development project upon the determination and relative to the extent that the business or project represents extraordinary economic development and employment growth of public benefit to Rockdale County, in accordance with adopted exemption criteria. It is also recognized that the cost of system improvements otherwise foregone through exemption of any impact fee must be funded through revenue sources other than impact fees.

# ROCKDALE COUNTY COMPREHENSIVE LAND USE PLAN SHORT TERM WORK PROGRAM (2005–2009) AMENDMENT

Capital Project	Start Year	Responsible Party	Cost Estimate	Anticipated Funding Source(s)
Collection Materials Purchase	2006	Rockdale County, Library Board	\$118,223	State of Georgia, 72% Impact Fees, General Fund
Collection Materials Purchase	2007	Rockdale County, Library Board	\$121,339	State of Georgia, 73% Impact Fees, General Fund
Collection Materials Purchase	2008	Rockdale County, Library Board	\$124,454	State of Georgia, 73% Impact Fees, General Fund
Collection Materials Purchase	2009	Rockdale County, Library Board	\$127,733	State of Georgia, 73% Impact Fees, General Fund
New Fire Station: Klondike @ Starr Road Station	2006	Rockdale County, Fire Department	\$1,050,000	General Fund, SPLOST
New Fire Station: Smyrna Rd @ Hwy 212 Station	2008	Rockdale County, Fire Department	\$1,050,000	General Fund, SPLOST
New Fire Truck	2006	Rockdale County, Fire Department	\$350,000	General Fund, SPLOST
New Fire Truck	2007	Rockdale County, Fire Department	\$350,000	100% Impact Fees
New Fire Truck	2009	Rockdale County, Fire Department	\$350,000	100% Impact Fees
New Road: Abbott Road Ext. (Turner Rd to McDaniel)	2007	Rockdale County, GA DOT	\$5,364,787	GA DOT, 37% Impact Fees
New Road: Dogwood Dr. Connector - Old Coving.)	2008	Rockdale County, GA DOT	\$2,660,000	GA DOT, 59% Impact Fees
Road Widening: Old Coving.Hwy (Dekalb CL- Sigman)	2009	Rockdale County, GA DOT	\$3,195,000	GA DOT, General Fund, 19% Impact Fees