Capital Improvement Plan and Development Impact Fee Study

Final Report Submitted to:

Elmore County

August 25, 2022

Prepared by:

TischlerBise FISCAL | ECONOMIC | PLANNING
Galena CONSULTING

999 W Main Street
Suite 100
Boise, Idaho 83702
208.515.7480
www.tischlerbise.com

TischlerBiseGalena
999 W Main Street
Suite 100
Boise, Idaho 83702
208.515.7480

www.tischlerbise.com

2022 Capital Improvement Plan and Development Impact Fee Study
Elmore County

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Elmore County ("County") retained TischlerBiseGalena to prepare a Capital Improvement Plan and Development Impact Fee Study in order to meet the new demands generated by new development within the County. This report presents the methodology and calculation used to generate current levels of service and updated maximum supportable impact fees. It is intended to serve as supporting documentation for the evaluation and establishment of impact fees in the County.

The purpose of this study is to demonstrate the County's compliance with Idaho Statutes as authorized by the Idaho Legislature. Consistent with the authorization, it is the intent of the County to: (Idaho Code 67-8202(1-4))

1. Collect impact fees to ensure that adequate public facilities are available to serve new growth and development;
2. Promote orderly growth and development by establishing uniform standards by which local governments may require that those who benefit from new growth and development pay a proportionate share of the cost of new public facilities needed to serve new growth and development;
3. Establish minimum standards for the adoption of development impact fee ordinances by government entities;
4. Ensure that those who benefit from new growth and development are required to pay no more than their proportionate share of the cost of public facilities needed to serve new growth and development and to prevent duplicate and ad hoc development requirements;

Impact fees are one-time payments used to construct system improvements needed to accommodate new development. An impact fee represents new growth's fair share of capital facility needs. By law, impact fees can only be used for capital improvements, not operating or maintenance costs. Impact fees are subject to legal standards, which require fulfillment of three key elements: need, benefit and proportionality.

- First, to justify a fee for public facilities, it must be demonstrated that new development will create a need for capital improvements.
- Second, new development must derive a benefit from the payment of the fees (i.e., in the form of public facilities constructed within a reasonable timeframe).
- Third, the fee paid by a particular type of development should not exceed its proportional share of the capital cost for system improvements.

TischlerBiseGalena evaluated possible methodologies and documented appropriate demand indicators by type of development for the levels of service and fees. Local demographic data and improvement costs were used to identify specific capital costs attributable to growth. This report includes summary tables indicating the specific factors, referred to as level of service standards, used to derive the impact fees.

IDAHO DEVELOPMENT IMPACT FEE ENABLING LEGISLATION

The Enabling Legislation governs how development fees are calculated for municipalities in Idaho. All requirements of the Idaho Development Impact Fee Act have been met in the supporting documentation prepared by TischlerBiseGalena. There are four requirements of the Idaho Act that are not common in the development impact fee enabling legislation of other states. This overview offers further clarification of these unique requirements.

First, as specified in 67-8204(2) of the Idaho Act, "development impact fees shall be calculated on the basis of levels of service for public facilities . . . applicable to existing development as well as new growth and development."

Second, Idaho requires a Capital Improvements Plan (CIP) [see 67-8208]. The CIP requirements are summarized in this report, with detailed documentation provided in the discussion on infrastructure.

Third, the Idaho Act also requires documentation of any existing deficiencies in the types of infrastructure to be funded by development impact fees [see 67-8208(1)(a)]. The intent of this requirement is to prevent charging new development to cure existing deficiencies. In the context of development impact fees for the County, the term "deficiencies" means a shortage or inadequacy of current system improvements when measured against the levels of service to be applied to new development. It does not mean a shortage or inadequacy when measured against some "hoped for" level of service.

TischlerBiseGalena used the current infrastructure cost per service unit (i.e., existing standards), or future levels of service where appropriate, multiplied by the projected increase in service units over an appropriate planning timeframe, to yield the cost of growth-related system improvements. The relationship between these three variables can be reduced to a mathematical formula, expressed as A x B = C. In section 67-8204(16), the Idaho Act simply reorganizes this formula, stating the cost per service unit (i.e., development impact fee) may not exceed the cost of growth-related system improvements divided by the number of projected service units attributable to new development (i.e., A = C ÷ B). By using existing infrastructure standards to determine the need for growth-related capital improvements, the County ensures the same level-of-service standards are applicable to existing and new development. Using existing infrastructure standards also means there are no existing deficiencies in the current system that must be corrected from non-development impact fee funding.

Fourth, Idaho requires a proportionate share determination [see 67-8207]. Basically, local government must consider various types of applicable credits and/or other revenues that may reduce the capital costs attributable to new development. The development impact fee methodologies and the cash flow analysis have addressed the need for credits to avoid potential double payment for growth-related infrastructure.

SUMMARY OF CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN AND DEVELOPMENT IMPACT FEES

METHODOLOGIES AND CREDITS

Development impact fees can be calculated by any one of several legitimate methods. The choice of a particular method depends primarily on the service characteristics and planning requirements for each facility type. Each method has advantages and disadvantages in a particular situation, and to some extent can be interchangeable, because each allocates facility costs in proportion to the needs created by development.

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

- **Plan-Based Fee Calculation.** The plan-based method allocates costs for a specified set of improvements to a specified amount of development. Facility plans identify needed improvements, and land use plans identify development. In this method, the total cost of relevant facilities is divided by total demand to calculate a cost per unit of demand. Then, the cost per unit of demand is multiplied by the amount of demand per unit of development (e.g., housing units or square feet of building area) in each category to arrive at a cost per specific unit of development (e.g., single family detached unit).
- **Cost Recovery or Buy-In Fee Calculation.** The rationale for the cost recovery approach is that new development is paying for its share of the useful life and remaining capacity of facilities already built or land already purchased from which new growth will benefit. This methodology is often used for systems that were oversized such as sewer and water facilities.
- **Incremental Expansion Fee Calculation.** The incremental expansion method documents the current level of service (LOS) for each type of public facility in both quantitative and qualitative measures, based on an existing service standard (such as square feet per officer). This approach ensures that there are no existing infrastructure deficiencies or surplus capacity in infrastructure. New development is only paying its proportionate share for growth-related infrastructure. The level of service standards are determined in a manner similar to the current replacement cost approach used by property insurance companies. However, in contrast to insurance practices, the fee revenues would not be for renewal and/or replacement of existing facilities. Rather, revenue will be used to expand or provide additional facilities, as needed, to accommodate new development. An incremental expansion cost method is best suited for public facilities that will be expanded in regular increments, with LOS standards based on current conditions in the community.

- **Credits.** Regardless of the methodology, a consideration of "credits" is integral to the development of a legally valid impact fee methodology. There are two types of "credits," each with specific and distinct characteristics, but both of which should be addressed in the calculation of development impact fees. The first is a credit due to possible double payment situations. This could occur when contributions are made by the property owner toward the capital costs of the public facility covered by the impact fee. This type of credit is integrated into the impact fee calculation. The second is a credit toward the payment of a fee for dedication of public sites or improvements provided by the developer and for which the impact fee is imposed. This type of credit is addressed in the administration and implementation of a facility fee program.

Fee Methodology

Of the fee methodologies discussed above, the *plan-based* methodology is used to calculate impact fees for the County. A summary of impact fee components is provided below:

Figure 1: Summary of Impact Fee Methodology

Fee Category	Service Area	Incremental Expansion	Plan-Based	Cost Recovery	Cost Allocation
Jail	Countywide	n/a	Station Facilities, Vehicles and Apparatus, Equipment	n/a	Population, Nonresidential Vehicle Trips
Sheriff	Countywide	n/a	Station Facilities, Vehicles and Apparatus, Equipment	n/a	Population, Nonresidential Vehicle Trips
EMS	Countywide	n/a	Station Facilities, Vehicles and Apparatus, Equipment	n/a	Population, Nonresidential Vehicle Trips

General Overriding Assumptions

The County is in the unusual position of coordinating a master planned community with a developer in the Mayfield area, on the westernmost portion of the County. This community is large enough to change the proportional makeup of the County. Originally, TishlerBiseGalena had proposed creating a separate service area for this development, but after further review, it was determined that the addition of this community would not materially affect the Impact Fee calculations. As such, the Mayfield area has been included in this study as part of the County.

Additionally, in some Idaho jurisdictions, Sheriff impact fees are not collected by a city that also provides policing services, such as the City of Boise. The Sheriff provides complimentary services to those provided by the local police departments, including dispatch. Sheriff services are a countywide statutory requirement and collection of fees by all jurisdictions within the county is an industry best practice. As such, TischlerBiseGalena recommends that the Sheriff office impact fees be shared equally throughout the County.

Capital Improvement Plan - Sheriff

The County Sheriff impact fee contains components for additional station space and equipment. Functional population is used to determine residential and nonresidential proportionate share factors (i.e., how much of the current infrastructure serves residential or nonresidential land uses).

To serve projected growth over the next ten years, the following infrastructure investment is planned:

- 3,461 square feet of station space
- 17 new pieces of equipment
- Cost recovery for Impact Fee Study

Capital Improvement Plan - Jail

The County Jail impact fee contains components for relocated and additional jail space and additional equipment. Similar to Sheriff, functional population is used to determine residential and nonresidential proportionate share factors (i.e., how much of the current infrastructure serves residential or nonresidential land uses).

To serve projected growth over the next ten years, the following infrastructure investment is planned:

- 13,309 square feet of total Jail space
- 13 new pieces of officer gear for growth related positions
- Cost recovery for Impact Fee Study

Capital Improvement Plan – Emergency Medical Services ("EMS")

The County EMS impact fee contains components for additional station space, vehicles and apparatus, and equipment. Again, similar to Sheriff, functional population is used to determine residential and nonresidential proportionate share factors (i.e., how much of the current infrastructure serves residential or nonresidential land uses).

To serve projected growth over the next ten years, the following infrastructure investment is planned:

- 6,000 square feet of station space
- 1 Quick Response Vehicle
- 31 new pieces of equipment
- Cost recovery for Impact Fee Study

Maximum Supportable Development Impact Fees by Type of Land Use

Figure 2 provides a schedule of the maximum supportable development impact fees by type of land use for the County. The fees represent the highest supportable amount for each type of applicable land use, and represents new growth's fair share of the cost for capital facilities. The County may adopt fees that

are less than the amounts shown. However, a reduction in impact fee revenue will necessitate an increase in other revenues, a decrease in planned capital expenditures, and/or a decrease in levels of service.

The fees for residential development are to be assessed per housing unit. For nonresidential development, the fees are assessed per square foot of floor area. Nonresidential development categories are consistent with the terminology and definitions contained in the reference book, Trip Generation 11th Edition, published by the Institute of Transportation Engineers. These definitions are provided in the Appendix A. Land Use Definitions.

Figure 2: Summary of Maximum Supportable Development Impact Fees by Land Use

Development Type	Sheriff	Jail	EMS	Maximum Supportable Fee
Residential (per housing unit)				
Single Family	$275	$1,664	$426	$2,365
Multifamily	$207	$1,252	$320	$1,779
Nonresidential (per 1,000 square feet)				
Retail	$525	$3,254	$821	$4,600
Office	$202	$1,254	$316	$1,772
Industrial	$91	$563	$142	$796
Institutional	$201	$1,246	$314	$1,761

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

DEVELOPMENT IMPACT FEE ANALYSIS

METHODOLOGY

The County development impact fee includes three components: station expansion, vehicles/apparatus, and equipment. TischlerBiseGalena recommends a *plan-based* approach, based on current capital expansion plans. Per the Idaho Act, capital improvements are limited to those improvements that have a certain lifespan. As specified in 67-8203(3) of the Idaho Act, "'Capital improvements' means improvements with a useful life of ten (10) years or more, by new construction or other action, which increase the service capacity of a public facility."

The residential portion of the fee is derived from the product of persons per housing unit (by type of unit) multiplied by the net capital cost per person. The nonresidential portion is derived from the product of nonresidential vehicle trips per 1,000 square feet of nonresidential space multiplied by the net capital cost per vehicle trip.

Specified in Idaho Code 67-8209(2), local governments must consider historical, available, and alternative sources of funding for system improvements. Currently, there are no dedicated revenues being collected by the County to fund growth-related projects for County facilities. Furthermore, the maximum supportable impact fees are constructed to offset all growth-related capital costs for County facilities. Evidence is given in this chapter that the projected capital costs from new development will be entirely offset by the development impact fees. Thus, no general tax dollars are assumed to be used to fund growth-related capital costs, requiring no further revenue credits.

PROPORTIONATE SHARE

TischlerBiseGalena recommends functional population to allocate the cost of County infrastructure to residential and nonresidential development. Functional population is similar to what the U.S. Census Bureau calls "daytime population," by accounting for people living and working in a jurisdiction, but also considers commuting patterns and time spent at home and at nonresidential locations. OnTheMap is a web-based mapping and reporting application that shows where workers are employed and where they live. It describes geographic patterns of jobs by their employment locations and residential locations as well as the connections between the two locations. OnTheMap was developed through a unique partnership between the U.S. Census Bureau and its Local Employment Dynamics (LED) partner states. OnTheMap data is used, as shown in Figure 3, to derive Functional Population shares for County.

Residents that do not work are assigned 20 hours per day to residential development and 4 hours per day to nonresidential development (annualized averages). Residents that work in the County boundary are assigned 14 hours to residential development and 10 hours to nonresidential development. Residents that work outside the population centers are assigned 14 hours to residential development. Inflow commuters are assigned 10 hours to nonresidential development. Based on 2020 functional population data for the

County, the cost allocation for residential development is 79 percent while nonresidential development accounts for 21 percent of the demand for County facilities, apparatus and equipment.

Figure 3: Proportionate Share Factors

Elmore County, ID (2020)				
Residential			*Demand*	*Person*
Population*	26,273		*Hours/Day*	*Hours*
Residents Not Working		16,820	20	336,400
Employed Residents		9,453		
Employed in Elmore		3,968	14	55,552
Employed outside Elmore		5,485	14	76,790
		Residential Subtotal		468,742
		Residential Share =>		**79%**
Nonresidential				
Non-working Residents		16,820	4	67,280
Jobs Located in Elmore		6,060		
Residents Employed in Elmore		2,092	10	20,920
Non-Resident Workers (inflow commuters)		3,968	10	39,680
		Nonresidential Subtotal		127,880
		Nonresidential Share =>		**21%**
		TOTAL		596,622

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, OnTheMap 6.1.1 Application and LEHD Origin-Destination Employment Statistics.
* Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 2020 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates

SERVICE UNITS

Figure 4 displays the service units for residential and nonresidential land uses. For residential development, the service units are persons per housing unit by type of unit. For nonresidential development, the service units are average day nonresidential vehicle trips.

Figure 4: Elmore County Service Units

Residential (per housing unit)

Type of Housing Unit	Persons per Housing Unit*
Single-Family	2.18
Multi-Family	1.64

Nonresidential Development (per 1,000 square feet)

Type	Trips per 1,000 Sq. Ft.**	Trip Rate Adjustment	Adjusted Trips per 1,000 Sq. Ft.
Retail	37.01	38%	14.06
Office	10.84	50%	5.42
Industrial	4.87	50%	2.44
Institutional	10.77	50%	5.39

**Derived from the U.S. Census Bureau American Community*
***ITE Trrip Generation Rates, 11th Edition (2021)*

ELMORE COUNTY SHERIFF LEVEL OF SERVICE ANALYSIS

The following section details the level of service calculations for the County Sheriff.

STATION SPACE

As shown in Figure 5, the County Sheriff currently operates one headquarters, which totals 2,474 square feet and three substations, which total 4,623 square feet. The existing level of service for residential development is 0.21 square feet per person, and the nonresidential level of service is 0.07 square feet per nonresidential vehicle trip. This is determined by multiplying the total square footage by the proportionate share factors (79% for residential development and 21% for nonresidential development), and then dividing the respective totals by the current service units (27,342 persons for residential and 22,540 nonresidential vehicle trips).

Figure 5: Existing Level of Service for Sheriff Station Space

Facility	Square Feet
Headquarters	2,474
Substation MH	2,498
Substation Pine/Atlanta	1,981
Substation GF	144
Total	**7,097**

Level-of-Service Standards	Residential	Nonresidential
Proportionate Share	79%	21%
Share of Facility Square Feet	5,607	1,490
2021 Population/Nonres.Vehicle Trips	27,342	22,540
Square Feet per Person/Nonres. Trips	**0.21**	**0.07**

EQUIPMENT

As shown in Figure 6, the County Sheriff currently has 92 pieces of equipment. The existing level of service for residential development is 2.66 pieces of equipment for every 1,000 persons, and the nonresidential level of service is 0.86 pieces of equipment per 1,000 nonresidential vehicle trips. This is determined by multiplying the total equipment inventory by the proportionate share factors (79% for residential development and 21% for nonresidential development), and then dividing the respective totals by the current service units (27,342 persons for residential and 22,540 nonresidential vehicle trips) and multiplying by 1,000.

Figure 6: Existing Level of Service for Sheriff Equipment

Equipment	Total Units
Handguns	51
Rifles	9
Shotguns	5
Portable Radios	23
Dispatch Consoles	4
Total	**92**

Level-of-Service Standards	Residential	Nonresidential
Proportionate Share	79%	21%
Share of Equipment	72.68	19.32
2021 Population/Nonres.Vehicle Trips	27,342	22,540
Equipment per 1,000 Persons/Nonres. Trips	**2.66**	**0.86**

ELMORE COUNTY JAIL LEVEL OF SERVICE ANALYSIS

The following section details the level of service calculations for the County Jail.

FACILITY SPACE

As shown in Figure 7, the County currently operates one jail, which totals 26,182 square feet. The existing level of service for residential development is 0.76 square feet per person, and the nonresidential level of service is 0.24 square feet per nonresidential vehicle trip. This is determined by multiplying the total square footage by the proportionate share factors (79% for residential development and 21% for nonresidential development), and then dividing the respective totals by the current service units (27,342 persons for residential and 22,540 nonresidential vehicle trips).

Figure 7: Existing Level of Service for County Jail Space

Facility	Square Feet
Jail	26,182
Total	**26,182**

Level-of-Service Standards	Residential	Nonresidential
Proportionate Share	79%	21%
Share of Facility Square Feet	20,684	5,498
2021 Population/Nonres.Vehicle Trips	27,342	22,540
Square Feet per Person/Nonres. Trips	**0.76**	**0.24**

EQUIPMENT

As shown in Figure 8, the County Jail currently has 96 pieces of equipment. The existing level of service for residential development is 2.77 pieces of equipment for every 1,000 persons, and the nonresidential level of service is 0.89 pieces of equipment per 1,000 nonresidential vehicle trips. This is determined by multiplying the total equipment inventory by the proportionate share factors (79% for residential development and 21% for nonresidential development), and then dividing the respective totals by the current service units (27,342 persons for residential and 22,540 nonresidential vehicle trips) and multiplying by 1,000.

Figure 8: Existing Level of Service for County Jail Equipment

Equipment	Total Units
Handguns	24
Rifles	24
Shotguns	24
Portable Radios	24
Total	**96**

Level-of-Service Standards	Residential	Nonresidential
Proportionate Share	79%	21%
Share of Equipment	75.84	20.16
2021 Population/Nonres.Vehicle Trips	27,342	22,540
Equipment per 1,000 Persons/Nonres. Trips	**2.77**	**0.89**

ELMORE COUNTY EMS LEVEL OF SERVICE ANALYSIS

The following section details the level of service calculations for the County EMS.

STATION SPACE

As shown in Figure 9, the County EMS currently operates three stations, which total 12,600 square feet. The existing level of service for residential development is 0.36 square feet per person, and the nonresidential level of service is 0.12 square feet per nonresidential vehicle trip. This is determined by multiplying the total square footage by the proportionate share factors (79% for residential development and 21% for nonresidential development), and then dividing the respective totals by the current service units (27,342 persons for residential and 22,540 nonresidential vehicle trips).

Figure 9: Existing Level of Service for EMS Station Space

Facility	Square Feet
Main Station	7,800
Glenns Ferry Station	1,800
Pine Station	3,000
Total	**12,600**

Level-of-Service Standards	**Residential**	**Nonresidential**
Proportionate Share	79%	21%
Share of Facility Square Feet	9,954	2,646
2021 Population/Nonres.Vehicle Trips	27,342	22,540
Square Feet per Person/Nonres. Trips	**0.36**	**0.12**

VEHICLES/APPARATUS

As shown in Figure 10, the County EMS currently has 8 pieces of apparatus. The existing level of service for residential development is 0.23 pieces of apparatus per 1,000 persons, and the nonresidential level of service is 0.07 pieces of apparatus per 1,000 nonresidential vehicle trips. This is determined by multiplying the total apparatus inventory by the proportionate share factors (79% for residential development and 21% for nonresidential development), and then dividing the respective totals by the current service units (27,342 persons for residential and 22,540 nonresidential vehicle trips) and then multiplying that amount by 1,000.

Figure 10: Existing Level of Service for EMS Vehicles/Apparatus

Apparatus	Total Units
Quick Response Units	2
Heavy Rescue	2
Medical Rescue	4
Total	**8**

Level-of-Service Standards	Residential	Nonresidential
Proportionate Share	79%	21%
Share of Apparatus	6.32	1.68
2021 Population/Nonres.Vehicle Trips	27,342	22,540
Apparatus per 1,000 Persons/Nonres. Trips	**0.23**	**0.07**

EQUIPMENT

As shown in Figure 11, the County currently has 57 pieces of equipment. The existing level of service for residential development is 1.65 pieces of equipment for every 1,000 persons, and the nonresidential level of service is 0.53 pieces of equipment per 1,000 nonresidential vehicle trips. This is determined by multiplying the total equipment inventory by the proportionate share factors (79% for residential development and 21% for nonresidential development), and then dividing the respective totals by the current service units (27,342 persons for residential and 22,540 nonresidential vehicle trips) and multiplying by 1,000.

Figure 11: Existing Level of Service for EMS Equipment

Equipment	Total Units
Stryker Systems	5
Zoll Monitors	7
Portable Radios	28
ATV - Automatic Transport Ventilator	5
Saphire Infusion Pumps	6
CradlePoint	6
Total	**57**

Level-of-Service Standards	Residential	Nonresidential
Proportionate Share	79%	21%
Share of Equipment	45.03	11.97
2021 Population/Nonres.Vehicle Trips	27,342	22,540
Equipment per 1,000 Persons/Nonres. Trips	**1.65**	**0.53**

ANTICIPATED SHIFT IN RESIDENTIAL/NONRESIDENTIAL MIX

As stated previously, development in the Mayfield area is anticipated to shift the mixture of residential and nonresidential uses. The proposed residential development in the area is projected to shift the residential share of the total county upward from 79% to 85% and the nonresidential share downward from 21% to 15%. This new mix was used to calculate the level of service for all forward-facing capital improvement projects. To ensure that new development is not paying to elevate the overall level of service in the County, we compared each component of the Capital Improvement Plan to the existing level of service and then aggregated all of the components. There were instances where one component was higher than the existing level of service but, in total and when fully executed, the Capital Improvement Plan would not exceed the existing level of service for the County.

PLANNED GROWTH-RELATED INFRASTRUCTURE IMPROVEMENTS – ELMORE COUNTY SHERIFF

PLANNED SHERIFF STATION SPACE

The County Sheriff plans on building three substations in Mayfield, Prairie and Glenns Ferry, in an effort to meet anticipated growth in those areas. Additionally, expansion of both their headquarters and the Pine/Atlanta substation is anticipated to service the growth that is projected to occur in those areas. As shown in Figure 12, the County anticipates that approximately 3,461 square feet of building space at an estimated cost of $1.7 million, would be sufficient through the year 2031. This would include a building footprint of approximately 980 square feet, with an estimated cost of $490,000 for Mayfield, 320 square feet and an estimated cost of $160,000 for Prairie, and 800 square feet and an estimated cost of $400,000 for Glenns Ferry. As shown in Figure 12, residential new development is being charged for a level of service that is slightly below that which currently exists in the County. For example, as shown previously in Figure 5, the existing level of service per person is 0.21 square feet, compared to 0.20 square feet per person for the impact fee calculation. Additionally, nonresidential development is being charged for a level of service that is lower than what currently exists in the County. The existing level of service per nonresidential vehicle trip is 0.07 square feet, compared to 0.06 square feet per nonresidential vehicle trip for the impact fee calculation.

As shown in Figure 12, the cost per residential and nonresidential service unit is determined by multiplying the planned square footage (3,461) by the proportionate share factors (85% for residential and 15% for nonresidential), and then dividing the respective totals by the projected increase in service units through the year 2031 (14,918 persons and 8,822 nonresidential vehicle trips). When the resulting residential and nonresidential levels of service (0.20 square feet per person and 0.06 square feet per nonresidential trip) are compared to the cost per square foot ($500), the resulting cost per service units are $100 per person and $30 per nonresidential vehicle trip.

Figure 12: Planned Sheriff Station Infrastructure and Cost per Service Unit

Facility	Square Feet	Cost per Square Foot	Estimated Cost
Headquarters	861	$500	$430,500
Substation Pine/Atlanta	500	$500	$250,000
Substation Mayfield	980	$500	$490,000
Substation Glenns Ferry	800	$500	$400,000
Substation Prairie	320	$500	$160,000
Total	**3,461**	**$500**	**$1,730,500**

Level-of-Service Standards	**Residential**	**Nonresidential**
Proportionate Share	85%	15%
Share of Facility Square Feet	2,942	519
Projected 2031 Population/Nonres.Vehicle Trips	14,918	8,822
Square Feet per Person/Nonres. Trips	**0.20**	**0.06**

Cost Analysis	**Residential**	**Nonresidential**
Square Feet per Person/Nonres. Trips	0.20	0.06
Average Cost per Square Foot	$500	$500
Capital Cost Per Person/Nonres. Trip	**$100**	**$30**

PLANNED SHERIFF EQUIPMENT

To complement both new and expanded stations, the County plans on purchasing 17 pieces of new equipment. As shown in Figure 13, the estimated cost of the equipment is $445,766. Similar to the planned stations, the County estimates the equipment will be sufficient through the year 2031. To ensure new development is not paying to elevate the level of service in the County, we compared the number of planned equipment (17 pieces) to the increase in residential and nonresidential service units through 2031. As shown in Figure 13, new development is actually being charged for a significantly lower level of service than what currently exists in the County. For example, as shown previously in Figure 6, the existing level of service per 1,000 persons is 2.66 equipment units, compared to 0.95 equipment units per 1,000 persons for the impact fee calculation.

As shown in Figure 13, the cost per residential and nonresidential service unit is determined by multiplying the planned equipment (17) by the proportionate share factors (85% for residential and 15% for nonresidential), and then dividing the respective totals by the projected increase in service units through the year 2031 (14,918 persons and 8,822 nonresidential vehicle trips). When the resulting residential and nonresidential levels of service (0.95 equipment units per 1,000 persons and 0.28 equipment units per 1,000 nonresidential trip) are compared to the weighted average cost per equipment ($26,693), the resulting cost per service units are $25 per person and $7 per nonresidential vehicle trip.

Figure 13: Planned Sheriff Equipment and Cost per Service Unit

Equipment	Total Units	Cost per Unit	Estimated Cost
Dispatch Consoles	3	$101,250	$303,750
New Officer Gear	8	$2,270	$18,164
Mayfield Dispatch Consoles	1	$112,500	$112,500
Mayfield New Officer Gear	5	$2,270	$11,352
Total	**17**	**$26,693**	**$445,766**

Level-of-Service Standards	Residential	Nonresidential
Proportionate Share	85%	15%
Share of Equipment	14.20	2.51
Projected 2031 Population/Nonres.Vehicle Trips	14,918	8,822
Equipment per 1,000 Persons/Nonres. Trips	**0.95**	**0.28**

Cost Analysis	Residential	Nonresidential
Equipment per 1,000 Persons/Nonres. Trips	0.95	0.28
Average Cost per Unit	$26,693	$26,693
Capital Cost Per Person/Nonres. Trip	**$25**	**$7**

Cost to Prepare Development Impact Fee Report

The cost to prepare the Capital Improvement Plan and Development Impact Fee Report totals $10,000. The County will need to update its report every five years. Based on this cost, proportionate share, and five-year projections of new residential and nonresidential development from the Appendix B (Demographic Assumptions), the cost is $1.24 per person and $0.35 per nonresidential vehicle trip.

Figure 14: Cost to Prepare Development Impact Fee Report

Component	*Cost*	*Demand Indicator*	*Proportionate Share*	*Cost Allocation*				Cost per Demand Unit Increase
				Units	*2022*	*2027*	*Increase*	
Sheriff	$10,000	Residential	85%	Population	28,311	35,159	6,849	**$1.24**
		Nonresidential	15%	Vehicle Trips	23,287	27,513	4,225	**$0.35**

PLANNED GROWTH-RELATED INFRASTRUCTURE IMPROVEMENTS – ELMORE COUNTY JAIL

Planned County Jail Facilities

The current County Jail is at capacity and the location will not allow for expansion. As such, the County plans on building a new Jail facility, in a new location. The cost for this facility has been segmented into growth and non-growth-related funding components. As shown in Figure 15, the County anticipates that the growth portion of the building footprint would be approximately 7,855 square feet, with an estimated cost of $7,854,600 along with an additional 5,455 square feet at an estimated cost of $5,454,583 related to the Mayfield area development. The County believes this would be sufficient through the year 2031 and intends to fund the remainder of the jail facility from other sources. As shown in Figure 15, residential

new development is being charged for a level of service that is equivalent to what currently exists in the County. For example, as shown previously in Figure 7, the existing level of service per person is 0.76 square feet, compared to 0.76 square feet per person for the impact fee calculation. Additionally, nonresidential development is also being charged for a level of service commensurate with that which currently exists in the County. The existing level of service per nonresidential vehicle trip is 0.24 square feet, compared to 0.23 square feet per nonresidential vehicle trip for the impact fee calculation.

As shown in Figure 15, the cost per residential and nonresidential service unit is determined by multiplying the planned square footage (13,309) by the proportionate share factors (85% for residential and 15% for nonresidential), and then dividing the respective totals by the projected increase in service units through the year 2031 (14,918 persons and 8,822 nonresidential vehicle trips). When the resulting residential and nonresidential levels of service (0.76 square feet per person and 0.23 square feet per nonresidential trip) are compared to the cost per square foot ($1,000), the resulting cost per service units are $760 per person and $230 per nonresidential vehicle trip.

Figure 15: Planned County Jail Facility Infrastructure and Cost per Service Unit

Facility	Square Feet	Cost per Square Foot	Estimated Cost
Jail	7,855	$1,000	$7,854,600
Jail - Mayfield Impact	5,455	$1,000	$5,454,583
Total	**13,309**	**$1,000**	**$13,309,183**

Level-of-Service Standards	**Residential**	**Nonresidential**
Proportionate Share	85%	15%
Share of Facility Square Feet	11,313	1,996
Projected 2031 Population/Nonres.Vehicle Trips	14,918	8,822
Square Feet per Person/Nonres. Trips	**0.76**	**0.23**

Cost Analysis	**Residential**	**Nonresidential**
Square Feet per Person/Nonres. Trips	0.76	0.23
Average Cost per Square Foot	$1,000	$1,000
Capital Cost Per Person/Nonres. Trip	**$760**	**$230**

PLANNED COUNTY JAIL EQUIPMENT

To complement the new jail, the County plans on purchasing officer gear for the newly hired staff necessary to maintain service levels. As shown in Figure 16, the estimated cost of the equipment is $29,900. Similar to the planned jail facility, the County estimates the equipment will be sufficient through the year 2031. To ensure new development is not paying to elevate the level of service in the County, we compared the number of planned equipment (13 pieces) to the increase in residential and nonresidential service units through 2031. As shown in Figure 16, similar to station space new development is actually being charged for a significantly lower level of service than what currently exists in the County. For example, as shown previously in Figure 8, the existing level of service per 1,000 persons is 2.77 equipment units, compared to 0.74 equipment units per 1,000 persons for the impact fee calculation.

As shown in Figure 16, the cost per residential and nonresidential service unit is determined by multiplying the planned equipment (13) by the proportionate share factors (85% for residential and 15% for nonresidential), and then dividing the respective totals by the projected increase in service units through the year 2031 (14,918 persons and 8,822 nonresidential vehicle trips). When the resulting residential and nonresidential levels of service (0.74 equipment units per 1,000 persons and 0.22 equipment units per 1,000 nonresidential trip) are compared to the weighted average cost per equipment ($2,300), the resulting cost per service units are $2 per person and $1 per nonresidential vehicle trip.

Figure 16: Planned County Jail Equipment and Cost per Service Unit

Equipment	Total Units	Cost per Unit	Estimated Cost
New Officer Gear	8	$2,300	$18,400
New Officer Gear - Mayfield	5	$2,300	$11,500
Total	**13**	**$2,300**	**$29,900**

Level-of-Service Standards	**Residential**	**Nonresidential**
Proportionate Share	85%	15%
Share of Equipment	11.05	1.95
Projected 2031 Population/Nonres.Vehicle Trips	14,918	8,822
Equipment per 1,000 Persons/Nonres. Trips	**0.74**	**0.22**

Cost Analysis	**Residential**	**Nonresidential**
Equipment per 1,000 Persons/Nonres. Trips	0.74	0.22
Average Cost per Unit	$2,300	$2,300
Capital Cost Per Person/Nonres. Trip	**$2**	**$1**

Cost to Prepare Development Impact Fee Report

The cost to prepare the Capital Improvement Plan and Development Impact Fee Report totals $10,000. The County will need to update its report every five years. Based on this cost, proportionate share, and five-year projections of new residential and nonresidential development from the Appendix B (Demographic Assumptions), the cost is $1.24 per person and $0.35 per nonresidential vehicle trip.

Figure 17: Cost to Prepare Development Impact Fee Report

Component	*Cost*	*Demand Indicator*	*Proportionate Share*	*Cost Allocation*				Cost per Demand Unit Increase
				Units	*2022*	*2027*	*Increase*	
Jail	$10,000	Residential	85%	Population	28,311	35,159	6,849	**$1.24**
		Nonresidential	15%	Vehicle Trips	23,287	27,513	4,225	**$0.35**

PLANNED GROWTH-RELATED INFRASTRUCTURE IMPROVEMENTS – ELMORE COUNTY EMS

PLANNED EMS STATIONS

The County, along with the City of Mountain Home, plan on co-locating the construction of a building in the western portion of Mountain Home for joint Fire and EMS delivery. Additionally, the County plans on building a new station in Mayfield, and an expansion of the Glenns Ferry and Pine stations, to service the growth that is projected to occur in those areas. As shown in Figure 18, the County anticipates that a building footprint of approximately 1,600 square feet, with an estimated cost of $720,000 for each of the two new stations, along with 2,800 total square feet of expansions at an estimated cost of $1.26 million, would be sufficient through the year 2031. As shown in Figure 18, residential new development is being charged for a level of service that is below that which currently exists in the County. For example, as shown previously in Figure 9, the existing level of service per person is 0.36 square feet, compared to 0.34 square feet per person for the impact fee calculation. Additionally, nonresidential development is being charged for a level of service that is lower than what currently exists in the County. The existing level of service per nonresidential vehicle trip is 0.12 square feet, compared to 0.10 square feet per nonresidential vehicle trip for the impact fee calculation.

As shown in Figure 18, the cost per residential and nonresidential service unit is determined by multiplying the planned square footage (6,000) by the proportionate share factors (85% for residential and 15% for nonresidential), and then dividing the respective totals by the projected increase in service units through the year 2031 (14,918 persons and 8,822 nonresidential vehicle trips). When the resulting residential and nonresidential levels of service (0.34 square feet per person and 0.10 square feet per nonresidential trip) are compared to the cost per square foot ($450), the resulting cost per service units are $153 per person and $45 per nonresidential vehicle trip.

Figure 18: Planned EMS Station Infrastructure and Cost per Service Unit

Facility	Square Feet	Cost per Square Foot	Estimated Cost
Mountain Home West Station	1,600	$450	$720,000
Glenns Ferry Station	1,400	$450	$630,000
Pine Station	1,400	$450	$630,000
Mayfield EMS Station	1,600	$450	$720,000
Total	**6,000**	**$450**	**$2,700,000**

Level-of-Service Standards	**Residential**	**Nonresidential**
Proportionate Share	85%	15%
Share of Facility Square Feet	5,100	900
Projected 2031 Population/Nonres.Vehicle Trips	14,918	8,822
Square Feet per Person/Nonres. Trips	**0.34**	**0.10**

Cost Analysis	**Residential**	**Nonresidential**
Square Feet per Person/Nonres. Trips	0.34	0.10
Average Cost per Square Foot	$450	$450
Capital Cost Per Person/Nonres. Trip	**$153**	**$45**

PLANNED EMS VEHICLES/APPARATUS

To compliment the planned Mayfield station, the County plans on purchasing 1 additional piece of apparatus - a quick response unit. As shown in Figure 19, the estimated cost of the apparatus is $250,000. Similar to the planned station, the County estimates the apparatus will be sufficient through the year 2031. To ensure new development is not paying to elevate the level of service in the County, we compared the number of planned apparatus (1 pieces) to the increase in residential and nonresidential service units through 2031. As shown in Figure 19, similar to station space new development is actually being charged for a substantially lower level of service than what currently exists in the County. For example, as shown previously in Figure 10,the existing level of service per 1,000 persons is 0.23 vehicles/apparatus, compared to 0.06 vehicles/apparatus per 1,000 persons for the impact fee calculation.

As shown in Figure 19, the cost per residential and nonresidential service unit is determined by multiplying the planned apparatus (1) by the proportionate share factors (85% for residential and 15% for nonresidential), and then dividing the respective totals by the projected increase in service units through the year 2031 (14,918 persons and 8,822 nonresidential vehicle trips). When the resulting residential and nonresidential levels of service 0.06 vehicles/apparatus per 1,000 persons and 0.02 apparatus per 1,000 nonresidential trips) are compared to the weighted average cost per apparatus ($250,000), the resulting cost per service units are $15 per person and $5 per nonresidential vehicle trip.

Figure 19: Planned EMS Vehicles/Apparatus and Cost per Service Unit

Apparatus	Total Units	Cost per Vehicle	Estimated Cost
Mayfield Quick Response Units	1	$250,000	$250,000
Total	**1**	**$250,000**	**$250,000**

Level-of-Service Standards	**Residential**	**Nonresidential**
Proportionate Share	85%	15%
Share of Apparatus	0.85	0.15
Projected 2031 Population/Nonres.Vehicle Trips	14,918	8,822
Apparatus per 1,000 Persons/Nonres. Trips	**0.06**	**0.02**

Cost Analysis	**Residential**	**Nonresidential**
Apparatus per 1,000 Persons/Nonres. Trips	0.06	0.02
Average Cost per Unit	$250,000	$250,000
Capital Cost Per Person/Nonres. Trip	**$15**	**$5**

PLANNED EMS EQUIPMENT

Again, to complement both the new and expanded stations and additional vehicles, the County plans on purchasing multiple pieces of equipment. As shown in Figure 20, the estimated cost of the equipment is $449,400. Similar to the planned station, the County estimates the equipment will be sufficient through the year 2031. To ensure new development is not paying to elevate the level of service in the County, we

compared the number of planned equipment (31 pieces) to the increase in residential and nonresidential service units through 2031. As shown in Figure 20, new development is actually being charged for a slightly higher level of service than what currently exists in the County. For example, as shown previously in Figure 11, the existing level of service per 1,000 persons is 1.65 equipment units, compared to 1.77 equipment units per 1,000 persons for the impact fee calculation. As stated earlier in this report, when viewed from a systemwide approach, this slight increase in equipment service levels is more than offset by the reduced service levels in apparatus, especially when comparing the average costs per unit for apparatus at $250,000 versus $14,497 for equipment.

As shown in Figure 20, the cost per residential and nonresidential service unit is determined by multiplying the planned equipment (31) by the proportionate share factors (85% for residential and 15% for nonresidential), and then dividing the respective totals by the projected increase in service units through the year 2031 (14,918 persons and 8,822 nonresidential vehicle trips). When the resulting residential and nonresidential levels of service (1.77 equipment units per 1,000 persons and 0.53 equipment units per 1,000 nonresidential trip) are compared to the weighted average cost per equipment ($14,497), the resulting cost per service units are $26 per person and $8 per nonresidential vehicle trip.

Figure 20: Planned EMS Equipment and Cost per Service Unit

Equipment	Total Units	Cost per Unit	Estimated Cost
Stryker Systems	4	$45,000	$180,000
Zoll Monitors	4	$32,000	$128,000
Portable Radios	6	$1,200	$7,200
ATV - Automatic Transport Ventilator	4	$4,500	$18,000
Saphire Infusion Pumps	4	$3,500	$14,000
CradlePoint	4	$4,000	$16,000
Mayfield Stryker Systems	1	$45,000	$45,000
Mayfield Zoll Monitors	1	$32,000	$32,000
Mayfield Portable Radios	1	$1,200	$1,200
Mayfield ATV - Automatic Transport Ventilator	1	$4,500	$4,500
Mayfield Saphire Infusion Pumps	1	$3,500	$3,500
Total	**31**	**$14,497**	**$449,400**

Level-of-Service Standards	**Residential**	**Nonresidential**
Proportionate Share	85%	15%
Share of Equipment	26.35	4.65
Projected 2031 Population/Nonres.Vehicle Trips	14,918	8,822
Equipment per 1,000 Persons/Nonres. Trips	**1.77**	**0.53**

Cost Analysis	**Residential**	**Nonresidential**
Equipment per 1,000 Persons/Nonres. Trips	1.77	0.53
Average Cost per Unit	$14,497	$14,497
Capital Cost Per Person/Nonres. Trip	**$26**	**$8**

Cost to Prepare Development Impact Fee Report

The cost to prepare the Capital Improvement Plan and Development Impact Fee Report totals $10,000. The County will need to update its report every five years. Based on this cost, proportionate share, and five-year projections of new residential and nonresidential development from the Appendix B (Demographic Assumptions), the cost is $1.24 per person and $0.35 per nonresidential vehicle trip.

Figure 21: Cost to Prepare Development Impact Fee Report

Component	Cost	Demand Indicator	Proportionate Share	Cost Allocation				Cost per Demand Unit Increase
				Units	2022	2027	Increase	
EMS	$10,000	Residential	85%	Population	28,311	35,159	6,849	**$1.24**
		Nonresidential	15%	Vehicle Trips	23,287	27,513	4,225	**$0.35**

INPUT VARIABLES AND DEVELOPMENT IMPACT FEES

COUNTY SHERIFF VARIABLES AND IMPACT FEES

Cost factors for County Sheriff facilities, equipment, and professional services are summarized at the top of Figure 22. The residential impact fees are calculated by multiplying the $126 cost per person by the service unit ratios (persons per housing unit) for each housing type. Nonresidential development fees are calculated by multiplying the $37 per nonresidential vehicle trip by the average weekday vehicle trips per 1,000 square feet ratios and the trip adjustment factors for each development type.

Figure 22: Elmore County Sheriff Maximum Supportable Impact Fees

	Proposed Fees	
Fee Component	**Cost per Person**	**Cost per Nonres. Vehicle Trips**
Sheriff Stations	$100.00	$30.00
Sheriff Vehicles and Apparatus	$0.00	$0.00
Sheriff Equipment	$25.00	$7.00
Cost of Impact Fee Study	$1.24	$0.35
Gross Total	$126.24	$37.35
Net Total	**$126.24**	**$37.35**

Residential

Housing Type	Persons per Housing Unit	Maximum Supportable Fee per Unit
Single Family	2.18	**$275**
Multifamily	1.64	**$207**

Nonresidential

Development Type	Trips per 1,000 Sq. Ft.	Maximum Supportable Fee per 1,000 Sq. Ft.
Retail	14.06	**$525**
Office	5.42	**$202**
Industrial	2.44	**$91**
Institutional	5.39	**$201**

COUNTY JAIL VARIABLES AND IMPACT FEES

Cost factors for County Jail facilities, equipment, and professional services are summarized at the top of Figure 23. The residential impact fees are calculated by multiplying the $763 cost per person by the service unit ratios (persons per housing unit) for each housing type. Nonresidential development fees are calculated by multiplying the $231 per nonresidential vehicle trip by the average weekday vehicle trips per 1,000 square feet ratios and the trip adjustment factors for each development type.

Figure 23: Elmore County Jail Maximum Supportable Impact Fees

Fee Component	Proposed Fees	
	Cost per Person	Cost per Nonres. Vehicle Trips
Jail	$760.00	$230.00
Jail Vehicles and Apparatus	$0.00	$0.00
Jail Equipment	$2.00	$1.00
Cost of Impact Fee Study	$1.24	$0.35
Gross Total	$763.24	$231.35
Net Total	**$763.24**	**$231.35**

Residential

Housing Type	Persons per Housing Unit	Maximum Supportable Fee per Unit
Single Family	2.18	**$1,664**
Multifamily	1.64	**$1,252**

Nonresidential

Development Type	Trips per 1,000 Sq. Ft.	Maximum Supportable Fee per 1,000 Sq. Ft.
Retail	14.06	**$3,254**
Office	5.42	**$1,254**
Industrial	2.44	**$563**
Institutional	5.39	**$1,246**

COUNTY EMS VARIABLES AND IMPACT FEES

Cost factors for County facilities, apparatus, and professional services are summarized at the top of Figure 24. The residential impact fees are calculated by multiplying the $195 cost per person by the service unit ratios (persons per housing unit) for each housing type. Nonresidential development fees are calculated by multiplying the $58 per nonresidential vehicle trip by the average weekday vehicle trips per 1,000 square feet ratios and the trip adjustment factors for each development type.

Figure 24: Elmore County EMS Maximum Supportable Impact Fees

Fee Component	Proposed Fees	
	Cost per Person	Cost per Nonres. Vehicle Trips
EMS Stations	$153.00	$45.00
EMS Vehicles and Apparatus	$15.00	$5.00
EMS Equipment	$26.00	$8.00
Cost of Impact Fee Study	$1.24	$0.35
Gross Total	$195.24	$58.35
Net Total	**$195.24**	**$58.35**

Residential

Housing Type	Persons per Housing Unit	Maximum Supportable Fee per Unit
Single Family	2.18	**$426**
Multifamily	1.64	**$320**

Nonresidential

Development Type	Trips per 1,000 Sq. Ft.	Maximum Supportable Fee per 1,000 Sq. Ft.
Retail	14.06	**$821**
Office	5.42	**$316**
Industrial	2.44	**$142**
Institutional	5.39	**$314**

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLANS

The following section provides a summary of the Capital Improvement Plans depicting growth-related capital demands and costs on which the County impact fees are based.

First, Figure 25 lists the projected growth over the next ten years in the County. Overall, there is about a 34 percent increase is residential development (14,918 new residents and 7,242 new housing units) and a 162 percent increase in nonresidential development (2,870 new jobs and 1.34 million square feet of development).

Figure 25: Ten-Year Projected Residential and Nonresidential Growth

Elmore County, ID	Base Year 2021	1 2022	2 2023	3 2024	4 2025	5 2026	6 2027	7 2028	8 2029	9 2030	10 2031	Total Increase
Population [1]	27,342	28,311	29,280	30,248	31,217	33,188	35,159	37,131	39,102	41,073	42,260	**14,918**
Housing Units by Type [2]												
Single Family	10,981	11,373	11,765	12,157	12,549	13,363	14,177	14,991	15,805	16,619	17,096	**6,115**
Multifamily	2,060	2,133	2,206	2,279	2,352	2,501	2,650	2,799	2,948	3,097	3,187	**1,127**
Total Housing Units	13,041	13,506	13,971	14,436	14,901	15,864	16,827	17,790	18,753	19,716	20,283	**7,242**
Jobs [3]												
Retail	1,995	2,061	2,131	2,204	2,280	2,359	2,442	2,530	2,622	2,704	2,788	**793**
Office	596	616	637	658	681	705	730	756	783	808	833	**237**
Industrial	2,224	2,299	2,376	2,457	2,542	2,630	2,723	2,821	2,924	3,015	3,109	**885**
Institutional	2,593	2,675	2,760	2,848	2,939	3,033	3,129	3,229	3,332	3,438	3,547	**955**
Total Jobs	7,407	7,651	7,904	8,167	8,441	8,726	9,024	9,335	9,661	9,964	10,277	**2,870**
Nonresidential Floor Area (1,000 sq. ft.) [4]												
Retail	939	971	1,004	1,038	1,074	1,111	1,150	1,192	1,235	1,273	1,313	**374**
Office	183	189	195	202	209	216	224	232	240	248	256	**73**
Industrial	1,417	1,464	1,514	1,565	1,619	1,675	1,735	1,797	1,862	1,920	1,980	**564**
Institutional	907	936	966	997	1,029	1,061	1,095	1,130	1,166	1,203	1,242	**334**
Total Floor Area	3,447	3,561	3,679	3,802	3,930	4,064	4,204	4,350	4,504	4,645	4,791	**1,344**

[1] Population growth is based on housing development and persons per housing unit factors
[2] Five-year average of building permits is assumed to continue over the next ten years
[3] Source: American Census Bureau OnTheMap
[4] Source: TischlerBise analysis; Institute of Transportation Engineers, Trip Generation, 2021

The Idaho Development Fee Act requires Capital Improvement Plans to be updated regularly, at least once every five years (Idaho Code 67-8208(2)). This report projects revenue and fees based on 10-year forecast in an effort to provide the public and elected officials with illustrative guidance of probable growth demands based on current trends however, per Idaho Code, it is expected that an update to the Capital Improvement Plan included in this study will occur within five years.

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLANS

Summaries of the capital improvement plans for all three County services are shown below in Figure 26, Figure 27, and Figure 28. As shown, the following additional infrastructure is needed to maintain current levels of service over the next ten years:

- County Sheriff – 3,461 square feet of station space with an estimated cost of $1,730,500; 17 pieces of equipment with an estimated cost of $445,766; and the cost of the first of two required Impact Fee Studies.

- County Jail – 13,309 square feet of jail space with an estimated cost of $13,309,183; 13 pieces of equipment with an estimated cost of $29,900; and the cost of the first of two required Impact Fee Studies.
- County EMS – 6,000 square feet of station space with an estimated cost of $2,700,000; 1 piece of apparatus with an estimated cost of $250,000 and 31 pieces of equipment with an estimated cost of $449,400; and the cost of the first of two required Impact Fee Studies.

Figure 26: Elmore County Sheriff Capital Improvement Plan

Type of Capital Infrastructure	Description	Units #/Sq.Ft	Cost $/Unit	Total Cost	Growth Allocation	Subject to Impact Fees	Funding from Other Sources
Facilities							
Headquarters	Additional Space to Accommodate Growth Related Officers	861	500	430,500	100%	430,500	0
Substation Pine/Atlanta	Summer Peaks at 15,000 people	2,000	500	1,000,000	25%	250,000	750,000
Substation Mayfield	Add as New Service Area	980	500	490,000	100%	490,000	0
Substation Glenns Ferry	Add for Growth	2,000	500	1,000,000	40%	400,000	600,000
Substation Prairie	Add for Growth	800	500	400,000	40%	160,000	240,000
Total Facilities	Growth Adjusted Number of Units	3,461		3,320,500		1,730,500	1,590,000
Equipment							
Dispatch Consoles	Add for Growth	3	112,500	337,500	90%	303,750	33,750
New Officer Gear	Additional Equipment to Accommodate Growth Related Officers	8	2,270	18,164	100%	18,164	0
Mayfield Dispatch Consoles	Add as New Service Area	1	112,500	112,500	100%	112,500	0
Mayfield New Officer Gear	Add for Growth	5	2,270	11,352	100%	11,352	0
Total Equipment	Growth Adjusted Number of Units	17		479,516		445,766	33,750
Total Capital Needs		3,478		3,800,016		2,176,266	1,623,750
Minus Current Impact Fee Fund Balance				0	100%	0	0
Plus Impact Fee Study				10,000	100%	10,000	0
Total Capital Improvement Plan				3,810,016		2,186,266	1,623,750

Figure 27: Elmore County Jail Capital Improvement Plan

Type of Capital Infrastructure	Description	Units #/Sq.Ft	Cost $/Unit	Total Cost	Growth Allocation	Subject to Impact Fees	Funding from Other Sources
Facilities							
Jail	44 Additional Beds to Accommodate Growth	8,727	1,000	8,727,333	90%	7,854,600	872,733
Jail	Replacement of Existing	26,182	1,000	26,182,000	0%	0	26,182,000
Jail - Mayfield Impact	Added Mayfield Growth to County Model for Combined Impact	5,455	1,000	5,454,583	100%	5,454,583	0
Total Facilities	Growth Adjusted Number of Units	13,309		40,363,917		13,309,183	27,054,733
Vehicles							
Total Vehicles	Growth Adjusted Number of Units	0.0		0		0	0
Equipment							
New Officer Gear	Additional Equipment to Accommodate Growth Related Officers	8	2,300	18,400	100%	18,400	0
New Officer Gear - Mayfield	Added Mayfield Growth to County Model for Combined Impact	5	2,300	11,500	100%	11,500	0
Total Equipment	Growth Adjusted Number of Units	13		29,900		29,900	0
Total Capital Needs		13,322		40,393,817		13,339,083	27,054,733
Minus Current Impact Fee Fund Balance				0	100%	0	0
Plus Impact Fee Study				10,000	100%	10,000	0
Total Capital Improvement Plan				40,403,817		13,349,083	27,054,733

Figure 28: Elmore County EMS Capital Improvement Plan

Type of Capital Infrastructure	Description	Units #/Sq.Ft	Cost $/Unit	Total Cost	Growth Allocation	Subject to Impact Fees	Funding from Other Sources
Facilities							
Mountain Home West Station	Either co-located or stand alone	1,600	450	720,000	100%	720,000	0
Glenns Ferry Station		1,400	450	630,000	100%	630,000	0
Pine Station		1,400	450	630,000	100%	630,000	0
Mayfield EMS Station	Add as New Service Area	1,600	450	720,000	100%	720,000	0
Total Facilities	Growth Adjusted Number of Units	6,000		2,700,000		2,700,000	0
Vehicles							
Mayfield Quick Response Units	Add as New Service Area	1	250,000	250,000	100%	250,000	0
Total Vehicles	Growth Adjusted Number of Units	1.0		250,000		250,000	0
Equipment							
Stryker Systems		4	45,000	180,000	100%	180,000	0
Zoll Monitors		4	32,000	128,000	100%	128,000	0
Portable Radios		6	1,200	7,200	100%	7,200	0
ATV - Automatic Transport Ventilator		4	4,500	18,000	100%	18,000	0
Saphire Infusion Pumps		4	3,500	14,000	100%	14,000	0
CradlePoint		4	4,000	16,000	100%	16,000	0
Mayfield Stryker Systems	Add as New Service Area	1	45,000	45,000	100%	45,000	0
Mayfield Zoll Monitors	Add as New Service Area	1	32,000	32,000	100%	32,000	0
Mayfield Portable Radios	Add as New Service Area	1	1,200	1,200	100%	1,200	0
Mayfield ATV - Automatic Transport Ventilator	Add as New Service Area	1	4,500	4,500	100%	4,500	0
Mayfield Saphire Infusion Pumps	Add as New Service Area	1	3,500	3,500	100%	3,500	0
Total Equipment	Growth Adjusted Number of Units	31		449,400		449,400	0
Total Capital Needs		6,032		3,399,400		3,399,400	0
Minus Current Impact Fee Fund Balance				0	100%	0	0
Plus Impact Fee Study				10,000	100%	10,000	0
Total Capital Improvement Plan				3,409,400		3,409,400	0

FUNDING SOURCES FOR CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS

In determining the proportionate share of capital costs attributable to new development, the Idaho Development Fee Act states that local governments must consider historical, available, and alternative sources of funding for system improvements (Idaho Code 67-8209(2)). Currently, there are no dedicated revenues being collected by the County to fund growth-related projects.

Furthermore, the maximum supportable impact fees are constructed to offset all growth-related capital costs to the County for their facilities. Evidence is given in Figure 29, Figure 30, Figure 31 and in the specific chapters of this report that the projected capital costs from new development will be entirely offset by the development impact fees. Thus, no general tax dollars are assumed to be used to fund growth-related capital costs, requiring no revenue credits.

Potential development impact fee revenues are summarized in Figure 29, Figure 30, and Figure 31 assuming implementation of the fees at the maximum supportable level as indicated in this report. Based on the land use assumptions detailed in the Appendix, over the next ten years the County development impact fees for Sheriff, Jail and EMS are projected to generate approximately $3.5 million, $13.6 million, and $3.5 million, respectively. At the bottom of the figure, the estimated revenues are compared to the estimated growth-related capital costs. The impact fee revenues are projected to completely offset the capital costs.

Figure 29: Projected County Sheriff Development Impact Fee Revenue

		Single Family $426 per unit	Multifamily $320 per unit	Retail $821 per KSF	Office $316 per KSF	Industrial $142 per KSF	Institutional $314 per KSF
Year		Housing Units	Housing Units	KSF	KSF	KSF	KSF
Base	2021	10,981	2,060	939	183	1,417	907
Year 1	2022	11,373	2,133	971	189	1,464	936
Year 2	2023	11,765	2,206	1,004	195	1,514	966
Year 3	2024	12,157	2,279	1,038	202	1,565	997
Year 4	2025	12,549	2,352	1,074	209	1,619	1,029
Year 5	2026	13,363	2,501	1,111	216	1,675	1,061
Year 6	2027	14,177	2,650	1,150	224	1,735	1,095
Year 7	2028	14,991	2,799	1,192	232	1,797	1,130
Year 8	2029	15,805	2,948	1,235	240	1,862	1,166
Year 9	2030	16,619	3,097	1,273	248	1,920	1,203
Year 10	2031	17,096	3,187	1,313	256	1,980	1,242
Ten-Year Increase		6,115	1,127	374	73	564	334
Projected Revenue =>		$2,604,990	$360,640	$306,816	$22,994	$80,025	$104,931
						Projected Revenue =>	**$3,480,000**
						Total Expenditures =>	**$3,409,000**
						Non-Impact Fee Funding =>	**$0**

Figure 30: Projected County Jail Development Impact Fee Revenue

		Single Family $1,664 per unit	Multifamily $1,252 per unit	Retail $3,254 per KSF	Office $1,254 per KSF	Industrial $563 per KSF	Institutional $1,246 per KSF
Year		Housing Units	Housing Units	KSF	KSF	KSF	KSF
Base	2021	10,981	2,060	939	183	1,417	907
Year 1	2022	11,373	2,133	971	189	1,464	936
Year 2	2023	11,765	2,206	1,004	195	1,514	966
Year 3	2024	12,157	2,279	1,038	202	1,565	997
Year 4	2025	12,549	2,352	1,074	209	1,619	1,029
Year 5	2026	13,363	2,501	1,111	216	1,675	1,061
Year 6	2027	14,177	2,650	1,150	224	1,735	1,095
Year 7	2028	14,991	2,799	1,192	232	1,797	1,130
Year 8	2029	15,805	2,948	1,235	240	1,862	1,166
Year 9	2030	16,619	3,097	1,273	248	1,920	1,203
Year 10	2031	17,096	3,187	1,313	256	1,980	1,242
Ten-Year Increase		6,115	1,127	374	73	564	334
Projected Revenue =>		$10,175,360	$1,411,004	$1,216,054	$91,247	$317,280	$416,383
						Projected Revenue =>	**$13,627,000**
						Total Expenditures =>	**$13,349,000**
						Non-Impact Fee Funding =>	**$0**

Figure 31: Projected County EMS Development Impact Fee Revenue

		Single Family $426 per unit	Multifamily $320 per unit	Retail $821 per KSF	Office $316 per KSF	Industrial $142 per KSF	Institutional $314 per KSF
Year		**Housing Units**	**Housing Units**	**KSF**	**KSF**	**KSF**	**KSF**
Base	2021	10,981	2,060	939	183	1,417	907
Year 1	2022	11,373	2,133	971	189	1,464	936
Year 2	2023	11,765	2,206	1,004	195	1,514	966
Year 3	2024	12,157	2,279	1,038	202	1,565	997
Year 4	2025	12,549	2,352	1,074	209	1,619	1,029
Year 5	2026	13,363	2,501	1,111	216	1,675	1,061
Year 6	2027	14,177	2,650	1,150	224	1,735	1,095
Year 7	2028	14,991	2,799	1,192	232	1,797	1,130
Year 8	2029	15,805	2,948	1,235	240	1,862	1,166
Year 9	2030	16,619	3,097	1,273	248	1,920	1,203
Year 10	2031	17,096	3,187	1,313	256	1,980	1,242
Ten-Year Increase		6,115	1,127	374	73	564	334
Projected Revenue =>		$2,604,990	$360,640	$306,816	$22,994	$80,025	$104,931
						Projected Revenue =>	**$3,480,000**
						Total Expenditures =>	**$3,409,000**
						Non-Impact Fee Funding =>	**$0**

PROPORTIONATE SHARE ANALYSIS

Development impact fees for the County are based on reasonable and fair formulas or methods. The fees do not exceed a proportionate share of the costs incurred or to be incurred by the County in the provision of system improvements to serve new development. The County will fund non-growth-related improvements with non-development impact fee funds as it has in the past. Specified in the Idaho Development Impact Fee Act (Idaho Code 67-8207), several factors must be evaluated in the development impact fee study and are discussed below.

1) The development impact fees for the County are based on new growth's share of the costs of previously built projects along with planned public facilities as provided by the County. Projects are included in the County's capital improvements plan and will be included in annual capital budgets.
2) Estimated development impact fee revenue was based on the maximum supportable development impact fees for the one, Countywide service area; results are shown in the cash flow analyses in this report. Development impact fee revenue will entirely fund growth-related improvements.
3) TischlerBiseGalena has evaluated the extent to which new development may contribute to the cost of public facilities. The development impact fees will enable the redirection of current revenues allocated for applicable public facilities. Also, the report has shown that all applicable growth-related public facility costs will be entirely funded by impact fees, thus no credit is necessary for general tax dollar funding.
4) The relative extent to which properties will make future contributions to the cost of existing public facilities has also been evaluated in regards to existing debt. Outstanding debt for growth's portion of already constructed facilities will be paid from development impact fee revenue, therefore a future revenue credit is not necessary.
5) The County will evaluate the extent to which newly developed properties are entitled to a credit for system improvements that have been provided by property owners or developers. These "site-specific" credits will be available for system improvements identified in the annual capital budget and long-term Capital Improvements Plans. Administrative procedures for site-specific credits should be addressed in the development impact fee ordinance.
6) Extraordinary costs, if any, in servicing newly developed properties should be addressed through administrative procedures that allow independent studies to be submitted to the County. These procedures should be addressed in the development impact fee ordinance. One service area represented by the County's geographic boundary is appropriate for the fees herein.
7) The time-price differential inherent in fair comparisons of amounts paid at different times has been addressed. All costs in the development impact fee calculations are given in current dollars with no assumed inflation rate over time. Necessary cost adjustments can be made as part of the annual review of the capital improvement plan and proposed amendments.

IMPLEMENTATION AND ADMINISTRATION

The Idaho Development Impact Fee Act (hereafter referred to as the Idaho Act) requires jurisdictions to form a Development Impact Fee Advisory Committee. The committee must have at least five members who are residents of the jurisdiction. At least 2 of the members must be active in the business of real estate, building, or development. At least 2 members cannot be active in business of real estate, building or development. The committee acts in an advisory capacity and is tasked to do the following:

- Assist the governmental entity in adopting land use assumptions;
- Review the capital improvements plan, and proposed amendments, and file written comments;
- Monitor and evaluate implementation of the capital improvements plan;
- File periodic reports, at least annually, with respect to the capital improvements plan and report to the governmental entity any perceived inequities in implementing the plan or imposing the development impact fees; and
- Advise the governmental entity of the need to update or revise land use assumptions, the capital improvements plan, and development impact fees.

Per the above, the County formed a Development Impact Fee Advisory Committee ("DIFAC"). TischlerBiseGalena and County staff met with the DIFAC during the process and provided information on land use assumptions, level of service and cost assumptions, and draft development impact fee schedules. This report reflects comments and feedback received from the DIFAC.

The County must develop and adopt a capital improvements plan ("CIP") that includes those improvements for which fees were developed. The Idaho Act defines a capital improvement as an "improvement with a useful life of ten years or more, by new construction or other action, which increases the service capacity of a public facility." Requirements for the CIP are outlined in Idaho Code 67-8208. Certain procedural requirements must be followed for adoption of the CIP and the development impact fee ordinance. Requirements are described in detail in Idaho Code 67-8206. The County has a CIP that meets the above requirements.

TischlerBiseGalena recommends that development impact fees be updated annually to reflect recent data. One approach is to adjust for inflation in construction costs by means of an index like the RSMeans or Engineering News Record (ENR). This index can be applied against the calculated development impact fee. If cost estimates change significantly, the County should evaluate an adjustment to the CIP and development impact fees.

Idaho's enabling legislation requires an annual development impact fees report that accounts for fees collected and spent during the preceding year (Idaho Code 67-8210). Development impact fees must be deposited in interest-bearing accounts earmarked for the associated capital facilities as outlined in capital improvements plans. Also, fees must be spent within eight years of when they are collected (on a first in, first out basis) unless the local governmental entity identifies in writing (a) a reasonable cause why the

fees should be held longer than eight years; and (b) an anticipated date by which the fees will be expended but in no event greater than eleven years from the date they were collected.

Credits must be provided for in accordance with Idaho Code Section 67-8209 regarding site-specific credits or developer reimbursements for system improvements that have been included in the development impact fee calculations. Project improvements normally required as part of the development approval process are not eligible for credits against development impact fees. Specific policies and procedures related to site-specific credits or developer reimbursements for system improvements should be addressed in the ordinance that establishes the County's fees.

The general concept is that developers may be eligible for site-specific credits or reimbursements only if they provide system improvements that have been included in CIP and development impact fee calculations. If a developer constructs a system improvement that was included in the fee calculations, it is necessary to either reimburse the developer or provide a credit against the fees in the area that benefits from the system improvement. The latter option is more difficult to administer because it creates unique fees for specific geographic areas. Based on TischlerBiseGalena's experience, it is better for a reimbursement agreement to be established with the developer that constructs a system improvement. For example, if a developer elects to construct a system improvement, then a reimbursement agreement can be established to payback the developer from future development impact fee revenue. The reimbursement agreement should be based on the actual documented cost of the system improvement, if less than the amount shown in the CIP. However, the reimbursement should not exceed the CIP amount that has been used in the development impact fee calculations.

APPENDIX A. LAND USE DEFINITIONS

RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT

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

Single Family Units:

1. Single family detached is a one-unit structure detached from any other house, that is, with open space on all four sides. Such structures are considered detached even if they have an adjoining shed or garage. A one-family house that contains a business is considered detached as long as the building has open space on all four sides.
2. Single family attached (townhouse) is a one-unit structure that has one or more walls extending from ground to roof separating it from adjoining structures. In row houses (sometimes called townhouses), double houses, or houses attached to nonresidential structures, each house is a separate, attached structure if the dividing or common wall goes from ground to roof.
3. Mobile home includes both occupied and vacant mobile homes, to which no permanent rooms have been added. Mobile homes used only for business purposes or for extra sleeping space and mobile homes for sale on a dealer's lot, at the factory, or in storage are not counted in the housing inventory.

Multifamily Units:

1. 2+ units (duplexes and apartments) are units in structures containing two or more housing units, further categorized as units in structures with "2, 3 or 4, 5 to 9, 10 to 19, 20 to 49, and 50 or more apartments."
2. Boat, RV, Van, etc. includes any living quarters occupied as a housing unit that does not fit the other categories (e.g., houseboats, railroad cars, campers, and vans). Recreational vehicles, boats, vans, railroad cars, and the like are included only if they are occupied as a current place of residence.

NONRESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT CATEGORIES

Nonresidential development categories used throughout this study are based on land use classifications from the book *Trip Generation* (ITE, 2021). A summary description of each development category is provided below.

Retail: Establishments primarily selling merchandise, eating/drinking places, and entertainment uses. By way of example, *Retail* includes shopping centers, supermarkets, pharmacies, restaurants, bars, nightclubs, automobile dealerships, movie theaters, and lodging (hotel/motel).

Office: Establishments providing management, administrative, professional, or business services. By way of example, *Office* includes banks, business offices, medical offices, and veterinarian clinics.

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

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

APPENDIX B. DEMOGRAPHIC ASSUMPTIONS

POPULATION AND HOUSING CHARACTERISTICS

Impact fees often use per capita standards and persons per housing unit or persons per household to derive proportionate share fee amounts. Housing types have varying household sizes and, consequently, a varying demand on City infrastructure and services. Thus, it is important to differentiate between housing types and size.

When persons per housing unit (PPHU) is used in the development impact fee calculations, infrastructure standards are derived using year-round population. In contrast, when persons per household (PPHH) is used in the development impact fee calculations, the fee methodology assumes all housing units will be occupied, thus requiring seasonal or peak population to be used when deriving infrastructure standards. Thus, TischlerBiseGalena recommends that fees for residential development in the County be imposed according to persons per housing unit.

Based on housing characteristics, TischlerBiseGalena recommends using two housing unit categories for the Impact Fee study: (1) Single Family and (2) Multifamily. Each housing type has different characteristics which results in a different demand on County facilities and services. Figure 32 shows TischlerBiseGalena estimates for the County using persons per housing unit from the US Census American Community Survey 2020 5-Year Estimates data for Elmore County. Housing units were provided by the Elmore County Assessor data and population was then calculated. Single family units have a person per housing unit factor of 2.18 persons and multifamily units have an average of 1.64 persons per unit.

Figure 32: Persons per Housing Unit

Housing Type	Persons	Housing Units	Persons per Housing Unit	Households	Persons per Household	Housing Unit Mix
Single Family [1]	23,030	10,547	**2.18**	9,094	2.53	84%
Multifamily [2]	3,243	1,979	**1.64**	1,785	1.82	16%
Total	26,273	12,526	**2.10**	10,879	2.42	

[1] Includes attached and detached single family homes and mobile homes

[2] Includes structures with 2+ units

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 2020 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates

BASE YEAR POPULATION AND HOUSING UNITS

Assessor data from Elmore County was used to determine the number of housing units in the County for the base year. The proportionate number of persons per housing unit portrayed in Figure 32 derived from the U.S. Census American Community Survey for both single family and multifamily units were then multiplied by the number of housing units to estimate the base year household population of 27,342 as illustrated in Figure 33 below.

Figure 33: Base Year Population and Housing Units

Elmore County, ID	Base Year 2021
Population [1]	27,342
Housing Units [1]	
Single Family	10,981
Multifamily	2,060
Total Housing Units	13,041

[1] Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 2020 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates

POPULATION AND HOUSING UNIT PROJECTIONS

Elmore County is experiencing growth patterns similar to its neighboring jurisdictions in Idaho.

The Mountain Home Community Development Department provided a list of over 2,700 planned housing units over the next several years, which, if completed would increase the size of Mountain Home City by nearly 50% over the next ten years. Additionally, the impact on housing and population in the Mayfield area of development will generate considerable growth in the County. These units, along with the normal anticipated growth in the remainder of the County have been taken into account when estimating the overall growth for the County. Population growth is based on persons per housing unit factors and housing development.

Estimates based upon the development data show a growth rate of approximately 3 percent annually for the County excluding the Mayfield area, or 34.5 percent over the next ten years. The addition of 2,800 housing units from Mayfield generates an annual growth rate of 4.5 percent, or 54.6 percent over the next ten years, as shown in Figure 34. Resulting in an increase of 14,918 residents and a housing unit increase of 7,242. Single family development accounts for approximately 85 percent of the total housing growth.

Figure 34. Residential Development Projections

Elmore County, ID	Base Year 2021	2022	2023	2024	2025	2026	2027	2028	2029	2030	2031	Total Increase
Population [1]	27,342	28,311	29,280	30,248	31,217	33,188	35,159	37,131	39,102	41,073	42,260	**14,918**
Percent Increase		*3.5%*	*3.4%*	*3.3%*	*3.2%*	*6.3%*	*5.9%*	*5.6%*	*5.3%*	*5.0%*	*2.9%*	*54.6%*
Housing Units [2]												
Single Family	10,981	11,373	11,765	12,157	12,549	13,363	14,177	14,991	15,805	16,619	17,096	**6,115**
Multifamily	2,060	2,133	2,206	2,279	2,352	2,501	2,650	2,799	2,948	3,097	3,187	**1,127**
Total Housing Units	13,041	13,506	13,971	14,436	14,901	15,864	16,827	17,790	18,753	19,716	20,283	**7,242**

[1] Population growth is based on housing development and persons per housing unit factors
[2] Five-year average of building permits is assumed to continue over the next ten years

CURRENT EMPLOYMENT AND NONRESIDENTIAL FLOOR AREA

Industry employment totals were determined using the United States Census Bureau's OnTheMap resource, using the County as a data source. OnTheMap provides employment breakdowns by industry for the County, most recently in the year 2019. By applying the industry specific employment breakdowns from 2019 to the previously determined growth projections, we are able to provide complete employment estimates by industry. As can be seen in Figure 35, nearly 30 percent of employment is in the Industrial industry predominantly in the agricultural sector, with the office industry featuring the lowest percentage share.

Figure 35. Base Year Employment by Industry

Employment Industries	Base Year Jobs [1]	Percent of Total
Retail	1,975	27%
Office	590	8%
Industrial	2,202	30%
Institutional	2,593	35%
Total	7,360	100%

[1] Source: U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics
Elmore Work Area Profile Analysis

The base year nonresidential floor area for the industry sectors is calculated with the Institution of Transportation Engineers' (ITE) square feet per employee averages, Figure 36. For Industrial the Light Industrial factors are used; for Institutional the Hospital factors are used; for Retail the Shopping Center factors are used; for Office the General Office factors are used.

Figure 36. Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) Employment Density Factors

ITE Code	Land Use Group	Demand Unit	Wkdy Trip Ends Per Dmd Unit	Wkdy Trip Ends Per Employee	Emp Per Dmd Unit	Sq Ft Per Emp
110	Light Industrial	1,000 Sq Ft	4.87	3.10	1.57	637
130	Industrial Park	1,000 Sq Ft	3.37	2.91	1.16	864
140	Manufacturing	1,000 Sq Ft	4.75	2.51	1.89	528
150	Warehousing	1,000 Sq Ft	1.71	5.05	0.34	2,953
254	Assisted Living	1,000 Sq Ft	4.19	4.24	0.99	1,012
520	Elementary School	student	2.27	22.50	0.10	na
610	Hospital	1,000 Sq Ft	10.77	3.77	2.86	350
710	General Office	1,000 Sq Ft	10.84	3.33	3.26	307
760	Research & Dev Center	1,000 Sq Ft	11.08	3.37	3.29	304
770	Business Park	1,000 Sq Ft	12.44	4.04	3.08	325
820	Shopping Center	1,000 Sq Ft	37.01	17.42	2.12	471

Source: Trip Generation, Institute of Transportation Engineers, 11th Edition (2021)

By combining the base year job totals and the ITE square feet per employee factors, the nonresidential

floor area is calculated in Figure 37. There is an estimated total of 3.4 million square feet of nonresidential floor area in the County. The Industrial industry accounts for the highest amount of the total nonresidential floor area in the County, with approximately 41 percent. Office accounts for 5 percent, Retail accounts for 27 percent, and Institutional accounts for 27 percent of the total.

Figure 37. Base Year Nonresidential Floor Area

Employment Industries	Base Year Jobs [1]	Sq. Ft. per job [2]	Floor Area (sq. ft.)
Retail	1,975	471	930,320
Office	590	307	181,141
Industrial	2,202	637	1,402,916
Institutional	2,593	350	907,404
Total	7,360		3,421,781

[1] Source: U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics

[2] Source: Trip Generation, Institute of Transportation Engineers, 11th Edition (2021)

NONRESIDENTIAL FLOOR AREA PROJECTIONS

Based on the growth projections described earlier, over the ten-year projection period, it is estimated that there will be an increase of 2,870 jobs. The majority of the increase comes from the Institutional industry (33%).

The nonresidential floor area projections are calculated by applying the ITE square feet per employee factors to the job growth. In the next ten years, the nonresidential floor area is projected to increase by 1.34 million square feet, a 39 percent increase from the base year. The Industrial sector has the greatest increase, predominantly driven by agriculture.

Figure 38. Employment Floor Area and Employment Projections

Industry	Base Year 2021	2022	2023	2024	2025	2026	2027	2028	2029	2030	2031	Total Increase
Jobs [1]												
Retail	1,995	2,061	2,131	2,204	2,280	2,359	2,442	2,530	2,622	2,704	2,788	**793**
Office	596	616	637	658	681	705	730	756	783	808	833	**237**
Industrial	2,224	2,299	2,376	2,457	2,542	2,630	2,723	2,821	2,924	3,015	3,109	**885**
Institutional	2,593	2,675	2,760	2,848	2,939	3,033	3,129	3,229	3,332	3,438	3,547	**955**
Total	7,407	7,651	7,904	8,167	8,441	8,726	9,024	9,335	9,661	9,964	10,277	**2,870**
Nonresidential Floor Area (1,000 sq. ft.) [2]												
Retail	939	971	1,004	1,038	1,074	1,111	1,150	1,192	1,235	1,273	1,313	**374**
Office	183	189	195	202	209	216	224	232	240	248	256	**73**
Industrial	1,417	1,464	1,514	1,565	1,619	1,675	1,735	1,797	1,862	1,920	1,980	**564**
Institutional	907	936	966	997	1,029	1,061	1,095	1,130	1,166	1,203	1,242	**334**
Total	3,447	3,561	3,679	3,802	3,930	4,064	4,204	4,350	4,504	4,645	4,791	**1,344**

[1] Source: American Census Bureau OnTheMap

[2] Source: TischlerBise analysis; Institute of Transportation Engineers, Trip Generation, 2021