

STREET IMPROVEMENT FEE UPDATE

CITY OF STOCKTON

APRIL 7, 2004

FINAL



Oakland Office

1736 Franklin Street Suite 450 Oakland, California 94612 Tel: (510) 832-0899 Fax. (510) 832-0898 Anaheim, CA Industry, CA Jacksonville, FL Lancaster, CA Oakland, CA Phoenix, AZ Seattle, WA Temecula, CA Washington, DC

www.muni.com

Agendo Hom TI

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction	7
Growth Projection	
Street Improvement Costs	2
Alternative Funding Sources	
Fee Schedule	
Fee Comparison	c
Implementation	/
AppendixA	\-1

STREET IMPROVEMENT FEE UPDATE

This report summarizes an update of the street improvement fee to support development within the City of Stockton. It is the City's intent that the current costs representing development's share of these facilities and improvements be imposed on that development in the form of the street improvement fee.

Introduction

MuniFinancial was retained by the City of Stockton to complete an update of the City's street improvement (traffic) fee. This report is an update of *Public Facilities Fee Update for the City of Stockton Street Improvement (Traffic) Fee*, completed by Recht Hausrath & Associates in January 1991 and adopted by City Council. It reflects changes in cost information since the previous analysis was completed.

The imposition of public facilities fees typically requires updates to cost information. This enables the fee to be adjusted for the effects of inflation so that fee revenue is sufficient to cover the costs of expanding facilities to serve new development. This report includes updated cost information provided by the City based on recent data.

MuniFinancial reconstructed the traffic impact fee model used to develop the previous update by Recht Hausrath & Associates to reflect the new information. Please refer to the previous report for additional information. The current report does not substantively affect the findings made in the previous report and required by state law to justify the imposition of the public facility fees.

Growth Projection

Table 1 presents the projected dwelling unit equivalents by zone from the 1991 Recht Hausrath & Associates report.

Table 1:	New Dwelling	Unit Equivalents	(DUEs)
14010 14	TION DISCHISING	Olite Edal raiolito	, /

DUEs	
58,903	
3,669	
28,708	
91,280	
	58,903 3,669 28,708

Sources: Public Facilities Fee Update for the City of Stockton Street Improvement (Traffic) Fee, Recht Hausrath & Associates, 1991; MuniFinancial.

Street Improvement Costs

The project costs from *Public Facilities Fee Update for the City of Stockton Street Improvement (Traffic) Fee* completed by Recht Hausrath & Associates in 1991 have been updated to 2004 dollars in three ways:

- A number of the projects were updated as part of a comprehensive cost update in
 1997. These projects were increased 15 percent to 2004 dollars by the Engineering
 News Record construction cost index from 1997 to present.
- The City and San Joaquin Council of Governments (SJCOG) have recently completed a 2004 cost estimate of the regional projects and a number of the City's street improvement projects.
- All remaining projects were increased 42 percent by the Engineering News Record construction cost index from 1991 to present.

Refer to the Appendix for more detail on the project cost increase.

Project Costs by Zone

Table 2 summarizes the updated street improvement costs associated with the fee program. The costs reflect remianing and completed projects in 2004 dollars. Tables 3 through 5 present the fee per DUE for Zones A, B, and C based on the total facilities cost listed in Table 2 and divided by the DUEs in each zone presented in Table 1. The percent of costs allocated to each zone is consistent with the Recht Hausrath & Associates report.

Table 2: Street Improvement Facilties Costs

		Remaining Completed Projects Projects ¹		: 	Total
Zone A	\$ 46	4,184,400	29,015,4	00 \$	493,199,800
Zone B	•	4,891,300	79,6		144,970,900
Zone C	17	0.822,400	4,357,20	<u> </u>	175,179,600
Total	\$ 77	9,898,100	\$ 33,452,20	00 \$	813,350,300

^{**}PFF revenues spent to date that represent cost of completed projects.

Sources: Table A.2 - A.5; Public Facilities Fee Update for the City of Stockton Street Improvement (Traffic) Fee, Recht Hausrath & Associates, 1991; MuniFinancial.

Table 3: Zone A Cost Per DUE

	Percent	Total		Total Zone		
Contribution to Zone A needs Contribution to Zone B needs Contribution to Zone C needs Total	83.8% 41.6% 24.5%	\$ 	493,199,800 144,970,900 175,179,600 813,350,300	\$ \$	413,301,432 60,235,409 42,831,412 516,368,254	
Zone A DUEs Cost per DUE				\$	58,903 8,766	

Sources: Tables 1 and 2; Public Facilities Fee Update for the City of Stockton Street Improvement (Traffic) Fee, Recht Hausrath & Associates, 1991; MuniFinancial.

Table 4: Zone B Cost Per DUE

	Percent Total		Total		otal Zone B
Contribution to Zone A needs Contribution to Zone B needs Contribution to Zone C needs Total	2.2% 6.7% 3.1%	\$ 	493,199,800 144,970,900 175,179,600 813,350,300	\$ 	10,850,396 9,713,050 5,430,568 25,994,014
Zone B DUEs Cost per DUE				\$	3,669 7,085

Sources: Tables 1 and 2; Public Facilities Fee Update for the City of Stockton Street Improvement (Traffic) Fee, Recht Hausrath & Associates, 1991; MuniFinancial.

Table 5: Zone C Cost Per DUE

	Percent		Percent Total		Total Zone C		
Contribution to Zone A needs	14.0%	\$	493,199,800	\$	69,047,972		
Contribution to Zone B needs	51.8%		144,970,900		75,022,441		
Contribution to Zone C needs	72.5%		175,179,600		126,917,620		
Total		\$	813,350,300	\$	270,988,033		
Zone C DUEs					28,708		
Cost per DUE				\$	9,439		

Sources: Tables 1 and 3; Public Facilities Fee Update for the City of Stockton Street Improvement (Traffic) Fee, Recht Hausrath & Associates, 1991; MuniFinancial.

Regional Project Costs

Table 6 summarizes the total project cost associated with regional projects. The cost estimate assumes 50 percent state funding for regional projects and \$47 million in Measure K funding as estimated in *Public Facilities Fee Update for the City of Stockton Street Improvement (Traffic) Fee.* The total regional cost is divided by total citywide DUEs as presented in Table 1 to calculate a cost per DUE for the regional component of the fee.

Table 6: Regional Cost Per DUE

	 2004
Citywide and Regional Project Costs	
Remaining regional project cost	\$ 589,525,000
Completed regional project cost	6,102,000
Completed city wide project cost	1,647,400
State funding ¹	(294,762,500)
Measure K funding ²	(47,000,000)
Total	\$ 255,511,900
Total DUEs Cost per DUE	\$ 91,280 2,799

Assumes 50 percent State funding of projects yet to be completed.

Sources: Tables A.1 and A.5; Public Facilities Fee Update for the City of Stockton Street Improvement (Traffic) Fee, Recht Hausrath & Associates, 1991; MuniFinancial.

² Per 1991 Recht Hausrath & Associates report.

Alternative Funding Sources

The City anticipates using existing revenue sources or developing new sources to fund the non-fee share of planned facility costs. Likely potential sources of revenue include existing or new general fund revenues, grants, or existing or new taxes. Any new tax would require two-thirds voter approval. Any new assessments or property-related charge would require majority property owner approval.

Fee Schedule

Tables 7 and 8 present the fee schedules for the street improvement and regional fees, respectively. Table 9 sums Tables 7 and 8 to show the total fee amount of both components of traffic fee. The cost per DUE is converted to a fee per unit of development based on a DUE calculation as reported in the Recht Hausrath & Associates report.

Table 7: Proposed Street Improvement Fee Schedule by Fee Area

			·		Fee ¹		
		Z	Zone A	Z	one B	Z	one C
	DUE	F	A1&2	F	A 3 & 4	F	A 5 & 6
Residential							
Single-Family	1.00	\$	8,766	\$	7,085	\$	9,439
Multiple-Family	0.73		6,399		5,172		6,891
Guestrooms	0.78		6,838		5,526		7,363
Nonresidential .							
General Office	1.23		10,783		8,714		11,611
General Commercial	1.33		11,659		9,423		12,554
Industrial/Warehouse	0.48		4,164		3,365		4,484
Downtown General Commercial & Office	0.82		N/A		5,810		N/A

Per unit for residential and per sq. ft. for nonresidential.

Sources: Tables 3 - 5; MuniFinancial.

Table 8: Proposed Regional Traffic Fee Schedule

					Fee ¹		
		Z	one A	Z	one B	Z	one C
	DUE	F	41&2	F/	4384	F/	1586
Residential							
Single-Family	1.00	\$	2,799	\$	2,799	\$	2,799
Multiple-Family	0.73		2,043		2,043		2,043
Guestrooms	0.78		2,183		2,183		2,183
Nonresidential							
General Office	1.23		3,443		3,443		3,443
General Commercial	1.33		3,723		3,723		3,723
Industrial/Warehouse	0.48		1,330		1,330		1,330
Downtown General Commercial & Office	0.82		N/A		2,295		N/A

¹ Per unit for residential and per sq. ft. for nonresidential.

Sources: Table 6; MuniFinancial.

Table 9: Proposed Total Traffic Fee Schedule

				Fee ¹		
		Zone A	4	Zone B		Zone C
	DUE	FA1&	2	FA3&4	F	A5&6
Residential						
Single-Family	1.00	\$ 11,5	65	\$ 9,884	\$	12,238
Multiple-Family	0.73	8,4	43	7,215		8,934
Guestrooms	0.78	9,0	21	7,709		9,546
Nonresidential						
General Office	1.23	14,2	25	12,157		15,053
General Commercial	1.33	15,3	82	13,145		16,277
Industrial/Warehouse	0.48	5,4	94	4,695		5,813
Downtown General Commercial & Office	0.82	N	!/A	8,105		N/A

Per unit for residential and per sq. ft. for nonresidential.

Sources: Tables 7 and 8; MuniFinancial.

Fee Comparison

Table 10 compares the proposed traffic fee to the existing fee for a single family unit in Zone A. The City's maximum justified fee is proposed to increase approximately \$6,300 and \$2,300

7

for the street improvement and regional fee components, respectively, for a total increase of \$8,700.

Table 10: Traffic Fee Per Single Family Unit - Zone A (Fee Areas 1 & 2)

	City		egional	 Total
Proposed	\$ 8,766	\$	2,799	\$ 11,565
Current	 2,407		454	2,861
Difference	6,359		2,345	8,704

Implementation

This section identifies tasks that the City should complete when implementing the fee programs.

Programming Revenues and Projects with the CIP

The City should update its Capital Improvement Plan (CIP) to program fee revenues to specific projects. Use of the CIP in this manner documents a reasonable relationship between new development and the use of fee revenues.

The City may alter the scope of the planned projects, or substitute new projects as long as the project continues to represent an expansion of the City's traffic facility capabilities. If the total cost of all planned projects varies from the total cost used as a basis for the fee, the City should revise the fee accordingly.

For the five-year planning period of the CIP, the City should allocate all existing fund balances and projected fee revenue to specific city office space facilities projects. The City can hold funds in a project account for longer than five years if necessary to collect sufficient funds to complete a project.

Identify Non-fee Revenue Sources

The City must identify non-fee revenue sources to fully fund the planned facilities and justify the maximum impact fee. The City should take any actions necessary to secure those funds.

Inflation Adjustment

The City should identify appropriate inflation indexes in the fee ordinance and adopt an automatic inflation adjustment to the fee annually. The City should use separate indexes for land and construction costs. Calculating the land cost index may require use of a property appraiser every several years. The construction cost index can be based on the City's recent capital project experience or taken from any reputable source, such as the *Engineering News*

Record. To calculate the fee increases, each index should be weighted by the share of total planned facility costs represented by land or construction, as appropriate.

Reporting Requirements

The City should comply with the annual and five-year reporting requirements of Government Code 66000 et seq. For facilities to be funded with a combination of impact fees and other revenues, the City must identify the source and amount of the other revenues. The City must also identify when the other revenues are anticipated to be available to fund the project.

APPENDIX

Table A.1 through A.4 present the regional projects and projects within Zones A, B, and C. The project costs from *Public Facilities Fee Update for the City of Stockton Street Improvement (Traffic) Fee* completed by Recht Hausrath & Associates in 1991 have been updated to 2004 dollars in three ways:

- A number of the projects were updated as part of a comprehensive cost update in 1997. These projects were increased 15 percent to 2004 dollars by the Engineering News Record construction cost index from 1997 to present.
- The City and San Joaquin Council of Governments (SJCOG) have recently completed a 2004 cost estimate of the regional projects and a number of the City's street improvement projects.
- All remaining projects were increased 42 percent by the Engineering News Record construction cost index from 1991 to present.

Table A.5 summarizes the revenue that has been collected to date for the street improvement fee. The revenues have been increase to 2004 dollars by the *Engineering News Record* construction cost index from the appropriate year and reflects the costs of projects that have been completed to date.

Table A.1: Regional Projects

Project		2004		
SR-99: Arch Rd to SR-4 (Crosstown)	\$	164,000,000		
SR-99: SR-4 to Hammer Ln		40,000,000		
SR-99: Hammer to Eight Mile Rd		39,000,000		
SR-99: Eight Mile Rd to SR-12		18,200,000		
I-5: French Camp/Sperry to Charter Wy		40,000,000		
I-5: Charter Wy To Monte Diablo		80,000,000		
I-5: Monte Diablo to Eight Mile Rd		190,125,000		
I-5: Eight Mile Rd to SR-12		18,200,000		
Total	\$	589,525,000		

Source: City of Stockton; MuniFinancial.

Table A.2: Area A Projects

Table A.2: Area A Projects			
		inflation	
Project	1991/1997	Factor ¹	2004
2004 Cost Update	LITA	N/A	\$ 11,000,000
Eight Mile Rd: Interchange at I-5	N/A	N/A	36,100,000
Eight Mile Rd: Interchange at SR-99	N/A	N/A	71,500,000
Eight Mile Rd: 3000' west pf I-5 to SR-99	N/A N/A	N/A	41,000,000
March Ln/Wilson Wy: Interchange at SR-99	N/A	N/A	43,500,000
March Ln: Aksland to SR-99 (includes I-5 inchange)	N/A	N/A	21,000,000
West Ln: Claveras River to Eight Mile Rd	N/A	N/A	4,100,000
Hammer Ln: Interchange at SR-99	N/A	N/A	23,400,000
Hammer Ln: I-5 to SR-99 (includes I-5 interchange) Morada Ln: Interchange at SR-99	N/A	N/A	34,000,000
Pacific Ave: Calveras River to Hammer Ln	N/A	N/A	25,000,000
Aksland Ave: McAuliffe Rd to Mosher Slough	N/A	N/A	9,600,000
Otto Drive: (Interchange with I-5)	N/A	N/A	29,000,000
Subtotal	1977	14173	\$ 349,200,000
QUDIOLAI			* *,,
Segments			
Aksland Dr: Mosher Slough to March Ln	\$ 4,451,722	1.15	\$ 5,119,500
Davis Rd: Eight Mile Rd to Thorton Rd	738,266	1,15	849,000
El Dorado St: Benjamin Holt Dr to Harper St	2,857,403	1.15	3,286,000
Feather River Dr: Seaguli Ln to Driftwood Pl	1,583,147	1.15	1,820,600
Holman Rd: Eight Mile Rd to March Ln	13,914,942	1.15	16,002,200
Morada Ln: Lower Sacramento Rd to SR 99 East Frontage Rd	5,060,525	1.15	5,819,600
Pershing Ave: Benjamin Holt to Brookside Rd	1,779,822	1.15	2,046,800
Maranatha Dr: March Ln to Calaveras River	415,123	1.15	477,400
Thornton Rd: Eight Mile Rd to Rivara Rd	6,788,848	1.15	7,807,100
Lower Sacramento Rd: Eight Mile to Pacific Ave	882,178	1.42	1,252,700
Lower Sacramento Rd: See road segment list	1,454,248	1.42	2,065,000
Lower Sacramento Rd: Morada Ln to Hammer Ln	3,140,411	1.42	4,459,400
Lower Sacramento Rd: Hammer Ln to Pacific Ave		1.42	400.000
Benjamin Holt Dr. Alexandria to Pershing Ave	75,195	1.42	106,800
Wilson Wy: March Ln to McAllen	962,334	1.42	1,366,500
Subtotal	\$ 44,104,164		\$ 52,478,600
Intersections			
Brookside Rd & Feather River Dr	\$ 51,073	1.15	\$ 58,700
1-5 & Benjamin Holt Dr	865,920	1.15	995,800
Lower Sacramento Rd & Morada Ln	426,979	1.15	491,000
Morada Ln & Holman Rd	304,437	1.15	350,100
Pershing Ave & Brookside Rd	143,472	1.15	165,000
Thornton Rd & Estate Dr	178,200	1.15	204,900
West Ln & Morada Ln	374,614	1.15	430,800
Pershing Ave & March Ln	693,33 6	1.42	984,500
El Dorado St & March Ln	1,018,037	1.42	1,445,600
Feather River Dr & Brookside	50,320	1.42	71,500
Subtotal	\$ 4,106,389		\$ 5,197,900
5.11			
Bridges	\$ 691,400	1.42	\$ 981,800
Lower Sacramento Rd @ Bear Creek	345,800	1.42	491,000
Lower Sacramento Rd @ Little Bear Creek Lower Sacramento Rd @ Mosher Slough	345,800	1.42	491,000
Holman Rd @ EBMUD	207,360	1.42	294,500
Feather River Dr @ Fourteen Mile	1,296,600	1.42	1,841,200
Wilson Wy @ Calaveras River	1,555,200	1.42	2,208,400
Subtotal	\$ 4,442,160		\$ 6,307,900
Subiotal	V 11.121.12		
Railroad Crossings			
Lower Sacramento Rd & U.P.R.R.	\$ 78,379	N/A	\$ 12,000,000
Morada Ln @ S.P.R.R.	68,940	N/A	14,000,000
Morada Ln @ U.P.R.R.	318,960	N/A	10,000,000
Alpine @ S.P.R.R.	49,378	N/A	7,500,000
Alpine @ U.P.R.R.	49,378	N/A	7,500,000
Subtotal	\$ 565,035		\$ 51,000,000
Total	\$ 53,217,748		\$ 464,184,400
Total	# 00,2 (1,1 1 0		

^{1 *}Inflation Factor* increases project costs by the ENR Construction Index to 2004 costs from 1991 or 1997 project costs.

Source: ENR Construction Index; City of Stockton; MuniFinancial.

Table A.3: Area B Projects

Table A.3: Area B Projects		Inflation	
Project	1991/1997	Factor ¹	2004
2004 Cost Update			* 45.000.000
Waterloo Rd/SR-8: Interchange at SR-99	N/A		\$ 45,000,000
Fremont St/SR-26: Interchange at SR-99	N/A	N/A	45,000,000
Frenso Ave & SR-4 (Charter Wy)	N/A	N/A	500,000
Charter Wy (SR-4): Interchange at I-5	N/A	N/A	11,000,000
Fremont Street ² Subtotal	N/A	N/A	1,500,000 \$ 103,000,000
Segments			
El Dorado St: Harper St to Alpine Ave	\$ 1,012,701	1.15	\$ 1,164,600
Pershing Ave: Brookside Rd to Alpine Ave	89,309	1.15	102,700
Maranatha Dr: Calaveras River to Wislon Wy	237,623	1.15	273,300
West Ln: Enterprise St to Harding Wy	948,908	1.15	1,091,200
Wilson Wy: Flora St to Weber Ave	77,994	1.15	89,700
Pacific Ave: Calaveras River to Alpine	1,254,698	1.42	1,781,700
El Dorado St: Alpine to Cleveland	1,851,685	1.42	2,629,400
Wilson Wy : Fremont to Channel	•	1.42	-
Wilson Wy: Waterloo to Fremont	-	1.42	-
Charter Wy: I-5 to Center	-	1.42	-
Charter Wy: El Dorado St to Airport Wy	-	1.42 1.42	-
Charter Wy: Wilson Wy to Mariposa Subtotal	\$ 5,472,918		\$ 7,132,600
Intersections			
Pacific Ave & Alpine Ave	\$ -	1.15	\$-
El Dorado St & Alpine Ave	224,376	1.15	258,000
West Ln & Alpine Ave	417,828	1.15	480,500
Pacific Ave & Harding Wy	383,877	1.15	441,500
West Ln & Harding Wy	252,244	1.15	290,100
Pershing Ave & Park St	178,200	1.15	204,900
Wilson Wy & Fremont St	913,346	1.15	1,050,300
El Dorado St & Weber Ave	1,958	1.15	2,300
Center St & Washington St	-	1.15	-
El Dorado St & Washington St	-	1.15	-
Center St & Lafayette St	•	1.15	-
El Dorado St & Lafayette St		1.15	0.000.700
SR 99 & Charter Wy	2,950,174	1.15	3,392,700
SR 99 & Cherokee Ln	1,930,500	1.15	2,220,100 587,700
Pacific Ave & Alpine	413,892	1.42 1.42	301,700
Center & Harding	•	1.42	_
El Dorado St & Harding	_	1.42	_
Wilson Wy & Waterloo Pershing Ave & Park	144,000	1.42	204,500
Pershing Ave & Fremont	144,000	1,42	
Center & Washington	_	1.42	-
El Dorado St & Washington	59,352	1.42	84,300
Stanislaus & Washington	-	1.42	_
Wilson Wy & Washington	70,460	1.42	100,100
Center & Lafayette	-	1.42	-
El Dorado St & Lafayette	-	1.42	-
Stanislaus & Lafayette	80,503	1.42	114,300
Wilson Wy & Lafayette	223,842	1.42 _	317,900
Subtotal	\$ 8,244,551	:	9,749,200
Railroad Crossings	ф 470.040	LUA /	10.000.000
West Ln & S.P.R.R.	\$ 179,640	N/A S	
Fremont & S.P.R.R.	49,378	N/A	7,500,000
Fremont @ Stockton Ter. & Eas	49,378	N/A	7,500,000
Wilson Wy @ S.P.R.R.	6,689	1.42	9,500 \$ 25,009,500
Sublotal	\$ 285,085		
Total	\$ 14,002,554		144,891,300

^{1 *}Inflation Factor* increases project costs by the ENR Construction Index to 2004 costs from 1991 or 1997 project

Source: ENR Construction Index; City of Stockton; MuniFinancial.

costs.

² Fremant Street widening not included in prior fee documentation. City staff believes that this project is necessary to accommodate increased traffic within the downtown area as growth occurs throughout the City.

Table	A.4:	Area	C	Рго	iects
-------	------	------	---	-----	-------

m		Inflation		
Project	1991/1997	Factor ¹ .		2004
2004 Cost Update			_	
Arch/Arch-Airport Rd: Interchange at SR-99	N/A	N/A	\$	6,000,000
Sperry/French Camp Rd: Interchange at I-5	N/A	N/A		35,000,000
Arch/Arch-Airport/Sperry Rd: Austin Rd to i-5	N/A	N/A		71,000,000
Downing Ave: Interchange at I-5	N/A	N/A		3,900,000
Subtotal			\$	115,900,000
Segments		4 4 22	_	205 520
B St: Ralph Ave to Arch-Airport Wy	\$ 578,694	1.15	\$	665,500
Boeing Wy: Pock Ln to SR 99 West Frontage Rd	-	1.15		
Charter Wy: Mariposa Rd to SR 99 on-ramp	1,976,820	1.15		2,273,300
Downing Ave: I-5 NB off-ramp to El Dorado Ave	1,486,963	1.15		1,710,000
El Dorado St: Downing Ave to I-5	4,209,535	1.15		4,841,000
Industrial Dr. Airport Wy to SR 99 West Frontage	1,936,634	1.15		2,227,200
Mariposa Rd: Charter Wy to SR 99 East Frontage Rd	1,901,196	1.15		2,186,400
Pock Ln: Ninth St to Boeing Wy	569,220	1.15		654,600
El Dorado St: Downing to I-5		1.42		-
Airport Wy: Industrial Dr to Sperry Rd	_	1.42		-
Airport Wy: North of Duck Creek to Industrial Dr	1,703,149	1.42		2,418,500
, ,	347,577	1,42		493,600
Airport Wy: Charter Wy to North of Duck Creek	341,311	1.42		435,000
Pock Ln: Ninth to Arch-Airport Wy	-			-
B St: Ralph to Arch-Airport Wy	-	1.42		-
Industrial Dr: Airport Wy to West SR	-	1.42		-
Downing Ave: I-5 to El Dorado St		1.42		
Eight St: El Dorado St to Airport Wy	2,695,413	1.42		3,827,500
Subtotal	\$ 17,405,201		\$	21,297,600
ntersections	£ 7.400.074	4.45	•	8,260,400
SR 99/Mariposa Rd - Farmington Rd	\$ 7,182,971	1.15	Ф	
I-5 & Downing Ave	3,915,120	1.15		4,502,400
I-5 & French Camp Rd	3,693,360	1.15		4,247,400
Charter Wy & Center St	125,656	1.15		144,500
Charter Wy & El Dorado St	6 9 ,543	1.15		80,000
Airport Wy & Charter Wy	102,840	1.15		118,300
Charter Wy & Wilson Wy	308,411	1.15		354,700
El Dorado St & Downing Ave	328,014	1.15		377,200
Airport Wy & Industrial Dr	386,005	1.15		443,900
Industrial Dr & SR 99 Frontage	528,684	1.15		608,000
El Dorado St & French Camp Rd	349,613	1.15		402,100
I-5 SB Ramps & Charter Wy		1.42		-
I-5 NB Ramps & Charter Wy	-	1.42		-
Eight St & El Dorado St	224,424	1.42		318,700
<u> </u>		1.42		_
El Dorado St & Downing Ave	992,731	1.42		1,409,700
Sperry Rd & Airport Wy			\$	21,267,300
Subtotal	\$ 18,207,371		Ψ	21,201,000
<i>Irldqes</i> Airport Wy @ Duck Creek	\$ -	1.42	\$	-
Airport Wy @ North Little John Creek	648,200	1.42		920,400
Pock Ln @ Duck Creek	- 10,200	1.42		
	432,000	1.42		613,400
Pock Ln @ North Little John Creek	432,000	1.42		613,400
Industrial Dr @ North Little John Creek	432,000	1.42		010,400
El Dorado St @ North Little John Creek	-			•
CI Dorado St @ French Camp Slouph		1.42		40.000.000
El Dorado St @ French Camp Slough	3,304,800 \$ 4,817,000	N/A _	\$	10,000,000 12,147,200
Eight St @ U.P.R.R./S.P.R.R. Subtotal	\$ 4,011,000			
Eight St @ U.P.R.R./S.P.R.R. Subtotal	\$ 4,511,600			
Eight St @ U.P.R.R./S.P.R.R. Subtotal <u>tailroad Crossings</u>		1.42	\$	70.100
Eight St @ U.P.R.R./S.P.R.R. Subtotal **Railroad Crossings Airport Wy @ AT & SF RR	\$ 49,378	1.42 1.42	\$	70,100 70,100
Eight St @ U.P.R.R./S.P.R.R. Subtotal Railroad Crossings Airport Wy @ AT & SF RR McKinley Ave @ S. P.R.R.	\$ 49,378 49,378	1.42	\$	70,100
Eight St @ U.P.R.R./S.P.R.R. Subtotal Railroad Crossings Airport Wy @ AT & SF RR	\$ 49,378	1.42 1.42 _	\$ \$	

^{1 &}quot;Inflation Factor" increases project costs by the ENR Construction Index to 2004 costs from 1991 or 1997 project costs.

Source: ENR Construction Index; City of Stockton; MuniFinancial.