

APPENDIX 3a

---

FISCAL IMPACT ANALYSIS

---

---

**EL MONTE TRANSIT VILLAGE  
EL MONTE, CA**

**FISCAL IMPACT ANALYSIS**

---

---

*Prepared for:*

**CITY OF EL MONTE**

*Prepared by:*

**THE NATELSON DALE GROUP, INC.**

24835 E. La Palma Avenue, Suite I

Yorba Linda, CA 92887

Telephone: (714) 692-9596

Fax: (714) 692-9597

Web: [www.natelsondale.com](http://www.natelsondale.com)

March 27, 2007

<b><u>SECTION</u></b>	<b><u>PAGE</u></b>
<b>1.0 INTRODUCTION.....</b>	<b>1-1</b>
1.1. Organization of the Report.....	1-1
1.2. Project Description .....	1-1
<b>2.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY .....</b>	<b>2-1</b>
<b>3.0 STUDY METHODOLOGY .....</b>	<b>3-3</b>
3.1. Scope of the Analysis.....	3-3
3.2. Overview of the Forecasting Methodology .....	3-4
3.3. General Fund Revenues.....	3-5
3.4. General Fund Expenditures .....	3-9

**APPENDICES**

Appendix A: Detailed Calculations

## 1.0 INTRODUCTION

This report evaluates the fiscal impacts that development of the proposed El Monte Transit Village (“project”) would have on the City of El Monte General Fund.

### 1.1 Organization of the Report

This introduction summarizes the Project description and forecasts the project’s resident and employee populations. Chapter 2.0 provides an Executive Summary of the study findings. Chapter 3.0 describes the methodology used for the analysis. Appendix A provides the detailed fiscal impact calculations.

### 1.2 Project Description

Table 1-1, on the following page, provides a land use summary for the proposed project. The summary is organized in terms of the five geographic sub-areas planned within the overall site. At full buildout the project would include:

- 1,850 dwelling units;
- 491,000 square feet of retail space;
- 500,000 square feet of office space;
- A 70,000 square foot movie theater;
- A 200 room (100,000 square foot) hotel;
- A 42,000 square foot conference center; and
- 8,333 parking spaces.

The project would also include the following public facilities:

- 14.5 acres of parks;
- 8.71 acres of private open space;
- 296 bus parking spaces;
- A 20,000 square foot child development center; and
- A 32,000 square foot community building.

Table 1-2 forecasts the project’s resident population. This table also projects the daytime (worker) population associated with the project’s commercial facilities. The daytime worker population has been projected based on standard employment density factors for each of the commercial land use types included in the project.

The project’s resident population has been projected based on the following assumed average household sizes: 2.00 persons per unit for condominiums and 1.75 persons per unit for apartments. These assumed household sizes have been estimated by The Natelson Dale Group, Inc. (TNDG) based on the following data:

- Information provided by the project applicant regarding the breakdown of the project’s residential components in terms of the numbers of bedrooms per unit; and
- U.S. Census data for El Monte and other San Gabriel Valley cities (especially Pasadena which TNDG believes is representative of the type of mixed-use development planned for the Transit Village) concerning typical household sizes in high-density multiple-family housing developments (defined by the Census Bureau as residential buildings that have 50 or more units per structure).

Table 1-1: Transit Village Land Use Summary

Land Use	Area I	Area II	Area III	Area IV	Area V	Total
<b>Residential (units)</b>						
Condominiums						
Market						
Affordable	709	59	249			1,017
	60	60	65			185
Apartments						
Senior	N/A	185	N/A			185
Other	<u>N/A</u>	<u>139</u>	<u>324</u>			<u>463</u>
Total	769	443	638			1,850
<b>Retail (square feet)</b>						
Supermarket	N/A	50,000	N/A	N/A		50,000
Other Retail	<u>181,100</u>	<u>122,500</u>	<u>114,000</u>	<u>23,400</u>		<u>441,000</u>
Total	181,100	172,500	114,000	23,400		491,000
<b>Other Commercial (square feet)</b>						
Theater		70,000				70,000
Hotel (200 rooms)			100,000			100,000
Conference Center			42,000			42,000
Office Space				500,000		500,000
<b>Community Facilities (square feet)</b>						
Child Development Center	20,000					20,000
3629 Building	32,000					32,000
<b>Parks and Open Space (acres)</b>						
Parks	14.10	N/A	N/A	N/A	0.40	14.50
Private Open Space	1.18	2.26	1.21	1.88	2.18	8.71
<b>Parking (spaces)</b>						
Automobile	2,147	2,064	1,549	1,800	900	8,460
Bus	N/A	N/A	N/A	296	N/A	296

SOURCE: Titan Group

**Table 1-2: Projected Resident Population and Onsite Employment**

Commercial Category	Square Feet Per Employee	On-Site Employees by Area					Total
		Area I	Area II	Area III	Area IV	Area V	
Supermarket	500	362	245	228	47		882
Other Retail	500		100				100
Hotel	333			300			300
Conference Center	1,000			42			42
Theater	1,500		47				47
Office Space	250				2,000		2,000
<b>Total Daytime Population</b>		<b>362</b>	<b>392</b>	<b>570</b>	<b>2,047</b>		<b>3,371</b>
Housing Type	Persons Per Household	On-Site Residents by Area					Total
		Area I	Area II	Area III	Area IV	Area V	
Condominiums	2.00	1,538	238	628			2,404
Apartments	1.75		567	567			1,134
<b>Total Resident Population</b>		<b>1,538</b>	<b>805</b>	<b>1,195</b>			<b>3,538</b>
Weighting Factor for Daytime Population	2.0						
<b>Total Effective Population (residents plus 2 times employees)</b>		<b>2,262</b>	<b>1,588</b>	<b>2,336</b>	<b>4,094</b>		<b>10,280</b>

Source: The Natelson Dale Group, Inc. (TNDG)

As described in Chapter 3 of this report, many of the fiscal revenues and costs considered in this analysis are projected on a per capita basis. Some revenue and cost items – those which are primarily affected by residential development – are projected on the basis of the project’s resident population. Other items – those which are affected by both residential and commercial development – are projected on the basis of the project’s total “effective” population. The effective population is a composite number that includes the full resident population and a *multiple* of the daytime employee population. This analysis weights employees based on a factor of 2.0. In other words, the analysis assumes that a daytime “resident” has twice the impact on City services (and relevant revenues) as a fulltime resident. This factor has been developed by the consultant based on an analysis of the relationship between resident and daytime population size and total municipal expenditures for cities comparable in size to El Monte. Using the employee weighting factor of 2.0, the total effective population for the Transit Village at buildout is projected at 10,280 (3,538 + 3,371 X 2.0).

## 2.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

**General Fund Revenues.** Table 2-1, on the following page, details the City of El Monte General Fund revenues that would be generated by the proposed project. At full buildout the project would generate total General Fund revenues of approximately \$6,135,000 per year.<sup>1</sup>

**General Fund Expenditures.** Table 2-1 also details the City costs that would be generated by the proposed project. At full buildout the project would generate total General Fund expenditures of approximately \$2,540,000 per year.

**Net Fiscal Impact.** Based on the above, it is projected that at full buildout the project would generate a General Fund surplus of nearly \$3,595,000 per year.

Given that a specific infrastructure plan is not yet available for the proposed project, the potential City costs of maintaining infrastructure within the project area have been projected on a per capita basis (as described further in Chapter 3.0 of this report) based on the City's existing budget. Implicit in this projection methodology is the assumption that the amount of infrastructure in the project area will ultimately be similar (on a per capita basis) to the citywide level of infrastructure development, and that the costs of maintaining the project area's infrastructure will be similar (again, on a per capita basis) to the City's existing costs. Once a detailed infrastructure plan is available, City staff will be able to develop a more precise projection of infrastructure maintenance costs related to the project. It should be noted, however, that even if staff's refined projection indicates a higher cost than indicated in this report, the net cost to the City would not necessarily increase since additional funding mechanisms (e.g., Mello Roos assessments) would be available to cover these costs.

---

<sup>1</sup> The property tax increment accruing to the El Monte Redevelopment Agency is not calculated in this report since it is not a General Fund revenue. The property tax increment related to the project has been evaluated in a separate analysis prepared by Rosenow Spevacek Group Inc. (RSG).

**Table 2-1: Summary of Fiscal Impact  
City of El Monte General Fund  
Transit Village Development Program  
In 2006 Constant Dollars**

	AREA I	AREA II	AREA III	AREA IV*	TOTAL
<b>Revenues</b>					
Property Taxes (VLF Swap)	\$ 683,764	\$ 481,861	\$ 706,821	\$1,103,431	\$2,975,877
Property Transfer Taxes	62,890	7,835	24,165	0	94,890
Franchises	26,385	18,524	27,239	47,741	119,888
Business Licenses	14,688	15,883	23,127	83,002	136,699
Sales Tax	407,475	331,125	309,750	52,650	1,101,000
Sales Tax In-Lieu	135,825	110,375	103,250	17,550	367,000
Parking Fines	5,860	4,114	6,050	10,603	26,627
Court Fines	1,946	1,366	2,009	3,522	8,844
Utility Tax	91,365	64,143	94,321	165,316	415,144
Motor Vehicle License Fee	8,874	4,645	6,895	0	20,414
Transient Occupancy Tax	0	0	766,500	0	766,500
Traffic Fines	4,390	3,082	4,532	7,943	19,946
Gas Tax & Proposition 111	24,921	13,044	19,363	0	57,327
Miscellaneous Charges for Services	1,569	1,101	1,619	2,838	7,127
Interest	<u>4,204</u>	<u>3,023</u>	<u>5,993</u>	<u>4,274</u>	<u>17,494</u>
Total Revenues	\$1,474,155	\$1,060,121	\$2,101,633	\$1,498,870	\$6,134,778
<b>Expenditures</b>					
Administration/Overhead	\$ 33,217	\$ 22,795	\$ 33,541	\$ 54,780	\$ 144,333
Police Department	221,493	155,501	228,659	400,770	1,006,423
Building & Ground Maintenance	12,522	8,791	12,928	22,658	56,899
License Collection	2,560	1,797	2,642	4,631	11,630
Information Technology	3,267	2,294	3,373	5,911	14,845
Election Expense	735	385	571	0	1,690
Insurance & Surety Bonds	126,756	88,990	130,858	229,354	575,958
Contract Fire Service	101,395	71,185	104,676	183,465	460,721
General Engineering	4,305	3,023	4,445	7,790	19,563
Museum	618	324	480	0	1,422
Traffic Safety	28,855	20,258	29,789	52,211	131,114
Recreation Operating Fund	47,492	24,858	36,901	0	109,251
Planning	<u>1,427</u>	<u>1,002</u>	<u>1,474</u>	<u>2,583</u>	<u>6,486</u>
Total Expenditures	\$ 584,644	\$ 401,201	\$ 590,335	\$ 964,153	\$2,540,334
<b>NET IMPACT (Revenues – Costs)</b>	\$ 889,511	\$ 658,919	\$1,511,298	\$ 534,716	\$3,594,444

SOURCE: TNDG

\* Area V is included in the Area IV total; the only development in Area V is a 900 space parking structure.

### 3.0 STUDY METHODOLOGY

This chapter of the report describes the methodology used to forecast City revenues and costs related to the proposed project.

#### 3.1 Scope of the Analysis

The analysis focuses on annually-recurring impacts to the City's General Fund. The following municipal revenues and costs are not addressed in this analysis:

- The property tax increment accruing to the El Monte Redevelopment Agency is not calculated in this report since it is not a General Fund revenue. The property tax increment related to the project has been evaluated in a separate analysis prepared by Rosenow Spevacek Group Inc. (RSG).
- Water, sewer and waste management costs are excluded from the analysis since it is assumed that these costs would be fully offset by additional operating revenues.
- The City's one-time costs for processing new development are excluded since it is assumed that these costs would be fully recovered through related revenue sources (i.e., plan check fees, etc.).
- The analysis does not consider the capital costs of new infrastructure needed to serve the project. It is anticipated that these costs would be fully funded by the project's redevelopment property tax increment. Specifically, the Redevelopment Agency would enter into an agreement with the County of Los Angeles whereby the County would defer 75% of its "pass-through" payments from the Agency for a period of 18 years, allowing the Agency to issue bonds to pay for project-related infrastructure improvements. This arrangement is evaluated in detail in the RSG analysis.

The analysis forecasts project-related revenues from the following sources:

- Property Tax In Lieu of Vehicle License Fees (VLF)<sup>2</sup>
- Property Transfer Tax
- Utility Franchise Fees
- Business Licenses
- Sales Tax
- Parking Fines
- Court Fines
- Utility Tax
- Motor Vehicle License Fees (VLF)
- Transient Occupancy Tax
- Traffic Fines (Traffic Safety Fund)
- Miscellaneous Charges for Services
- Interest Income

The analysis forecasts the following municipal costs related to the proposed project:

---

<sup>2</sup> As explained later in the report, this is a separate line item from the standard property tax and accrues to the City's General Fund rather than the Redevelopment Agency.

- Police Department
- Building and Ground Maintenance
- License Collection
- Information Technology
- Election Expense
- Insurance and Surety Bonds
- Contract Fire Service
- General Engineering
- Museum
- Traffic Safety
- Recreation Operating Fund
- Planning
- Administrative/Overhead functions<sup>3</sup>

The Traffic Safety costs include street maintenance, signs and striping, street cleaning, parking enforcement, storm drain maintenance, traffic signal maintenance, street tree and pathway maintenance, and related equipment maintenance. Given that a specific infrastructure plan is not yet available for the proposed project, these infrastructure maintenance costs have been projected on a per capita basis (as described further below) based on the City's existing Traffic Safety budget. Implicit in this projection methodology is the assumption that the amount of infrastructure in the project area will ultimately be similar (on a per capita basis) to the citywide level of infrastructure development, and that the costs of maintaining the project area's infrastructure will be similar (again, on a per capita basis) to the City's existing costs. Once a detailed infrastructure plan is available, City staff will be able to develop a more precise projection of infrastructure maintenance costs related to the project. It should be noted, however, that even if staff's refined projection indicates a higher cost than indicated in this report, the net cost to the City would not necessarily increase since additional funding mechanisms (e.g., Mello Roos assessments) would be available to cover these costs.

### 3.2 Overview of the Forecasting Methodology

The analysis is based primarily on per capita cost and revenue factors derived from the City's current (Fiscal Year 2006-2007) budget. The basic methodology for developing these factors involves the following steps:

- Identify the General Fund line items that would be impacted on an annually-recurring basis due to the development of the proposed project.
- For each identified line item, identify the "relevant population" for purposes of calculating per capita cost and revenue factors. For costs and revenues that primarily relate to residential development, the relevant population is the City's household population. For cost and revenues that are primarily affected by commercial and industrial development, the relevant population is the number of commercial/industrial jobs located in the City. For line items affected by both residential and non-residential development, the combined resident and "daytime" employee populations are considered.

<sup>3</sup> Includes City Council, Administration, City Clerk, Purchasing, Finance, City Treasurer, City Attorney, Human Resources, General City Expense and Unallocated Expenses.

- Calculate per capita factors for each affected cost and revenue item based on the total dollar amount in the City's current budget divided by the relevant Citywide population (as determined in the previous step for each line item).
- Apply these per capita factors to the projected resident and employee populations for the Transit Village project in order to forecast the project's revenue/cost impacts.

The allocation of the City's existing budget between residential and non-residential development (measured in terms of residents and employees, respectively) is unique for each cost/revenue category. The specific calculations for each line item are discussed below and provided in detail in the report appendix.

There are several revenue and expense categories for which the analysis does not use the per capita factor methodology. These are as follows:

- Property taxes in lieu of VLF are projected based on the project's anticipated development values;
- Property transfer taxes are projected based on anticipated condominium values and ownership turnover rates;
- Sales taxes are projected based on anticipated taxable transactions in the project's onsite retail and other commercial space;
- Transient occupancy taxes are projected based on the anticipated operating revenues of the project's onsite hotel; and
- Interest income is projected as a percentage of all other City revenues generated by the project.

### 3.3 General Fund Revenues

The specific assumptions for each revenue line item are described below. The actual calculations are shown in Appendix A.

**Sales Tax.** Appendix Table A-6 forecasts the sales tax generation associated with the project's onsite commercial facilities. Taxable sales on site are projected based on the following factors:

- Supermarket: total sales of \$400 per square foot, of which 30% are assumed to be taxable;
- Other retail space: taxable sales of \$300 per square foot;
- Hotel: taxable sales (for food/beverage service, etc.) of \$20 per square foot;
- Conference center: taxable sales (for food/beverage service) of \$50 per square foot;
- Theater: taxable (for food concessions) of \$20 per square foot.

The above factors were derived by TNDG based on a review of the following data sources: Dollars & Cents of Shopping Centers published by the Urban Land Institute (2006 edition); sales performance data for various retail and restaurant chains; hotel industry operating data published by PKF Consulting; and proprietary sales tax data from other cities. It should be noted that the above factors reflect industry-wide averages and may therefore be conservative for a new, regionally-significant project such as the Transit Village. That is, it is likely that actual sales tax revenue generated by the proposed project will exceed the projections in this report.

Prior to 2004, cities in California received sales tax revenues of 1.0% of taxable sales occurring within their jurisdictions. With the passage of Proposition 57 in 2004, the cities' share of sales tax revenues was reduced to 0.75% of taxable sales. However, the lost portion of the local sales tax revenue has been replaced by additional revenues from the State (identified in El Monte's budget as "Sales Tax in Lieu"). This separate line item currently amounts to 0.25% of taxable sales in the City. Thus, the City's effective sales tax rate is still 1.0%.

**Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT).** Based on a review of hotel operating data for other communities in the San Gabriel Valley, TNDG projects that the project's 200-room hotel would have an average daily room rate of \$150. Based on hotel industry operating standards, TNDG has assumed that the hotel would have an annual average occupancy rate of 70%. The City receives TOT revenue of 10% of hotel room revenues. The TOT calculations are shown in appendix Table A-7.

**Property Tax in Lieu of VLF.** As noted previously, the standard property tax increment associated with the proposed project would accrue to the El Monte Redevelopment Agency and is therefore not included in this analysis. However, the City also receives separate property tax payments from the State in lieu of Vehicle License Fee (VLF) revenues. This separate property tax line item accrues to the City's General Fund. The amount the City receives from the State increases annually based on the percentage increase in the City's total assessed valuation.

Appendix Table A-8 forecasts the proposed project's total assessed value. The projections are provided in 2006 dollars and are conservative in that they do not reflect potential appreciation of real estate values in future years. The analysis assumes the following base-year development values in the project area:

<b>Development Component</b>	<b>Assumed Development Value</b>
Market Rate Condominiums	\$385,000/unit
Affordable Condominiums	215,000/unit
Apartments	\$175,000/unit
Commercial Development	\$170/square foot
Parking Structures	\$34,000/space

The above development values were derived from the RSG property tax increment analysis and have been confirmed by the project applicant.

Appendix Table A-9 forecasts the Property Tax in Lieu of VLF revenue that the proposed project would generate for the City's General Fund.

**Property Transfer Taxes.** The City receives a property transfer tax based on the value of all real estate transactions occurring in the City. This analysis conservatively assumes that the property transfer tax would be generated only by ownership housing (i.e., condominium units). Although the project's commercial and apartment buildings could also change ownership at some time in the future, sales of income properties tend to occur less frequently than sales of individually-owned homes. Thus, in order to be analytically conservative the study does not project any transfer tax income for the commercial or apartment buildings.

The City's property transfer tax rate is 0.11% of the value of sold properties (i.e., \$1.10 for every \$1,000 in transferred value).

In order to forecast property transfer taxes, it is necessary to project the turnover rate for housing within the project area. Based on a review of Census data for multiple-family residential units the City of El Monte, TNDG projects that the typical home within the project will change ownership once every five years. This equates to an annual turnover rate of 20%.

Appendix Table A-1o shows the calculation of the property transfer tax revenues for the Transit Village project.

**Business License Revenues.** The analysis projects business license revenues on a per capita basis, using the City's "daytime" (worker) population as the basis. The City's adopted budget for Fiscal Year (FY) 2006-2007 indicates total business license revenue of \$1,837,000. The City's commercial/industrial "population" by January 1, 2007 (the midpoint of the fiscal year) is projected at 45,300 jobs<sup>4</sup>. Thus, total business license revenue equates to \$40.55 per commercial/industrial job in the City (see appendix Table A-2). At buildout, the proposed project's retail, theater, office and hotel components would support a total of 3,371 jobs. Thus, TNDG forecasts that the project at full buildout would generate approximately \$136,700 in annual business license income to the City.

**Utility Taxes and Franchise Fees.** Utility taxes and franchise fees accruing to the City are projected on a per capita basis, taking into account both the resident and the daytime (worker) populations. The resident population is used in this analysis as a proxy for revenues generated by residential development and the daytime employee population is used as a proxy for revenues generated by non-residential land uses. Since both residential and non-residential land uses generate utility billings, both are considered in the utility tax and franchise fee calculations. The City's residential population for the beginning of 2007 is projected at 125,600 persons<sup>5</sup> and the City's commercial/industrial "population" is projected at 45,300 jobs. For purposes of calculating utility-related revenues, this analysis assumes that a typical daytime employee generates twice the revenue of a full-time resident of the City. Thus, the total relevant population for these calculations is 216,200 (125,900 + 45,300 X 2).

As shown in appendix Table A-2, Citywide utility franchise fees in the FY 2006-2007 budget are projected at \$2,521,400, or approximately \$11.66 per capita (based on the relevant population of 216,200). The Transit Village project is projected to generate a resident

<sup>4</sup> TNDG has projected the number of commercial and industrial jobs based on estimates and forecasts published by the Southern California Association Governments (SCAG).

<sup>5</sup> TNDG has projected the City's population based on household and population data from the State Department of Finance.

population of 3,538 persons and a daytime population of 3,371 jobs. Using the assumption that one job is the equivalent of two residents, the project's total effective population for forecasting utility franchise fees is 10,280 ( $3,538 + 3,371 \times 2$ ). By multiplying this effective population number by the per capita factor of \$11.66, TNDG forecasts that the project at full buildout would generate approximately \$119,900 per year in utility franchise fee revenue for the City.

As shown in appendix Table A-2, Citywide utility tax revenue in the FY 2006-2007 budget is projected at \$8,731,000, or approximately \$40.38 per capita (based on the relevant population of 216,200). By applying this per capita factor to the projected effective population of the Transit Village project (10,280), TNDG forecasts that the project at full buildout would generate approximately \$415,100 per year in utility taxes for the City.

**Court Fines.** The analysis projects court fines on a per capita basis. Since court fines can be generated both by residents and businesses, the relevant population for this calculation includes both the City's resident population and its daytime employee population. The City's resident population for the beginning of 2007 is projected at 125,600 persons and the City's commercial/industrial "population" is projected at 45,300 jobs. Using the assumption that one job is the equivalent of two residents, the total effective population is 216,200 ( $125,600 + 45,300 \times 2$ ). As shown in appendix Table A-2, Citywide court fine revenue in the FY 2006-2007 budget is projected at \$186,000, or approximately \$0.86 per capita (based on the relevant population of 216,200). By applying this per capita factor to the projected effective population of the Transit Village project (10,280), TNDG forecasts that the project at full buildout would generate approximately \$8,800 per year in court fine revenue for the City.

**Traffic and Parking Fines.** Traffic and parking fines are calculated on a per capita basis. Since these fines can be generated both by residents and businesses, the relevant population for this calculation includes both the City's resident population and its daytime employee population.

As shown in appendix Table A-2, Citywide traffic fine revenue in the FY 2006-2007 budget is projected at \$419,500, or approximately \$1.94 per capita (based on the relevant population of 216,200). By applying this per capita factor to the projected effective population of the Transit Village project (10,280), TNDG forecasts that the project at full buildout would generate approximately \$19,900 per year in traffic fine revenue for the City.

As shown in appendix Table A-2, Citywide parking fine revenue in the FY 2006-2007 budget is projected at \$560,000, or approximately \$2.59 per capita (based on the relevant population of 216,200). By applying this per capita factor to the projected effective population of the Transit Village project (10,280), TNDG forecasts that the project at full buildout would generate approximately \$26,600 per year in parking fine revenue for the City.

**Motor Vehicle License Fees (VLF).** VLF revenues are a subvention paid by the State to local governments on a per capita basis. The City's 2006-2007 budget projects total VLF revenues of \$724,700, or approximately \$5.77 per capita based on a total resident population of 125,600 persons (see appendix Table A-2). By applying this per capita factor to the projected resident population of the Transit Village project (3,538), TNDG forecasts that the project at full buildout would generate approximately \$20,400 per year in VLF revenue for the City.

**Other Miscellaneous Charges for Services.** The City's budget for FY 2006-2007 projects \$149,892 in other Miscellaneous Charges for Services. These revenues can be expected to grow in proportion to the City's resident and daytime employee populations. The City's resident population for the beginning of 2007 is projected at 125,600 persons and the City's commercial/industrial "population" is projected at 45,300 jobs. Using the assumption that one job is the equivalent of two residents, the total effective population is 216,200 (125,600 + 45,300 X 2). As shown in appendix Table A-2, the budget projection of \$149,892 amounts to approximately \$0.69 per capita (based on the relevant population of 216,200). By applying this per capita factor to the projected effective population of the Transit Village project (10,280), TNDG forecasts that the project at full buildout would generate approximately \$7,100 per year in service charge revenues for the City.

**Interest Earnings.** The City's interest earnings (per the FY 2006-2007 budget) amount to approximately 0.3% of other General Fund revenues. This analysis therefore assumes that proposed project would generate new investment earnings for the City equivalent to 0.3% of other General Fund revenues generated by the project. The rationale is that since the project will increase the City's overall revenue base, it will proportionately increase the amount of money the City has available to invest.

### 3.4 General Fund Expenditures

The specific assumptions for each affected cost category are described below.

**Police Department.** Since both the residential and the commercial portions of the proposed project will generate demand for police services, the analysis projects Police Department costs on a per capita basis taking both populations into account. The Citywide Police budget for FY 2006-2007 is \$22,427,732. Of this total, the budget identifies \$670,136 in non-recurring costs and another \$591,250 in costs that are directly recovered through fees. Thus, the net Citywide budget for purposes of this analysis is \$21,166,346. Based on a total relevant population of 216,200 persons (125,600 residents plus twice the 45,300 employees), the net Citywide budget amounts to approximately \$97.90 per capita (see appendix Table A-3). By applying this per capita factor to the projected effective population of the Transit Village project (10,280), TNDG forecasts that the project at full buildout would generate approximately \$1,006,000 per year in Police Department costs.

**Building and Ground Maintenance.** The analysis projects Building and Ground Maintenance costs on a per capita basis, taking into account both the resident and the daytime employee populations. The Citywide Building and Ground Maintenance budget for FY 2006-2007 is \$1,511,663. Of this total, the budget identifies \$315,000 in non-recurring costs. Thus, the net Citywide budget for purposes of this analysis is \$1,196,663. Based on a total relevant population of 216,200 persons, the net Citywide budget amounts to approximately \$5.53 per capita (see appendix Table A-3). By applying this per capita factor to the projected effective population of the Transit Village project (10,280), TNDG forecasts that the project at full buildout would generate approximately \$56,900 per year in Building and Ground Maintenance costs.

**License Collection.** The analysis projects License Collection costs on a per capita basis, taking into account both the resident and the daytime employee populations. The Citywide License Collection budget for FY 2006-2007 is \$244,600, or approximately \$1.13 per capita based on the relevant population of 216,200 persons (see appendix Table A-3). By applying this per capita factor to the projected effective population of the Transit Village project

(10,280), TNDG forecasts that the project at full buildout would generate approximately \$11,600 per year in License Collection costs.

**Information Technology.** The analysis projects Information Technology costs on a per capita basis, taking into account both the resident and the daytime employee populations. The Citywide Information Technology budget for FY 2006-2007 is \$312,200, or approximately \$1.44 per capita based on the relevant population of 216,200 persons (see appendix Table A-3). By applying this per capita factor to the projected effective population of the Transit Village project (10,280), TNDG forecasts that the project at full buildout would generate approximately \$14,800 per year in Information Technology costs.

**Election Expense.** The analysis projects the City's Election costs on a per capita basis. The Citywide Election Expense budget for FY 2006-2007 is \$60,000, or approximately \$0.48 per resident based on a total resident population of 125,600 persons (see appendix Table A-3). By applying this per capita factor to the projected resident population of the Transit Village project (3,538), TNDG forecasts that the project at full buildout would generate approximately \$1,700 per year in Election costs.

**Insurance and Surety Bonds.** The analysis projects the City's Insurance costs on a per capita basis, taking into account both the resident and the daytime employee populations. The Citywide Insurance and Surety Bond budget for FY 2006-2007 is \$12,113,120, or approximately \$56.03 per capita based on the relevant population of 216,200 persons (see appendix Table A-3). By applying this per capita factor to the projected effective population of the Transit Village project (10,280), TNDG forecasts that the project at full buildout would generate approximately \$576,000 per year in Insurance and Surety Bond costs.

**Contract Fire Service.** Fire protection services in the City are provided through a contract with the County of Los Angeles. This analysis assumes that the cost of this contract will increase in proportion to the City's resident and daytime employee populations. Thus, the analysis projects the City's fire protection costs on a per capita basis, taking into account both the resident and the daytime employee populations. The Contract Fire Service budget for FY 2006-2007 is \$9,689,554, or approximately \$44.82 per capita based on the relevant population of 216,200 persons (see appendix Table A-3). By applying this per capita factor to the projected effective population of the Transit Village project (10,280), TNDG forecasts that the project at full buildout would generate approximately \$460,700 per year in fire protection costs.

**General Engineering.** The analysis projects the City's General Engineering costs on a per capita basis, taking into account both the resident and the daytime employee populations. The Citywide General Engineering budget for FY 2006-2007 is \$470,430. Of this total, the budget identifies \$59,000 in costs that are directly recovered through fees. Thus, the net Citywide budget for purposes of this analysis is \$411,430. Based on a total relevant population of 216,200 persons, the net Citywide budget amounts to approximately \$1.90 per capita (see appendix Table A-3). By applying this per capita factor to the projected effective population of the Transit Village project (10,280), TNDG forecasts that the project at full buildout would generate approximately \$19,500 per year in General Engineering costs.

**Recreation and Museum.** The analysis projects the City's Recreation and Museum costs on a per capita basis. The Citywide budget for the Recreation Operating Fund for FY 2006-2007 is \$4,231,424. Of this total, the budget identifies \$15,000 in non-recurring costs and another \$338,000 in costs that are directly recovered through fees. Thus, the net Citywide

budget for purposes of this analysis is \$3,878,424. Based on a total resident population of 125,600 persons, the net Recreation budget amounts to approximately \$30.88 per capita (see appendix Table A-3). By applying this per capita factor to the projected resident population of the Transit Village project (3,538), TNDG forecasts that the project at full buildout would generate approximately \$109,300 per year in Recreation costs.

The Citywide Museum budget for FY 2006-2007 is 50,480, or approximately \$0.40 per resident based on a total resident population of 125,600 persons (see appendix Table A-3). By applying this per capita factor to the projected resident population of the Transit Village project (3,538), TNDG forecasts that the project at full buildout would generate approximately \$1,400 per year in Museum costs.

**Traffic Safety.** The City's Traffic Safety costs include street maintenance, signs and striping, street cleaning, parking enforcement, storm drain maintenance, traffic signal maintenance, street tree and pathway maintenance, and related equipment maintenance. This analysis projects Traffic Safety costs on a per capita basis, taking into account both the resident and the daytime employee populations. The Citywide Traffic budget for FY 2006-2007 is \$2,782,486. Of this total, the budget identifies \$25,000 in costs that are directly recovered through fees. Thus, the net Citywide budget for purposes of this analysis is \$2,757,486. Based on a total relevant population of 216,200 persons, the net Citywide budget amounts to approximately \$12.75 per capita (see appendix Table A-3). By applying this per capita factor to the projected effective population of the Transit Village project (10,280), TNDG forecasts that the project at full buildout would generate approximately \$131,100 per year in Traffic Safety costs.

**Planning.** The analysis projects the City's recurring Planning costs on a per capita basis, taking into account both the resident and daytime employee populations. The Citywide Planning budget for FY 2006-2007 is \$671,403. Of this total, the budget identifies \$235,000 in non-recurring costs and another \$300,000 in costs that are directly recovered through fees. Thus, the net Citywide budget for purposes of this analysis is \$136,403. Based on a total relevant population of 216,200 persons, the net Planning budget amounts to approximately \$0.63 per capita (see appendix Table A-3). By applying this per capita factor to the projected effective population of the Transit Village project (10,280), TNDG forecasts that the project at full buildout would generate approximately \$6,500 per year in recurring Planning costs. This amount does not include the one-time costs associated with processing new development in the project area; it is assumed that these one-time costs would be directly offset by fees or other developer reimbursements.

**Administrative/Overhead Functions.** The following budget line items are classified in this analysis as administrative/overhead functions:

- City Council
- Administration
- City Clerk
- Purchasing
- Finance
- City Treasurer
- City Attorney
- Human Resources
- General City Expense
- Unallocated Expenses

The cost of these functions can be expected to grow in proportion to the budgets for core City services. As shown on appendix Table A-3, the adopted budgets for these line items in FY 2006-2007 total \$3,286,943. This amounts to 6.0% of other General Fund expenditures. Thus, TNDG estimates that for every new dollar spent on "core" General Fund services, the administrative/overhead costs will increase \$0.06.

**APPENDIX A:**  
**Detailed Fiscal Impact Calculations**

**Table A-1**  
**Detail of Impacts to City of El Monte General Fund**  
**Transit Village Development Program**  
**In 2006 Constant (Uninflated) Dollars**

*Annual Impact of Each Area at Buildout:*

	Area I	Area II	Area III	Area IV/V	Total
<b>General Fund Revenues:</b>					
Property Taxes (VLF Swap)	\$683,764	\$481,861	\$706,821	\$1,103,431	\$2,975,877
Property Transfer Taxes	\$62,890	\$7,835	\$24,165	\$0	\$94,890
Franchises	\$26,385	\$18,524	\$27,239	\$47,741	\$119,888
Business Licenses	\$14,688	\$15,883	\$23,127	\$83,002	\$136,699
Sales Tax	\$407,475	\$331,125	\$309,750	\$52,650	\$1,101,000
Sales Tax In-Lieu	\$135,825	\$110,375	\$103,250	\$17,550	\$367,000
Parking Fines	\$5,860	\$4,114	\$6,050	\$10,603	\$26,627
Court Fines	\$1,946	\$1,366	\$2,009	\$3,522	\$8,844
Utility Tax	\$91,365	\$64,143	\$94,321	\$165,316	\$415,144
Motor Vehicle License Fee	\$8,874	\$4,645	\$6,895	\$0	\$20,414
Transit Occupancy Tax	\$0	\$0	\$766,500	\$0	\$766,500
Traffic Fines (Traffic Safety Fund)	\$4,390	\$3,082	\$4,532	\$7,943	\$19,946
Gas Tax & Prop. 111 (Traffic Safety Fund)	\$24,921	\$13,044	\$19,363	\$0	\$57,327
Miscellaneous Charges for Services	\$1,569	\$1,101	\$1,619	\$2,838	\$7,127
Interest	\$4,204	\$3,023	\$5,993	\$4,274	\$17,494
Total General Fund Revenues	\$1,474,155	\$1,060,121	\$2,101,633	\$1,498,870	\$6,134,778
<b>General Fund Costs:</b>					
Administrative/Overhead Functions	\$33,217	\$22,795	\$33,541	\$54,780	\$144,333
Police Department	\$221,493	\$155,501	\$228,659	\$400,770	\$1,006,423
Building & Ground Maintenance	\$12,522	\$8,791	\$12,928	\$22,658	\$56,899
License Collection	\$2,560	\$1,797	\$2,642	\$4,631	\$11,630
Information Technology	\$3,267	\$2,294	\$3,373	\$5,911	\$14,845
Election Expense	\$735	\$385	\$571	\$0	\$1,690
Insurance and Surety Bonds/W.C. Insurance	\$126,756	\$88,990	\$130,858	\$229,354	\$575,958
Contract Fire Service	\$101,395	\$71,185	\$104,676	\$183,465	\$460,721
General Engineering	\$4,305	\$3,023	\$4,445	\$7,790	\$19,563
Museum	\$618	\$324	\$480	\$0	\$1,422
Traffic Safety	\$28,855	\$20,258	\$29,789	\$52,211	\$131,114
Recreation Operating Fund	\$47,492	\$24,858	\$36,901	\$0	\$109,251
Planning	\$1,427	\$1,002	\$1,474	\$2,583	\$6,486
Total General Fund Costs	\$584,644	\$401,201	\$590,335	\$964,153	\$2,540,334
<b>NET IMPACT (Revenues - Costs)</b>	<b>\$889,511</b>	<b>\$658,919</b>	<b>\$1,511,298</b>	<b>\$534,716</b>	<b>\$3,594,444</b>

Source: The Natelson Dale Group, Inc. (TNDG).

**Table A-2  
Derivation of Revenue Projection Factors  
City of El Monte Fiscal Impact Analysis  
Transit Village Development Program**

City of El Monte Population	125,600
City of El Monte, Daytime Employee Population	45,300
Employee Weighting Factor	2.0

<b>General Fund Revenues Calculated on a Per Capita Basis</b>				
	<b>Citywide Budget FY 2006/07</b>	<b>Allocation Basis</b>	<b>Relevant Population</b>	<b>Per Capita Revenue</b>
Franchises	\$2,521,400	R+E	216,200	\$11.66
Business Licenses	\$1,837,000	E	45,300	\$40.55
Parking Fines	\$560,000	R+E	216,200	\$2.59
Court Fines	\$186,000	R+E	216,200	\$0.86
Utility Tax	\$8,731,000	R+E	216,200	\$40.38
Motor Vehicle License Fee	\$724,700	R	125,600	\$5.77
Traffic Fines (Traffic Safety Fund)	\$419,500	R+E	216,200	\$1.94
Gas Tax & Prop. 111 (Traffic Safety Fund)	\$2,035,125	R	125,600	\$16.20
Miscellaneous Charges for Services	\$149,892	R+E	216,200	\$0.69

Allocation basis: R - residents; E - employees (daytime population); R+E residents plus 2 X employees.

<b>Other General Fund Revenues</b>	
Sales Tax	Calculated separately on Table A-6
Sales Tax In-Lieu	Calculated separately on Table A-6
Transient Occupancy Tax	Calculated separately on Table A-7
Property Tax (VLF Swap)	Calculated separately on Table A-9
Property Transfer Tax	Calculated separately on Table A-10
Interest Income	0.3% of other General Fund revenues

Sources: City of El Monte Proposed Budget 2006-2007; State Department of Finance; Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG); The Natelson Dale Group, Inc. (TNDG).

**Table A-3  
Derivation of Cost Projection Factors  
City of El Monte Fiscal Impact Analysis  
Transit Village Development Program**

City of El Monte Population	125,600
City of El Monte, Daytime Employee Population	45,300
Employee Weighting Factor	2.0

Budget Category	Citywide Budget FY 2006/07	Non-Recurring Amount	Amount Recovered Through Fees	% Subject to Per Capita Increases	Adjusted Amount	Allocation Basis (3)	Relevant Population	Per Capita Cost
<b>Administrative/Overhead Functions:</b>	\$3,286,943 (1)			6.0% of other General Fund costs				
<b>Core City Services:</b>								
Police Department	\$22,427,732	\$670,136	\$591,250	94%	\$21,166,346	R+E	216,200	\$97.90
Building & Ground Maintenance	\$1,511,663	\$315,000	\$0	0%	\$1,196,663	R+E	216,200	\$5.53
License Collection	\$244,600	\$0	\$0	100%	\$244,600	R+E	216,200	\$1.13
Information Technology	\$312,200	\$0	\$0	100%	\$312,200	R+E	216,200	\$1.44
Election Expense	\$60,000	\$0	\$0	100%	\$60,000	R	125,600	\$0.48
Insurance and Surety Bonds/W.C. Insurance	\$12,113,120	\$0	\$0	100%	\$12,113,120	R+E	216,200	\$56.03
Contract Fire Service	\$9,689,554	\$0	\$0	100%	\$9,689,554	R+E	216,200	\$44.82
General Engineering	\$470,430	\$0	\$59,000	87%	\$411,430	R+E	216,200	\$1.90
Museum	\$50,480	\$0	\$0	100%	\$50,480	R	125,600	\$0.40
Traffic Safety (2)	\$2,782,486	\$0	\$25,000	99%	\$2,757,486	R+E	216,200	\$12.75
Recreation Operating Fund	\$4,231,424	\$15,000	\$338,000	92%	\$3,878,424	R	125,600	\$30.88
Planning	\$671,403	\$235,000	\$300,000	20%	\$136,403	R+E	216,200	\$0.63
Subtotal, Core City Services	\$54,565,092							
<b>Other Cost Categories Unlikely to be Impacted</b>								
Public Information	\$3,250							
Code Enforcement	\$234,187							
Community Promotion	\$97,336							
Sister City Program	\$19,500							
Building Regulations	\$381,730							
Valley Mall	\$103,956							
Parking Lot Maintenance	\$11,446							
Sanitary Sewer Maintenance	\$122,794							
Debt Service	\$1,051,462							
Subtotal, Other	\$2,025,661							
<b>GRAND TOTAL</b>	<b>\$59,877,696</b>							

- (1) Includes City Council, Administration, City Clerk, Purchasing, Finance, City Treasurer, City Attorney, Human Resources, General City Expense and Unallocated Expenses.  
(2) Includes Street Maintenance, Signs & Striping, Street Cleaning, Parking Enforcement, Storm Drains, Traffic Signals, Street Trees & Pathways and Equipment Maintenance.  
(3) Allocation basis: R - residents; R+E - residents plus 2 X employees.

Sources: City of El Monte Proposed Budget 2006-2007; State Department of Finance; SCAG; TNDG.

**Table A-4**  
**Project Description by Area**  
**Transit Village Development Program**

	Area I	Area II	Area III	Area IV	Area V	Total
Market Rate Condominiums	709	59	249			1,017
Affordable Condominiums	60	60	65			185
Apartments	0	324	324			648
Total Housing (dwelling units)	<u>769</u>	<u>443</u>	<u>638</u>			<u>1,850</u>
Supermarket (square feet)		50,000				50,000
Other Retail (square feet)	181,100	122,500	114,000	23,400		441,000
Conference Center (square feet)			42,000			42,000
Office (square feet)				500,000		500,000
Theater (square feet)		70,000				70,000
Hotel (rooms)			200			200
Child Development Center (square feet)	20,000					20,000
3629 Building (square feet)	32,000					32,000
Parking (spaces)	2,147	2,064	1,549	1,800	900	8,460
Bus Parking (spaces)				296		296
Parks (acres)	14.10	N/A	N/A	N/A	0.40	14.50
Private Open Space (acres)	1.18	2.26	1.21	1.88	2.18	8.71

Sources: Titan Group; TNDG.

**Table A-5  
Projected On-Site Employment and Resident Population  
Transit Village Development Program**

	Square Feet Per Employee	On-Site Employees by Area:				
		Area I	Area II	Area III	Area IV	Total
Retail	500	362	245	228	47	882
Supermarket	500	-	100	-	-	100
Hotel (200 rooms)	333	-	-	300	-	300
Conference Center	1,000	-	-	42	-	42
Theatre	1,500	-	47	-	-	47
Office Space	250	-	-	-	2,000	2,000
<b>Total Daytime Population</b>		<b>362</b>	<b>392</b>	<b>570</b>	<b>2,047</b>	<b>3,371</b>
<b>-- Weighted at factor of 2.0</b>		<b>724</b>	<b>783</b>	<b>1,141</b>	<b>4,094</b>	<b>6,742</b>
	Persons Per Household	Resident Population by Area:				
		Area I	Area II	Area III	Area IV	
Condominiums	2.00	1,538	238	628	0	2,404
Senior Apartments	1.75	0	567	567	0	1,134
<b>Total Resident Population</b>		<b>1,538</b>	<b>805</b>	<b>1,195</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>3,538</b>
<b>TOTAL EFFECTIVE POPULATION</b>		<b>2,262</b>	<b>1,588</b>	<b>2,336</b>	<b>4,094</b>	<b>10,280</b>

Sources: The Natelson Dale Group, Inc. (TNDG); Titan Group.

**Table A-6  
 Projected On-Site Sales Tax Generation  
 Transit Village Development Program**

		<i>Total Annual Taxable Sales by Area at Buildout</i>				
	<b>Taxable Sales Per Square Foot</b>	<b>Area I</b>	<b>Area II</b>	<b>Area III</b>	<b>Area IV</b>	<b>Total</b>
Retail	\$300	\$54,330,000	\$36,750,000	\$34,200,000	\$7,020,000	\$132,300,000
Supermarket	\$120	\$0	\$6,000,000	\$0	\$0	\$6,000,000
Hotel (200 rooms)	\$50	\$0	\$0	\$5,000,000	\$0	\$5,000,000
Conference Center	\$50	\$0	\$0	\$2,100,000	\$0	\$2,100,000
Theatre	\$20	\$0	\$1,400,000	\$0	\$0	\$1,400,000
<b>GRAND TOTAL, TAXABLE SALES</b>		<b>\$54,330,000</b>	<b>\$44,150,000</b>	<b>\$41,300,000</b>	<b>\$7,020,000</b>	<b>\$146,800,000</b>
<b>Basic City Sales Tax Apportionment @</b>	0.75%	<b>\$407,475</b>	<b>\$331,125</b>	<b>\$309,750</b>	<b>\$52,650</b>	<b>\$1,101,000</b>
<b>Sales Tax In-Lieu @</b>	0.25%	<b>\$135,825</b>	<b>\$110,375</b>	<b>\$103,250</b>	<b>\$17,550</b>	<b>\$367,000</b>

Source: The Natelson Dale Group, Inc. (TNDG).

**Table A-7**  
**Projected Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT)**  
**Transit Village Development Program**

*Annual TOT Revenue:*

		<b>Area I</b>	<b>Area II</b>	<b>Area III</b>	<b>Area IV</b>
Hotel Rooms		-	-	200	-
Available Annual Room Nights		-	-	73,000	-
Average Annual Occupancy Rate		-	-	70%	-
Occupied Annual Room Nights		-	-	51,100	-
Average Daily Room Rate		-	-	\$150.00	-
Total Annual Room Revenues		-	-	7,665,000	-
<b>City TOT Revenue @</b>	<b>10.0%</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$766,500</b>	<b>\$0</b>

Source: The Natelson Dale Group, Inc.

**Table A-8  
Calculation of Property Tax Base  
Transit Village Development Program**

	Average Value Per Unit	<i>Total Assessed Value (000's) at Buildout of Each Phase:</i>				
		Area I	Area II	Area III	Area IV	Area V
Market Rate Condominiums (per unit)	\$385,000	\$272,965	\$22,715	\$95,865	\$0	\$0
Affordable Condominiums (per unit)	\$215,000	\$12,900	\$12,900	\$13,975	\$0	\$0
Apartments (per unit)	\$175,000	\$0	\$56,700	\$56,700	\$0	\$0
Commercial (per square foot)	\$170	\$30,477	\$41,225	\$43,520	\$88,978	\$0
Parking Structures (per space)	\$34,000	\$72,735	\$143,174	\$195,840	\$257,040	\$287,640
Land Transfer & Grading (% of other costs)	4.0%	\$15,658	\$11,136	\$16,335	\$13,925	\$11,575
Existing Building Renovation	N/A	\$3,727	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
<b><i>New Assessed Value</i></b>		<b><i>\$408,461</i></b>	<b><i>\$287,850</i></b>	<b><i>\$422,235</i></b>	<b><i>\$359,943</i></b>	<b><i>\$299,215</i></b>

Sources: RSG, Inc.; TNDG.

**Table A-9**  
**Projected Revenue from Property Tax VLF Swap**  
**Transit Village Development Program**

Base Year (2005-2006) Citywide Assessed Value \$4,610,356,194

Incremental Assessed Value from TV Development	
Area I	\$408,461,180
Area II	\$287,849,795
Area III	\$422,234,625
Area IV	\$359,942,795
Area V	\$299,215,490
Total	<u>\$1,777,703,884</u>

Percentage Change from Base Year Value	
Area I	9%
Area II	6%
Area III	9%
Area IV	8%
Area V	6%
Total	<u>39%</u>

Base Value of VLF \$7,717,738

Incremental Revenue from Property Tax VLF Swap	
Area I	\$683,764
Area II	\$481,861
Area III	\$706,821
Area IV	\$602,544
Area V	\$500,887
Total	<u>\$2,975,877</u>

Sources: TNDG, based on model developed by HdL, Coren & Cone.

**Table A-10**  
**Projection of Property Transfer Tax**  
**Transit Village Development Program**

	<b>Area I</b>	<b>Area II</b>	<b>Area III</b>	<b>Area IV</b>
Number of Condominiums	769	119	314	0
Average Value Per Unit (1)	\$371,736	\$299,286	\$349,809	N/A
Total Value of Condominiums (000's)	\$285,865	\$35,615	\$109,840	N/A
Property Turnover Rate (per year)	20.0%	20.0%	20.0%	N/A
Value of Properties Transferred (000's)	\$57,173	\$7,123	\$21,968	N/A
<b>City Transfer Tax Revenue @</b>	0.110%	<b>\$62,890</b>	<b>\$7,835</b>	<b>\$24,165</b>
				<b>\$0</b>

(1) In 2006 dollars, assumes average value of \$385,000 for market-rate units and \$215,000 for affordable units.

Sources: Titan Group; RSG, Inc.; The Natelson Dale Group, Inc.