

KEYSER MARSTON ASSOCIATES

MEMORANDUM

Advisors in: Real Estate Affordable Housing Economic Development	То:	Elycia Knight City of Santa Clara
Berkeley Debbie M. Kern David Doezema	From:	Keyser Marston Associates, Inc.
Los Angeles Kathleen H. Head	Date:	November 14, 2024
Kevin E. Engstrom Julie L. Romey Tim Bretz	Subject:	Mission Point Project, Fiscal Impact Analysis Peer Review and Testing of Alternatives
San Diego Paul C. Marra Linnie Gavino Emeritus A. Jerry Keyser Timothy C. Kelly	(City) to prov FIA") prepare	ton Associates, Inc. (KMA) has been retained by the City of Santa Clara vide a peer review of the Fiscal Impact Analysis of Mission Point ("Applicant ed by Economic and Planning Systems (EPS) on behalf of the developer, ted February 1, 2024.

The Mission Point Project ("Project") has been presented as two options:

Option A encompasses up to 1,800 residential units, 3 million square feet of office / R&D uses, 100,000 square feet of retail / amenity uses, 10,000 square feet of childcare space, associated parking, parks, and open space.

Option B includes up to 2,600 residential units, 2.2 million square feet of office / R&D uses, 100,000 square feet of retail / amenity uses, 10,000 square feet of childcare space, associated parking, parks, and open space.

The Applicant FIA provides findings regarding annual recurring fiscal impacts to the City of Santa Clara General Fund and the Santa Clara Unified School District (SCUSD) for Option A of the Project. The following memorandum presents the findings of the KMA peer review, modified findings for Option A based on the results of the peer review, an analysis of Option B, and an analysis of the residential component of the Project on its own.

2130 CENTER STREET, SUITE 301 > BERKELEY, CALIFORNIA 94704 > PHONE: 415 398 3050 > FAX: 415 397 5065

I. Summary

The Applicant FIA is reasonable and generally aligns with standard practices in preparation of fiscal impact analyses but warrants modification to select elements to provide a more accurate assessment of fiscal impacts. Recommended modifications affect estimated revenues as well as police, fire, public works, parks, and SCUSD expenses, as described in Section II. Table 1 presents a summary of revenue and expense estimates for the City General Fund and SCUSD, including:

- > Option A as presented in the Applicant FIA.
- > Option A with KMA's recommended adjustments to the analysis.
- > Option B with KMA's recommended adjustments to the analysis.
- Residential phase on its own based on the 1,800 units in Option A.

Except for the first column of Table 1 identifying the Applicant FIA results for Option A, all findings reflect KMA's recommended adjustments to the analysis discussed herein. Results are as follows:

- Option A is projected to generate a \$4 million annual net surplus to the City General Fund upon full buildout and a net surplus of \$12.4 million per year to SCUSD.
- Option B is projected to generate a \$3.1 million annual net surplus to the City General Fund upon full buildout and a net surplus of \$9.2 million per year to SCUSD.
- The residential phase of Option A is projected to generate a \$0.3 million annual net surplus to the City General Fund and be approximately fiscally neutral to SCUSD¹.

¹ Findings for the residential phase of Option B are similar at a projected net positive General Fund surplus of \$0.35 million.

Table 1. Annual Recurring Fiscal Impacts (\$Millions)							
		FIA Findings with KMA Adjustments					
	Applicant FIA, Option A (1,800 units) ⁽¹⁾	Option A (1,800 units)	Option B (2,600 units)	Residential Phase Only (1,800 units) ⁽²⁾			
City of Santa Clara General Fund							
General Fund Revenues	\$7.7	\$8.0	\$7.4	\$2.1			
General Fund Expense	(\$4.8)	(\$4.0)	(\$4.3)	(\$1.8)			
City Net Fiscal Impact	\$2.9	\$4.0	\$3.1	\$0.3			
Santa Clara Unified School District							
Revenue	\$17.7	\$17.3	\$16.2	\$5.0			
Expense	(\$4.3)	(\$4.9)	(\$7.0)	(\$4.9)			
SCUSD Net Fiscal Impact	\$13.3	\$12.4	\$9.2	\$0.1			

(1) Applicant FIA results for rental units are presented. The Applicant FIA includes a separate analysis if residential units are condos, with very similar results.

(2) Findings for the residential phase of Option B are very similar, with a projected net General Fund surplus of \$0.35 million and the Santa Clara Unified School District approximately fiscally neutral.

Table 2 summarizes the development alternatives that are evaluated.

Table 2. Development Alternatives Evaluated						
	Option A (1,800 units)	Option B (2,600 units)	Residential Phase Only (1,800 units)			
Residential						
BMR Units	270	390	270	units		
Market Rate	<u>1,530</u>	<u>2,210</u>	<u>1,530</u>	<u>units</u>		
Subtotal	1,800	2,600	1,800	units		
<u>Commercial</u>						
Office/R&D	3,000,000	2,210,000	0	sq.ft.		
Retail/Amenities	100,000	100,000	8,000	sq.ft.		
Childcare	<u>10,000</u>	<u>10,000</u>	<u>10,000</u>	sq.ft.		
Subtotal	3,110,000	2,320,000	18,000	sq.ft.		

		FIA Findi	stments	
	Applicant FIA, Option A (1,800 units)	Option A (1,800 units)	Option B (2,600 units)	Residential Phase Only (1,800 units)
General Fund Revenues		· · · ·	· · · ·	
Property Tax	\$4,364,800	\$4,240,200	\$3,832,000	\$1,015,000
Property Tax In Lieu of VLF	\$1,464,800	\$1,423,000	\$1,286,000	\$341,000
Sales and Use Tax	\$944,400	\$944,400	\$971,000	\$291,000
SVP Transfers	not included	\$541,000	\$498,000	\$200,000
Franchise Fees	\$246,800	\$246,800	\$250,000	\$95,000
Permits and Licenses	\$194,800	\$194,800	\$198,000	\$75,000
Transient Occupancy Tax	\$142,500	\$142,500	\$105,000	\$0
Document Transfer Tax	\$127,400	\$124,000	\$113,000	\$30,000
Business License Tax	\$88,200	\$88,200	\$66,000	\$1,000
Fines and Forfeitures	\$79,200	\$79,200	\$80,000	\$31,000
Total Revenues	\$7,652,900	\$8,024,100	\$7,399,000	\$2,079,000
General Fund Service Costs				
Fire/EMS	\$1,665,700	\$1,261,000	\$1,196,000	\$358,000
Police	\$1,676,900	\$1,318,000	\$1,496,000	\$672,000
Public Works	\$356,000	\$534,000	\$542,000	\$207,000
General Government	\$444,400	\$444,400	\$451,000	\$172,000
Parks & Recreation	\$415,300	\$214,000	\$310,000	\$214,000
Library	\$163,000	\$163,000	\$235,000	\$163,000
Planning & Inspection	\$68,000	\$68,000	\$69,000	\$26,000
Total Expenditures	\$4,789,300	\$4,002,400	\$4,299,000	\$1,812,000
Net Annual Fiscal Impact	\$2,863,600	\$4,021,700	\$3,100,000	\$267,000

Table 3 presents City General Fund fiscal impacts by revenue source and department.

Items that reflect KMA modification of the Applicant FIA methodology or assumptions are highlighted. See discussion in Section II.

		FIA Find	FIA Findings with KMA Adjustments			
	Applicant FIA, Option A (1,800 units)	Option A (1,800 units)	Option B (2,600 units)	Residential Phase Only (1,800 units)		
Revenues			· · ·	· · · ·		
Property Tax	\$16,690,000	\$16,214,000	\$14,654,000	\$3,882,000		
Other Revenues	\$970,000	\$1,091,000	\$1,573,000	\$1,091,000		
Total Revenues	\$17,660,000	\$17,305,000	\$16,227,000	\$4,973,000		
Expenses	\$4,347,000	\$4,886,000	\$7,049,000	\$4,886,000		
Net Annual Fiscal Impact	\$13,313,000	\$12,419,000	\$9,178,000	\$87,000		

Table 4 presents estimates for SCUSD.

Section II. describes the recommended adjustments to the Applicant FIA, which is focused on Option A.

Appendix A. provides supporting analysis for the residential phase estimates.

Appendix B. provides supporting analysis for the Option B estimates.

II. Recommended Modifications to Applicant FIA

A discussion of recommended modifications to the Applicant FIA is provided below. The Applicant FIA evaluated Option A only, thus the discussion and tables presented in this section pertain only to Option A.

A. Santa Clara Fire Department (SCFD) Expenses

The methodology used by the Applicant FIA is drawn from the recommendations of a fire needs assessment prepared on behalf of the developer ("Needs Assessment)². The Applicant FIA selects one of the two metrics provided in the Needs Assessment on which an estimate of Fire / EMS service costs could be based:

- **A. Existing Staffing Ratio to Population** Staffing needed to maintain the existing ratio of fire / EMS staff to population, which results in an estimated need for approximately four additional firefighters (used in Applicant FIA).
- **B.** Fire / EMS Service Calls the Project will generate 840 new Fire / EMS calls for service annually according to the Needs Assessment (not used in Applicant FIA).

The selected population-based staffing metric is problematic in that it does not directly consider service needs of non-residential uses that represent approximately two thirds of the Project by building area. Of the two metrices provided in the Needs Assessment, service call generation by the Project is the most direct measure of service needs; however, the estimated calls for service identified by the Needs Assessment is likely inaccurate, as discussed below.

Two additional approaches for estimating Fire/EMS service costs were examined based on feedback from the Santa Clara Fire Department, including:

- **C. Staffing Ratio for Higher Density Communities** Santa Clara Fire Department (SCFD) indicates a staffing ratio of 1.5 per 1,000 population is more appropriate to a high-density community, such as the Proposed Project.
- D. Daytime Service Population Estimating service costs proportionate to daytime service population is used in the Applicant FIA for a number of other revenue and expense items and could be applied to Fire / EMS service costs as well.

Estimates using each of the four approaches follow.

² Mission Point Development Fire Service Needs Assessment by PryoAnalysis, June 12, 2023.

Approach A. Ratio of Fire / EMS Staff to Population (Applicant FIA Method)

Approach A using the current ratio of Fire / EMS staff to population is presented in Table 5-1 and yields an estimated expense of approximately \$1.7 million. As noted above, the approach is problematic because it does not consider costs associated with non-residential uses comprising three of the four major phases in the Project. Further, SCFD does not use a population-based ratio for staffing decisions³.

Table 5-1 Approach A Based on Existing FTEs Per	1,000 Populati	on (Applicant FIA Method)
FY 23-24 Field Ops and EMS Division costs	\$57,020,592	Excludes Admin, Community Risk Reduction, Training, and Office of Emergency Services
Field Operations FTEs	138	
Cost per FTE	\$413,193	
Existing Residents	132,476	
Existing Field Operations FTEs per 1,000 residents	1.0417	
Number of residents, Proposed Project	3,870	
Number of New FTEs needed at current staffing ratio	4.031	
Estimated Fire/EMS Services Cost (Approach A)	\$1,666,000	= 4.031 FTEs x \$413,193 cost per FTE

Approach B. Based on Fire/EMS Calls for Service

Fire/EMS service costs can be estimated based on the number of Fire/EMS service calls projected to be generated. This approach considers both residential and non-residential components and relates directly to the service demands created by the Project. As stated in the Needs Assessment *"as the call volume in District 10 continues to rise, there is an increased likelihood of simultaneous service requests and the potential for the primary responding unit to be engaged at another emergency. This situation, known as concurrent calls for service, will necessitate a response from a secondary or tertiary unit stationed south of Hwy 101, further worsening the already delayed response times in <i>District 10."*

The Needs Assessment indicates the Project will generate 840 additional Fire / EMS calls for service annually. However, the 840 service calls is not based on analysis of service call data, rather it assumes existing citywide calls increase proportionate to the sum of population and employment, and so may not be accurate.

³ As stated in the DEIR, "SCFD does not use a population-based staffing standard but, rather, bases its staffing model on the ability to send trained and equipped personnel within response times."

KMA prepared a modified estimate of the number of Fire/EMS calls for service based on SCFD data on actual Fire/EMS calls for service to the following existing properties:

- Santa Clara Square, a mixed use development with multi-family, retail and office;
- Santa Clara Gateway, an office development; and
- St Anton Apartments, a multi-family 100% affordable development.

Fire / EMS call generation rates from these existing properties are shown in Table 5-2.

Table 5-2. Fire/EMS Calls for Service Generation Rate Estimate							
				Service Call			
	Annual			Generation Rate Per			
	Fire/EMS Calls	Data	No. of Units or	Unit or 1,000 Square			
	for Service	Year ⁽¹⁾	Square Feet	Feet			
Santa Clara Square: Office	18	2019	1,700,000 sq.ft.	0.0106 / 1,000 SF			
Santa Clara Gateway: Office	46	2019	900,000 sq.ft.	0.0511 / 1,000 SF			
Santa Clara Square: Retail	26	2023	166,313 sq.ft.	0.1563 / 1,000 SF			
Santa Clara Square: Multifamily	51	2023	1,482 units	0.0344 / unit			
St. Anton Apartments: Affordable	8	2023	196 units	0.0408 / unit			

Sources: City of Santa Clara Fire Department, CoStar, Realquest.

(1) Calls for service to office uses dropped during the pandemic and are currently affected by high vacancies. For office, 2019 data is used to establish call rates.

Call generation rates from Table 5-2 are applied to estimate annual fire/EMS calls for service to the Project. Fire/EMS service costs are estimated using the existing cost per call. These calculations are shown in Table 5-3 and yield an estimate of Fire/EMS service expenses of approximately \$1.3 million per year.

Table 5-3. Fire / EMS Approach B, Based o	on Projected Calls For Se	ervice	
FY 23-24 Field Ops and EMS Division costs			\$57,020,592
Fire/EMS Calls For Service, 2023			10,586
Cost Per Service Call			\$5,386
Calls for Service, Proposed Project Market Rate Residential Affordable Residential Office ⁽¹⁾	<u>Call Generation</u> 0.0344 / unit 0.0408 / unit 0.0511 / 1,000 SF	<u>Development</u> 1,530 units 270 units 3,000,000 SF	Estimated Calls for Service 53 11 153
Retail / Amenities	0.1563 / 1,000 SF	110,000 SF	<u>17</u>
Total Calls			234
Estimated Fire/EMS Service Expense	= no. of calls x cost p	er call	\$1,261,000

(1) Uses Santa Clara Gateway call generation rate.

Approach C. Higher Density / Urban Staffing Ratio

SCFD indicated that a higher staffing ratio of 1.5 FTEs per 1,000 population is more applicable to a higher density community such as the Project. The existing staffing ratio of 1.04 FTEs per 1,000 population aligns more closely with National Fire Protection Association guidance for lower density suburban environments. Use of a higher population-based staffing ratio shares the disadvantage of Approach A in attributing all service needs to residential uses, with no direct consideration of service needs associated with the non-residential component. With Approach C, Fire / EMS service costs are estimated at \$2.4 million per year, as shown in Table 5-4.

Table 5-4. Approach C Based on Higher Density / Urba	an Staffing Ratio	o of 1.5 Per 1,000 Population
FY 23-24 Field Ops and EMS Division costs	\$57,020,592	Excludes Admin, Community Risk Reduction, Training, and Office of Emergency Services
Field Operations FTEs	138	FTEs
Cost per FTE	\$413,193	/FTE
Number of residents, Proposed Project	3,870	Residents
Staffing Ratio per 1,000, Higher Density Communities	1.5	per SCFD
Number of New FTEs needed	5.81	FTEs
Estimated Fire/EMS Services Cost (Approach C)	\$2,399,000	=5.81 FTEs x \$413,193 cost per FTE.

Approach D. Daytime Service Population

With Approach D, existing Fire / EMS costs are estimated proportionate to daytime service population. This methodology is consistent with analyses of six other revenue and expense items in the Applicant FIA. Approach D considers service needs of both residential and non-residential components of the Project. As shown in Table 5-5, this method results in an estimated service cost of \$2.9 million per year.

Table 5-5. Approach D Based on Daytime Service Population							
FY 23-24 Field Ops and EMS Division Budget	\$57,020,592	Excludes Admin, Community Risk Reduction, Training, and Office of Emergency Services					
Existing Daytime Service Population	196,597						
Cost per Daytime Service Population	\$290.04						
New Daytime Service Population	10,152						
Estimated Fire/EMS Services Cost (Approach D)	\$2,944,000	= \$290.04 cost per daytime population x 10,152 new daytime population					

As evident from the discussion above, estimates are sensitive to methodology. KMA's recommendation is to use Approach B (Table 5-3), which yields a Fire/EMS service cost

of approximately \$1.3 million per year. Approach B considers service demands of both residential and non-residential Project components and is the most data-driven estimate based on actual service demands of comparable existing uses.

B. Police Service Costs

The Applicant FIA estimates the cost to provide police services at \$1.7 million per year based on the existing ratio of officers per 1,000 population. This approach has the same drawbacks as Approach A of the Fire/EMS analysis in that estimated police service expenses are based solely on the residential component of the Project, with no expenses attributed to non-residential uses. As stated in the Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR) for the Project, Santa Clara Police Department (SCPD) does not maintain a population-based standard for staffing, rather SCPD bases staffing decisions on actual workload and the interpretation and analysis of data.

KMA prepared a separate analysis of police service expenses based on the estimated number of calls for service, an approach to capturing service needs of all Project components based on the actual service demands of comparable existing uses. The estimate uses the same properties as the Fire/EMS calls for service analysis. Table 6-1 summarizes the Police call generation rates from these existing properties.

	Α.	В.	C.	D.
	Annual Police	No. of Units or	Adjustment	Service Call
	Calls for Service (1)	Square Feet	Factor ⁽²⁾	Generation Rate
				=A. / B x C.
Santa Clara Square: Office	36	1,700,000 sq.ft.	2	0.0424 / 1,000 SF
Santa Clara Gateway: Office	27	900,000 sq.ft.	2	0.0600 / 1,000 SF
Santa Clara Square: Retail	248	166,313 sq.ft.	1	1.4912 / 1,000 SF
Santa Clara Square: Multi-Family	209	1,482 units	1	0.1410 / Unit
St. Anton Apartments: Affordable	63	196 units	1	0.3214 / Unit

Sources: KMA analysis of data provided by City of Santa Clara Police Department, CoStar, Realquest.

Represents calls for service excluding traffic-related incidents that include police beat and location coordinates.
A comparison to pre-pandemic call generation rates indicates a drop of nearly 60% for office uses from 2019 to 2023. The 2x adjustment factor assumes calls for service will return to near pre-pandemic rates.

Call generation rates from Table 6-1 are applied to estimate annual police calls for service to the Project. Police service expenses are estimated using the existing cost per call. These calculations are shown in Table 6-2 and yield an estimate of police service expenses of approximately \$1.3 million per year. This estimate is reflected in the adjusted findings presented in Tables 1 and 3.

To: Elycia Knight

Subject: Mission Point Project, Fiscal Impact Analysis Peer Review

Page 11

Table 6-2. Police Service Cost Estim	ate Based on Projected	Calls For Service	
	Police 23-24 Budget	Variable Costs	Police Variable Cost
Administrative Services	\$20,300,570	75%	\$15,225,428
Field Operations	\$45,311,222	100%	\$45,311,222
Investigations	\$16,060,444	100%	\$16,060,444
Special Operations	<u>\$3,926,326</u>	0%	<u>\$0</u>
Total	\$85,598,562		\$76,597,094
Police Calls For Service, 2023 ⁽¹⁾			37,558 calls
Variable Cost Per Service Call	= variable cost / 2023 calls		\$2,039 / call
Calls for Service, Proposed Project	Call Generation Rate	<u>Development</u>	Estimated Calls for Service
Market Rate Residential	0.1410 / unit	1,530 units	216 calls
Affordable Residential	0.3214 / unit	270 units	87 calls
Office ⁽²⁾	0.0600 / 1,000 SF	3,000,000 SF	180 calls
Retail / Amenities	1.4912 / 1,000 SF	110,000 SF	164 calls
Total Calls			647 calls
Estimated Police Service Expense	= no. of calls x cost per	call	\$1,318,000

(1) Represents 2023 calls for service that include police beat and location data but excluding traffic-related incidents that cannot be allocated to a specific land use.

(2) Uses Santa Clara Gateway call generation rate.

C. Public Works

The Applicant FIA makes a 50% downward adjustment to Public Works expenses based on private maintenance of streets interior to the Project. Multi-building office and retail developments in Santa Clara commonly incorporate privately maintained interior access improvements. Since the Project is not unique in this regard, expense factors derived from the City's budget will already incorporate this. A reduced adjustment factor of 25% is applied to the estimate presented in Table 7.

Table 7. Modified Estimate of Public W	orks Expense			
	<u>Budget</u>	Direct Revenue	Percent Variable	Variable Cost
Existing Budget	\$25,203,805	\$6,818,366	75%	\$13,789,079
Existing Daytime Service Population				196,597
Cost Per Daytime Service Population				\$70.14
Less: Adjustment for Private Street Mainte	enance		25%	<u>(\$17.54)</u>
Adjusted Variable Cost Per Daytime Serv	ice Population			\$52.61
Daytime Service Population, Proposed Pr	oject			10,152
Estimated Public Works Expense	:	\$534,000		

D. Park and Recreation Expenses

The Applicant FIA estimate of Park and Recreation departmental expenses is approximately \$415,000 per year. The estimate is based on the City's existing per capita costs. Subsequent to preparation of the Applicant FIA, the property owner agreed to assume responsibility for maintenance of on-site parks as part of the proposed DA. A modified estimate of park and recreation expenses is provided in Table 8 to reflect this. This modified estimate is based on the City's existing per capita costs for departmental administration, recreation programs, facility maintenance, and operations, but assumes incremental park maintenance expenses will be minimal. As shown in Table 8, expenses are estimated to total \$214,000 annually.

Table 8. Parks and Recreation Expenses						
	<u>Budget</u>	Direct Revenue	Percent Variable	Variable Cost		
Administration Division	\$2,344,976	\$525,557	75%	\$1,364,564		
Parks ⁽¹⁾	\$9,033,152	\$0	0%	\$0		
Pools	\$1,405,285	\$0	75%	\$1,053,964		
Buildings	\$1,320,398	\$0	75%	\$990,299		
Operations	\$534,380	\$0	75%	\$400,785		
Recreation Division	\$8,419,639	\$3,717,000	75%	<u>\$3,526,979</u>		
			Total Variable Cost:	\$7,336,591		
Existing Residents				132,476		
Variable Cost Per Resident	t			\$55.38		
New Residents				3,870		
Estimated Parks and Recreation Expense \$214,000						

Source: City of Santa Clara FY 2024-25 budget.

(1) Incremental City park maintenance expenses are assumed to be minor since parks within the Project are to be privately maintained.

E. SVP Transfers

The Applicant FIA does not include transfers from Silicon Valley Power (SVP) to the City General Fund. Transfers from SVP are made in accordance with the City's charter based on a 5% share of gross SVP revenue. Since SVP will supply electricity to the Project, SVP transfer revenues will increase. SVP transfer revenue generated by the Project is estimated proportionate to electricity usage, as shown in Table 9.

Table 9. Silicon Valley Power Transfers				
Electricity Use: SVP Service Area (1)	4,382.10 3,412.14	Gigawatt Hours Million BTUs per Gigawatt	14,952,000	Million BTUs per year
Project Electric use ⁽²⁾			254,284	Million BTUs per year
Less: Existing Site Electric Use (3)			<u>(1,636)</u>	Million BTUs per year
Net Increase in Electricity Use from Project			252,648	Million BTUs per year
Percent Increase in Usage: SVP System			1.69%	
Existing 23-24 Budgeted SVP Transfers			\$32,000,000	
Estimated SVP Transfer Revenue		ncrease x \$32,000,000 dgeted revenue	\$541,000	

(1) Per DEIR Table 3.5-2.
(2) Per DEIR Table 3.5-5.
(3) Per DEIR Table 3.5-3.

F. Assessed Values

The Applicant FIA assumes that affordable units will be on the tax rolls at a \$124 million assessed value. The developer is proposing units at an average AMI of 80% or below. Units at 80% of AMI and below may qualify for an exemption from property taxes depending on ownership structure. Given a property tax exemption is a possibility, one is assumed for purposes of the modified assessed value and property tax revenue estimates in Table 10. Although other assessed value estimates presented in the Applicant FIA appear somewhat optimistic based on a review of actual assessed values of other recent developments in Santa Clara, the Project is likely to require these higher values to achieve feasibility and so additional adjustments to assessed value assumptions were not made.

Table 10. Property Tax and Transfer Tax E	stimates			
Property Taxes				
Applicant FIA Assessed Value Estimate				\$4,633,104,444
Less: Assessed Value of Affordable Units, lik		<u>(\$123,927,804)</u>		
Total Assessed Value				\$4,509,176,640
Less: Existing Assessed Value				<u>(\$290,034,923)</u>
Net Value Increase				\$4,219,141,717
1% Property Tax				\$42,191,417
City Share of Property Taxes		10.1%	of 1% tax	\$4,240,200
Property Tax In Lieu of VLF				
Existing Citywide Property Tax in Lieu of VLF	:			\$19,200,000
Citywide Assessed Value				\$56,925,917,348
Net Assessed Value Increase with Project				7.412%
Property Tax In Lieu of VLF				\$1,423,000
Real Property Document Transfer Tax	Value	0	%Turnover	Turnover Value
Residential	\$1,072,256,640	5.0%	per Year	\$53,612,832
Commercial	\$3,436,920,000	5.0%	per Year	\$171,846,000
Total	\$4,509,176,640			\$225,458,832
Transfer Tax		\$0.55	per \$1,000 value	\$124,000

G. Budget Year

The Applicant uses FY 22-23 expenditure information for most estimates, although there is some mixing and matching of budget years, with FY 23-24 used for Fire/EMS. Since expenses have increased since FY 2022-23, use of FY 23-24 or FY 24-25 budget year information consistently throughout would have resulted in higher expense estimates. KMA has not updated the analysis to reflect this comment.

H. SCUSD Student Generation Rates

While the Applicant FIA references student generation rates from the DEIR, and the DEIR cites information from SCUSD staff, the figures are not consistent with the source data. The analysis of SCUSD revenues and expenses was modified to reflect the student generation rates identified in SCUSD enrollment projections. Property tax revenue estimates have been adjusted consistent with the assumption that affordable units will be exempt. The modified analysis is presented in Table 11.

To: Elycia Knight

Subject: Mission Point Project, Fiscal Impact Analysis Peer Review Page 15

Expenses	\$26,701	per ADA ⁽³⁾			\$4,886,000	
Total Revenue					\$17,305,000	
Other State Revenue	\$2,370	per ADA ⁽³⁾			<u>\$434,000</u>	
Federal Revenues	\$376	per ADA ⁽³⁾			\$69,000	
Other Local Revenue	\$3,212	per ADA ⁽³⁾			\$588,000	
Revenues Property Tax	\$4,219,141,717	AV added (2)	38.43%	of 1% tax	\$16,214,000	
Estimated Increase in Average Daily Attendance (ADA)	92.8%	ADA as share of enrollment			183	ADA
Number of Added K-12 Students	45.9		151.2		197.1	Students
K-12 Student Generation Rate (1)	0.03		0.56			
Number of Residential Units	1,530		270		1,800	Units
	Market Rate		<u>Affordable</u>		<u>Total</u>	

(1) Student Generation Rates derived by Enrollment Projection Consultants for Santa Clara Unified, January 2020. (2) See Table 10.

(3) From Applicant FIA.

APPENDIX A: SENSITIVITY TEST WITH RESIDENTIAL PHASE ONLY

The following tables provide the supporting analysis for findings in Tables 1 through 4 evaluating the fiscal impacts of the residential phase of Option A on its own. The analysis is based on the uses proposed for Area D, including 1,800 residential units, childcare and amenity uses. The residential phase analysis reflects the Applicant FIA methodology and assumptions, without updating to reflect current budget information or tax rates, and incorporates the recommended modifications described in Section II. As shown in Table A-1, the residential phase alone is estimated to generate a net positive fiscal impact of approximately \$0.3 million to the City's General Fund. Supporting analysis is provided in Appendix Tables A-2 to A-12.

Table A-1. General Fund Revenue and Exp	enses, Residential (Area D) Only
General Fund Revenues	
Property Tax	\$1,015,000
SVP Transfers	\$341,000
Property Tax In Lieu of VLF	\$291,000
Sales and Use Tax	\$200,000
Franchise Fees	\$95,000
Permits and Licenses	\$75,000
Transient Occupancy Tax	\$0
Document Transfer Tax	\$30,000
Business License Tax	\$1,000
Fines and Forfeitures	\$31,000
Total Revenues	\$2,079,000
General Fund Service Costs	
Fire/EMS	\$358,000
Police	\$672,000
Public Works	\$207,000
General Government	\$172,000
Parks & Recreation	\$214,000
Library	\$163,000
Planning & Inspection	\$26,000
Total Expenditures	\$1,812,000
Net Annual Fiscal Impact	\$267,000

To: Elycia Knight November 14, 2024 Page

Subject: Mission Point Project, Fiscal Impact Analysis Peer Review

Page	1	7
~ ~ ~ ~		

Table. A-2 Popula	Table. A-2 Population and Employment, Residential (Area D) Only								
	Developm	nent	Popul	Population / Employment Factor			Population	Employees	Daytime Pop
Residential									
BMR	270	units	2.15	population per unit	47	units/employee	581	6	583
Market Rate	<u>1,530</u>	<u>units</u>	2.15	population per unit	47	units/employee	<u>3,290</u>	<u>33</u>	<u>3,306</u>
Subtotal	1,800	units					3,870	38	3,889
<u>Commercial</u>									
Retail/Amenities	8,000	sq.ft.	204	sq.ft./employee		employee/sq.ft.		39	20
Childcare	<u>10,000</u>	<u>sq.ft.</u>	286	sq.ft./employee		employee/sq.ft.		<u>35</u>	<u>17</u>
Subtotal	18,000	sq.ft.						74	37
Total							3,870	112	3,926

Source: Applicant FIA with Areas A to C Removed.

Table A-3. Assessed Value, Residential Only						
Residential						
BMR	270	units			assume exempt	
Market Rate	<u>1,530</u>	<u>units</u>	\$700,821	/unit	<u>\$1,072,256,640</u>	
Subtotal	1,800	units			\$1,072,256,640	
<u>Commercial</u>						
Retail/Amenities	8,000	sq.ft.	\$822	/sq.ft.	\$6,576,000	
Childcare	<u>10,000</u>	<u>sq.ft.</u>	\$372	/sq.ft.	<u>\$3,720,000</u>	
Subtotal	18,000	sq.ft.			\$10,296,000	
Total Assessed Value					\$1,082,552,640	
Less Existing Assessed Valu	(\$72,508,731)					
Net Increase in Assessed Va	\$1,010,043,909					

Source: Applicant FIA with Areas A to C removed and BMR units exempt.

To:	Elycia Knight	November 14, 2024
Subject:	Mission Point Project, Fiscal Impact Analysis Peer Revie	ew Page 18

Property Taxes				* 4 0 40 0 40 0 0
Net Value Increase				\$1,010,043,90
1% Property Tax				\$10,100,43
City Share of Property Taxes		10.1%	of 1% tax	\$1,015,00
Property Tax In Lieu of VLF				
Existing Citywide Property Tax in Lieu of VLF				\$19,200,00
Citywide Assessed Value				\$56,925,917,34
Net Assessed Value Increase with Project				1.774
Property Tax In Lieu of VLF				\$341,00
Real Property Document Transfer Tax	Value		%Turnover	Turnover Valu
Residential	\$1,072,256,640	5.0%	per Year	\$53,612,83
Commercial	<u>\$10,296,000</u>	5.0%	per Year	<u>\$514,80</u>
Total	\$1,082,552,640			\$54,127,63
Transfer Tax		\$0.55	per \$1,000 in AV	\$30,00

Source: Applicant FIA with Areas A to C removed and BMR units exempt.

Table A-5. Silicon Valley Power Transfers	, Residential C	only		
Total Electricity Use: SVP Service Area (1)	4,382.10	Gigawatt Hours	14,952,000	Million BTUs per year
	3,412.14	Million BTUs per Gigawatt		
Project Electric use (2)			254,284	M Btu per year
Less: Existing Site Electric use (3)			<u>(1,636)</u>	M Btu per year
Net Increase in Electric use with Project			252,648	
Block D as % of Total Project GSF			37%	
Percent Increase in Usage: SVP System			0.63%	
Existing 23-24 Budgeted SVP Transfers			\$32,000,000	
Estimated SVP Transfer Revenue	= 0.63% incre budgeted reve	ease x \$32,000,000 existing enue	\$200,000	

(1) Per DEIR Table 3.5-2.

(2) Per DEIR Table 3.5-5.

(3) Per DEIR Table 3.5-3.

Table A-6. Sales Tax Est	imate, Res	idential Only			
	<u>Spe</u>	ending per unit or worker	Units/V	Vorkers	<u>% in Santa Clara</u>
Market Rate Units	\$33,173	Taxable Sales Per Unit	1,530	Units	50%
Below Market Rate Units	\$25,958	Taxable Sales Per Unit	270	Units	50%
Employee Spending	\$4,958	Taxable Sales Per Worker	112	Workers	33.3%
Total Taxable Sales					
Sales Tax Estimate, Res	Sales Tax Estimate, Residential Only			=1% taxable sales	

Source: Applicant FIA, adjusted to residential only

Table A-7. Other Revenues Estimated on Per Capita Basis, Residential Only						
ltem	Employment or Daytime Population		<u>Revenue Factor</u>	Revenue Estimate		
Franchise Fees	3,926	\$24.31	per daytime population	\$95,000		
Fines and Forfeitures	3,926	\$7.80	per daytime population	\$31,000		
Permits and Licenses	3,926	\$19.19	per daytime population	\$75,000		
Business License Tax	74	\$7.02	per employee	\$1,000		
Total Revenues				\$202,000		

Source: Applicant FIA with Areas A to C Removed.

Table A-8. Fire/EMS Service Cost Estimate,	Residential Only		
FY 23-24 Field Ops and EMS Division costs			\$57,020,592
Fire/EMS Calls For Service, 2023			10,586
Cost Per Service Call			\$5,386
Calls for Service, Proposed Project	<u>Call</u> Generation	<u>Development</u>	Estimated Calls for Service
Market Rate Residential	0.0344	1,530	53
Affordable Residential	0.0408	270	11
Retail / Amenities	0.1563	18,000	<u>3</u>
Total Calls			66
Estimated Fire/EMS Service Expense	= no. of calls x of	cost per call	\$358,000

To:	Elycia Knight November	r 14, 2024
Subject:	Mission Point Project, Fiscal Impact Analysis Peer Review	Page 20

= no. of calls x cost p	er call	\$672,000
		329 calls
1.4912 / 1,000 SF	18,000 SF	27 calls
0.3214 / unit	270 units	87 calls
0.1410 / unit	1,530 units	216 calls
Call Generation	Development	Estimated Calls for Service
		\$2,039
		37,558
\$85,598,562		\$76,597,094
<u>\$3,926,326</u>	0%	<u>\$0</u>
\$16,060,444	100%	\$16,060,444
\$45,311,222	100%	\$45,311,222
\$20,300,570	75%	\$15,225,428
<u>23-24 Budget</u>	Percent Variable	Variable Cost
	\$20,300,570 \$45,311,222 \$16,060,444 <u>\$3,926,326</u> \$85,598,562 <u>Call Generation</u> 0.1410 / unit 0.3214 / unit 1.4912 / 1,000 SF	\$20,300,570 75% \$45,311,222 100% \$16,060,444 100% \$3,926,326 0% \$85,598,562 0% Development 0.1410 / unit 1,530 units 0.3214 / unit 270 units

(1) Represents 2023 calls for service that include police beat and location data but excluding traffic-related incidents that cannot be allocated to a specific land use.

Table A-10. Public Works Expense Estimate, F	Residential Only			
	<u>Budget</u>	Direct Revenue	Percent Variable	Variable Cost
Administrative Services	\$25,203,805	\$6,818,366	75%	\$13,789,079
Existing Daytime Service Population				196,597
Variable Cost Per Daytime Service Population		\$70.14		
Less: Adjustment for Private Street Maintenance	25%	<u>(\$17.54)</u>		
Adjusted Variable Cost Per Daytime Service Pop		\$52.61		
Daytime Service Population				3,926
Estimated Public Works Expense				\$207,000

To: Elycia Knight

Subject: Mission Point Project, Fiscal Impact Analysis Peer Review

Page 21

Table A-11. Parks and Re	creation Expens	es, Residential (Only			
	<u>Budget</u>	Direct	Percent Variable	Variable Cost		
		Revenue				
Administration Division	\$2,344,976	\$525,557	75%	\$1,364,564		
Parks ⁽¹⁾	\$9,033,152	\$0	0%	\$0		
Pools	\$1,405,285	\$0	75%	\$1,053,964		
Buildings	\$1,320,398	\$0	75%	\$990,299		
Operations	\$534,380	\$0	75%	\$400,785		
Recreation Division	\$8,419,639	\$3,717,000	75%	<u>\$3,526,979</u>		
			Total Variable Cost:	\$7,336,591		
Existing Residents				132,476		
Variable Cost Per Resident				\$55.38		
New Residents				3,870		
Estimated Parks and Rec	Estimated Parks and Recreation Expense \$214,000					

Source: City of Santa Clara FY 2024-25 budget.

(1) Park maintenance variable expense assumed to be \$0 since parks within the Project are to be privately maintained.

	Residents or		• · - ·	
Item	Daytime Population		Cost Factor	Expense Estimate
General Government	3,926	\$43.77	per daytime population	\$172,000
Library	3,870	\$42.12	per resident	\$163,000
Community Development	3,926	\$6.70	per daytime population	\$26,000

Source: Applicant FIA with Areas A to C Removed.

To:	Elycia Knight	November 14, 2024
Subject:	Mission Point Project, Fiscal Impact Analysis Peer Review	w Page 22

		Market Rate	Affordable		Total	
Number of Residential Units		1,530	270		1,800	Units
K-12 Student Generation Rate (1)	0.03	0.56			
Number of Added K-12 Student	s	45.9	151.2		197.1	Students
Estimated Increase in ADA	92.8%	ADA as share	of enrollment		183	ADA
Revenues						
Property Tax	\$1,010,043,909	AV added	38.43%	of 1% tax	\$3,882,000	
Other Local Revenue	\$3,212	per ADA			\$588,000	
Federal Revenues	\$376	per ADA			\$69,000	
Other State Revenue	\$2,370	per ADA			\$434,000	
Total Revenue					\$4,973,000	
Expenses	\$26,701	per ADA			\$4,886,000	
Net Annual Fiscal Impact					\$87,000	

(1) Student Generation Rates derived by Enrollment Projection Consultants for Santa Clara Unified, January 2020. Source: Applicant FIA with Areas A to C Removed.

To:	Elycia Knight No	ovember 14, 2024
Subject:	Mission Point Project, Fiscal Impact Analysis Peer Review	Page 23

APPENDIX B: ANALYSIS OF OPTION B

The following tables provide the supporting analysis for findings in Tables 1 through 4 evaluating the fiscal impacts of Option B, which includes up to 2,600 residential units (800 more than the Option A) and a 790,000 square foot reduction in the Office/R&D component to 2.2 million square feet. Analysis of Option B reflects the Applicant FIA methodology and assumptions, without updating to reflect current budget information or tax rates, and incorporates the recommended modifications described in Section II. As shown in Table B-1, Option B is estimated to generate a net positive fiscal impact of approximately \$3.1 million to the City's General Fund. Supporting analysis is provided in Appendix Tables B-2 to B-13.

Table B-1. General Fund Revenue and Ex	penses, Option B
General Fund Revenues	
Property Tax	\$3,832,000
Property Tax In Lieu of VLF	\$1,286,000
Sales and Use Tax	\$971,000
SVP Transfers	\$498,000
Franchise Fees	\$250,000
Permits and Licenses	\$198,000
Transient Occupancy Tax	\$105,000
Document Transfer Tax	\$113,000
Business License Tax	\$66,000
Fines and Forfeitures	\$80,000
Total Revenues	\$7,399,000
General Fund Service Costs	
Fire/EMS	\$1,196,000
Police	\$1,496,000
Public Works	\$542,000
General Government	\$451,000
Parks & Recreation	\$310,000
Library	\$235,000
Planning & Inspection	\$69,000
Total Expenditures	\$4,299,000
Net Annual Fiscal Impact	\$3,100,000

To:	Elycia Knight Novembe	er 14, 2024
Subject:	Mission Point Project, Fiscal Impact Analysis Peer Review	Page 24

Table B-2. Popul	ation and Er	nploym	ent, Op	otion B					
<u>ltem</u>	Developr	nent		Population / Employment Factor				Employees	Daytime Pop ⁽¹⁾
Residential									
BMR	390	units	2.15	population per unit	47	units/employee	839	8	843
Market Rate	<u>2,210</u>	<u>units</u>	2.15	population per unit	47	units/employee	4,752	<u>47</u>	<u>4,775</u>
Subtotal	2,600	units					5,590	55	5,618
<u>Commercial</u>									
Office/R&D	2,210,000	sq.ft.	250	sq.ft./employee		employee/sq.ft.		8,840	4,420
Retail/Amenities	100,000	sq.ft.	204	sq.ft./employee		employee/sq.ft.		490	245
Childcare	<u>10,000</u>	<u>sq.ft.</u>	286	sq.ft./employee		employee/sq.ft.		<u>35</u>	<u>17</u>
Subtotal	2,320,000	sq.ft.						9,365	4,683
Total							5,590	9,420	10,300

Source: Applicant FIA as adjusted to Option B (1) Calculated as one per resident and 0.5 per employee.

ie, Option B					
390	units			assume exempt	
<u>2,210</u>	<u>units</u>	\$700,821	/unit	<u>\$1,548,815,147</u>	
2,600	units			\$1,548,815,147	
2,210,000	sq.ft.	\$1,117	/sq.ft.	\$2,468,570,000	
100,000	sq.ft.	\$822	/sq.ft.	\$82,200,000	
<u>10,000</u>	sq.ft.	\$372	/sq.ft.	<u>\$3,720,000</u>	
2,320,000	sq.ft.			\$2,554,490,000	
				\$4,103,305,147	
lue				(\$290,034,923)	
/alue				\$3,813,270,224	
	390 <u>2,210</u> 2,600 2,210,000 100,000 <u>10,000</u> 2,320,000	390 units 2,210 units 2,600 units 2,210,000 sq.ft. 100,000 sq.ft. 10,000 sq.ft. 2,320,000 sq.ft.	390 units 2,210 units \$700,821 2,600 units \$1,117 2,210,000 sq.ft. \$1,117 100,000 sq.ft. \$822 10,000 sq.ft. \$372 2,320,000 sq.ft. \$372 units \$372 \$320,000	390 units 2,210 units 2,600 units 2,210,000 sq.ft. \$1,117 /sq.ft. 100,000 sq.ft. \$822 /sq.ft. 10,000 sq.ft. \$372 /sq.ft. 2,320,000 sq.ft.	$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$

Source: Applicant FIA as adjusted to Option B

Table B-4. Property Tax and Transfer Tax	Estimates, Option B			
Property Taxes				
Net Value Increase				\$3,813,270,224
1% Property Tax				\$38,132,702
City Share of Property Taxes		10.1%	of 1% tax	\$3,832,000
Property Tax In Lieu of VLF				
Existing Citywide Property Tax in Lieu of VLR	-			\$19,200,000
Citywide Assessed Value				\$56,925,917,348
Net Assessed Value Increase with Project				6.699%
Property Tax In Lieu of VLF				\$1,286,000
Real Property Document Transfer Tax	Value	<u>%Turnc</u>	over	Turnover Value
Residential	\$1,548,815,147	5.0%	per Year	\$77,440,757
Commercial	\$2,554,490,000	5.0%	per Year	<u>\$127,724,500</u>
Total	\$4,103,305,147			\$205,165,257
Transfer Tax		\$0.55	per \$1,000 in AV	\$113,000

Source: Applicant FIA as adjusted to Option B

Table B-5. Silicon Valley Power Transfers,	Option B			
Total Electricity Use: SVP Service Area (1)	4,382.10	Gigawatt Hours	14,952,000	Million BTUs per year
	3,412.14	Million BTUs per Gigawatt		
Project Electric use (2)			254,284	M Btu per year
Less: Adjustment for Option B (3)			(20,494)	M Btu per year
Less: Existing Site Electric use (4)			<u>(1,636)</u>	M Btu per year
Net Increase in Electric use			232,154	
% of Total Project GSF			100%	
Percent Increase in Usage: SVP System			1.56%	
Existing 23-24 Budgeted SVP Transfers			\$32,000,000	
Estimated SVP Transfer Revenue			\$498,000	

(1) Per DEIR Table 3.5-2.

(2) Per DEIR Table 3.5-5.

(3) Adjustment for decrease in office/R&D and increase in residential use estimated based upon the U.S. Department of Energy, 2018 Commercial Buildings Energy Consumption Survey (CBECS), Pacific Region and 2020 Residential Energy Consumption Survey (RECS) data for apartments with five or more units, indicating residential units use approximately 7,612 kwh per year less energy than 1,000 square feet of office space.

(4) Per DEIR Table 3.5-3.

	taxable	sales per unit, worker or sq.ft.	Units/Worker	s <u>% Ne</u>	t New	<u>% in Santa Clara</u>	Total
Market Rate Units	\$33,173	Taxable Sales Per Unit	2,210	Units	100%	50%	\$36,656,476
Below Market Rate Units	\$25,958	Taxable Sales Per Unit	390	Units	100%	50%	\$5,061,810
Employee Spend	\$4,958	Taxable Sales Per Worker	9,420	Workers	100%	33.3%	\$15,570,101
Business Spend/Catering	\$1,600	Taxable Sales Per Worker	9,420	Workers	100%	100%	\$15,070,901
Retail	\$494	Avg. Taxable Sales Per Sq.ft.	100,000	sq.ft.	50%	100%	<u>\$24,694,800</u>
							\$97,054,088
Sales Tax Estimate				=1% taxab	le sales		\$971,000

Source: Applicant FIA as adjusted to Option B

Table B-7. Silicon Valley Power Transfers, Option B							
Hotel Room Nights	2,210,000	sq.ft. office	5	per 1,000 office sq. ft.	11,050	room nights	
Gross Daily Room Revenue	\$200	per night	50%	Captured in Santa Clara	\$1,105,000	room sales	
Hotel Taxes			9.50%		\$105,000		

Source: Applicant FIA as adjusted to Option B. TOT rate was not adjusted to the current rate to remain consistent with the Applicant FIA assumptions and use of prior budget information.

Table B-8. Other Revenues Estimated on Per Capita Basis, Option B

ltem	Employment or Daytime Population		Allocation Factor	Revenue Estimate
Franchise Fees	10,300	\$24.31	per daytime population	\$250,000
Fines and Forfeitures	10,300	\$7.80	per daytime population	\$80,000
Permits and Licenses	10,300	\$19.19	per daytime population	\$198,000
Business License Tax	9,420	\$7.02	per employee	\$66,000
Total Revenues				\$594,000

Source: Applicant FIA as adjusted to Option B. Business license tax rate was not adjusted to the current rate to remain consistent with the Applicant FIA assumptions and use of prior budget information.

Table B-9. Fire/EMS Service Cost Estimate	, Option B		
FY 23-24 Field Ops and EMS Division costs			\$57,020,592
Fire/EMS Calls For Service, 2023			10,586
Cost Per Service Call			\$5,386
Calls for Service, Proposed Project	Call Generation	<u>Development</u>	Estimated Calls for Service
Market Rate Residential	0.0344	2,210	76
Affordable Residential	0.0408	390	16
Office ⁽¹⁾	0.0511	2,210,000	113
Retail / Amenities	0.1563	110,000	<u>17</u>
Total Calls			222
Estimated Fire/EMS Service Expense	= no. of calls x cost per call		\$1,196,000

(1) Uses Santa Clara Gateway call generation rate.

To:	Elycia Knight Novembe	er 14, 2024
Subject:	Mission Point Project, Fiscal Impact Analysis Peer Review	Page 27

Table B-10. Police Service Cost Estim	23-24 Budget	Percent Variable	Variable Cost
Administrative Services	\$20,300,570	75%	\$15,225,428
Field Operations	\$45,311,222	100%	\$45,311,222
Investigations	\$16,060,444	100%	\$16,060,444
Special Operations	\$3,926,326	0%	<u>\$0</u>
Total	\$85,598,562		\$76,597,094
Police Calls For Service, 2023 ⁽¹⁾			37,558
Variable Cost Per Service Call			\$2,039
Calls for Service, Proposed Project	Call Generation	<u>Development</u>	Estimated Calls for Service
Market Rate Residential	0.1410	2,210	312
Affordable Residential	0.3214	390	125
Office ⁽²⁾	0.0600	2,210,000	133
Retail / Amenities	1.4912	110,000	<u>164</u>
Total Calls			734
Estimated Police Service Expense	= no. of calls x co	st per call	\$1,496,000

(1) Represents calls for service with Police Beat and location, excluding traffic-related incidents.

(2) A comparison to pre-pandemic call generation rates indicates call volume to office uses dropped by half. Estimate based on double the 2023 call generation rate for Santa Clara Gateway.

	<u>Budget</u>	Direct Revenue	Percent Variable	Variable Cost
Administrative Services	\$25,203,805	\$6,818,366	75%	\$13,789,079
Existing Daytime Service Population				196,597
Variable Cost Per Daytime Service Population	on			\$70.14
Less: Adjustment for Private Street Mainten	ance		25%	<u>(\$17.54)</u>
Adjusted Variable Cost Per Daytime Service	Population			\$52.61
Daytime Service Population				10,300
Estimated Public Works Expense				\$542,000

Source: Applicant FIA as adjusted to Option B and modified adjustment for private maintenance.

То:	Elycia Knight	November 14, 2024
Subject:	Mission Point Project, Fiscal Impact Analysis Peer Revie	w Page 28

	<u>Budget</u>	Direct Revenue	Percent Variable	Variable Cost
Administration Division	\$2,344,976	\$525,557	75%	\$1,364,564
Parks ⁽¹⁾	\$9,033,152	\$0	0%	\$0
Pools	\$1,405,285	\$0	75%	\$1,053,964
Buildings	\$1,320,398	\$0	75%	\$990,299
Operations	\$534,380	\$0	75%	\$400,785
Recreation Division	\$8,419,639	\$3,717,000	75%	<u>\$3,526,979</u>
			Total Variable Cost:	7,336,591
Existing Residents				132,476
Variable Cost Per Resident				\$55.38
New Residents				5,590
Estimated Parks and Recreation Expense				

Source: City of Santa Clara FY 2024-25 budget. (1) No variable cost assumed since new parks within project are to be privately maintained per the proposed DA.

Table B-13. Other Expenses Estimated on Per Capita Basis, Option B					
Item	Employment or Daytime Population		Cost Factor	Expense Estimate	
General Government	10,300	\$43.77	per daytime population	\$451,000	
Library	5,590	\$42.12	per resident	\$235,000	
Community Development	10,300	\$6.70	per daytime population	\$69,000	
Total Revenues				\$755,000	

Source: Applicant FIA as adjusted to Option B.

To:	Elycia Knight	November	14, 2024
Subject:	Mission Point Project, Fiscal Impact Analysis Peer Revie	ew	Page 29

Net Annual Fiscal Impact					\$9,178,000	
Expenses	\$26,701	per ADA			\$7,049,000	
Total Revenue					\$16,227,000	
Other State Revenue	\$2,370	per ADA			<u>\$626,000</u>	
Federal Revenues	\$376	per ADA			\$99,000	
Other Local Revenue	\$3,212	per ADA			\$848,000	
Property Tax	\$3,813,270,224	AV added	38.43%	of 1% tax	\$14,654,000	
Revenues						
Estimated Increase in ADA	92.8%	ADA as share of enrollment			264	ADA
Number of Added K-12 Students		66.3	218.4		284.7	Student
K-12 Student Generation Rate ⁽¹⁾		0.03	0.56			
Number of Residential Units		2,210	390		2,600	Units
		<u>Market Rate</u>	<u>Affordable</u>		<u>Total</u>	

(1) Student Generation Rates derived by Enrollment Projection Consultants for Santa Clara Unified, January 2020. Source: Applicant FIA as adjusted to Option B.