

CITY OF DAVIS FINANCE & BUDGET COMMISSION

DATE: February 7, 2018
TO: Finance & Budget Commission
FROM: Ray Salomon, Commissioner
SUBJECT: Nishi Fiscal Model

Attached please find a fiscal model that has been updated to include:

- Public Works: A division-by-division examination of Public Works department functions and a 98.1% allocation of all department general fund costs based on this examination.
- Community Development and Sustainability: A division-by-division examination of department functions and a proportional allocation of all department general fund costs based on this examination.
- Fire Department: A call-by-call examination of all Fire Department calls categorized in the most recent available annual report and a proportional allocation of 88.4% of department general fund costs based on this examination. Since revenue from Public Safety and Proposition 172 taxes, and general fund fees were included in the fiscal summary, the corresponding costs are now included for consistency.
- Police Department: A division-by-division examination of Police Department functions and a 94.7% allocation of all department general fund costs based on this examination. Since revenue from Public Safety and Proposition 172 taxes, and general fund fees were included in the fiscal summary, the corresponding costs are now included for consistency.
- Capital Improvement Projects: An analysis of the average of all other departmental allocations and a proportional allocation of 89.9% of these expenditures based on this average since these capital expenditures will depreciate fully and turn into cost.
- General Government (City Manager, City Attorney, Administrative, etc.): An analysis of the average of all other departmental allocations and a proportional allocation of 89.9% of general government general fund costs based on this average.
- Property Tax Revenue: An increase in the year-over-year valuation to 2.0% in years one through five and a corresponding increase in tax revenue. Although this increase was identified in the assumptions tab, the formulas in the calculation tab reflected the prior 1.5% assumption.
- Sales Tax Revenue: An analysis of the effect of business-to-business revenue and the effect of population in the metro area but just outside the city limits have been included and allocated to the model.
- Model Design Issues: Where identified, problems with referential integrity (i.e., differing values for the same number such as with property tax discussed above) and hard-coded formulas have been corrected.

City of Davis Finance & Budget Commission

UPDATES TO NISHI FISCAL MODEL (2-7-18)

1) SUMMARY

- | Based on the language in the Nishi motion that the findings were preliminary and subject to change, the opportunity to further develop the analysis with a thorough review of the formulas, additional data, and further analysis has been undertaken.
- | Updates and additions are highlighted in orange.

2) PUBLIC WORKS

- | Cost allocation updated based on a division-by-division analysis of the department.
Based on this analysis, 98.1% of all department general fund costs were allocated to the project.
 - The initial model allocated no Public Works costs to the project in the fiscal summary, even though the assumption tab called for a 75% allocation. There was no analysis included supporting either the 75% allocation or no allocation of costs.

3) COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT AND SUSTAINABILITY DEPARTMENT

- | Cost allocation updated based on a division-by-division analysis of the department.
 - Based on this analysis, a proportional share of all department general fund costs were allocated to the project.
 - The initial model allocated 75% of department costs to the project.

4) PARKS & COMMUNITY SERVICE

- | Cost allocation of general fund costs unchanged at 75% based on a division-by-division analysis (Tab #4).

5) FIRE DEPARTMENT

- | Cost allocation updated based on analysis of the 4,787 calls categorized in the annual report.
 - Based on this analysis, 88.4% of department general fund costs were allocated to the project.
 - The initial model allocated 75% of department costs to the project although no analysis supporting this allocation was included in the model.
- | Since the revenue from Public Safety and Prop 172 taxes, and general fund fees was included in the fiscal summary, the corresponding costs were added for consistency.

6) POLICE DEPARTMENT

- | Cost allocation updated based on analysis of officer assignments from the annual report.
 - Based on this analysis (Tab #6), 94.7% of department general fund costs were allocated to the project.
 - This less than full allocation reflects the effect of fewer cars per person (and thus proportionally lower police traffic enforcement costs) in the Nishi project due to the limited parking on or near the site.
 - The initial model allocated 75% of department costs to the project although no analysis supporting this allocation was included in the model.
- | Since the revenue from Public Safety and Prop 172 taxes, and general fund fees was

included in the fiscal summary, the corresponding costs were added for consistency.

7) CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROJECTS

- | General fund expenditures related to capital improvements were added to the model.
 - Based on this analysis (Tab #7), 89.9% of proportional capital costs were allocated to the project since these near-term expenditures will depreciate fully over time and turn into cost.
 - The prior model included a tab that appeared to be started, but not finished, and did not allocate any capital improvement program costs to the project. No analysis was included supporting the allocation of no capital improvement project cost to the model.

8) GENERAL GOVERNMENT COSTS (CITY ATTORNEY, CITY MANAGER, ADMIN SERVICES, ETC.)

- | Cost allocation updated based on an overall analysis of all other department allocations
 - Based on this analysis (Tab #8), 89.9% of proportional general government general fund costs were allocated to the project.
 - The initial model allocated 75% of these costs to the project although no analysis supporting this allocation was included in the model.

9) COMPARISON WITH EPS STUDY

- | Although the very detailed EPS study was not consulted during the updates to the present model, a comparison shows that city expenditures per person in the EPS model and the updated fiscal model are within 0.5% of each other (Tab #9).

10) PROPERTY TAX REVENUE

- | The model was updated to a consistent 2% increase in years 1 through 5.
 - Some of the model had the 2% assumption discussed in the January 2018 F&BC meeting while other parts of the model (e.g., t5, the property tax tab) had a 1.5% assumption.
 - Property tax revenue is increased as a result of the 0.5% per year increase in taxable valuation in years one through five.

11) SALES TAX

- | Sales tax revenue was adjusted for business-to-business sales tax.
 - The initial model allocated all revenue on a per person basis and did not include the effect of business-to-business (vs. consumer) taxable sales.
 - EPS consultants had previously examined actual revenue data and concluded that the existing 2.6 million sq. ft. of commercial space generated \$20 per sq. ft. of taxable business-to-business revenue.
 - This adjustment reduces sales tax revenue by ~8%
- | Sales tax revenue from nearby residents who live next to the city border is now included.
 - These include the 9,000+ residents on the UCD campus and estimated 1,182 residents in the El Macero subdivision who are in areas right on the city boundary.
 - Dividing sales tax revenue by these additional 10,182 people reduces per person revenue by approximately 13%.

12) GAS TAX

- | Gas tax revenue was reduced by 50% to be consistent with the reduced allocation of police department traffic enforcement related cost.

- The lower allocation reflects the effect of fewer cars per person (and thus proportionally lower gas tax revenue) among Nishi residents due to the limited parking on or near the Nishi site.

13) CANNABIS TAX

- I An attempt was made to find revenue estimates for the city cannabis tax.
 - Research found that a City Staff memo to the City Council for the 8/29/17 meeting stating: "There is not enough information at this time to provide accurate estimates of the revenue potential of the proposed business types."
 - The limited number of dispensaries may limit potential city revenue (compared to the potential revenue with open licensing).

14) OVERALL MODEL DESIGN

- I The overall model should be evaluated for design issues and updated as appropriate.
 - The model should be revised to ensure referential integrity (i.e., inputs should be entered only in one place and should then flow through the entire model). As with property tax, there were inconsistencies.
 - The model should be revised to eliminate hard-coded formulas. Rather, the formulas should pick up the visible inputs (which should be consistent throughout the model).

City of Davis Finance & Budget Commission

ALLOCATION OF PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT COSTS

Methodology:

Examine each department's functions and allocate the cost based on whether the Nishi CFD will substitute for its existing functions.

<u>Division</u>	<u>2017/8 General Fund Budget</u>	<u>Nishi Allocation</u>	<u>Total Allocation</u>	<u>Explanation</u>
Transportation	\$ 1,961,456	100%	\$ 1,961,456	Department maintains, operates and plans transportation infrastructure which benefits all residents. The private property of the Nishi site does not substitute for existing public roads and other transportation infrastructure which the Nishi residents will use. The 3% increase in city population will likewise increase traffic volume and thus the need for these services.
Facilities Management	658,857	95%	625,914	Department supports all city buildings and facilities, and responds to service requests. The city buildings and facilities serve all residents. The allocation is reduced slightly due to the CFD that will support the Nishi area.
Administrative	357,314	95%	339,448	Department provides policy administration and management to the department. Public works (and its administrative department) support all residents. The allocation is reduced slightly due to the CFD that will support the Nishi area.
Engineering Services	229,633	95%	218,151	Department provides engineering for public works projects. These serve all residents. The allocation is reduced slightly due to the CFD that will support the Nishi area.
Environmental Resources	<u>127,539</u>	100%	127,539	Department promotes conservation and environmental protection and thus serves all residents. No comparable function has been identified in the Nishi proposal.
Total	\$ 3,334,799		\$ 3,272,509	
		Allocation %:	98.1%	

Note: The functions of the various departments are taken from the 2017/8 budget document.

City of Davis Finance & Budget Commission

ALLOCATION OF COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT & SUSTAINABILITY DEPARTMENT COSTS

Methodology:

Examine each department's functions and allocate the cost based on whether the Nishi CFD will substitute for its existing functions.

<u>Division</u>	<u>2017/8 General Fund Budget</u>	<u>Nishi Allocation</u>	<u>Total Allocation</u>	<u>Explanation</u>
Planning	\$ 1,397,072	100%	\$ 1,397,072	This department develops and implements planning and zoning services for the development of a livable and sustainable community. This division serves all residents and no reduction in the need for these activities due to the Nishi project has been identified.
Building	23,947	100%	23,947	This department ensures that all new construction and improvements to city or privately owned property conform to requirements of state and city codes including accessibility requirements and energy and water conservation. This division serves all residents and no reduction in the need for these activities due to the Nishi project have been identified.
Administrative	<u>190,040</u>	100%	<u>190,040</u>	Department develops, implements, and monitors departmental policies and procedures to ensure effective use of resources, and coordinates and administers activities in current and long-range planning, sustainability, property management, and building programs within the department and with appropriate staff in public works. No comparable function has been identified in the Nishi proposals and this function serves all residents.
Total	\$ 1,611,059	Allocation %:	\$ 1,611,059	
			100.0%	

Note: The functions of the various departments are taken from the 2017/8 budget document.

City of Davis Finance & Budget Commission

ALLOCATION OF PARKS AND COMMUNITY SERVICES DEPARTMENT COSTS

Methodology:

Examine each department's functions and allocate the cost based on whether the Nishi CFD will substitute for its existing functions.

<u>Division</u>	<u>2017/8 General Fund Budget</u>	<u>Nishi Allocation</u>	<u>Total Allocation</u>	<u>Explanation</u>
Parks & Urban Forestry	\$ 5,721,840	75%	\$ 4,291,380	This division provides comprehensive management of city-owned assets, including community and neighborhood parks, greenbelts, streetscapes, public parking lots, athletic fields, community gardens, special use/dog parks, urban trees, and open space. This allocation is assumed to be 75% reflecting the availability of some similar resources on the Nishi site and maintained as part of the Nishi CSD. The 75% allocation reflects potential usage of other public amenities including Central Park for the Davis Farmer's Market, performances, and other events; public parking lots; athletic fields; tennis courts; community gardens; urban trees; other open space and greenbelts; and some potential usage of other parks. This is consistent with the allocation in the model as originally presented.
Aquatics & Pool Maintenance	434,168	75%	325,626	This division is responsible for the maintenance of four pool complexes, including nine distinct bodies of water and one splash pad, including adhering to all State of California Health and Safety Code regulations, and providing recreational swimming program for all Davis residents. This allocation is reduced to 75% reflecting the availability of some similar services from U.C. Davis for those residents who are students, faculty, or employees of the university. This is consistent with the allocation in the model as originally presented.
Recreation & Community Services	<u>2,307,717</u>	75%	<u>1,730,788</u>	This division enriches and enhances resident's lives by providing quality recreational, social, and community services programs. This allocation is reduced to 75% reflecting the availability of some similar services from U.C. Davis for those residents who are students, faculty, or employees of the university. This is consistent with the allocation in the model as originally presented.
Total	\$ 8,463,725	Allocation %:	\$ 6,347,794	
			75.0%	

 Note: The functions of the various departments are taken from the 2017/8 budget document.

City of Davis Finance & Budget Commission

ALLOCATION OF FIRE DEPARTMENT COSTS

Methodology:

Examine the type of calls that the each department's functions and determine whether they would be likely to occur with Nishi residents or in Nishi units.

- | Many calls (e.g., illness and injury) are a function of population.
- | Others (e.g., a fire alarm malfunction) are a function of the number of units.
- | Many others are affected by both the number of people and the number of units. For example, a smoke detector can be activated by food burnt during cooking. This is likely to be a function of both the number of people (more people equals more cooking) and the number of units (due to shared cooking among all residents.)

Type of Unit	2010 Census Data		
	Total Population	Number Of Units	Average Per Unit
Owner-Occupied	27,594	10,699	2.58
Renter Occupied	35,928	14,174	2.53
Average	63,522	24,873	2.55

/ 3.14 = 81.3% Since Nishi has more people per unit, this means that Nishi will have a lower number of those calls that are a function of the number of units (vs. the population).

Davis Fire Department Calls (Per Latest Available Annual Report)

Total Calls	4,787
Type Not Recorded	(166)
Total Type Categorized	4,621

<u>TYPE OF CALL</u>	Total Allocated	Nishi % Allocation	Nishi Type Allocation	Explanation
<u>Medical Call</u>				
Illness/Injury	2,797	100.0%	2,797	Illness/Injury is driven by the population, not the number of units
Vehicle Accident (Injury)	124	50.0%	62	Assume that limited parking reduces rate by 50%.
<u>Service Call</u>				
Assist Invalid	271	2.0%	5	Reduce by 98% due to likely demographics.
Cover/Stand By/Move Up	24	90.7%	22	Based 50% on population (100%) and 50% on number of units (81.3%).
Assist Police/Other Govt.	90	90.7%	82	Based 50% on population (100%) and 50% on number of units (81.3%).
Smoke/Odor Removal	17	90.7%	15	Based 50% on population (100%) and 50% on number of units (81.3%).
Other (Water/Steam Leak, unauthorized burning)	90	81.3%	73	Function of number of units vs. population
<u>Good Intent</u>				
Dispatched and Cancelled	340	90.7%	308	Based 50% on population (100%) and 50% on number of units (81.3%).
No Incident Found/Wrong Location	216	90.7%	196	Based 50% on population (100%) and 50% on number of units (81.3%).
Smoke Scare/Odor of Smoke	29	90.7%	26	Based 50% on population (100%) and 50% on number of units (81.3%).
Other (Hazmat, etc.)	29	90.7%	26	Based 50% on population (100%) and 50% on number of units (81.3%).
<u>Hazardous Material/Condition</u>				
Vehicle Accident (Non-Injury)	73	50.0%	37	Assume that limited parking reduces rate by 50%.
Gasoline/Flammable Liquid Spill	43	50.0%	22	Assume that limited parking reduces rate by 50%.
Other Hazardous Condition	58	90.7%	53	Based 50% on population and 50% on number of units.
<u>Fires</u>				
Structures	31	90.7%	28	Based 50% on population and 50% on number of units.
Vehicles	29	50.0%	15	
Grass, Wild Land	56	100.0%	56	Allocated based on population.
Other (Cooking, etc.)	43	100.0%	43	Amount of cooking, etc. is driven by the population.
<u>False Alarms</u>				
Smoke Detector Activation	71	90.7%	64	Based 50% on population and 50% on number of units.
Alarm Malfunction	73	81.3%	59	Function of number of units vs. population.
Other Malfunction	90	81.3%	73	Function of number of units vs. population.
<u>Overpressure</u>				
Excessive Heat	6	81.3%	5	Function of number of units vs. population.
Overpressure Rupture	3	81.3%	2	Function of number of units vs. population.
<u>Rescue</u>				
Extrication of Victim	12	100.0%	12	Based on Population
<u>Other</u>	6	90.7%	5	Assumed based 50% on population and 50% on number of units.
Total/Average	4,621	/	4,087	

Allocation %: 88.4% or 11.6% fewer calls on average than existing residents.

City of Davis Finance & Budget Commission

ALLOCATION OF POLICE DEPARTMENT COSTS

<u>Type of Officer *</u>	<u>Officers</u>	<u>Corporals</u>	<u>Total Personnel</u>	<u>Nishi % Allocation */</u>	<u>Nishi Type Allocation</u>
Patrol	28	6	34	100.0%	34
Traffic	<u>3</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>4</u>	50.0%	<u>2</u>
Total	<u>31</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>38</u>		<u>36</u>
				Allocation %:	94.7%

*/ Assumes that the limited number of parking spaces at Nishi (700 spaces for 2,198 residents) will reduce the amount of vehicle usage compared to the average resident. As such, the allocation of traffic enforcement resources is reduced by 50%.

City of Davis Finance & Budget Commission

ALLOCATION OF CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROJECT COSTS

Methodology:

Allocate the capital improvement project budget proportionally to the overall cost of city services allocated to Nishi based on the department-by-department analysis.

<u>Department</u>	<u>2017/8 General Fund Budget</u>	<u>Nishi Allocation</u>	<u>Total Allocation</u>	<u>Explanation</u>
Department of Public Works Administration	\$ 357,314	98.1%	\$ 350,640	See tab 2) DPW Allocation
Department of Public Works Support Services	2,977,485	98.1%	2,921,869	See tab 2) DPW Allocation
Community Development Department	1,611,059	100.0%	1,611,059	See tab 3) Community Devel. Allocation
Parks and Community Services Administration	8,463,725	75.0%	6,347,794	See tab 4) Parks & Comm. Services Alloc.
Fire Department	10,737,619	88.4%	9,496,748	See tab 5) Fire Department Allocation
Police Department	20,437,859	94.7%	19,362,182	See tab 6) Police Department Allocation
	\$ 44,585,061	89.9%	\$ 40,090,292	
 Capital Improvement Projects	 8,371,213	 Allocation %:	 \$ 7,527,283	 Capital Improvement involves the planning, design, and construction of all new City improvements identified in the 5-year capital improvement plan and major rehabilitation of existing facilities. As these facilities benefit all citizens, they are allocated proportional to the estimated Nishi allocation for each department.
			89.9%	

 Note: The description is taken from the 2017/8 budget document.

City of Davis Finance & Budget Commission

ALLOCATION OF GENERAL GOVERNMENT (CITY MANAGER, CITY ATTORNEY, ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES, ETC.) COSTS

Methodology:

Allocate the capital improvement project budget proportionally to the overall cost of city services allocated to Nishi based on the department-by-department analysis.

<u>Department</u>	<u>2017/8 General Fund Budget</u>	<u>Nishi Allocation</u>	<u>Total Allocation</u>	<u>Explanation</u>
Department of Public Works Administration	\$ 357,314	98.1%	\$ 350,640	See tab 2) DPW Allocation
Department of Public Works Support Services	2,977,485	98.1%	2,921,869	See tab 2) DPW Allocation
Community Development Department	1,611,059	100.0%	1,611,059	See tab 3) Community Devel. Allocation
Parks and Community Services Administration	8,463,725	75.0%	6,347,794	See tab 4) Parks & Comm. Services Alloc.
Fire Department	10,737,619	88.4%	9,496,748	See tab 5) Fire Department Allocation
Police Department	20,437,859	94.7%	19,362,182	See tab 6) Police Department Allocation
Capital Improvement Projects	8,371,213	89.9%	7,527,283	Capital Improvement involves the planning, design, and construction
	<u>\$ 52,956,274</u>		<u>\$ 47,617,575</u>	of all new City improvements identified in the 5-year capital
		Allocation %:	<u>89.9%</u>	improvement plan and major rehabilitation of existing facilities.
				As these facilities benefit all citizens, they are allocated proportional
				to the estimated Nishi allocation for each department.

Note: The description is taken from the 2017/8 budget document.

City of Davis Finance & Budget Commission

COMPARISON WITH EPS STUDY

	<u>CITY EXPENDITURES AT BUILD-OUT</u>		<u>PERSONS SERVED</u>		<u>COST PER PERSON</u>
EPS MODEL	\$ 1,351,000	/	2,269	=	\$ 595
PRESENT MODEL	\$ 1,302,419	/	2,198	=	\$ 593
			DIFFERENCE	=	<u>0.48%</u>

Exhibit A: Key Fiscal Impact Analysis Assumptions

Project: **Nishi**

Inflation

General Rate of Revenue Inflation:	Per Leland Model	per year
Inflation for Personnel Costs:	Per Leland Model	per year
Inflation for Non-Personnel Costs:	Per Leland Model	per year

Annual Real Estate Market Price Appreciation	Study Years		
	1-5	6-10	11-15
Affordable for-sale units	2.0%	3.8%	4.0%
Residential for-sale units	2.0%	3.8%	4.0%
Multifamily rental units	2.0%	3.8%	4.0%
Non-residential properties	2.0%	2.5%	3.5%
Property tax = 6.928%	Modified as per discussion in 1/8/18 F&BC meeting.		

Population and Employment Densities

Ownership

Small Affordable Units	2.83	persons per unit
Medium Affordable Units	2.83	persons per unit
Large Affordable Units	2.83	persons per unit
Townhouse	2.83	persons per unit
Small Market Rate Units	2.83	persons per unit
Medium Small Market Rate Units	2.83	persons per unit
Medium Market Rate Units	2.83	persons per unit
Large Market Rate Units	2.83	persons per unit
Very Large Market Rate Units	2.83	persons per unit

Senior Ownership (Age Restricted)

Senior Assisted Living Units	1.05	persons per unit
Senior Continuing Care Retirement	1.20	persons per unit
Senior Multi-Family	1.35	persons per unit
Senior Single Family Attached	1.73	persons per unit
Senior Single Family Detached	1.80	persons per unit

Ownership

Low-Mod (Six-Plex)	1.80	persons per unit
Low-Mod (Co-Operative)	1.80	persons per unit
Low-Mod (Townhouses)	1.80	persons per unit

Multifamily

Apartments	3.14	persons per unit
------------	------	------------------

Other Residential

Co-Housing	3.14	persons per unit
Student Apartments	3.14	persons per unit
Land Dedication (Apts.)	2.32	persons per unit
Work-Live	1.80	persons per unit
Low Income MF not for Profit	1.83	persons per unit
Village Apartments	3.14	persons per unit

Senior Congregate Care Core Facility

1.00 per bed

Non-Residential

Retail	500	square feet per employee
Office	300	square feet per employee
Senior Care Facility	750	square feet per employee
Industrial	1,000	square feet per employee
Satellite School (Property Tax Exempt)	1,000	square feet per employee
Restaurant	500	square feet per employee
Athletic Club	750	square feet per employee
Community Rec. Building	0	n.a.
Institutional Meeting house	0	n.a.
Hotel	2,000	square feet per employee
Other	1,000	square feet per employee

Variable vs. Fixed Costs for Service Expansion

Department or Function	Percent of General Fund Costs Variable
Department of Public Works Administration	98.1%
Department of Public Works Support Services	98.1%
Community Development Department Overall	100.0%
Parks and Community Services Administration	75.0%
Fire Department	88.4%
Police Department	94.7%
Capital Improvement Projects	89.9%
General Government Functions Overall	89.9%

Property Tax Assessment for Affordable For-Sale Units

Assumed Taxed at Full Market Value

Note:

This is the base assumptions but can be changed with information provided by the developer

Table 1: Development Program

Project: Nishi

	Units		Acres
Ownership		Parks and Open Space	
Small Affordable Units		Park	0.00
Medium Affordable Units		Mini-Park/Green Space/Village Greens	
Large Affordable Units		Greenbelts	0.00
Townhouse		Linear Green	0.00
Small Market Rate Units		Habitat	0.00
Medium Small Market Rate Units		Sub-Total Parks and Open Space	0
Medium Market Rate Units			
Large Market Rate Units		Streets	Linear Ft.
Very Large Market Rate Units		Two-Lane Arterial	
		Collector Street 1	
Senior Ownership (Age Restricted)		Collector Street 2	
Senior Assisted Living Units		Residential Street (Connector to Collector)	0
Senior Continuing Care Retirement		Residential Lane	0
Senior Multi-Family		Residential Park Side Street	
Senior Single Family Attached		Residential Linear Green Side Street	
Senior Single Family Detached		Linear Green Frontage / Live-Work Street	
		Residential Half-Circle (One Way)	
Ownership		Residential Connector Lanes	
Low-Mod (Six-Plex)		Alley Commons	
Low-Mod (Co-Operative)		Main Arterial Traffic Calming	
Low-Mod (Townhouses)		Collector Street Traffic Calming	0
		Residential Street Traffic Calming	0
Multifamily		Residential Lane - Modified	
Apartments	700	Residential Lane Side Street	0
		Total Publicly Maintained Streets	0
Other Residential			
Co-Housing		Urban Forestry	Trees
Student Apartments	0	Street Trees	0
Land Dedication (Apts.)		Sub-Total Street Trees	0
Work-Live			
Low Income MF not for Profit			
Village Apartments			
Sub-Total Residential Units	700		
Non-Residential	Square Feet		
Retail	7,500		
Office	0		
Senior Care Facility			
Industrial			
Satellite School (Property Tax Exempt)			
Restaurant	2,500		
Athletic Club			
Community Rec. Building			
Institutional Meeting house			
Hotel			
Other			
Sub-Total Non-Residential Square Feet	10,000		

Notes:

This information is given to the City by the Developer

Sources: City of Davis, Community Development Department

Table 2: Absorption Schedule

Project: Nishi

	Total Units	Cumulative Absorption (Year)														
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
Phased Ownership																
Small Affordable Units	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Medium Affordable Units	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Large Affordable Units	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Townhouse	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Small Market Rate Units	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Medium Small Market Rate Units	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Medium Market Rate Units	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Large Market Rate Units	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Very Large Market Rate Units	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Senior Ownership (Age Restricted)																
Senior Assisted Living Units	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Senior Continuing Care Retirement	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Senior Multi-Family	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Senior Single Family Attached	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Senior Single Family Detached	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Ownership																
Low-Mod (Six-Plex)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Low-Mod (Co-Operative)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Low-Mod (Townhouses)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Multifamily																
Apartments	700	140	280	420	560	700	700	700	700	700	700	700	700	700	700	700
Other Residential																
Co-Housing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Student Apartments	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Land Dedication (Apts.)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Work-Live	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Low Income MF not for Profit	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Village Apartments	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
SUB-TOTAL RESIDENTIAL UNITS	700	140	280	420	560	700	700	700	700	700	700	700	700	700	700	700
Non-Residential	Square Feet															
Retail	7,500	0	7,500	7,500	7,500	7,500	7,500	7,500	7,500	7,500	7,500	7,500	7,500	7,500	7,500	7,500
Office	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Senior Care Facility	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Industrial	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Satellite School (Property Tax Exempt)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Restaurant	2,500	0	0	2,500	2,500	2,500	2,500	2,500	2,500	2,500	2,500	2,500	2,500	2,500	2,500	2,500
Athletic Club	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Community Rec. Building	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Institutional Meeting house	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Hotel	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Other	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Sub-Total Non-Residential Square Feet	10,000	0	0	7,500	10,000	10,000	10,000	10,000	10,000	10,000	10,000	10,000	10,000	10,000	10,000	10,000
Parks and Open Space	Acres															
Park	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Mini-Park/Green Space/Village Greens	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Greenbelts	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Linear Green	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Habitat	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Sub-Total Parks and Open Space	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Urban Forestry	Trees															
Street Trees	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Streets	Linear Feet															
Two-Lane Arterial	0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Collector Street 1	0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Collector Street 2	0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Residential Street (Connector to Collector)	0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Residential Lane	0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Residential Park Side Street	0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Alley Commons	0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Main Arterial Traffic Calming	0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Collector Street Traffic Calming	0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Residential Lane - Modified	0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Residential Lane Side Street	0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total Publicly Maintained Streets	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Notes:

Absorption information is furnished by the developer

Sources: City of Davis, Community Development Department

Table 3: Estimated Dwelling Unit Equivalents

Project: Nishi

	Population Density	Estimated Population	DUE Factors (a)	Estimated DUEs	Cumulative DUE Absorption (Year)														
					1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
Phased Ownership																			
Small Affordable Units	2.83 per unit	0	0.90 per unit	-	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Medium Affordable Units	2.83 per unit	0	0.90 per unit	-	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Large Affordable Units	2.83 per unit	0	0.90 per unit	-	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Townhouse	2.83 per unit	0	0.90 per unit	-	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Small Market Rate Units	2.83 per unit	0	0.90 per unit	-	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Medium Small Market Rate Units	2.83 per unit	0	0.90 per unit	-	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Medium Market Rate Units	2.83 per unit	0	0.90 per unit	-	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Large Market Rate Units	2.83 per unit	0	0.90 per unit	-	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Very Large Market Rate Units	2.83 per unit	0	0.90 per unit	-	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Senior Ownership (Age Restricted)																			
Senior Assisted Living Units	1.05 per unit	0	0.33 per unit	-	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Senior Continuing Care Retirement	1.20 per unit	0	0.38 per unit	-	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Senior Multi-Family	1.35 per unit	0	0.43 per unit	-	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Senior Single Family Attached	1.73 per unit	0	0.55 per unit	-	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Senior Single Family Detached	1.80 per unit	0	0.57 per unit	-	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Ownership																			
Low-Mod (Six-Plex)	1.80 per unit	0	0.57 per unit	-	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Low-Mod (Co-Operative)	1.80 per unit	0	0.57 per unit	-	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Low-Mod (Townhouses)	1.80 per unit	0	0.57 per unit	-	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Multifamily																			
Apartments	3.14 per unit	2,198	1.00 per unit	700	140	280	420	560	700	700	700	700	700	700	700	700	700	700	700
Other Residential																			
Co-Housing	3.14 per unit	0	1.00 per unit	-	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Student Apartments	3.14 per unit	0	1.00 per unit	-	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Land Dedication (Apts.)	2.32 per unit	0	0.74 per unit	-	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Work-Live	1.80 per unit	0	0.57 per unit	-	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Low Income MF not for Profit	1.83 per unit	0	0.58 per unit	-	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Village Apartments	3.14 per unit	0	1.00 per unit	-	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Senior Congregate Care Core Facility	1 per bed	0	0.32 per bed	-	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Sub-Total Residential		2,198		700	140	280	420	560	700	700	700	700	700	700	700	700	700	700	700
Non-Residential																			
		Employees																	
Retail	500 square feet per employee	15	0.64 per 1,000 square feet	5	0	0	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5
Office	300 square feet per employee	0	1.06 per 1,000 square feet	-	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Senior Care Facility	750 square feet per employee	0	0.42 per 1,000 square feet	-	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Industrial	1000 square feet per employee	0	0.32 per 1,000 square feet	-	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Satellite School (Property Tax Exempt)	1000 square feet per employee	0	0.32 per 1,000 square feet	-	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Restaurant	500 square feet per employee	5	0.64 per 1,000 square feet	2	0	0	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
Athletic Club	750 square feet per employee	0	0.42 per 1,000 square feet	-	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Community Rec. Building	n.a. square feet per employee	0	0.00 per 1,000 square feet	-	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Institutional Meeting house	n.a. square feet per employee	0	0.00 per 1,000 square feet	-	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Hotel	2000 square feet per employee	0	0.16 per 1,000 square feet	-	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Other	1000 square feet per employee	0	0.32 per 1,000 square feet	-	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Sub-Total Non-Residential		20		7	0	0	5	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7
Total DUES				707	140	280	425	567	707	707	707	707	707	707	707	707	707	707	707

Note:
(a) UCD Neigh. Master Plan Fiscal Impact Analysis indicates that City of Davis Final Development Impact Fee Study Update 2000-2105 establishes 1 DUE equal to 3.14 persons.

Sources: City of Davis, 2004; UC Davis Neighborhood Master Plan - Public Review Draft Fiscal Impact Analysis, 2003; Bay Area Economics, 2005.

Table 4: Assessed Valuation (current \$)

Project: Nishi

	Estimated Valuation Market Rate Units	Estimated Valuation Affordable Units	Percentage variance	Assumed valuation	Units
Ownership					
Small Affordable Units	n.a.	\$0	0%	\$0	0
Medium Affordable Units	n.a.	\$0	0%	\$0	0
Large Affordable Units	n.a.	\$0	0%	\$0	0
Townhouse	n.a.	\$0	0%	\$0	0
Small Market Rate Units	\$0		0%	\$0	0
Medium Small Market Rate Units	\$0		0%	\$0	0
Medium Market Rate Units	\$0		0%	\$0	0
Large Market Rate Units	\$0		0%	\$0	0
Very Large Market Rate Units	\$0		0%	\$0	0
Senior Ownership (Age Restricted)					
Senior Assisted Living Units	n.a.	\$0	0%	\$0	0
Senior Continuing Care Retirement	\$0		0%	\$0	0
Senior Multi-Family	\$0		0%	\$0	0
Senior Single Family Attached	\$0		0%	\$0	0
Senior Single Family Detached	\$0		0%	\$0	0
Ownership					
Low-Mod (Six-Plex)	n.a.	\$0	0%	\$0	0
Low-Mod (Co-Operative)	n.a.	\$0	0%	\$0	0
Low-Mod (Townhouses)	n.a.	\$0	0%	\$0	0
Multifamily					
Apartments	\$350,000		0%	\$350,000	700
Other Residential					
Co-Housing	\$0		0%	\$0	0
Student Apartments	\$350,000	\$350,000	0%	\$350,000	0
Land Dedication (Apts.)	\$0		0%	\$0	0
Work-Live	\$0		0%	\$0	0
Low Income MF not for Profit	\$0		0%	\$0	0
Village Apartments	\$0		0%	\$0	0
Non-Residential					
Retail	\$350 /s.f.			\$350	7,500
Office	\$0			\$0	0
Senior Care Facility	\$0			\$0	0
Industrial	\$0			\$0	0
Satellite School (Property Tax Exempt)	\$0			\$0	0
Restaurant	\$500			\$500	2,500
Athletic Club	\$0			\$0	0
Community Rec. Building	\$0			\$0	0
Institutional Meeting house	\$0			\$0	0
Hotel	\$0			\$0	0
Other					

Note

Based on cost information provided by the developer

- (a) Estimated valuation of affordable middle-income for-sale units assumes units are assessed at full market value, per Affordable Housing Foundation proposal. Low-Mod. For-sale affordable units are assessed at restricted sale price.
- (b) Assumes units would be owned by for-profit developer. Actual assessment may be reduced due to restricted rents.

Table 5: Property Tax Revenues

	Tax Rate Area 4		Cumulative Absorption (Year)														
	City Share	6.9275%	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
Phased Multifamily																	
Apartments																	
Absorbed Year 1		\$49,000,000	\$49,980,000	\$50,979,600	\$51,999,192	\$53,039,176	\$54,099,959	\$55,181,959	\$56,285,598	\$57,411,310	\$58,559,536	\$59,730,727	\$60,925,341	\$62,143,848	\$63,386,725	\$64,654,459	
Absorbed Year 2			\$49,980,000	\$50,979,600	\$51,999,192	\$53,039,176	\$54,099,959	\$55,181,959	\$56,285,598	\$57,411,310	\$58,559,536	\$59,730,727	\$60,925,341	\$62,143,848	\$63,386,725	\$64,654,459	
Absorbed Year 3				\$50,979,600	\$51,999,192	\$53,039,176	\$54,099,959	\$55,181,959	\$56,285,598	\$57,411,310	\$58,559,536	\$59,730,727	\$60,925,341	\$62,143,848	\$63,386,725	\$64,654,459	
Absorbed Year 4					\$51,999,192	\$53,039,176	\$54,099,959	\$55,181,959	\$56,285,598	\$57,411,310	\$58,559,536	\$59,730,727	\$60,925,341	\$62,143,848	\$63,386,725	\$64,654,459	
Absorbed Year 5						\$53,039,176	\$54,099,959	\$55,181,959	\$56,285,598	\$57,411,310	\$58,559,536	\$59,730,727	\$60,925,341	\$62,143,848	\$63,386,725	\$64,654,459	
Absorbed Year 6							\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	
Absorbed Year 7								\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Absorbed Year 8									\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Absorbed Year 9										\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Absorbed Year 10											\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
SUB-TOTAL RESIDENTIAL UNITS		\$49,000,000	\$99,960,000	\$152,938,800	\$207,996,768	\$265,195,879	\$270,499,797	\$275,909,793	\$281,427,989	\$287,056,548	\$292,797,679	\$298,653,633	\$304,626,706	\$310,719,240	\$316,933,624	\$323,272,297	
Non-Residential																	
Retail																	
Absorbed Year 1		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Absorbed Year 2			\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Absorbed Year 3				\$2,731,050	\$2,785,671	\$2,841,384	\$2,898,212	\$2,956,176	\$3,015,300	\$3,075,606	\$3,137,118	\$3,199,860	\$3,263,858	\$3,329,135	\$3,395,717	\$3,463,632	
Absorbed Year 4					\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Absorbed Year 5						\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Absorbed Year 6							\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Absorbed Year 7								\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Absorbed Year 8									\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Absorbed Year 9										\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Absorbed Year 10											\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Sub-Total Non-Residential		\$0	\$0	\$2,731,050	\$4,112,181	\$4,194,425	\$4,278,313	\$4,363,879	\$4,451,157	\$4,540,180	\$4,630,984	\$4,723,603	\$4,818,075	\$4,914,437	\$5,012,726	\$5,112,980	
Total Secured Valuation		\$49,000,000	\$99,960,000	\$155,669,850	\$212,108,949	\$269,390,304	\$274,778,110	\$280,273,672	\$285,879,146	\$291,596,728	\$297,428,663	\$303,377,236	\$309,444,781	\$315,633,677	\$321,946,350	\$328,385,277	
Unsecured Property Tax Valuation (e)		\$713,196	\$1,454,920	\$2,265,778	\$3,087,251	\$3,920,982	\$3,999,402	\$4,079,390	\$4,160,977	\$4,244,197	\$4,329,081	\$4,415,663	\$4,503,976	\$4,594,055	\$4,685,936	\$4,779,655	
Total Assessed Valuation		\$49,713,196	\$101,414,920	\$157,935,628	\$215,196,200	\$273,311,286	\$278,777,512	\$284,353,062	\$290,040,123	\$295,840,925	\$301,757,744	\$307,792,899	\$313,948,757	\$320,227,732	\$326,632,287	\$333,164,932	
Basic Property Taxes Paid		\$497,132	\$1,014,149	\$1,579,356	\$2,151,962	\$2,733,113	\$2,787,775	\$2,843,531	\$2,900,401	\$2,958,409	\$3,017,577	\$3,077,929	\$3,139,488	\$3,202,277	\$3,266,323	\$3,331,649	
Basic Property Taxes Allocated to City (f)		\$34,439	\$70,255	\$109,410	\$149,077	\$189,336	\$193,123	\$196,986	\$200,925	\$204,944	\$209,043	\$213,224	\$217,488	\$221,838	\$226,275	\$230,800	

Note:

(a) See Appendix A for property tax re-allocation assumptions.

(b) Estimated average annual real estate appreciation rate (initial sales and for periodic turnover of property)

	Study Years		
	1-5	6-10	11-15
Affordable for-sale units	2.0%	3.8%	4.0%
Residential for-sale units	2.0%	3.8%	4.0%
Multifamily rental units	2.0%	3.8%	4.0%
Non-residential properties	2.0%	2.5%	3.5%

Linked to assumption tab. Modification to 2% (vs. 1.5% as per discussion in 1/8/18 F&BC meeting)

(c) Prop. 13 maximum annual assessment increase when property held in same ownership.

Percentages are based on the percentage of change on the Leland Model	2.3%	4.4%	4.2%	4.3%	4.3%	3.7%	3.7%	3.7%	1.7%	4.3%	4.3%	4.3%	3.7%	3.7%
---	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------

(d) Assumed average number of years between sales.

Residential for-sale units	12
Senior for-sale units	25
Multifamily for-sale units	20
Multifamily rental units	20
Non-residential properties	33

(e) Estimate is based on City of Davis' current ratio of unsecured property tax revenue to secured property tax revenue.

	Secured	Unsecured	Unsecured to secured property tax ratio FY 2017-18
	12,710,389	185,000	1.46%
	001-0000-301.0500	001-0000-301.0800 and 1000	

(f) Based on existing City of Davis/Yolo County property tax sharing agreement for Area selected.

Sources: City of Davis; Leland Fiscal Model; UC Davis Neighborhood Master Plan - Public Review Draft Fiscal Impact Analysis, 2003; Bay Area Economics; Goodwin Consulting Group, Inc.

Table 6: Property Transfer Tax

Ownership	Cumulative Absorption (Year)														
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
Value of Initial Sales	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Total Valuation In Place	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Value of Resales		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Senior Ownership (Age Restricted)															
Value of Initial Sales	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Total Valuation In Place	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Value of Resales		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Ownership															
Value of Initial Sales	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Total Valuation In Place	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Value of Resales		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Multifamily															
Value of Initial Sales (assumes no initial property turnover)															
Total Valuation In Place	\$49,000,000	\$99,960,000	\$152,938,800	\$207,996,768	\$265,195,879	\$270,499,797	\$275,909,793	\$281,427,989	\$287,056,548	\$292,797,679	\$298,653,633	\$304,626,706	\$310,719,240	\$316,933,624	\$323,272,297
Value of Resales		\$4,998,000	\$7,646,940	\$10,399,838	\$13,259,794	\$13,524,990	\$13,795,490	\$14,071,399	\$14,352,827	\$14,639,884	\$14,932,682	\$15,231,335	\$15,535,962	\$15,846,681	\$16,163,615
Other Residential															
Value of Initial Sales (assumes no initial property turnover)															
Total Valuation In Place	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Value of Resales		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Non-Residential															
Value of Initial Sales (assumes no initial property turnover)	\$0														
Total Valuation In Place	\$0	\$0	\$2,731,050	\$4,112,181	\$4,194,425	\$4,278,313	\$4,363,879	\$4,451,157	\$4,540,180	\$4,630,984	\$4,723,603	\$4,818,075	\$4,914,437	\$5,012,726	\$5,112,980
Value of Resales		\$0	\$82,759	\$124,612	\$127,104	\$129,646	\$132,239	\$134,884	\$137,581	\$140,333	\$143,139	\$146,002	\$148,922	\$151,901	\$154,939
Total Valuation Subject to Transfer Tax	\$0	\$4,998,000	\$7,729,699	\$10,524,450	\$13,386,898	\$13,654,636	\$13,927,728	\$14,206,283	\$14,490,409	\$14,780,217	\$15,075,821	\$15,377,338	\$15,684,884	\$15,998,582	\$16,318,554
Property Transfer Tax Allocated to City	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$7,660	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0

Note:

(a) Property transfer tax rate is \$1.10 per \$1,000 in value. The City of Davis receives half and Yolo County receives the other half.

(b) Proportion of existing units assumed sold annually:

Single-family for-sale	8.0%	12 years	per the 2013 report
Senior for-sale	4.0%		
Other for-sale	5.0%		
Multifamily Rental	5.0%		
Non-residential	3.0%		

Source: Bay Area Economics, 2005.

Table 7: Sales and Use Tax

PER CAPITA DEMAND-BASED REVENUES

	Estimated Persons Per Household	Estimated Expenditures Per Household	Cumulative Expenditures (Year)														
			1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
Phased Ownership																	
Small Affordable Units	2.83	\$21,189	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Medium Affordable Units	2.83	\$21,189	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Large Affordable Units	2.83	\$21,189	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Townhouse	2.83	\$21,189	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Small Market Rate Units	2.83	\$21,189	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Medium Small Market Rate Units	2.83	\$21,189	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Medium Market Rate Units	2.83	\$21,189	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Large Market Rate Units	2.83	\$21,189	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Very Large Market Rate Units	2.83	\$21,189	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Senior Ownership (Age Restricted)																	
Senior Assisted Living Units	1.05	\$7,862	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Senior Continuing Care Retirement	1.20	\$9,985	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Senior Multi-Family	1.35	\$10,108	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Senior Single Family Attached	1.73	\$12,953	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Senior Single Family Detached	1.80	\$13,477	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Ownership																	
Low-Mod (Six-Plex)	1.80	\$13,477	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Low-Mod (Co-Operative)	1.80	\$13,477	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Low-Mod (Townhouses)	1.80	\$13,477	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Multifamily																	
Apartments	3.14	\$9,925.55	\$1,389,576	\$2,731,907	\$4,179,818	\$5,846,172	\$7,665,793	\$9,934,096	\$12,203,855	\$14,474,582	\$16,722,040	\$18,973,176	\$21,221,408	\$23,470,716	\$25,719,516	\$27,968,264	\$30,217,019
Other Residential																	
Co-Housing	3.14	\$23,511	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Student Apartments	3.14	\$11,395.68	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Land Dedication (Apts.)	2.32	\$17,371	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Work-Live	1.80	\$13,477	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Low Income MF not for Profit	1.83	\$13,697	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Village Apartments	3.14	\$23,511	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0

INCREMENTAL SALES TAX RELATED TO EXPANSION OF CITYWIDE RETAIL BASE

Quantity of Proposed Retail Assumed as Community-Serving Retail (a)	0	0	2,632	2,632	2,632	2,632	2,632	2,632	2,632	2,632	2,632	2,632	2,632	2,632	2,632	2,632	2,632
Gross Potential Community Retail Sales (b)	\$0	\$0	\$657,895	\$657,895	\$657,895	\$657,895	\$657,895	\$657,895	\$657,895	\$657,895	\$657,895	\$657,895	\$657,895	\$657,895	\$657,895	\$657,895	\$657,895
Portion of Community Retail Sales Attributed as Additional Revenue Beyond Per-Capita Expenditures, Above (c)	\$0	\$0	\$164,474	\$164,474	\$164,474	\$164,474	\$164,474	\$164,474	\$164,474	\$164,474	\$164,474	\$164,474	\$164,474	\$164,474	\$164,474	\$164,474	\$164,474
Total Net Increase in Local Taxable Retail Expenditures			\$1,389,576	\$2,731,907	\$4,344,292	\$6,010,646	\$7,830,267	\$9,934,096	\$12,203,855	\$14,474,582	\$16,722,040	\$18,973,176	\$21,221,408	\$23,470,716	\$25,719,516	\$27,968,264	\$30,217,019
Local Sales Tax Revenues (d)	\$27,792	\$54,638	\$86,886	\$120,213	\$156,605	\$161,971	\$167,367	\$172,781	\$178,211	\$183,661	\$189,131	\$194,631	\$199,161	\$204,711	\$209,281	\$214,871	\$219,491
Pooled County and State Sales Tax Revenues (e)	\$2,507	\$4,928	\$7,837	\$10,843	\$14,126	\$14,610	\$15,096	\$15,585	\$16,075	\$16,565	\$17,055	\$17,545	\$18,035	\$18,525	\$19,015	\$19,505	\$19,995
Total Sales and Use Tax	\$30,298	\$59,567	\$94,723	\$131,056	\$170,731	\$176,581	\$182,463	\$188,366	\$194,286	\$200,216	\$206,151	\$212,091	\$218,036	\$223,986	\$229,941	\$235,896	\$241,856
Public Safety Sales Tax (f)	\$861	\$3,692	\$5,871	\$8,122	\$10,581	\$10,944	\$11,308	\$11,674	\$12,041	\$12,408	\$12,776	\$13,144	\$13,512	\$13,880	\$14,248	\$14,616	\$14,984

Notes:
(a) Sales tax revenue assumptions:
Population (DOF JANUARY 2017) 68,740 87.1% Reflects those in city limits only, even though others in areas abutting Davis (e.g., campus residents, El Macero, other nearby rural residents) will go to Davis to shop.
UCD Population (Not in City Limits) 9,000 11.4% Per UCD Catalog which states "...more than 9,000". Based on the UCD release relative to adding more student housing, the number may be 9,400.
El Macero Subdivision 1,182 1.5% Based on 467 homes/condominiums at the average of 2.53 people per owner-occupied unit. As the renter-occupied average is similar at 2.58, the owner vs. renter assumption is not significant. Source: https://factfinder.census.gov
Actual Population for Sales Tax Purposes 78,922 100.0% Reflects population who are in Davis, live in an area that borders Davis, or are closer to Davis than any other city.

2015 Taxable Sales Est. (SBOE) \$633,471,479 100.0%
Subtract Business-To-Business Revenue -\$52,000,000 -8.2% Per 2015 EPS Study, the 2.6 million square feet of commercial space in Davis yields an average of \$20 per square foot in taxable revenue. (2,600,000 x \$20 = \$52,000,000)
Taxable Sales from Personal (vs. Commercial) Purchases \$581,471,479 91.8%

	June 2016	June 2017	
Average Per Capita Taxable Sales	\$7,368	\$7,368	
Inflation Factor	101.63%	101.63%	http://www.bls.gov/bls/inflation.htm
Estimated current year Local Per Capita Taxable Sales	\$7,487.45	\$7,487.45	
Assumed average rate of increase for per capita sales	1.6%	1.6%	
	1	0.983	1.00266
		1.05179034	1.10332807
		1.14194455	1.18077066
		1.2197361	1.29778085
		1.25407655	1.31427222
		1.37735729	1.42281008
		1.47118562	1.52120593

- (a) Per City Council direction 35%
- (b) Assumed \$ in sales per square foot of community retail space \$ 250
- (c) Assumed portion not already counted in per capita expenditures 25%
- (d) With passage of Measure O, local allocation of sales taxes is 2.0% of taxable sales; assumes Measure O is extended through analysis period. Actual sales tax revenues may be less than 2.0% due to local sales of autos to people residing outside Davis.
- (e) Based on SBOE data for 2014Q3 through 2016 Q2, the City of Davis pooled sales tax revenue is 18.04% of the base 1% sales tax revenues.
- (f) Public Safety Sales Tax as Pct. Of Base 1% Sales Tax 6.2%

2017-18 Citywide Sales Tax Revenue 8,067,577 001-0000-303.0500
2017-18 Citywide Prop. 172 Public Safety 500,000 155-0000-303.0510

Sources: State Board of Equalization; State Department of Finance; U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics; City of Davis; Bay Area Economics; Goodwin Consulting Group, Inc.; Leland Model

Table 8: Municipal Services Tax

Ownership	Average Lot Size (Sq. Ft.)	Base Tax	Lot Size Charge	Average Revenue/Unit	Total Revenue	Annual Revenues (Year)															
						1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	
Small Affordable Units	2,500	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Medium Affordable Units	2,900	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Large Affordable Units	3,200	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Townhouse	3,600	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Small Market Rate Units	4,500	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Medium Small Market Rate Units	5,500	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Medium Market Rate Units	6,500	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Large Market Rate Units	7,500	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Very Large Market Rate Units	8,500	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Senior Ownership (Age Restricted)						\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Senior Assisted Living Units	2,500	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Senior Continuing Care Retirement	3,500	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Senior Multi-Family	4,250	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Senior Single Family Attached	4,750	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Senior Single Family Detached	5,500	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Ownership						\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Low-Mod (Six-Plex)	2,500	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Low-Mod (Co-Operative)	2,500	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Low-Mod (Townhouses)	2,500	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Multifamily						\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Apartments	1,500	\$62,160.00	\$756.00	\$89.88	\$62,916.00	\$12,583	\$12,583	\$40,049	\$55,000	\$70,813	\$72,937	\$75,125	\$77,379	\$79,700	\$82,091	\$84,554	\$87,090	\$89,703	\$92,394	\$95,166	
Other Residential						\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Co-Housing	2,500	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Student Apartments	1,500	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Land Dedication (Apts.)	1,500	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Work-Live	1,500	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Low Income MF not for Profit	1,500	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Village Apartments	1,500	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
SUB-TOTAL RESIDENTIAL UNITS		\$62,160.00	\$756.00	\$0.00	\$62,916.00	\$12,583.20	\$12,583.20	\$40,048.55	\$55,000.01	\$70,812.51	\$72,936.89	\$75,124.99	\$77,378.74	\$79,700.11	\$82,091.11	\$84,553.84	\$87,090.46	\$89,703.17	\$92,394.27	\$95,166.10	
Non-Residential																					
Retail	30,000	\$869.40	\$21.60	\$0.12	\$891.00	\$0	\$0	\$945	\$974	\$1,003	\$1,033	\$1,064	\$1,096	\$1,129	\$1,163	\$1,197	\$1,233	\$1,270	\$1,308	\$1,348	
Office	-	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Senior Care Facility	-	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Industrial	-	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Satellite School (Property Tax Exempt)	-	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Restaurant	10,000	\$289.80	\$7.20	\$0.12	\$297.00	\$0	\$0	\$325	\$334	\$344	\$355	\$365	\$376	\$388	\$399	\$411	\$423	\$436	\$449		
Athletic Club	-	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Community Rec. Building	-	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Institutional Meeting house	-	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Hotel	-	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Other	-	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
SUB-TOTAL NON-RESIDENTIAL SQUARE FEET	40,000	\$1,159	\$29	\$0.24	\$1,188	\$0	\$0	\$945	\$1,298	\$1,337	\$1,377	\$1,419	\$1,461	\$1,505	\$1,550	\$1,597	\$1,644	\$1,694	\$1,745	\$1,797	
TOTAL MUNICIPAL SERVICES TAX		\$63,319	\$785	\$0	\$64,104	\$12,583	\$12,583	\$40,994	\$56,298	\$72,150	\$74,314	\$76,544	\$78,840	\$81,205	\$83,641	\$86,150	\$88,735	\$91,397	\$94,139	\$96,963	

Notes:

Tax schedule:
 Residential Base/unit \$88.80 per year
 Residential lot/s.f. \$0.000720 per year
 Commercial Base/S.f. \$0.115920 per year
 Commercial lot/S.f. \$0.000720 per year
 Annual Escalator 3.0%
 Voted in by City Council pre Prop 13
 Sources: City of Davis; Bay Area Economics; Goodwin Consulting Group, Inc.

Table 9: Parks Maintenance Tax

Ownership	Annual Revenues (Year)														
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
Small Affordable Units	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Medium Affordable Units	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Large Affordable Units	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Townhouse	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Small Market Rate Units	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Medium Small Market Rate Units	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Medium Market Rate Units	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Large Market Rate Units	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Very Large Market Rate Units	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Senior Ownership (Age Restricted)															
Senior Assisted Living Units	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Senior Continuing Care Retirement	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Senior Multi-Family	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Senior Single Family Attached	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Senior Single Family Detached	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Ownership															
Low-Mod (Six-Plex)	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Low-Mod (Co-Operative)	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Low-Mod (Townhouses)	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Multifamily															
Apartments	\$6,860	\$13,720	\$20,580	\$27,440	\$34,300	\$34,300	\$34,300	\$34,300	\$34,300	\$34,300	\$34,300	\$34,300	\$34,300	\$34,300	\$34,300
Other Residential															
Co-Housing	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Student Apartments	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Land Dedication (Apts.)	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Work-Live	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Low Income MF not for Profit	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Village Apartments	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
SUB-TOTAL RESIDENTIAL UNITS	\$6,860	\$13,720	\$20,580	\$27,440	\$34,300	\$34,300	\$34,300	\$34,300	\$34,300	\$34,300	\$34,300	\$34,300	\$34,300	\$34,300	\$34,300
Non-Residential															
Retail	\$0	\$0	\$300	\$300	\$300	\$300	\$300	\$300	\$300	\$300	\$300	\$300	\$300	\$300	\$300
Office	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Senior Care Facility	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Industrial	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Satellite School (Property Tax Exempt)	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Restaurant	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$100	\$100	\$100	\$100	\$100	\$100	\$100	\$100	\$100	\$100	\$100	\$100
Athletic Club	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Community Rec. Building	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Institutional Meeting house	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Hotel	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Other	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
SUB-TOTAL NONRESIDENTIAL SQ. FT.	\$0	\$0	\$300	\$400	\$400	\$400	\$400	\$400	\$400	\$400	\$400	\$400	\$400	\$400	\$400
Total	\$6,860	\$13,720	\$20,880	\$27,840	\$34,700	\$34,700	\$34,700	\$34,700	\$34,700	\$34,700	\$34,700	\$34,700	\$34,700	\$34,700	\$34,700

Notes:

Maintenance Tax Per Residential Unit **\$49**

Maint. Tax Per 1,000 Sq. Ft. Commercial building (Max of 10,000 Sq. Ft.) **\$40**

Fees are set at current rates

Sources: City of Davis; Bay Area Economics; Goodwin Consulting Group, Inc.

Table 10: Public Safety Tax

Ownership	Average Lot Size (Sq. Ft.)	Base Tax	Lot Size Charge	Average Revenue Per Unit	Total Revenue	Cumulative Absorption (Year)														
						1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
Small Affordable Units	2,500	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Medium Affordable Units	2,900	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Large Affordable Units	3,200	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Townhouse	3,600	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Small Market Rate Units	4,500	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Medium Small Market Rate Units	5,500	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Medium Market Rate Units	6,500	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Large Market Rate Units	7,500	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Very Large Market Rate Units	8,500	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Multifamily																				
Apartments	1,500	\$48,636.00	\$554.40	\$70.27	\$49,190	\$9,838	\$20,266	\$31,312	\$43,001	\$55,364	\$57,025	\$58,736	\$60,498	\$62,313	\$64,182	\$66,108	\$68,091	\$70,134	\$72,238	\$74,405
Other Residential																				
Co-Housing	2,500	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Student Apartments	1,500	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Land Dedication (Apts.)	1,500	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Work-Live	1,500	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Low Income MF not for Profit	1,500	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Village Apartments	1,500	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	1,500	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
SUB-TOTAL RESIDENTIAL UNITS						\$9,838	\$20,266	\$31,312	\$43,001	\$55,364	\$57,025	\$58,736	\$60,498	\$62,313	\$64,182	\$66,108	\$68,091	\$70,134	\$72,238	\$74,405
Non-Residential				<u>Revenue/Sq. Ft.</u>																
Retail	30,000	\$1,039.50	\$15.84	\$0.14	\$1,055.34	\$0	\$0	\$1,120	\$1,153	\$1,188	\$1,223	\$1,260	\$1,298	\$1,337	\$1,377	\$1,418	\$1,461	\$1,505	\$1,550	\$1,596
Office	-	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Senior Care Facility	-	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Industrial	-	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Satellite School (Property Tax Exempt)	-	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Restaurant	10,000	\$346.50	\$5.28	\$0.14	\$351.78	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$384	\$396	\$408	\$420	\$433	\$446	\$459	\$473	\$487	\$502	\$517	\$532
Athletic Club	-	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Community Rec. Building	-	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Institutional Meeting house	-	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Hotel	-	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Other	-	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
0	-	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
0	-	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
SUB-TOTAL NON-RESIDENTIAL SQUARE FEET						\$0	\$0	\$1,120	\$1,538	\$1,584	\$1,631	\$1,680	\$1,731	\$1,782	\$1,836	\$1,891	\$1,948	\$2,006	\$2,066	\$2,128
TOTAL						\$9,838	\$20,266	\$32,431	\$44,539	\$56,948	\$58,656	\$60,416	\$62,229	\$64,095	\$66,018	\$67,999	\$70,039	\$72,140	\$74,304	\$76,533

Notes:

Base Rate Per Residential Unit \$ 69.48
 Rate Per Square Foot of Residential Lot Size \$ 0.00053

Base Rate Per Commercial Square Foot \$ 0.14
 Rate Per Square Foot of Commercial Lot Size \$ 0.00053

Annual Increase in Tax Rate 3.0%

Voted in by City Council pre Prop 13

Sources: City of Davis; Bay Area Economics; Goodwin Consulting Group, Inc.

Table 11: Other Revenues

		Cumulative Absorption (Year)															
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	
Transient Occupancy Tax																	
Transient Occupancy Tax Revenues	\$1,752,030																
Current Resident Population (2017 DOF)	68,740																
Residents Per DUE (a)	3.14																
Residential DUEs in Davis	21,892																
Existing City Employment (2016 Claritas)	22,167																
Employees Per DUE (b)	3.14																
Employee DUEs in Davis	7,060																
Total DUEs in Davis	28,951																
Average Revenue Per DUE	\$60.52	(a)	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	
Business License Tax																	
	Gross Receipts Per Sq. Ft.	Tax Rate Per \$10,000 Gross	Avg. Revenue Per Sq. Ft.														
Retail	\$200	\$6.00	\$0	\$0	\$920	\$945	\$971	\$991	\$1,011	\$1,031	\$1,026	\$1,054	\$1,083	\$1,113	\$1,135	\$1,158	\$1,181
Office	\$200	\$9.00	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Senior Care Facility	n.avail.	\$0.00	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Industrial	n.avail.	\$0.00	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Satellite School (Property Tax Exempt)	n.avail.	\$0.00	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Restaurant	\$200	\$9.00	\$0.18	\$0	\$0	\$473	\$486	\$495	\$505	\$515	\$513	\$527	\$541	\$556	\$567	\$579	\$590
Athletic Club	\$40	\$9.00	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Community Rec. Building	\$0	\$0.00	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Institutional Meeting house	\$0	\$0.00	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Hotel	\$50	\$6.00	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Other	\$0	\$0.00	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	n.avail.	\$0.00	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	n.avail.	\$0.00	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Total			\$0	\$0	\$920	\$1,418	\$1,457	\$1,486	\$1,516	\$1,546	\$1,539	\$1,581	\$1,624	\$1,669	\$1,702	\$1,736	\$1,771
Franchise Fees																	
General Franchise Fee Revenues	\$1,181,696																
Residential DUEs in Davis	21,892																
Employee DUEs in Davis	7,060																
Total DUEs in Davis	28,951																
Average Revenue Per DUE	\$40.82		\$5,714	\$11,612	\$18,101	\$24,800	\$31,759	\$32,553	\$33,366	\$34,201	\$34,782	\$35,721	\$36,686	\$37,676	\$38,618	\$40,819	\$41,840
Property Tax In-Lieu of VLF																	
In-Lieu VLF	\$6,471,172																
Gross Citywide AV	\$8,082,393,549																
Project AV		\$49,713,196	\$101,414,920	\$157,935,628	\$215,196,200	\$273,311,286	\$278,777,512	\$284,353,062	\$290,040,123	\$295,840,925	\$301,757,744	\$307,792,899	\$313,948,757	\$320,227,732	\$326,632,287	\$333,164,932	
Percent Increase in Project AV from Year 1		204%	318%	433%	550%	561%	572%	583%	595%	607%	619%	632%	644%	657%	670%		
ILVLF		\$39,803	\$81,198	\$126,451	\$172,297	\$218,827	\$223,203	\$227,667	\$232,221	\$236,865	\$241,602	\$246,435	\$251,363	\$256,390	\$261,518	\$266,749	
Gas Tax Revenues																	
Total Gas Tax Revenues	\$1,435,625																
Residential DUEs in Davis	21,892																
Average Revenue Per DUE	\$65.58																
Effect of Limited Parking at Nishi ^{1/}	50%																
Average Revenue Per DUE (Adjusted for Nishi)	\$32.79		\$4,590	\$9,135	\$14,086	\$19,308	\$24,617	\$25,110	\$25,612	\$26,124	\$24,818	\$25,513	\$26,227	\$26,961	\$27,501	\$28,051	\$28,612
^{1/} Allocation of police services related to traffic was reduced by 50% reflecting limited parking for Nishi (700 spaces for an assumed 2,198 residents). As such, either gas tax revenue will be lower, or police expenditures will be higher.																	
Community Services Revenues																	
Total Community Services Revenues	\$2,221,899																
Existing Resident Population	68,740																
Total Registrations	16,166																
Utilization rate	23.52%																
Total DUEs in Davis	28,951																
Average Adjusted Revenue Per DUE	\$18.05		\$2,527	\$5,028	\$7,846	\$10,761	\$13,686	\$13,960	\$14,239	\$14,524	\$13,798	\$14,184	\$14,581	\$14,989	\$15,289	\$15,595	\$15,907
Other Charges for Service Revenues																	
Total Other Charges for Service Revenues	\$3,363,535																
Residential DUEs in Davis	21,892																
Employee DUEs in Davis	7,060																
Total DUEs in Davis	28,951																
Average Revenue Per DUE	\$116.18		\$16,265	\$32,368	\$50,505	\$69,266	\$88,096	\$89,858	\$91,655	\$93,488	\$88,814	\$91,301	\$93,857	\$96,485	\$98,415	\$100,383	\$102,391
Fines and Forfeitures																	
General Fund Revenue	\$647,750																
Residential DUEs in Davis	21,892																
Employee DUEs in Davis	7,060																
Total DUEs in Davis	28,951																
Average Revenue Per DUE	\$22.37																
Effect of Limited Parking at Nishi ^{1/}	50%																
Average Revenue Per DUE (Adjusted for Nishi)	\$11.19		\$1,566	\$3,117	\$4,863	\$6,670	\$8,483	\$8,652	\$8,825	\$9,002	\$8,552	\$8,791	\$9,038	\$9,291	\$9,476	\$9,666	\$9,859
^{1/} Allocation of police services related to traffic was reduced by 50% reflecting limited parking for Nishi (700 spaces for an assumed 2,198 residents). As such, either traffic fine revenue will be lower, or police expenditures will be higher.																	
Cannabis Tax																	
Per the City Staff memo to the City Council for the 8/29/17 meeting: "There is not enough information at this time to provide accurate estimates of the revenue potential of the proposed business types."																	

Notes:
(a) Current average revenue per DUE is provided for informational purposes only. The City's current transient occupancy tax is generated primarily from hotel/motel establishments catering to university-related demand and/or highway related demand.
(b) Assumed average annual rate of increase for other revenue sources:
(c) FY 2016-17 VLF amount and AV per County Auditor's Office

Table 14: Community Services Expenditures

	17/18 Costs	Cumulative Absorption (Year)														
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
Per DUE CS General Fund Costs																
Aquatics (Div 25)	\$434,168															
Community Services (Div 47)	\$2,307,717															
Sub-total Per DUE CS Costs	\$2,741,885															
Current City Resident DUEs	21,892															
Current City Employment DUEs	7,060															
Employment DUE Reduction Factor	0.36															
Adjusted Citywide Employment DUEs	2,541															
Total Adjusted Citywide DUEs	24,433															
Estimated General Fund Per Adjusted DUE costs	\$ 112.22															
Assumed Percent of GF Expenditures Variable	75%															
Variable Costs Per DUE	\$ 84.16															
Project Residential DUEs	700	140	280	420	560	700	700	700	700	700	700	700	700	700	700	700
Project Employment DUEs	7	0	0	5	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7
Employment DUE Reduction Factor	0.36	0.36	0.36	0.36	0.36	0.36	0.36	0.36	0.36	0.36	0.36	0.36	0.36	0.36	0.36	0.36
Adjusted Project Employment DUEs	2.52	0	0	2	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3
Total Adjusted Project DUEs	703	140	280	422	563	703	703	703	703	703	703	703	703	703	703	703
Non-personnel Cost		\$3,947	\$6,062	\$9,288	\$12,597	\$15,999	\$16,271	\$16,548	\$16,829	\$17,132	\$17,423	\$17,719	\$18,021	\$18,327	\$18,803	\$19,292
Personnel Cost		\$7,836	\$16,770	\$26,803	\$37,497	\$48,983	\$51,139	\$53,082	\$55,046	\$56,422	\$58,397	\$59,974	\$62,013	\$64,183	\$66,237	\$67,893
Total Community Services Expenditures		\$11,783	\$22,832	\$36,091	\$50,094	\$64,983	\$67,410	\$69,630	\$71,875	\$73,554	\$75,820	\$77,693	\$80,033	\$82,510	\$85,041	\$87,185

Notes:

	Pct. Of Dept.			Operating Expenses & Interdepartmental	2,030,738										
Percentage of costs from the general fund for non-personnel costs	33.5%	\$ 28.19		Salaries and Expenses	4,032,048										
Percentage of costs from the general fund for personnel costs	66.5%	\$ 55.97			6,062,786										
Per Leland model annual increase in non-personnel costs	1	0.768	0.781056	0.794333952	0.807837629	0.82157087	0.83553757	0.84974171	0.86503706	0.87974269	0.89469832	0.90990819	0.92537663	0.94943642	0.97412177
Per Leland model annual increase in personnel costs	1	1.07	1.13527	1.19089823	1.245679549	1.30048945	1.34990805	1.39985465	1.43485101	1.4850708	1.52516771	1.57702341	1.63221923	1.68445025	1.7265615

Sources: City of Davis FY 2017-18 Adopted Budget; Assumption based form Leland Model

Table 15: Asset Management Expenditures

	17/18 Costs	Cumulative Absorption (Year)														
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
Park and Open Space Maintenance																
Park	\$11,274 /ac.	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Mini-Park	\$11,274 /ac.	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Greenbelts	\$6,725 /ac.	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Linear Green	\$7,428 /ac.	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Habitat	\$876 /ac.	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Urban Forestry	\$55 /tree	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Sub-total Park and Park Maintenance		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Asset Management General Fund Costs	\$6,380,697															
Current City Resident DUEs	21,892															
Current City Employment DUEs	7,060															
Employment DUE Reduction Factor	0.36															
Adjusted Citywide Employment DUEs	2,541															
Total Adjusted Citywide DUEs	24,433															
Estimated General Fund Per Adjusted DUE costs	\$ 261.15 \$ 195.86															
Project Residential DUEs	700	140	280	420	560	700	700	700	700	700	700	700	700	700	700	700
Project Employment DUEs	7	0	0	5	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7
Employment DUE Reduction Factor	0.36	0.36	0.36	0.36	0.36	0.36	0.36	0.36	0.36	0.36	0.36	0.36	0.36	0.36	0.36	0.36
Adjusted Project Employment DUEs	2.52	0	0	2	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3
Total Adjusted Project DUEs	703	140	280	422	563	703	703	703	703	703	703	703	703	703	703	703
Non-Personnel Costs		\$17,608	\$27,046	\$41,435	\$56,198	\$71,378	\$72,592	\$73,826	\$75,081	\$76,432	\$77,731	\$79,053	\$80,397	\$81,763	\$83,889	\$86,070
Personnel costs		\$9,813	\$20,999	\$33,563	\$46,954	\$61,337	\$64,036	\$66,469	\$68,929	\$70,652	\$73,125	\$75,099	\$77,652	\$80,370	\$82,942	\$85,016
Total Asset Management Expenditures		\$27,421	\$48,045	\$74,999	\$103,152	\$132,715	\$136,627	\$140,295	\$144,009	\$147,084	\$150,856	\$154,152	\$158,049	\$162,134	\$166,831	\$171,086

Notes:

	Pct. Of Dept.															
Percentage of costs from the general fund for non-personnel costs	64.2%	\$	125.77													
Percentage of costs from the general fund for personnel costs	35.8%	\$	70.09													
Operating Expenses & Interdepartmental Charges + Salaries and Expenses			6,664,812													
			3,714,186													
			10,378,998													
Per Leland model annual increase in non-personnel costs		1	0.768	0.781056	0.794334	0.807838	0.8215709	0.8355376	0.8497417	0.8650371	0.8797427	0.8946983	0.9099082	0.9253766	0.9494364	0.9741218
Per Leland model annual increase in personnel costs		1	1.07	1.13527	1.190898	1.24568	1.3004894	1.349908	1.3998546	1.434851	1.4850708	1.5251677	1.5770234	1.6322192	1.6844502	1.7265615

Sources: City of Davis FY 2017-18 Adopted Budget

Table 16: Police Department Expenditures

Police Department Expenditures	17/18 Budget	Cumulative Absorption (Year)														
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
Net General Fund Expense + Public Safety Tax and Prop. 172	\$20,437,859	Updated to include Public Safety Taxes and Prop 172, along with Fees and Charges, as these are all included as revenue in the fiscal summary.														
Total Current DUEs (Non-Adjusted) (a)	28,951															
Variable cost	95%															
Current Average Cost Per DUE	\$669															
Project DUEs (Non-Adjusted)	707	140	280	425	567	707	707	707	707	707	707	707	707	707	707	707
Projected Non Personnel Costs		\$11,664	\$47,753	\$48,564	\$49,390	\$50,230	\$51,084	\$51,952	\$52,835	\$53,786	\$54,701	\$55,630	\$56,576	\$57,538	\$59,034	\$60,569
Projected Personnel Costs		\$58,558	\$125,314	\$201,812	\$282,433	\$368,370	\$384,578	\$399,192	\$413,962	\$424,311	\$439,162	\$451,019	\$466,354	\$482,676	\$498,122	\$510,575
Estimated Police Department Expenditures		\$70,222	\$173,067	\$250,376	\$331,823	\$418,599	\$435,662	\$451,144	\$466,797	\$478,097	\$493,863	\$506,650	\$522,930	\$540,214	\$557,156	\$571,144

Notes:

	Pct. Of Dept.																		
Percentage of costs from the general fund for non-personnel costs	16.6%	3,356,988	\$	87.95															
Percentage of costs from the general fund for personnel costs	83.4%	16,852,805	\$	441.51															
		20,209,793																	
Per Leland model annual increase in non-personnel costs					1	0.768	0.781056	0.794333952	0.807837629	0.821570869	0.835537574	0.849741712	0.865037063	0.879742693	0.894698319	0.909908191	0.92537663	0.949436422	0.974121769
Per Leland model annual increase in personnel costs					1	1.07	1.13527	1.19089823	1.245679549	1.300489449	1.349908048	1.399854646	1.434851012	1.485070797	1.525167709	1.577023411	1.63221923	1.684450245	1.726561502
Sources: City of Davis FY 2017-18 Adopted Budget																			

Table 17: Fire Department Expenditures

Fire Department Expenditures	17/18	Cumulative Absorption (Year)														
	Budget	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
Net General Fund Expenditure + Public Safety Tax and Prop. 172	\$10,737,619	Updated to include Public Safety Taxes and Prop 172, along with Fees and Charges, as these are all included as revenue in the fiscal summary.														
Plus Cost of Additional Fire Station	\$0															
Total Fire Dept. GF Cost	\$10,737,619															
Variable cost	88%															
Total Current DUEs	28,951															
Average Cost Per DUE	\$328															
Projected Non Personnel Costs		140	280	425	567	707	707	707	707	707	707	707	707	707	707	707
Projected Personnel Costs		\$ 8,333	\$ 12,800	\$ 19,759	\$ 26,809	\$ 33,996	\$ 34,574	\$ 35,162	\$ 35,760	\$ 36,404	\$ 37,022	\$ 37,652	\$ 38,292	\$ 38,943	\$ 39,955	\$ 40,994
Cost Allocation to Project		\$ 45,924	\$ 93,243	\$ 149,308	\$ 208,112	\$ 270,465	\$ 281,447	\$ 291,416	\$ 301,495	\$ 308,782	\$ 318,934	\$ 327,175	\$ 337,659	\$ 348,788	\$ 359,716	\$ 368,748

Note:

	Pct. Of Dept.		
Percentage of costs from the general fund for non-personnel costs	18.1%	1,970,449	\$59.52
Percentage of costs from the general fund for personnel costs	81.9%	8,888,373	\$268.50
		10,858,822	

Per Leland model annual increase in non-personnel costs	1	0.768	0.781056	0.794333952	0.807837629	0.821570869	0.835537574	0.849741712	0.865037063	0.879742693	0.894698319	0.909908191	0.92537663	0.949436422	0.974121769
Per Leland model annual increase in personnel costs	1	1.07	1.13527	1.19089823	1.245679549	1.300489449	1.349908048	1.399854646	1.434851012	1.485070797	1.525167709	1.577023411	1.63221923	1.684450245	1.726561502

Sources: City of Davis FY 2017-18 Adopted Budget

Table 18: General Government Expenditures

	17/18 Budget	Cumulative Absorption (Year)														
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
City Council	\$213,838															
City Attorney	\$362,967															
City Manager's Office	\$3,073,346															
ASD Department	\$2,605,004															
Sub-Total General Government General Fund Expenditures	\$6,255,155															
Resident DUEs	21,892	140	280	420	560	700	700	700	700	700	700	700	700	700	700	700
Employee DUEs	7,060	-	-	5	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7
Employee DUE reduction factor: Employee DUEs equal residential DUEs	0.36															
Adjusted Employee DUEs	2,541	-	-	2	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3
Total Adjusted DUEs	24,433															
Average Cost Per Adjusted DUE	\$256															
Cost Allocation to Nishi	89.9%															
Total Growth-Related Cost Per Adjusted DUE	\$230															
Project Residential DUEs	700															
Project Employee DUES	7															
Adjusted Project Employee DUES	3															
Total Adjusted Project DUES	703	140	280	422	563	703	703	703	703	703	703	703	703	703	703	703
Projected Non Personnel Costs		\$ 24,715	\$ 37,963	\$ 58,161	\$ 78,883	\$ 100,190	\$ 101,893	\$ 103,625	\$ 105,387	\$ 107,284	\$ 109,108	\$ 110,962	\$ 112,849	\$ 114,767	\$ 117,751	\$ 120,813
Projected Personnel Costs		\$ 7,513	\$ 16,077	\$ 25,697	\$ 35,949	\$ 46,961	\$ 49,027	\$ 50,890	\$ 52,773	\$ 54,092	\$ 55,986	\$ 57,497	\$ 59,452	\$ 61,533	\$ 63,502	\$ 65,090
Total General Government Expenditure		\$32,228	\$54,040	\$83,857	\$114,831	\$147,151	\$150,920	\$154,515	\$158,160	\$161,376	\$165,093	\$168,460	\$172,301	\$176,300	\$181,253	\$185,902

Notes:

	Pct. Of Dept.	
Percentage of costs from the general fund for non-personnel costs	76.7%	\$ 176.54
Percentage of costs from the general fund for personnel costs	23.3%	\$ 53.66
Per Leland model annual increase in non-personnel costs	1	0.768
Per Leland model annual increase in personnel costs	1	1.07

	City Attorney	City Council	CMO	ASD	total
Operating Expenses & Interdepartmental Charges +	512,967	39,308	3,276,128	18,257,410	22,085,813
Salaries and Expenses		174,530	2,300,801	4,238,095	6,713,426
	512,967	213,838	5,576,929	22,495,505	28,799,239

Sources: City of Davis FY 2017-18 Adopted Budget

Table 19 - Capital Improvement Projects

	17/18 Budget	
Capital Improvement Projects		
Net General Fund Expense	\$8,621,213	Includes General While the present maintenance to r
Total Current DUEs (Non-Adjusted) (a)	28,951	
Variable cost	90%	
Current Average Cost Per DUE	\$268	
Project DUEs (Non-Adjusted)	707	
Projected Non Personnel Costs		
Projected Personnel Costs		
Estimated Capital Improvement Expenditures		

Notes:

	Pct. Of Dept.			
Percentage of costs from the general fund for non-personnel costs	96.9%	43,842,393	\$	216.50
Percentage of costs from the general fund for personnel costs	3.1%	1,384,827	\$	6.84
		45,227,220		

Per Leland model annual increase in non-personnel costs

Per Leland model annual increase in personnel costs

Sources: City of Davis FY 2017-18 Adopted Budget

Cumulative Absorption (Year)

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8

Fund Support along with General Fund Fees/Charges since these are included in the revenue assumptions. capital budget is a cash outlay (vs. the actual depreciation expense), over time these will even out. Moreover, the existing deferred road, parks, and buildings suggest a higher (vs. lower) level of spending (and thus depreciation) going forward.

140	280	425	567	707	707	707	707
\$27,254	\$117,554	\$119,552	\$121,585	\$123,652	\$125,754	\$127,892	\$130,066
\$861	\$1,842	\$2,967	\$4,152	\$5,415	\$5,654	\$5,869	\$6,086
\$28,115	\$119,396	\$122,519	\$125,737	\$129,067	\$131,407	\$133,760	\$136,151

1	0.768	0.781056	0.794333952	0.807837629	0.821570869	0.835537574	0.849741712
1	1.07	1.13527	1.19089823	1.245679549	1.300489449	1.349908048	1.399854646

9	10	11	12	13	14	15
---	----	----	----	----	----	----

707	707	707	707	707	707	707
\$132,407	\$134,658	\$136,947	\$139,275	\$141,643	\$145,325	\$149,104
\$6,238	\$6,456	\$6,630	\$6,856	\$7,096	\$7,323	\$7,506
\$138,645	\$141,114	\$143,577	\$146,131	\$148,739	\$152,648	\$156,610

0.865037063	0.879742693	0.894698319	0.909908191	0.92537663	0.949436422	0.974121769
1.434851012	1.485070797	1.525167709	1.577023411	1.63221923	1.684450245	1.726561502

Table 21: One time Revenues

	VALUATION	7500 sqft Retail	2500 sqft Restaurant
		\$ 2,625,000	\$ 1,250,000
Permit fees			
Bldg.: Records / Archive Fee		\$ 7,600	\$ 3,560
CA Bldg. Standards Admin		\$ 105	\$ 50
CASp Training Com. New		\$ 375	\$ 179
Constr. Tax Multi Family		\$ -	\$ -
Constr. Tax Commercial / Industrial		\$ 27,075	\$ 9,025
Fire Pln CK Comm New		\$ 2,696	\$ 1,621
CalGreen Commercial New		\$ 1,369	\$ 823
Long Range Plng: Community		\$ 2,625	\$ 1,250
Long Range Plng: GP Update		\$ 2,625	\$ 1,250
Strong Motion Commercial		\$ 551	\$ 263
Planning Review Time		\$ 9,400	\$ 7,520
Public Works Plan Check		\$ 2,696	\$ 1,621
Plan Check Fees		\$ 10,785	\$ 6,483
Permit Fees		\$ 16,592	\$ 9,975
Total		\$ 84,494	\$ 43,619
Impact Fees			
	PER 1,000 SQFT	7,500	,000 SQFT
	Rates		Rates
Roadways	\$20,239.00	\$ 151,793	\$ 20,239
Water		\$ -	\$ -
Storm Sewer	\$118.00	\$ 885	\$ 118
Sewer		\$ -	\$ -
Parks	\$730.00	\$ 5,475	\$ 730
Open Space	\$126.00	\$ 945	\$ 126
Public Safety	\$1,078.00	\$ 8,085	\$ 1,078
General Facilities	\$928.00	\$ 6,960	\$ 928
Total		\$ 174,143	\$ 58,048
			Charges from other A
Yolo County (FSA)		\$ 3,750	\$ 1,250
School Impact Fee		\$ 3,525	\$ 1,175
Total		\$ 7,275	\$ 2,425
Grand Total		\$ 265,912	\$ 104,091

725000 sqft Multi Family

\$	217,000,000			
\$	14,160	\$	25,320	\$ 25,320
\$	8,680	\$	8,835	\$ 8,835
\$	-	\$	554	\$ 554
\$	2,080,750	\$	2,080,750	
\$	-	\$	36,100	\$ 2,116,850
\$	111,940	\$	116,257	\$ 116,257
\$	159,128	\$	161,319	\$ 161,319
\$	217,000	\$	220,875	\$ 220,875
\$	217,000	\$	220,875	\$ 220,875
\$	21,700	\$	22,514	\$ 22,514
\$	15,040	\$	31,960	\$ 31,960
\$	111,940	\$	116,257	\$ 116,257
\$	447,762	\$	465,030	\$ 465,030
\$	688,864	\$	715,430	\$ 715,430
\$	4,093,964			\$ 2,105,227

PER UNIT \$ 700

Rates

\$ 4,942	\$	3,459,400	\$ 3,661,790	
			\$ -	
\$ 85	\$	59,500	\$ 60,680	
\$ 3,320	\$	2,324,000	\$ 2,324,000	
\$ 3,827	\$	2,678,900	\$ 2,686,200	
\$ 659	\$	461,300	\$ 462,560	
\$ 757	\$	529,900	\$ 540,680	
\$ 1,823	\$	1,276,100	\$ 1,285,380	
	\$	10,789,100	\$ 11,021,290	

Fees are determined by Public Works

Agencies

\$ 3,180	\$	2,226,000		
	\$	2,153,250		
	\$	4,379,250	\$ 4,388,950	
	\$	19,262,314		

Table 21: Summary of Fiscal Impacts for City of Davis

Project: Nishi

Revenues	Cumulative Absorption (Year)														
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
Property Taxes	\$34,439	\$70,255	\$109,410	\$149,077	\$189,336	\$193,123	\$196,986	\$200,925	\$204,944	\$209,043	\$213,224	\$217,488	\$221,838	\$226,275	\$230,800
Property Transfer Tax	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$7,660	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Sales and Use Taxes	\$30,298	\$59,567	\$94,723	\$131,056	\$170,731	\$176,581	\$182,463	\$188,366	\$185,040	\$193,568	\$202,687	\$212,244	\$219,130	\$226,458	\$234,036
Prop. 172 Public Safety Sales Tax	\$861	\$3,692	\$5,871	\$8,122	\$10,581	\$10,944	\$11,308	\$11,674	\$11,468	\$11,997	\$12,562	\$13,154	\$13,581	\$14,035	\$14,505
Municipal Service Tax	\$12,583	\$12,583	\$40,994	\$56,298	\$72,150	\$74,314	\$76,544	\$78,840	\$81,205	\$83,641	\$86,150	\$88,735	\$91,397	\$94,139	\$96,963
Parks Maintenance Tax	\$6,860	\$13,720	\$20,880	\$27,840	\$34,700	\$34,700	\$34,700	\$34,700	\$34,700	\$34,700	\$34,700	\$34,700	\$34,700	\$34,700	\$34,700
Public Safety Tax	\$9,838	\$20,266	\$32,431	\$44,539	\$56,948	\$58,656	\$60,416	\$62,229	\$64,095	\$66,018	\$67,999	\$70,039	\$72,140	\$74,304	\$76,533
Transient Occupancy Tax	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Business License Tax	\$0	\$0	\$920	\$1,418	\$1,457	\$1,486	\$1,516	\$1,546	\$1,539	\$1,581	\$1,624	\$1,669	\$1,702	\$1,736	\$1,771
Franchise Fees	\$5,714	\$11,612	\$18,101	\$24,800	\$31,759	\$32,553	\$33,366	\$34,201	\$34,782	\$35,721	\$36,686	\$37,676	\$38,618	\$40,819	\$41,840
Property Tax In-Lieu of Vehicle License Fees	\$39,803	\$81,198	\$126,451	\$172,297	\$218,827	\$223,203	\$227,667	\$232,221	\$236,865	\$241,602	\$246,435	\$251,363	\$256,390	\$261,518	\$266,749
Gas Tax Revenues	\$4,590	\$9,135	\$14,086	\$19,308	\$24,617	\$25,110	\$25,612	\$26,124	\$24,818	\$25,513	\$26,227	\$26,961	\$27,501	\$28,051	\$28,612
Community Services Revenues	\$2,527	\$5,028	\$7,846	\$10,761	\$13,686	\$13,960	\$14,239	\$14,524	\$13,798	\$14,184	\$14,581	\$14,989	\$15,289	\$15,595	\$15,907
Other Charges for Service Revenues	\$16,265	\$32,368	\$50,505	\$69,266	\$88,096	\$89,858	\$91,655	\$93,488	\$88,814	\$91,301	\$93,857	\$96,485	\$98,415	\$100,383	\$102,391
Fines and Forfeitures	\$1,566	\$3,117	\$4,863	\$6,670	\$8,483	\$8,652	\$8,825	\$9,002	\$8,552	\$8,791	\$9,038	\$9,291	\$9,476	\$9,666	\$9,859
Sub-Total Revenues	\$165,345	\$322,540	\$527,081	\$721,452	\$921,371	\$943,141	\$972,958	\$987,840	\$990,619	\$1,017,660	\$1,045,769	\$1,074,795	\$1,100,178	\$1,127,680	\$1,154,665
Percentage change from prior year		48.74%	38.81%	26.94%	21.70%	2.31%	3.06%	1.51%	0.28%	2.66%	2.69%	2.70%	2.31%	2.44%	2.34%
Expenditures	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
Public Works	\$20,789	\$35,154	\$55,029	\$75,448	\$96,607	\$99,155	\$101,577	\$104,031	\$106,167	\$108,668	\$110,915	\$113,499	\$116,194	\$119,479	\$122,540
Community Development	\$7,785	\$14,983	\$23,844	\$33,088	\$42,833	\$44,412	\$45,857	\$47,320	\$48,419	\$49,896	\$51,119	\$52,644	\$54,257	\$55,916	\$57,327
Community Services	\$11,783	\$22,832	\$36,091	\$50,094	\$64,983	\$67,410	\$69,630	\$71,875	\$73,554	\$75,820	\$77,693	\$80,033	\$82,510	\$85,041	\$87,185
Parks and General Services	\$27,421	\$48,045	\$74,999	\$103,152	\$132,715	\$136,627	\$140,295	\$144,009	\$147,084	\$150,856	\$154,152	\$158,049	\$162,134	\$166,831	\$171,086
Police	\$70,222	\$173,067	\$250,376	\$331,823	\$418,599	\$435,662	\$451,144	\$466,797	\$478,097	\$493,863	\$506,650	\$522,930	\$540,214	\$557,156	\$571,144
Fire	\$45,924	\$93,243	\$149,308	\$208,112	\$270,465	\$281,447	\$291,416	\$301,495	\$308,782	\$318,934	\$327,175	\$337,659	\$348,788	\$359,716	\$368,748
Capital Improvement Program	\$28,115	\$119,396	\$122,519	\$125,737	\$129,067	\$131,407	\$133,760	\$136,151	\$138,645	\$141,114	\$143,577	\$146,131	\$148,739	\$152,648	\$156,610
General Government	\$32,228	\$54,040	\$83,857	\$114,831	\$147,151	\$150,920	\$154,515	\$158,160	\$161,376	\$165,093	\$168,460	\$172,301	\$176,300	\$181,253	\$185,902
Sub-Total Expenditures	\$244,267	\$560,760	\$796,023	\$1,042,285	\$1,302,419	\$1,347,040	\$1,388,194	\$1,429,839	\$1,462,125	\$1,504,244	\$1,539,742	\$1,583,248	\$1,629,136	\$1,678,039	\$1,720,543
Percentage change from prior year		56.44%	29.55%	23.63%	19.97%	3.31%	2.96%	2.91%	2.21%	2.80%	2.31%	2.75%	2.82%	2.91%	2.47%
NET GENERAL FUND BALANCE	(\$78,921.76)	(\$238,219.95)	(\$268,942.18)	(\$320,832.81)	(\$381,047.84)	(\$403,899.54)	(\$415,235.71)	(\$441,998.80)	(\$471,505.85)	(\$486,583.69)	(\$493,972.86)	(\$508,452.71)	(\$528,958.57)	(\$550,359.60)	(\$565,877.21)
Cumulative Total		(\$317,141.71)	(\$586,083.90)	(\$906,916.71)	(\$1,287,964.55)	(\$1,691,864.09)	(\$2,107,099.80)	(\$2,549,098.60)	(\$3,020,604.45)	(\$3,507,188.14)	(\$4,001,161.00)	(\$4,509,613.71)	(\$5,038,572.29)	(\$5,588,931.89)	(\$6,154,809.10)
Cumulative Total		(\$6,154,809.10)													
NPV		(\$233,548.97)	(\$258,498.83)	(\$302,327.92)	(\$352,029.31)	(\$365,824.26)	(\$368,717.43)	(\$384,786.55)	(\$402,425.70)	(\$407,151.47)	(\$405,229.80)	(\$408,929.72)	(\$417,080.23)	(\$425,445.87)	(\$428,864.21)
Cumulative NPV		(\$5,239,782.03)													

Source: City of Davis; Leland Model assumes a 2% inflation

NPV assumes a 2% rate of inflation