## Memorandum

To: Helen Bean, City of Emeryville
From: James Edison and Carlos Villarreal, Willdan Financial Services
Date: March 11, 2014

## Re: REVISED Development Fee Comparison

Willdan Financial Services was retained by the City of Emeryville to conduct an analysis of the overall fees amounts charged to new development in other local Bay Area cities. Specifically, the analysis examines the aggregate impact of plan check fees, permit fees, school developer fees and development impact fees on seven prototype development projects.
While a fee comparison analysis should not be used as a tool to justify maximum fee amounts, it does provide a reference point indicating how the fees charged in a given area compare to those in neighboring or similar communities. In the case of Emeryville, the existing level of service standards combined with high land costs justify extremely high development impact fees under the Mitigation Fee Act. Therefore, the City could use this analysis to inform setting a fee at a level below the maximum allowed and focuses on an evaluation of the average fees charged in neighboring jurisdictions and the financial impact of fees on development projects.

## Approach and Methodology

The cities analyzed in this study include:

- City of Emeryville (population 10,269);
- City of Berkeley (population 115,716);
- City of Oakland (population 399,326);
- City of El Cerrito (population 23,910);
- City of Albany (population 18,430);
- City of Alameda (population 75,126);
- City of Walnut Creek (population 65,684); and,
- City of Richmond (population 105,562).

The fee data collected for each city is based on the development scenarios shown in Table 1. Note that these development scenarios constitute hypothetical rather than actual projects.

The City identified seven prototypical development projects to estimate fees for because these projects represent typical development likely to take place in Emeryville. The prototypical projects vary across land use, building size, and market value. Additionally, the square footages used in the development scenarios do not include any land that surrounds buildings.

Willdan Financial Services primarily estimated fees through the information found in each City's most current Master Fee Schedule. Willdan used each City's municipal code, ordinances, and resolutions to estimate the fees charged to new development. When necessary, Willdan confirmed fee calculation estimates with appropriate City staff. In some cases, fees charged will also vary by geography within a city. In these cases, Willdan Financial Services used fee amounts that represent the most typical type or location of development for a given city.

Table 1: Poject Prototype Assumptions

townome. Hotel square footage based on assumption of 350 square feet per room, including
for location.

Sources: rsmeansonline.com; Willdan Financial Services

## Fees by Jurisdiction

The following tables show the full range of fees charged to new development in each of the cities surveyed. Note that the range of fees charged varies by jurisdiction.

Tables 2 through 9 show the current fees charged to new development for the cities included in the analysis.

| Fee Categories | 100 MultiFamily Units Rental |  |  | idential -- |  |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { Office } 100,000 \\ \text { sq.ft. } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |  |  | -- Nonres | Retail Mix 5,000 sq. ft. Restaurant, 20,000 <br> Commercial sq. ft. |  | Hotel - 200 Rooms |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | 100 MultiFamily Units Owner Occupied |  | $100 \text { - }$ <br> Townhomes |  |  |  | Research \& Development 150,000 sq.ft. |  |  |  |  |  |
| Development Impact Fees |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Sewer Connection Fee ${ }^{1}$ | \$ | 118,500 | \$ | 118,500 | \$ | 118,500 | \$ | 17,775 | \$ | 26,781 | \$ | 7,110 | \$ | 142,200 |
| Traffic Impact Fee ${ }^{2}$ |  | 50,300 |  | 43,800 |  | 43,800 |  | 101,000 |  | 117,600 |  | 89,675 |  | 66,800 |
| School District Facilities Development $\mathrm{Fee}^{3}$ |  | 252,450 |  | 297,000 |  | 415,800 |  | 47,000 |  | 70,500 |  | 11,750 |  | 32,900 |
| Art In Public Places ${ }^{4}$ |  | 82,875 |  | 97,500 |  | 136,500 |  | 197,690 |  | 296,535 |  | 40,800 |  | 163,800 |
| Subtotal, Development Impact Fees | \$ | 504,125 | \$ | 556,800 | \$ | 714,600 | \$ | 363,465 | \$ | 511,416 | \$ | 149,335 | \$ | 405,700 |
| Plan Review \& Inspection Fees |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Plan Review Fee ${ }^{5}$ | \$ | 86,190 | \$ | 101,400 | \$ | 141,960 | \$ | 102,799 | \$ | 154,198 | \$ | 21,216 | \$ | 85,176 |
| Energy Conservation Review Fee ${ }^{6}$ |  | 16,575 |  | 19,500 |  | 27,300 |  | 19,769 |  | 29,654 |  | 4,080 |  | 16,380 |
| Microfiche ${ }^{7}$ |  | 1,326 |  | 1,560 |  | 2,184 |  | 1,582 |  | 2,372 |  | 326 |  | 1,310 |
| Fire Department Fees ${ }^{8}$ |  | 46,410 |  | 54,600 |  | 76,440 |  | 55,353 |  | 83,030 |  | 11,424 |  | 45,864 |
| Technology Fee ${ }^{9}$ |  | 16,575 |  | 19,500 |  | 27,300 |  | 19,769 |  | 29,654 |  | 4,080 |  | 16,380 |
| Building Standards Commission Fee ${ }^{10}$ |  | 663 |  | 780 |  | 1,092 |  | 791 |  | 1,187 |  | 164 |  | 656 |
| General Plan Maintenance Fee ${ }^{11}$ |  | 82,875 |  | 97,500 |  | 136,500 |  | 98,845 |  | 148,268 |  | 20,400 |  | 81,900 |
| Subtotal, Plan Check, Inspection Fees | \$ | 250,614 | \$ | 294,840 | \$ | 412,776 | \$ | 298,908 | \$ | 448,362 | \$ | 61,690 | \$ | 247,666 |
| Permit Fees |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Building Permit Fee ${ }^{12}$ | \$ | 132,600 | \$ | 156,000 | \$ | 218,400 | \$ | 158,152 | \$ | 237,228 | \$ | 32,640 | \$ | 131,040 |
| Electrical Permit Fee ${ }^{13}$ |  | 26,520 |  | 31,200 |  | 43,680 |  | 31,630 |  | 47,446 |  | 6,528 |  | 26,208 |
| Plumbing Permit Fee ${ }^{14}$ |  | 23,868 |  | 28,080 |  | 39,312 |  | 28,467 |  | 42,701 |  | 5,875 |  | 23,587 |
| Mechanical Permit Fee ${ }^{15}$ |  | 22,542 |  | 26,520 |  | 37,128 |  | 26,886 |  | 40,329 |  | 5,549 |  | 22,277 |
| S.M.I.P. ${ }^{17}$ |  | 3,481 |  | 4,095 |  | 2,730 |  | 4,151 |  | 6,227 |  | 857 |  | 3,440 |
| Subtotal, Permit Fees | \$ | 209,011 | \$ | 245,895 | \$ | 341,250 | \$ | 249,287 | \$ | 373,931 | \$ | 51,449 | \$ | 206,552 |
| Total Fees | \$ | 963,750 | \$ | 1,097,535 | \$ | 1,468,626 | \$ | 911,660 | \$ | 1,333,708 | \$ | 262,474 | \$ | 859,918 |

1 Sew er connection fee of $\$ 237$ per trap or $\$ 1,185$ per dw elling unit.
${ }^{2}$ Traffic fee of $\$ 503$ per apartment, $\$ 438$ per condo, $\$ 1,010$ per 1,000 sq. ft. of office, $\$ 3,523$ per 1,000 sq. ft. of retail, $\$ 3,603$ per sq. ft. of restaurant, $\$ 784$ per sq. ft. of research center and $\$ 334$ per hotel room.
${ }^{3}$ School fees are calculated based on a cost of $\$ 2.97$ per sq. ft. for residential development and $\$ 0.47 \mathrm{per} \mathrm{sq}$. ft . for non-residential development.
${ }^{4}$ Applicable to commercial projects $>\$ 300,000$ valuation. Artw ork or in-lieu fee of $1 \%$ of value.
${ }^{5}$ Plan review fee equal to $65 \%$ of building permit fee for nonresidential and $50 \%$ of building permit fee for residential.
${ }^{6}$ Energy conservation fee equal to $12.5 \%$ of building permit fee.
${ }^{7}$ Energy conservation fee equal to $12.5 \%$ of building permit fee.
${ }^{8}$ Applicable to new construction and T.I. Equal to $35 \%$ of building permit fee.
${ }^{8}$ Applicable to new construction and T.I. Equal to $35 \%$
${ }^{\circ}$ Fee of $\$ 1.00$ per $\$ 25,000$ valuation
General plan standards fee equal to $0.5 \%$ of valuation.
${ }^{12}$ Building permit fee equal to $1 \%$ of valutaion to $\$ 50,000,0.75 \%$ of valuation to $\$ 250,000,0.50 \%$ of valuation over $\$ 250,000$. Sprinkler and sprinkler plan check fees included.
${ }^{13}$ Electrical permit fee equal to $20 \%$ of building permit fee.
${ }^{14}$ Plumbing permit fee equal to $18 \%$ of building permit fee
${ }^{15}$ Mechanical permit fee equal to $18 \%$ of building permit fee.
${ }^{16}$ Residential <= 3 story $=0.0001$ or 0.00021 of the valuation.
Sources: City of Emeryville; Willdan Financial Services
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Table 3: Fees to New Development (City of Berkeley)

| Fee Categories | 100 MultiFamily Units Rental |  |  | dential | $100 \text { - }$ <br> Townhomes |  | Office$100,000 \text { sq.ft. }$ |  | Research \& Development 150,000 sq.ft. |  | sidential $\qquad$ <br> Retail Mix <br> 5,000 sq. ft. <br> Restaurant, 20,000 <br> Commercial sq. ft. |  | Hotel - 200 Rooms |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | 100 MultiFamily Units Owner Occupied |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Development Impact Fees |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Sewer Connection ${ }^{1}$ | \$ | 132,439 | \$ | 132,439 | \$ | 132,439 | \$ | 12,055 | \$ | 18,082 | \$ | 4,822 | \$ | 96,436 |
| Housing Mitigation Fee ${ }^{2}$ |  | 2,800,000 |  | - |  | 2,921,563 |  | 400,000 |  | 600,000 |  | 100,000 |  | 280,000 |
| Child Care Mitigation Fee ${ }^{3}$ |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | 100,000 |  | 150,000 |  | 25,000 |  | 70,000 |
| Affordable Housing In-Lieu ${ }^{4}$ |  | - |  | - |  | - |  |  |  | - |  | - |  | - |
| Subtotal, Development Impact Fees | \$ | 2,932,439 | \$ | 132,439 | \$ | 3,054,002 | \$ | 512,055 | \$ | 768,082 | \$ | 129,822 | \$ | 446,436 |
| Plan Review \& Inspection Fees |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Plan Check ${ }^{5}$ | \$ | 237,045 | \$ | 278,872 | \$ | 390,412 | \$ | 277,442 | \$ | 414,007 | \$ | 58,366 | \$ | 234,256 |
| Design Review ${ }^{6}$ |  | 10,494 |  | 10,494 |  | 10,494 |  | 10,494 |  | 10,494 |  | 10,494 |  | 10,494 |
| Traffic Engineering ${ }^{7}$ |  | 126,731 |  | 126,821 |  | 177,521 |  | 126,171 |  | 188,246 |  | 26,591 |  | 106,541 |
| California Senate Bill 1473 Fee (Blgd. Strds.) ${ }^{5}$ |  | 663 |  | 780 |  | 1,092 |  | 776 |  | 1,158 |  | 164 |  | 656 |
| Building Permit Filing Fee ${ }^{5}$ |  | 22 |  | 22 |  | 22 |  | 22 |  | 22 |  | 22 |  | 22 |
| Zoning Review for Building Project ${ }^{5}$ |  | 180 |  | 180 |  | 180 |  | 180 |  | 180 |  | 180 |  | 180 |
| Environmental Health Plan Check Fee ${ }^{5}$ |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | 680 |  | - |
| Community Planning Fee ${ }^{5}$ |  | 18,234 |  | 21,452 |  | 30,032 |  | 21,342 |  | 31,847 |  | 4,490 |  | 18,020 |
| California Title 24 Energy Fee ${ }^{5}$ |  | 43,762 |  | 51,484 |  | 72,076 |  | 51,220 |  | 76,432 |  | 10,775 |  | 43,247 |
| California Title 24 Disability Access Fee ${ }^{5}$ |  | 43,762 |  | 51,484 |  | 72,076 |  | 51,220 |  | 76,432 |  | 10,775 |  | 43,247 |
| Fire Life and Safety Plan Check Fee ${ }^{5}$ |  | 25,528 |  | 30,032 |  | 42,044 |  | 29,878 |  | 44,585 |  | 6,286 |  | 25,228 |
| Sustainable Development Fee ${ }^{5}$ |  | 21,881 |  | 25,742 |  | 36,038 |  | 25,610 |  | 38,216 |  | 5,388 |  | 21,624 |
| Subtotal, Plan Check, Inspection Fees | \$ | 528,301 | \$ | 597,363 | \$ | 831,987 | \$ | 594,355 | \$ | 881,619 | \$ | 134,210 | \$ | 503,514 |
| Permit Fees |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Building Permit ${ }^{5}$ | \$ | 364,684 | \$ | 429,034 | \$ | 600,634 | \$ | 426,834 | \$ | 636,934 | \$ | 89,794 | \$ | 360,394 |
| Use Permit ${ }^{8}$ |  | 6,683 |  | 6,683 |  | 6,683 |  | 6,683 |  | 6,683 |  | 6,683 |  | 6,683 |
| Building Permit Technology Fee ${ }^{5}$ |  | 18,234 |  | 21,452 |  | 30,032 |  | 21,342 |  | 31,847 |  | 4,490 |  | 18,020 |
| California Strong Motion Instrumentation Fee ${ }^{5}$ |  | 1,658 |  | 1,950 |  | 2,730 |  | 4,074 |  | 6,080 |  | 857 |  | 3,440 |
| Subtotal, Permit Fees | \$ | 391,259 | \$ | 459,119 | \$ | 640,079 | \$ | 458,933 | \$ | 681,543 | \$ | 101,824 | \$ | 388,537 |
| Total Fees | \$ | 3,851,999 | \$ | 1,188,921 | \$ | 4,526,067 | \$ | 1,565,343 | \$ | 2,331,244 | \$ | 365,855 | \$ | 1,338,487 |
| ${ }^{1}$ Assumes 824 drainage fixture units (DFU) for the 100 unit residential projects, 75 DFU for office, 112 DFU for R\&D, 30 DFU for retail mix and 600 DFU for hotel. Fee of $\$ 160.73$ per DFU. ${ }^{2}$ Fee for nonresidential based on Housing Mitigation fee of $\$ 4$ per square foot. Residential fee of $\$ 28,000$ per rental unit. <br> ${ }^{3}$ Fee only charged to nonresidential development at a rate of $\$ 1$ per square foot. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ${ }^{4}$ Developer is exempt from this fee if appropriate number of affordable units are offered on site ( $20 \%$ ). If the developer elects to pay the fee it w ould be an additional $\$ 2.9$ million for the 100 unit ow ner occupied scenario, and $\$ 5.2$ million for the 100 tow nhome scenario. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ${ }^{5}$ Charge estimated based on construction valuation and land use type using the City's online permit fee estimator. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ${ }^{6}$ Fee includes staff review, preliminary committee review and final committee review. Includes $\$ 50$ records management fee for each stage of review |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ${ }^{7}$ Fee based on project valuation. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ${ }^{8}$ Assumes Tier 2 use permit. Base fee show n. Includes $15 \%$ Community Planning Fee, \$1,025 Public Hearing Fee, $\$ 50$ Records Management Fee, and base Traffic Engineering Review fee. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Sources: Land Use Planning Fees (Effective July 16, 2012), City of Berkeley; w w w .ci.berkeley.ca.us/permitfeeEstimator.aspx; Willdan Financial Services. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |



| Fee Categories | 100 MultiFamily Units Rental |  | -- | dential -- | --- |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { Office } \\ 100,000 \text { sq.ft. } \end{gathered}$ |  |  | ---- Nonre | sid | I-- | Hotel - 200 Rooms |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | 100 Multi- <br> Family Units Owner Occupied |  | $100 \text { - }$ <br> Townhomes |  |  |  | Research \& Development 150,000 sq.ft. |  | Retail Mix 5,000 sq. ft. Restaurant, 20,000 Commercial sq. ft. |  |  |  |
| Development Impact Fees ${ }^{1}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| School Developer Fee ${ }^{2}$ | \$ | 333,200 | \$ | 392,000 | \$ | 548,800 | \$ | 42,000 | \$ | 63,000 | \$ | 10,500 | \$ | 29,400 |
| WCCTAC Subregional Transportation ${ }^{3}$ |  | 164,800 |  | 164,800 |  | 164,800 |  | 351,000 |  | 526,500 |  | 45,500 |  | 392,800 |
| Construction Tax ${ }^{4}$ |  | 425 |  | 495 |  | 668 |  | 361 |  | 529 |  | 194 |  | 194 |
| Art in Public Places ${ }^{5}$ |  | 165,750 |  | 195,000 |  | 273,000 |  | 194,000 |  | 289,500 |  | 40,800 |  | 163,800 |
| Subtotal, Development Impact Fees | \$ | 664,175 | \$ | 752,295 | \$ | 987,268 | \$ | 587,361 | \$ | 879,529 | \$ | 96,994 | \$ | 586,194 |
| Plan Review \& Inspection Fees |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Plan Check ${ }^{6}$ | \$ | 47,967 | \$ | 56,367 | \$ | 79,168 | \$ | 35,165 | \$ | 52,665 | \$ | 13,278 | \$ | 13,278 |
| Inspection ${ }^{7}$ |  | 28,522 |  | 33,472 |  | 46,672 |  | 25,401 |  | 37,901 |  | 19,050 |  | 19,050 |
| Calif. Building Standards Commission ${ }^{8}$ |  | 663 |  | 780 |  | 1,092 |  | 776 |  | 1,158 |  | 163 |  | 655 |
| Subtotal, Plan Check Fees | \$ | 77,152 | \$ | 90,619 | \$ | 126,932 | \$ | 61,342 | \$ | 91,724 | \$ | 32,491 | \$ | 32,983 |
| Permit Fees |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| S.M.I.P ${ }^{9}$ | \$ | 1,658 | \$ | 1,950 | \$ | 2,730 | \$ | 3,880 | \$ | 5,790 | \$ | 816 | \$ | 3,276 |
| General Plan and Zoning Ordinance ${ }^{10}$ |  | 22,764 |  | 22,764 |  | 22,764 |  | 22,764 |  | 22,764 |  | 22,764 |  | 22,764 |
| Planned Development |  | 14,870 |  | 14,870 |  | 14,870 |  | 14,870 |  | 14,870 |  | 14,870 |  | 14,870 |
| Use Permit ${ }^{11}$ |  | 4,445 |  | 4,445 |  | 4,445 |  | 4,445 |  | 4,445 |  | 4,445 |  | 4,445 |
| Grading ${ }^{12}$ |  | 3,954 |  | 4,677 |  | 3,231 |  | 7,088 |  | 10,705 |  | 2,025 |  | 2,025 |
| Encroachment ${ }^{13}$ |  | 75 |  | 75 |  | 75 |  | 75 |  | 75 |  | 75 |  | 75 |
| Subtotal, Permit Fees | \$ | 47,765 | \$ | 48,781 | \$ | 48,115 | \$ | 53,122 | \$ | 58,649 | \$ | 44,995 | \$ | 47,455 |
| Total Fees | \$ | 789,092 | \$ | 891,695 | \$ | 1,162,315 | \$ | 701,825 | \$ | 1,029,902 | \$ | 174,481 | \$ | 666,633 |

${ }^{1}$ The City of 日 Cerrito does not charge development impact fees. Fees noted in this section are charged and administered by other agencies.
${ }^{2}$ School fees are calculated based on a cost of $\$ 3.92$ per sq. ft. for residential development and $\$ 0.42$ per sq. ft. for non-residential development.
${ }^{3}$ Fees charged at $\$ 1,648$ per multifamily unit, $\$ 1,964$ per hotel room, $\$ 3.51$ per square foot of office and $\$ 1.82$ per square foot of retail space.
${ }^{4}$ Construction tax equal to $0.5 \%$ of total permit fees charged to new constructions and additions.
${ }^{5}$ Art in public places fee equal to $1 \%$ of total project valuation for projects over $\$ 250,000$.
${ }^{6}$ Includes electric, mechanic, and electric permits. Based on project size and construction type. See Master Fee Schedule p. 27
Includes grading plan check, issuance, and inspection charges. Based on project size and construction type. See Master Fee Schedule p. 35.
${ }^{8}$ Administration fee equal to $\$ 1.00$ per $\$ 25,000.00$ (or fraction thereof) of project valuation.
${ }^{9}$ Fee is equal to the construction value $\times 0.0001$ for residential development, and equal to the construction value $\times 0.0002$ for commercial development.
${ }^{10}$ If required.
${ }^{1}$ Based on residential rate for properties greater than 11 units, and on nonresidential rate for properties greater than 10,000 square feet
${ }^{12}$ Includes grading plan check, issuance, and inspection charges.
${ }^{13}$ Includes encroachment issuance and permit charges.
Sources: Proposed Master Fee Schedule FY2012-13, City of 日 Cerrito; Willdan Financial Services.
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Table 6: Fees to New Development (City of Albany)

| Fee Categories | 100 MultiFamily Units Rental |  | -- R | Residential -- | 100 - <br> Townhomes |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { Office } \\ 100,000 \text { sq.ft. } \end{gathered}$ |  |  | - Nonre |  | ---- |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | 100 MultiFamily Units Owner Occupied |  |  |  | Research \& Development 150,000 sq.ft. | Retail Mix 5,000 sq. ft. Restaurant, 20,000 Commercial sq. ft. |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { Hotel - } 200 \\ \text { Rooms } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |  |
| Development Impact Fees |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| School Developer Fee ${ }^{1}$ | \$ | 252,450 | \$ | 297,000 | \$ | 415,800 |  |  | \$ | 47,000 | \$ | 70,500 | \$ | 11,750 | \$ | 32,900 |
| Parkland Dedication (In-Lieu) ${ }^{2}$ |  | 691,950 |  | 864,938 |  | 2,767,804 |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |
| Capital Facilities Impact ${ }^{3}$ |  | 84,000 |  | 84,000 |  | 84,100 |  | 65,000 |  | 97,500 |  | 16,250 |  | 45,500 |
| Storm Drain Impact ${ }^{4}$ |  | 8,500 |  | 10,000 |  | 14,000 |  | 10,000 |  | 15,000 |  | 2,500 |  | 7,000 |
| Sewer Connection ${ }^{5}$ |  | 1,166 |  | 1,166 |  | 1,166 |  | 13,667 |  | 20,500 |  | 5,467 |  | 109,332 |
| Subtotal, Development Impact Fees | \$ | 1,038,066 | \$ | 1,257,104 | \$ | 3,282,870 | \$ | 135,667 | \$ | 203,500 | \$ | 35,967 | \$ | 194,732 |
| Plan Review \& Inspection Fees |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Plan Check ${ }^{6}$ | \$ | 7,400 | \$ | 7,400 | \$ | 7,400 | \$ | 7,400 | \$ | 7,400 | \$ | 7,400 | \$ | 7,400 |
| Fire Inspection ${ }^{7}$ |  | 1,026 |  | 1,026 |  | 1,026 |  | 26 |  | 26 |  | 26 |  | 26 |
| Building Standards Administration $\mathrm{Fee}^{8}$ |  | 663 |  | 780 |  | 1,092 |  | 776 |  | 1,158 |  | 163 |  | 655 |
| Subtotal, Plan Check Fees | \$ | 9,089 | \$ | 9,206 | \$ | 9,518 | \$ | 8,202 | \$ | 8,584 | \$ | 7,589 | \$ | 8,081 |
| Permit Fees |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Construction Permit ${ }^{8}$ | \$ | 71,464 | \$ | 84,304 | \$ | 229,294 | \$ | 100,889 | \$ | 151,981 | \$ | 17,295 | \$ | 50,759 |
| S.M.I. ${ }^{10}$ |  | 3,481 |  | 4,095 |  | 5,733 |  | 4,074 |  | 6,080 |  | 408 |  | 3,440 |
| Use Permits ${ }^{11}$ |  | 1,974 |  | 1,974 |  | 1,975 |  | 1,974 |  | 1,974 |  | 1,974 |  | 1,974 |
| Miscellaneous Permit Fees |  | 130 |  | 130 |  | 130 |  | 130 |  | 130 |  | 130 |  | 130 |
| Electric, Plumbing and Mech. Permits ${ }^{12}$ |  | 16,142 |  | 18,983 |  | 26,558 |  | 18,983 |  | 28,452 |  | 4,779 |  | 13,301 |
| Subtotal, Permit Fees | \$ | 93,190 | \$ | 109,485 | \$ | 263,690 | \$ | 126,049 | \$ | 188,617 | \$ | 24,585 | \$ | 69,604 |
| Total Fees | \$ | 1,140,345 | \$ | 1,375,795 | \$ | 3,556,078 | \$ | 269,918 | \$ | 400,701 | \$ | 68,141 | \$ | 272,417 |

${ }^{1}$ School fees are calculated based on a cost of $\$ 2.97$ per sq. ft. for residential development and $\$ 0.47$ per sq. ft. for non-residential development.
${ }^{2}$ Assumes fair market value of $\$ 659,000$ per acre of parkland.
${ }^{3}$ Fee is $\$ 840$ per dw elling unit, or $\$ 0.65$ per square foot of nonresidential.
${ }^{4}$ Storm drain impact fee is equal to $\$ 0.10$ per square foot for both residential and nonresidential development
${ }^{5}$ Sew er connection fee of $\$ 1,166$ per dw elling unit, and $\$ 182$ per nonresidential fixture.
${ }^{6}$ Plan check fee estimated based on cost per hour of $\$ 92.50$. Assumes 80 hours of review per project.
${ }^{7}$ Fee for multi-family development includes a $\$ 154$ administrative fee; fees for non-residential developments represent minimum fees, additional fees are determined by the Fire Chief.
${ }^{8}$ Administration fee equal to $\$ 1.00$ per $\$ 25,000.00$ (or fraction thereof) of project valuation
${ }^{9}$ Construction valuation for the purposes of calculating construction permit cost, is based on valuation data provided in the City's Master Fee Schedule.
${ }^{10}$ Buildings one to three stories in height, except hotels and motels, $\$ 10$ per $\$ 100,000$ valuation. All other buildings $\$ 21$ per $\$ 100,000$ valuation.
${ }^{11}$ Based on major use permit. Additional cost may apply.
${ }^{12}$ Based on rate of $\$ 5.90$ per 100 square feet for each type of permit (electrical, plumbing, and mechanical).
Sources: Master Fee Schedule (Effective July 3, 2012), City of Albany; Willdan Financial Services.
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Table 7: Fees to New Development (City of Alameda)

| Fee Categories | 100 MultiFamily Units Rental |  | R | Residential - |  |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { Office } \\ 100,000 \text { sq.ft. } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |  |  | ---- Nonre | de | $11--$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Hotel - } 200 \\ & \text { Rooms } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | 100 Multi- <br> Family Units Owner Occupied |  | $\begin{gathered} 100- \\ \text { Townhomes } \end{gathered}$ |  |  |  | Research \& Development 150,000 sq.ft. |  | Retail Mix 5,000 sq. ft. Restaurant, 20,000 Commercial sq. ft. |  |  |  |
| Development Impact Fees |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Affordable Housing In-Lieu ${ }^{1}$ | \$ | 1,716,102 | \$ | 1,716,102 | \$ | 1,716,102 | \$ | 421,000 | \$ | 631,500 | \$ | 53,500 | \$ | 216,200 |
| School Developer Fee ${ }^{2}$ |  | 272,000 |  | 320,000 |  | 448,000 |  | 51,000 |  | 76,500 |  | 12,750 |  | 35,700 |
| Citywide Development ${ }^{3}$ |  | 360,700 |  | 360,700 |  | 360,700 |  | 577,000 |  | 865,500 |  | 150,500 |  | 403,900 |
| Community Planning ${ }^{4}$ |  | 49,725 |  | 58,500 |  | 81,900 |  | 58,200 |  | 86,850 |  | 12,240 |  | 49,140 |
| Dwelling Unit Tax ${ }^{5}$ |  | 153,100 |  | 153,100 |  | 153,100 |  | - |  | - |  | - |  |  |
| Sewer Connection ${ }^{6}$ |  | 98,900 |  | 98,900 |  | 98,900 |  | 74,175 |  | 111,263 |  | 29,670 |  | 593,400 |
| Improvement Tax ${ }^{7}$ |  | 165,750 |  | 195,000 |  | 273,000 |  | 194,000 |  | 289,500 |  | 40,800 |  | 163,800 |
| Subtotal, Development Impact Fees | \$ | 2,816,277 | \$ | 2,902,302 | \$ | 3,131,702 | \$ | 1,375,375 | \$ | 2,061,113 | \$ | 299,460 | \$ | 1,462,140 |
| Plan Review \& Inspection Fees |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Plan Check ${ }^{8}$ | \$ | 6,404 | \$ | 6,404 | \$ | 6,404 | \$ | 7,659 | \$ | 11,489 | \$ | 2,770 | \$ | 6,164 |
| Inspection ${ }^{9}$ |  | 19,858 |  | 19,858 |  | 19,858 |  | 10,536 |  | 15,806 |  | 8,818 |  | 24,151 |
| Design Review ${ }^{10}$ |  | 343 |  | 343 |  | 343 |  | 343 |  | 343 |  | 343 |  | 343 |
| Subtotal, Plan Check Fees | \$ | 26,605 | \$ | 26,605 | \$ | 26,605 | \$ | 18,538 | \$ | 27,638 | \$ | 11,931 | \$ | 30,658 |
| Permit Fees |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Permit Center Processing Fee ${ }^{11}$ | \$ | 46 | \$ | 46 | \$ | 46 | \$ | 46 | \$ | 46 | \$ | 46 | \$ | 46 |
| Excavation \& Grading |  | 1,736 |  | 1,914 |  | 1,558 |  | 2,506 |  | 3,394 |  | 400 |  | 1,558 |
| Subtotal, Permit Fees | \$ | 1,782 | \$ | 1,960 | \$ | 1,604 | \$ | 2,552 | \$ | 3,440 | \$ | 446 | \$ | 1,604 |
| Total Fees | \$ | 2,844,664 | \$ | 2,930,867 | \$ | 3,159,912 | \$ | 1,396,464 | \$ | 2,092,190 | \$ | 311,837 | \$ | 1,494,402 |

${ }^{1}$ Fee per unit of 17,161 used to estimate affordable housing in-lieu fees for residential units. Nonresidential fees based on rate of $\$ 4.21$ per square foot. Affordable housing fees are typically negotiated through a development agreement for large projects. Note that the city is currently updating its fees, and aims to adopt updated fees in September 2013.
${ }^{2}$ School fees are calculated based on a cost of $\$ 3.20$ per sq. ft. for residential development and $\$ 0.51$ per sq. ft. for non-residential development.
${ }^{3}$ Cityw ide development fee is $\$ 3,607$ per multi family unit, $\$ 5.77$ per sq. ft. of office and industrial space, and $\$ 6.02$ per sq. ft. of retail development in the West End District.
${ }^{4}$ Equal to $0.3 \%$ of construction valuation.
${ }^{5}$ Tax of 1,531 per unit.
${ }^{6}$ Based on fee of $\$ 989$ per connection
${ }^{7}$ Equal to $1 \%$ of construction valuation
${ }^{8}$ 日ectrical, Pumbing, and Mechanical Permit fees are included in the Plan Check fee.
${ }^{9}$ Inspection fees are based on the square footage of the project, per the Master Fee Schedule.
${ }^{10}$ Base fee show n. Additional time may be required to complete review. Developers are charged for time and materials for any review above the listed amount.
${ }^{11}$ Flat fee.
Sources: Master Fee Schedule July 2012 - June 2013, City of Alameda; Willdan Financial Services.

Table 8: Fees to New Development (City of Walnut Creek)

| Fee Categories |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Office ,000 sq.ft. |  | ---- Nonresi <br>  <br> elopment <br> ,000 sq.ft. |  | $\qquad$ <br> sq. ft. aurant, ,000 mercial |  | otel - 200 Rooms |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Development Impact Fees |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| School Impact Fees ${ }^{1}$ | \$ | 272,000 | \$ | 320,000 | \$ | 448,000 | \$ | 51,000 | \$ | 76,500 | \$ | 12,750 | \$ | 35,700 |
| Public Arts In-lieu Fee ${ }^{2}$ |  | 165,750 |  | 195,000 |  | 273,000 |  | 194,000 |  | 289,500 |  | 40,800 |  | 163,800 |
| Traffic Impact Fees ${ }^{3}$ |  | 150,500 |  | 150,500 |  | 150,500 |  | 430,000 |  | 645,000 |  | 134,500 |  | 376,600 |
| Property Development Tax ${ }^{4}$ |  | 15,750 |  | 15,750 |  | 15,750 |  | 6,000 |  | 9,000 |  | 1,500 |  | 4,200 |
| Commercial Linkage Fees ${ }^{5}$ |  | 425,000 |  | - |  | - |  | 500,000 |  | 750,000 |  | 125,000 |  | 350,000 |
| Inclusionary Housing Fees ${ }^{6}$ |  | - |  | 1,485,000 |  | 2,085,000 |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |
| Parkland Dedication Acreage and/or $\mathrm{Fee}^{7}$ |  | 400,000 |  | 800,000 |  | 1,200,000 |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |
| Total - Development Impact Fees | \$ | 1,429,000 | \$ | 2,966,250 | \$ | 4,172,250 | \$ | 1,181,000 | \$ | 1,770,000 | \$ | 314,550 | \$ | 930,300 |
| Plan Review \& Inspection Fees |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Plan Review ${ }^{8}$ | \$ | 64,826 | \$ | 75,795 | \$ | 105,045 | \$ | 75,420 | \$ | 111,232 | \$ | 17,970 | \$ | 64,095 |
| Electric Review ${ }^{9}$ |  | 25,120 |  | 29,371 |  | 40,705 |  | 29,225 |  | 43,103 |  | 6,963 |  | 24,837 |
| Plumbing Review ${ }^{9}$ |  | 25,120 |  | 29,371 |  | 40,705 |  | 29,225 |  | 43,103 |  | 6,963 |  | 24,837 |
| Mechanical Review ${ }^{9}$ |  | 25,120 |  | 29,371 |  | 40,705 |  | 29,225 |  | 43,103 |  | 6,963 |  | 24,837 |
| Green Building Code Plan Review ${ }^{10}$ |  | 14,019 |  | 16,391 |  | 22,716 |  | 16,310 |  | 24,054 |  | 3,886 |  | 13,861 |
| Building Permit Planning Division Review |  | 16,579 |  | 19,385 |  | 26,865 |  | 19,289 |  | 28,448 |  | 4,596 |  | 16,392 |
| Technology Fee ${ }^{11}$ |  | 140,656 |  | 81,953 |  | 113,580 |  | 81,548 |  | 120,270 |  | 19,430 |  | 69,303 |
| Waste Management Fee |  | 51 |  | 51 |  | 51 |  | 51 |  | 51 |  | 51 |  | 51 |
| Building Division Training Fee ${ }^{12}$ |  | 3,516 |  | 4,111 |  | 5,698 |  | 4,091 |  | 6,034 |  | 975 |  | 3,477 |
| General Plan Update Fee ${ }^{13}$ |  | 16,575 |  | 19,500 |  | 27,300 |  | 19,400 |  | 28,950 |  | 4,080 |  | 16,380 |
| CALGreen Fees ${ }^{14}$ |  | 663 |  | 780 |  | 1,092 |  | 776 |  | 1,158 |  | 163 |  | 655 |
| Engineering Department Review ${ }^{15}$ |  | 16,579 |  | 19,385 |  | 26,865 |  | 19,289 |  | 28,448 |  | 4,596 |  | 16,392 |
| Application Processing Fee ${ }^{16}$ |  | 400 |  | 400 |  | 400 |  | 400 |  | 400 |  | 400 |  | 400 |
| Subtotal, Plan Check, Inspection Fees | \$ | 349,226 | \$ | 325,862 | \$ | 451,727 | \$ | 324,248 | \$ | 478,352 | \$ | 77,036 | \$ | 275,516 |
| Permit Fees |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Building Permit ${ }^{17}$ | \$ | 64,826 | \$ | 75,795 | \$ | 105,045 | \$ | 75,420 | \$ | 111,232 | \$ | 17,970 | \$ | 64,095 |
| Consolidated Elect., Plumb., and Mech. Permit ${ }^{18}$ |  | 35,654 |  | 41,687 |  | 57,775 |  | 41,481 |  | 61,178 |  | 9,883 |  | 35,252 |
| S.M.I.P. ${ }^{19}$ |  | 3,481 |  | 4,095 |  | 5,733 |  | 4,074 |  | 6,080 |  | 408 |  | 3,440 |
| Green Building Code Permit Fee ${ }^{20}$ |  | 10,048 |  | 11,748 |  | 16,282 |  | 11,690 |  | 17,241 |  | 2,785 |  | 9,935 |
| Subtotal, Permit Fees | \$ | 114,009 | \$ | 133,325 | \$ | 184,835 | \$ | 132,665 | \$ | 195,731 | \$ | 31,047 | \$ | 112,722 |
| Total Fees | \$ | 1,892,235 | \$ | 3,425,437 | \$ | 4,808,811 | \$ | 1,637,913 | \$ | 2,444,083 | \$ | 422,633 | \$ | 1,318,537 |
| ${ }^{1}$ School fees are calculated based on a cost of $\$ 3.20$ per sq. ft. for residential development and $\$ 0.51$ per sq. ft. for non-residential development. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ${ }^{2}$ Public Arts in-Lieu fee equal to $1 \%$ of the construction valuation of a major project. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ${ }^{3}$ Traffic impact fees are $\$ 1,505$ per multifamily unit, $\$ 4.30$ per square foot of office and industrial space, and $\$ 5.38$ per square foot of retail. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ${ }^{4}$ Assumes three bedrooms per unit. Fee of $\$ 0.06$ per square foot charged to nonresidential. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ${ }^{5}$ Fee is estimated at $\$ 5$ per square foot of nonresidential and multifamily development. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ${ }^{6}$ Fee is estimated at $\$ 15$ per square foot of residential development. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ${ }^{7}$ Fee is estimated at $\$ 4,000$ per bedroom. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ${ }^{8}$ Equal to cost of building permit. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ${ }^{9}$ The plan review fee for electrical, plumbing and engineering w ork shall be $25 \%$ of the sum of the building, electrical, plumbing, and mechanical permits. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ${ }^{10}$ Green building code plan review fee equal to $10 \%$ of combined permits. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ${ }^{11}$ Technology surcharge fee equal to 5 percent of the combined total of permit and plan review fees |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ${ }^{12}$ Building department training fee equal to 1.25 percent of the combined total of permit fee and plan review fees. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ${ }^{13}$ Equal to $1 \%$ of building valuation. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ${ }^{14}$ Administration fee equal to $\$ 1.00$ per $\$ 25,000.00$ (or fraction thereof) of project valuation. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ${ }^{15}$ Equal to $15 \%$ of building and trade permits. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ${ }^{16}$ Maximum fee of $\$ 400$. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ${ }^{17}$ Building permit fee based on base rate of $\$ 6,419.87$ plus $\$ 3.75$ for every additional $\$ 1,000$ of building valuation. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ${ }^{18}$ Equal to $55 \%$ of cost of building permit. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ${ }^{19}$ Buildings one to three stories in height, except hotels and motels, \$10 per \$100,000 valuation. All other buildings \$21 per \$100,000 valuation. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ${ }^{20}$ Equal to $1 \%$ of building and trade permits. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Table 9: Fees to New Development (City of Richmond)

| Fee Categories | 100 MultiFamily Units Rental |  | -- Residential -- <br> 100 Multi- <br> Family Units Owner Occupied |  | $100 \text { - }$ <br> Townhomes |  |  | ------------ |  | -- Nonresi | den | al - | Hotel - 200 Rooms |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Office 100,000 sq.ft. | Research \& Development 150,000 sq.ft. |  | 5,000 sq. ft. <br> Restaurant, 20,000 <br> Commercial |  |  |  |
| Development Impact Fees |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Park/Open Space | \$ | 454,800 |  |  | \$ | 454,800 | \$ | 454,800 | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - |
| Traffic Fee |  | 125,400 |  | 125,400 |  |  |  | 125,400 |  | 343,700 |  | 584,400 |  | 38,960 |  | 272,720 |
| Community/Aquatic Center |  | 109,100 |  | 109,100 |  | 109,100 |  | - |  |  |  |  |  | - |
| Storm Drainage |  | 30,700 |  | 30,700 |  | 30,700 |  | 59,100 |  | 118,050 |  | 7,870 |  | 55,090 |
| Library |  | 150,100 |  | 150,100 |  | 150,100 |  | 33,300 |  | 30,300 |  | 2,020 |  | 14,140 |
| Police Facilities |  | 16,700 |  | 16,700 |  | 16,700 |  | 24,000 |  | 36,000 |  | 2,400 |  | 16,800 |
| Fire Facilities |  | 14,200 |  | 14,200 |  | 14,200 |  | 20,900 |  | 31,350 |  | 2,090 |  | 14,630 |
| Subregional Transportation Mit. Fee Pros |  | 183,800 |  | 183,800 |  | 183,800 |  | 391,500 |  | 587,250 |  | 10,155 |  | 2,191 |
| Sewer |  | 233,800 |  | 233,800 |  | 233,800 |  | 184,800 |  | 394,950 |  | 26,330 |  | 184,310 |
| School Impact Fees ${ }^{1}$ |  | 272,000 |  | 320,000 |  | 448,000 |  | 51,000 |  | 76,500 |  | 12,750 |  | 35,700 |
| Subtotal, Development Impact Fees | \$ | 1,590,600 | \$ | 1,638,600 | \$ | 1,766,600 | \$ | 1,108,300 | \$ | 1,858,800 | \$ | 102,575 | \$ | 595,581 |
| Plan Check \& Inspection Fees |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Landscape Plan Check | \$ | 4,224 |  | 4,915 |  | 4,915 |  | 9,782 |  | 14,294 |  | 5086.8 | \$ | 4,178 |
| Comprehensive Planning |  | 29,321 |  | 34,496 |  | 34,496 |  | 34,318 |  | 51,213 |  | 14435.04 |  | 28,976 |
| PC Engineering Site Plan Review |  | 1,304 |  | 1,304 |  | 1,304 |  | 1,304 |  | 1,304 |  | 2,608 |  | 1,304 |
| Plan Check All Others |  | 6,762 |  | 6,762 |  | 6,762 |  | 6,762 |  | 6,762 |  | 13524 |  | 6,762 |
| P-3 New Construction @ .11c per SF |  |  |  | 11,404 |  | 15,804 |  | 11,404 |  | 16,904 |  | 1908 |  | 8,104 |
| Grading Inspection |  | 898 |  | 898 |  | 898 |  | 898 |  | 898 |  | 898 |  | 898 |
| Plumbing Fixture Plan Review |  | 160 |  | 160 |  | 160 |  | 160 |  | 160 |  | 160 |  | 160 |
| Grading Plan Review |  | 2,000 |  | 2,000 |  | 2,000 |  | 2,000 |  | 2,000 |  | 2,000 |  | 2,000 |
| PC Energy Convservation Site Review |  | 1,305 |  | 1,305 |  | 1,305 |  | 1,305 |  | 1,305 |  | 2,610 |  | 1,305 |
| Subtotal, Plan Check Fees | \$ | 45,974 | \$ | 63,243 | \$ | 67,643 | \$ | 67,933 | \$ | 94,840 | \$ | 43,230 | \$ | 53,687 |
| Permit Fees |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Building Permit | \$ | 9,468 | \$ | 9,468 | \$ | 9,468 | \$ | 9,468 | \$ | 9,468 | \$ | 18,936 | \$ | 9,468 |
| CAL Admin Revolving Fund |  | 597 |  | 702 |  | 702 |  | 698 |  | 1,042 |  | 295 |  | 590 |
| Cost to Administer SB1473 |  | 66 |  | 78 |  | 78 |  | 78 |  | 116 |  | 33 |  | 66 |
| Filing 3 or more Ress Adds \& all others |  | 226 |  | 226 |  | 226 |  | 226 |  | 226 |  | 226 |  | 226 |
| Occupancy Program Fee |  | 947 |  | 947 |  | 947 |  | 947 |  | 947 |  | 1,894 |  | 947 |
| Certificate of Occupancy |  |  |  | 6,000 |  | 6,000 |  | 60 |  | 60 |  | 60 |  | 60 |
| SMIP Commercial |  | 3,481 |  | 4,095 |  | 4,095 |  | 4,074 |  | 6,080 |  | 1,714 |  | 3,440 |
| Electrical Permit |  | 2,508 |  | 2,508 |  | 2,508 |  | 2,508 |  | 2,508 |  | 5,016 |  | 2,508 |
| Plumbing Permit |  | 3,064 |  | 3,064 |  | 3,064 |  | 3,064 |  | 3,064 |  | 6,128 |  | 3,064 |
| Mechanical Permit |  | 1,737 |  | 1,737 |  | 1,737 |  | 1,737 |  | 1,737 |  | 3,474 |  | 1,737 |
| Subtotal, Permit Fees | \$ | 22,094 | \$ | 28,825 | \$ | 28,825 | \$ | 22,860 | \$ | 25,247 | \$ | 37,775 | \$ | 22,106 |
| Total Fees | \$ | 1,658,667 | \$ | 1,730,668 | \$ | 1,863,068 | \$ | 1,199,093 | \$ | 1,978,887 | \$ | 183,580 | \$ | 671,373 |

Note: All fee estimates and calculations provided by the City of Richmond, except for the school district fees, calculated by Willdan Financial Services
${ }^{1}$ School fees are calculated based on a cost of $\$ 2.63$ per sq. ft. for residential development and $\$ 0.42$ per sq. ft. for non-residential development.
Source: City of Richmond.

## Fees Comparison Summary by Land Use

Tables 10 through 16 and the corresponding Figures 1 through 7 below present a summary of fees charged to new development by city and development type.

## Multifamily Rental Prototype Fee Comparison

Total fees for the multifamily rental development prototype project range from approximately $\$ 789,000$ (El Cerrito) to $\$ 3.9$ million (Berkeley), with a median fee of $\$ 1.2$ million. Emeryville's existing fees of approximately $\$ 964,000$ were the second lowest fees among the cities surveyed.

## Multifamily Owner-Occupied Development Prototype Fee Comparison

Total fees for the multifamily owner-occupied development prototype project range from approximately $\$ 892,000$ (El Cerrito) to $\$ 3.4$ million (Walnut Creek), with a median fee of $\$ 1.4$ million. Similar to the multifamily rental prototype project, Emeryville's existing fees of approximately $\$ 1.1$ million were the second lowest fees among the cities surveyed.

## Townhome Development Prototype Fee Comparison

Total fees for the townhome development prototype project range from approximately $\$ 1.2$ million (El Cerrito) to $\$ 4.8$ million (Walnut Creek), with a median fee of $\$ 2.5$ million. Walnut Creek's fees for this prototype are particularly high because of the City's high inclusionary housing and parkland dedication fees. Emeryville's existing fees of approximately $\$ 1.5$ million were the second lowest fees among the cities surveyed.

## Office Development Prototype Fee Comparison

Total fees for the 100,000 square foot office development prototype project range from approximately $\$ 270,000$ (Albany) to $\$ 1.8$ million (Oakland), with a median fee of $\$ 1.3$ million. Emeryville's existing fees of approximately $\$ 911,000$ were less than the median, and the third lowest fees among the cities surveyed.

## Research and Development Facility Prototype Fee Comparison

Total fees for the 150,000 square foot research and development facility prototype project range from approximately $\$ 401,000$ (El Cerrito) to $\$ 2.7$ million (Oakland), with a median fee of $\$ 2$ million. Emeryville's existing fees of approximately $\$ 1.3$ were the third lowest fees among the cities surveyed.

## Mixed Commercial Development Facility Prototype Fee Comparison

Total fees for the mixed commercial development prototype project ( 20,000 square foot retail and 5,000 square foot restaurant) range from approximately $\$ 68,000$ (Albany) to $\$ 434,000$ (Oakland), with a median fee of $\$ 287,000$. Emeryville's existing fees of approximately $\$ 262,000$ were the closest to the median fees of all the cities surveyed.

## Hotel Development Prototype Fee Comparison

Total fees for the 200 room hotel development prototype project range from approximately $\$ 272,000$ (Albany) to $\$ 1.5$ million (Alameda), with a median fee of $\$ 1.1$ million. Emeryville's existing fees of approximately $\$ 860,000$ were less than the median fees charged to hotel development.

Table 10: Fees for Multifamily Rental Development ( 100 units, 85,000 sq.ft., $\$ 16.6 \mathrm{M}$ )

| Fee Categories | Emeryville (Existing) |  | Berkeley |  | Oakland |  | El Cerrito |  | Albany |  | Alameda |  | Walnut Creek |  | Richmond |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Development Impact Fees | \$ | 504,125 | \$ | 2,932,439 | \$ | 697,000 | \$ | 664,175 | \$ | 1,038,066 | \$ | 2,816,277 | \$ | 1,429,000 | \$ | 1,590,600 |
| Plan Review \& Inspection Fees |  | 250,614 |  | 528,301 |  | 451,572 |  | 77,152 |  | 9,089 |  | 26,605 |  | 349,226 |  | 45,974 |
| Permit Fees |  | 209,011 |  | 391,259 |  | 61,286 |  | 47,765 |  | 93,190 |  | 1,782 |  | 114,009 |  | 22,094 |
| Total Fees | \$ | 963,750 | \$ | 3,851,999 | \$ | 1,209,858 | \$ | 789,092 | \$ | 1,140,345 | \$ | 2,844,664 | \$ | 1,892,235 | \$ | 1,658,667 |

Sources: Tables 2 to 9; Willdan Financial Services..

Table 11: Fees for Multifamily Owner-Occupied Development (100 units, 100,000 sq.ft., \$19.5M)

| Fee Categories | Emeryville (Existing) |  | Berkeley |  | Oakland |  | El Cerrito |  | Albany |  | Alameda |  | Walnut Creek |  | Richmond |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Development Impact Fees | \$ | 556,800 | \$ | 132,439 | \$ | 820,000 | \$ | 752,295 | \$ | 1,257,104 | \$ | 2,902,302 | \$ | 2,966,250 | \$ | 1,766,600 |
| Plan Check and Inspection Fees |  | 294,840 |  | 597,363 |  | 521,873 |  | 90,619 |  | 9,206 |  | 26,605 |  | 325,862 |  | 67,643 |
| Permit Fees |  | 245,895 |  | 459,119 |  | 71,991 |  | 48,781 |  | 109,485 |  | 1,960 |  | 133,325 |  | 28,825 |
| Total Fees | \$ | 1,097,535 | \$ | 1,188,921 | \$ | 1,413,864 | \$ | 891,695 | \$ | 1,375,795 | \$ | 2,930,867 | \$ | 3,425,437 | \$ | 1,863,068 |

Sources: Tables 2 to 9; Willdan Financial Services..
Table 12: Fees for Townhome Development ( 100 units, 100,000 sq.ft., \$27.3M)

| Fee Categories | Emeryville (Existing) |  | Berkeley |  | Oakland |  | El Cerrito |  | Albany |  | Alameda |  | Walnut Creek |  | Richmond |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Development Impact Fees | \$ | 714,600 | \$ | 3,054,002 | \$ | 1,148,000 | \$ | 987,268 | \$ | 3,282,870 | \$ | 3,131,702 | \$ | 4,172,250 | \$ | 1,766,600 |
| Plan Check and Inspection Fees |  | 412,776 |  | 831,987 |  | 674,916 |  | 126,932 |  | 9,518 |  | 26,605 |  | 451,727 |  | 67,643 |
| Permit Fees |  | 341,250 |  | 640,079 |  | 100,540 |  | 48,115 |  | 263,690 |  | 1,604 |  | 184,835 |  | 28,825 |
| Total Fees | \$ | 1,468,626 | \$ | 4,526,067 | \$ | 1,923,456 | \$ | 1,162,315 | \$ | 3,556,078 | \$ | 3,159,912 | \$ | 4,808,811 | \$ | 1,863,068 |

Sources: Tables 2 to 9; Willdan Financial Services..

Table 13: Fees for Office Development (100,000 sq.ft., \$19.4M)

|  |  | Emeryville <br> Fee Categories |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |

Sources: Tables 2 to 9; Willdan Financial Services..

Table 14: Fees for R\&D Development ( 150,000 sq.ft., $\$ 28.95 \mathrm{M}$ )

| Fee Categories | Emeryville (Existing) |  | Berkeley |  | Oakland |  | El Cerrito |  | Albany |  | Alameda |  | Walnut Creek |  | Richmond |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Development Impact Fees | \$ | 511,416 | \$ | 768,082 | \$ | 1,537,500 | \$ | 879,529 | \$ | 203,500 | \$ | 2,061,113 | \$ | 1,770,000 | \$ | 1,858,800 |
| Plan Check and Inspection Fees |  | 448,362 |  | 881,619 |  | 793,180 |  | 91,724 |  | 8,584 |  | 27,638 |  | 478,352 |  | 94,840 |
| Permit Fees |  | 373,931 |  | 681,543 |  | 327,099 |  | 58,649 |  | 188,617 |  | 3,440 |  | 195,731 |  | 25,247 |
| Total Fees | \$ | 1,333,708 | \$ | 2,331,244 | \$ | 2,657,778 | \$ | 1,029,902 | \$ | 400,701 | \$ | 2,092,190 | \$ | 2,444,083 | \$ | 1,978,887 |

Sources: Tables 2 to 9 ; Willdan Financial Services.

Table 15: Fees for Mixed Retail Development (5,000 sq. ft. restaurant, 20,000 sq. ft. retail, $\$ 16.38 \mathrm{M}$ )

| Fee Categories | Emeryville (Existing) |  | Berkeley |  | Oakland |  | El Cerrito |  | Albany |  | Alameda |  | Walnut Creek |  | Richmond |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Development Impact Fees | \$ | 149,335 | \$ | 129,822 | \$ | 256,250 | \$ | 96,994 | \$ | 35,967 | \$ | 299,460 | \$ | 314,550 | \$ | 102,575 |
| Plan Check and Inspection Fees |  | 61,690 |  | 134,210 |  | 130,887 |  | 32,491 |  | 7,589 |  | 11,931 |  | 77,036 |  | 43,230 |
| Permit Fees |  | 51,449 |  | 101,824 |  | 46,495 |  | 44,995 |  | 24,585 |  | 446 |  | 31,047 |  | 37,775 |
| Total Fees | \$ | 262,474 | \$ | 365,855 | \$ | 433,632 | \$ | 174,481 | \$ | 68,141 | \$ | 311,837 | \$ | 422,633 | \$ | 183,580 |

[^0]Table 16: Fees for Hotel Development (200 rooms, 70,000 sq. ft., \$16.38M)

|  | Emeryville <br> (Existing) | Berkeley |  | Oakland |  | El Cerrito |  | Albany | Alameda | Walnut Creek | Richmond |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Development Impact Fees | $\$$ | 405,700 | $\$$ | 446,436 | $\$$ | 717,500 | $\$$ | 586,194 | $\$$ | 194,732 | $\$$ | $1,462,140$ |

Sources: Tables 2 to 9; Willdan Financial Services..

Figure 1: Fee Comparison for Multifamily Rental Development (100 units, 85,000 sq.ft., \$15.6M)







Figure 7: Fee Comparison for Hotel Development ( $\mathbf{2 0 0}$ rooms, $\mathbf{7 0 , 0 0 0}$ sq. ft., $\$ 16.38 \mathrm{M}$ )
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Attachment 8

Attachment 8a - Proposed Fee Comparison - Commercial



| Attachment 9 - Proposed and Existing Fees as Percent of Value |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Multifamily Rental | Multifamily Ownership | Townhomes | Office | R\&D | Retail \& Resturant Mix | Hotel |
|  | per unit | per unit | per unit | per sf | per sf | per sf | per room |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Prototype |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Project Size sf | 85,000 | 100,000 | 140,000 | 100,000 | 150,000 | 25,000 | 70,000 |
| Units/Rooms | 100 | 100 | 100 |  |  |  | 200 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Value/sf or room | \$406 | \$400 | \$325 | \$333 | \$290 | \$286 | \$150,000 |
| Total Estimated Value | \$34,000,000 | \$32,500,000 | \$56,000,000 | \$33,300,000 | \$43,500,000 | \$7,250,000 | \$30,000,000 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Fee for Prototype |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Traffic | \$155,500 | \$130,420 | \$130,420 | \$373,800 | \$402,600 | \$123,200 | \$210,680 |
| Park | \$374,200 | \$374,200 | \$388,825 | \$380,500 | \$391,875 | \$67,938 | \$73,150 |
| Government Facilities | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Housing | \$2,000,000 |  |  | \$200,000 | \$300,000 | \$50,000 | \$140,000 |
| Total | \$2,529,700 | \$504,620 | \$519,245 | \$954,300 | \$1,094,475 | \$241,138 | \$423,830 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Plus Emeryville Existing Permit/Planning/Impact Fees | \$913,450 | \$1,053,735 | \$1,424,826 | \$810,660 | \$1,216,108 | \$172,799 | \$793,118 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Existing Plus Increase | \$3,443,150 | \$1,558,355 | \$1,944,071 | \$1,764,960 | \$2,310,583 | \$413,937 | \$1,216,948 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Increase as \% of Existing | 376.94\% | 147.89\% | 136.44\% | 217.72\% | 190.00\% | 239.55\% | 153.44\% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Proposed Total Fees as \% of Value | 10.13\% | 4.79\% | 3.47\% | 5.30\% | 5.31\% | 5.71\% | 4.06\% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Emeryville's Existing Fees as Percent of Value | 2.69\% | 3.24\% | 2.54\% | 2.43\% | 2.80\% | 2.38\% | 2.64\% |

Attachment 9

## Memorandum

To: Helen Bean, City of Emeryville
From: James Edison and Carlos Villarreal, Willdan Financial Services
Date: March 12, 2014

## Re: DRAFT - Fee Burden Analysis

Willdan Financial Services was retained by the City of Emeryville to conduct an analysis of the overall fees amounts charged to new development in other local Bay Area cities. This memorandum compares the total fee amounts surveyed in the November 8, 2013 revision of the fee comparison memorandum to the estimated market values of each prototype development project to determine the average fee burden per land use.
While a fee comparison analysis and fee burden analysis should not be used as a tool to justify maximum fee amounts, it does provide a reference point indicating how the fees charged in a given area compare to those in neighboring or similar communities. In the case of Emeryville, the existing level of service standards combined with high land costs justify extremely high development impact fees under the Mitigation Fee Act. Therefore, the City could use this analysis to inform setting a fee at a level below the maximum allowed and focuses on an evaluation of the average fees charged in neighboring jurisdictions and the financial impact of fees on development projects.

Although the fees charged to new development are not typically large enough to have a tangible affect on real estate markets, substantial differences in the fee amounts between two otherwise similar cities could potentially impact the location patterns of development over time.

## Approach and Methodology

The cities analyzed in this study include:

- City of Emeryville (population 10,269);
- City of Berkeley (population 115,716);
- City of Oakland (population 399,326);
- City of El Cerrito (population 23,910);
- City of Albany (population 18,430);
- City of Alameda (population 75,126);
- City of Walnut Creek (population 65,684 ); and,
- City of Richmond (population 105,562).

The fee data collected for each city is based on the development scenarios shown in Table 1. Note that these development scenarios constitute hypothetical rather than actual projects. The City identified seven prototypical development projects to estimate fees for because these projects represent typical development likely to take place in Emeryville. The prototypical projects vary across land use, building size, and market value. Additionally, the square footages used in the development scenarios do not include any land that surrounds buildings.

Table 1: Poject Prototype Assumptions

|  | 100 MultiFamily Units Rental | Residential 100 MultiFamily Units Owner Occupied | $100 \text { - }$ <br> Townhomes | $\begin{gathered} \text { Office } \\ 100,000 \text { sq.ft. } \end{gathered}$ | $\qquad$ Nonres <br> Research \& Development 150,000 sq.ft. | dential $\qquad$ <br> Retail Mix 5,000 sq. ft. Restaurant, 20,000 |  | Hotel - 200 Rooms |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Dwelling Units | 100 | 100 | 100 | - | - | - |  | - |
| Hotel Rooms | - | - |  | - | - | - |  | 200 |
| Project Size (Sq. Ft.) ${ }^{1}$ | 85,000 | 100,000 | 140,000 | 100,000 | 150,000 | 25,000 |  | 70,000 |
| Cost per Square Foot ${ }^{2}$ | \$ 195 | \$ 195 | \$ 195 | \$ 194 | \$ 193 | \$264 Rest. <br> $\$ 138$ Com. | \$ | 234 |
| Construction Valuation | \$ 16,575,000 | \$ 19,500,000 | \$ 27,300,000 | \$ 19,400,000 | \$ 28,950,000 | \$ 4,080,000 | \$ | 16,380,000 |
| Type of Construction | V-1 hr over I | V-1 hr over I | V-1 hr over I | 1 | 1 | 1 |  | 1 |
| Number of Stories | 4 | 4 | 2 | 6 | 6 | 1 |  | 4 |
| Grading (Cubic Yards) | 188,889 | 222,222 | 155,556 | 333,333 | 500,000 | 13,889 |  | 155,556 |
| ${ }^{1}$ Assumes 850 square feet per rental unit, 1,000 square feet per ow ner occupied multifamily unit, and 1,400 square feet per tow nhome. Hotel square footage based on assumption of 350 square feet per room, including common areas. <br> ${ }^{2}$ Cost per square foot based on RSMeansOnline construction cost estimator, adjusted for location. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Sources: rsmeansonline.com; Willdan Financial Services. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## Prototype Market Valuation

Willdan consulted a variety of sources to estimate the market value of each prototype. Table 2 documents the market valuation assumptions for each prototype project. Descriptions of the data sources consulted to develop the market valuations follow.

Table 2: Prototype Market Valuation Estimate


Sources: East Bay Retail Report, Second Quarter 2013, Terranomics Retail Services; Loopnet.com; R\&D Market Snapshot, East Bay Oakland, Third Quarter 2013, Cassidy Turley; Office Market
Snapshot, East Bay Oakland and East Bay Walnut Creek, Third Quarter 2013, Cassidy Turley; CBRE Cap Rate Survey, February 2013; Penn State Index of U.S. Hotel Values, 2013, Summary Outline of Residential Prototypes \& Market Conditions for Nexus Analysis, Keyser Marston Associates.

## Residential

Residential market values per square foot for the owner occupied multifamily prototype and for the townhome prototype are based data from the Summary Outline of Residential Prototypes \& Market Conditions for Nexus Analysis Memorandum, by Keyser Marston Associates developed for use in the City's affordable housing fee study. The memorandum identified market values of $\$ 400$ per square foot, and $\$ 325$ per square foot for the owner occupied multifamily and the townhome scenario, respectively. Market value per square for the multifamily prototype was assumed to equal $\$ 406$ per square foot, based on a valuation of $\$ 345,000$ per unit, and 850 square feet per unit..

Office
Office market values we developed by surveying recent office building sales in the East Bay/Oakland market, and in Walnut Creek, as reported in the Office Market Snapshot, East Bay Oakland and East Bay Walnut Creek, Third Quarter 2013 by Cassidy Turley. The average value per square foot of office space is $\$ 333$.

## Research and Development

Research and Development market values were based on data from Cassidy Turley's Red Market Snapshot, East Bay Oakland, Third Quarter 2013. Willdan used the NNN lease rate of $\$ 1.45$ per month, indicated for Emeryville in the Market Snapshot, in conjunction with estimated cap rate of $6.0 \%$ for R\&D development from the February 2013 CBRE Cap Rate Survey, to estimate a market value of $\$ 290$ per square foot.

## Retail

Retail market values were based on data from Terranomics' East Bay Retail Report, Second Quarter 2013. Willdan used the NNN lease rate of $\$ 20.34$ per year, indicated in the Retail Report, in conjunction with estimated cap rate of $7.1 \%$ for retail development from Colliers International's Q2 2013 Retail Highlights Market Report, to estimate a market value of \$286 per square foot of retail space.

Hotel
Willdan consulted the Penn State Index of U.S. Hotel Values, 2013, to develop the assumption of $\$ 150,000$ per hotel room.

## Average Fee Burden

Table 3 compares the total fee amounts for each prototype project identified in the March 11, 2014 revision to the Development Fee Comparison memorandum by Willdan, to the estimated market values identified in Table 2. The average fee burden per land use for the comparison cities is reported at the bottom of Table 1. A typical maximum impact fee for development ranges from five to fifteen percent, depending on the type of use (commercial is typically more sensitive and therefore sees lower fees) and market conditions. The range observed in Table 1 is typical. Emeryville could probably impose slightly higher fees, but might want to consider staying in the same range as comparable cities. Existing Emeryville fees are excluded from the average fee burden calculations.
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Table 3: Fee Burden Survey

|  | 100 MultiFamily Units Rental |  | 100 MultiFamily Units Owner Occupied |  | $100 \text { - }$ <br> Townhomes |  | Office 100,000 sq.ft. |  | Research \& Development 150,000 sq.ft. |  | Retail Mix 5,000 sq. ft. Restaurant, 20,000 Commercial sq. ft. |  | Hotel - 200 Rooms |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Estimated Market Valuation |  | 34,510,000 |  | 40,000,000 |  | 45,500,000 | \$ | 33,300,000 |  | 43,500,000 | \$ | 7,150,000 |  | 30,000,000 |
| Emeryville - Existing Fees | \$ | 963,750 | \$ | 1,097,535 | \$ | 1,468,626 | \$ | 911,660 | \$ | 1,333,708 | \$ | 262,474 | \$ | 859,918 |
| Total Fees as \% of Estimated Market Price |  | 3\% |  | 3\% |  | 3\% |  | 3\% |  | 3\% |  | 4\% |  | 3\% |
| Berkeley | \$ | 3,851,999 | \$ | 1,188,921 | \$ | 4,526,067 | \$ | 1,565,343 | \$ | 2,331,244 | \$ | 365,855 | \$ | 1,338,487 |
| Total Fees as \% of Estimated Market Price |  | 11\% |  | 3\% |  | 10\% |  | 5\% |  | 5\% |  | 5\% |  | 4\% |
| Oakland | \$ | 1,209,858 | \$ | 1,413,864 | \$ | 1,923,456 | \$ | 1,782,021 | \$ | 2,657,778 | \$ | 433,632 | \$ | 1,348,659 |
| Total Fees as \% of Estimated Market Price |  | 4\% |  | 4\% |  | 4\% ! |  | 5\% |  | 6\% |  | 6\% |  | 4\% |
| El Cerrito | \$ | 789,092 | \$ | 891,695 | \$ | 1,162,315 | \$ | 701,825 | \$ | 1,029,902 | \$ | 174,481 | \$ | 666,633 |
| Total Fees as \% of Estimated Market Price |  | 2\% |  | 2\% |  | 3\% |  | 2\% |  | 2\% |  | 2\% |  | 2\% |
| Albany | \$ | 1,140,345 | \$ | 1,375,795 | \$ | 3,556,078 | \$ | 269,918 | \$ | 400,701 | \$ | 68,141 | \$ | 272,417 |
| Total Fees as \% of Estimated Market Price |  | 3\% |  | 3\% |  | 8\% |  | 1\% |  | 1\% |  | 1\% |  | 1\% |
| Alameda | \$ | 2,844,664 | \$ | 2,930,867 | \$ | 3,159,912 | \$ | 1,396,464 | \$ | 2,092,190 | \$ | 311,837 | \$ | 1,494,402 |
| Total Fees as \% of Estimated Market Price |  | 8\% |  | 7\% |  | 7\% |  | 4\% |  | 5\% |  | 4\% |  | 5\% |
| Walnut Creek | \$ | 1,892,235 | \$ | 3,425,437 | \$ | 4,808,811 | \$ | 1,637,913 | \$ | 2,444,083 | \$ | 422,633 | \$ | 1,318,537 |
| Total Fees as \% of Estimated Market Price |  | 5\% |  | 9\% |  | 11\% |  | 5\% |  | 6\% |  | 6\% |  | 4\% |
| Richmond | \$ | 1,658,667 | \$ | 1,730,668 | \$ | 1,863,068 | \$ | 1,199,093 | \$ | 1,391,637 | \$ | 183,580 | \$ | 671,373 |
| Total Fees as \% of Estimated Market Price |  | 5\% |  | 4\% |  | 4\% |  | 4\% |  | 3\% |  | 3\% |  | 2\% |
| Average Fee Burden ${ }^{1}$ |  | 6\% |  | 5\% |  | 7\% |  | 4\% |  | 4\% |  | 4\% |  | 3\% |

${ }^{1}$ Excludes existing Emeryville fees.
Sources: Table 1, Draft Development Fee Comparison Memorandum, March 11, 2014, Willdan Financial Services.

Based on the average fee burden identified in Table 3, Table 4 calculates the unused fee capacity for Emeryville, both as a percentage of market values, and as a dollar amount. Emeryville's fees for each prototype project are lower than the average, thus fee capacity exists for each land use category. In particular, residential land use categories have between $\$ 949,000$ and $\$ 1.5$ million in fee capacity when compared to the comparison city averages. Nonresidential land uses have less fee capacity, between $\$ 18,000$ and $\$ 430,000$, when compared to the comparison city averages.

Table 4: Emeryville Fee Capacity

|  | 100 Multi- <br> Family Units Rental |  | 100 MultiFamily Units Owner Occupied |  | $100 \text { - }$ <br> Townhomes |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { Office } 100,000 \\ \text { sq.ft. } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |  | Research \& Development 150,000 sq.ft. |  | 5,000 sq. ft. <br> Restaurant, 20,000 <br> Commercial sq. |  | Hotel - 200 Rooms |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Estimated Market Valuation | \$ | 34,510,000 | \$ | 40,000,000 | \$ | 45,500,000 | \$ | 33,300,000 | \$ | 43,500,000 | \$ | 7,150,000 | \$ | 30,000,000 |
| Emeryville - Existing Fees | \$ | 963,750 | \$ | 1,097,535 | \$ | 1,468,626 | \$ | 911,660 | \$ | 1,333,708 | \$ | 262,474 | \$ | 859,918 |
| Total Fees as \% of Market Price |  | 3\% |  | 3\% |  | 3\% |  | 3\% |  | 3\% |  | 4\% |  | 3\% |
| Averages From Comparison Cties |  | 6\% |  | 5\% |  | 7\% |  | 4\% |  | 4\% |  | 4\% |  | 3\% |
| Everyville Fee Capacity - \% |  | 3\% |  | 2\% |  | 3\% |  | 1\% |  | 1\% |  | 0\% |  | 1\% |
| Everyville Fee Capacity - \$ | \$ | 948,659 | \$ | 753,500 | \$ | 1,531,332 | \$ | 310,137 | \$ | 430,225 | \$ | 17,548 | \$ | 155,869 |

Table 1
On-Site Percentage Estimated to Have Equivalent Cost to Payment of a $\mathbf{\$ 2 0 , 0 0 0}$ Impact Fee Affordable Housing Impact Fee Analysis
City of Emeryville, CA

|  |  | Prototypical Rental Project of 100 Units |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Per Unit |  |
| A. Illustrative Housing Impact Fee | \$20,000 $\times 100$ Units = | \$2,000,000 |
| B. Estimated Cost To Project to Provide One Affordable Unit On-Site at Low-Income [Rents based on 60\% AMI] | see Table 2 | \$290,000 |
| C. Number of Affordable Units Provided On-Site at LowIncome that would Represent an Equal Cost to a 100-Unit Project as Payment of a \$20,000 Impact Fee | A. $/ \mathrm{B} .=$ | 6.9 units |
| D. Percent of Affordable Units Provided On-Site at LowIncome that would Represent an Equivalent Cost to Payment of a \$20,000 Impact Fee | C. / 100 Units = | 6.9\% |

## Table 2 <br> Net Cost to a Market Rate Rental Project for Each Low-Income Unit Provided On-Site <br> Affordable Housing Impact Fee Analysis <br> City of Emeryville, CA

|  | Prototypical Rental Unit |
| :---: | :---: |
| 1 Average Unit Size | 850 sq ft |
| 2 Average Number of Bedrooms | 1.25 |
| 3 Average Household Size | 2.25 persons |
| . Market Rate Rental Unit Value |  |
| 4 Rent per month (\$2.90psf) | \$2,465 |
| 5 Annual Rent | \$29,580 |
| 6 Household Income | \$99,000 |
| 7 Affordability Level (\% AMI) | 128\% |
| 8 Annual Operating Expenses ${ }^{3}$ | \$8,900 |
| 9 Annual Net Operating Income (NOI) | \$20,680 |
| 10 Unit Value @ 6.0\% Cap | \$345,000 |

B. Affordable Unit Value Restricted to Low-Income Household at 60\% of AMI

11 HH Income ${ }^{1}$
\$46,300
12 Gross Rent per month ${ }^{1}$
\$1,158
13 (Less Utility Allowance) ${ }^{2}$
(\$72)
14 Net Rent \$1,086
15 Annual Rent \$13,026
16 Annual Operating Expenses ${ }^{3} \quad \underline{(\$ 8,900)}$
17 Annual Net Operating Income (NOI)
\$4,126
18 Unit value @ 7.5\% Cap
$\$ 55,000 \quad \begin{aligned} & \text { Higher cap rate on affordable unit } \\ & \text { since potential for rent growth is }\end{aligned}$ limited.

## C. Affordability Gap or Estimated Net Cost to a Market Rate <br> $\mathbf{\$ 2 9 0 , 0 0 0}=$ Line $10-$ Line 18 <br> Rental Project for Each Low-Income Unit Provided On-Site

1. City of Emeryville, Housing Affordability Table, updated $5 / 21 / 13$. Assumes $30 \%$ of income spent on housing. 2013 official State Income Limits, California Housing \& Community Development. Based on 2.25 Person Household at 60\% AMI.
2. Utility allowance assumes tenant pays for gas heat, cooking and hot water, water, and other electric. Utility allowance per the Housing Authority of the County of Alameda.
3. Estimated based on operating expense comps for other similar apartment projects in the market and includes property taxes.

[^0]:    Sources: Tables 2 to 9; Willdan Financial Services..

