

SOCIO-ECONOMIC EVALUATION CHECKLIST FORM

BACKGROUND

1. **Project Title:**
Conditional Use Permit No. 945; Minor Subdivision No. 330 (Tentative Parcel Map No. 330).
2. **Contact Person and Phone Number:**
Robert D. Dalquest, AICP
Assistant Development Services Director
(909) 798-7555
3. **Project Location:**
The project site is located on the southeast corner of San Bernardino Avenue and Tennessee Street.
4. **Project Sponsor's Name and Address:**
Walmart Stores, Inc.
2001 SE 10th Street
Bentonville, AR 72716
5. **General Plan Designation:**
The General Plan designation of the project site is Commercial.
6. **Zoning:**
The project site is within Concept Plan No. 4 of the East Valley Corridor Specific Plan (EVCSP). The land use designation is General Commercial District.
7. **Description of Project:**
The proposed Redlands Crossing Project is located within Concept Plan No. 4 of the East Valley Corridor Specific Plan. Concept Plan No. 4 is the development suitability analysis and land use plan for the development envelope that the Redlands Crossing Project is within. Concept Plan No. 4 establishes limits, parameters, and development standards that guide development based on development constraints and opportunities. The Redlands Crossing Project is designed to comply with the land use plan and development regulations of Concept Plan No. 4 and the East Valley Corridor Specific Plan. There are no legislative actions associated with the project's entitlements.

The Redlands Crossing Project consists of a Conditional Use Permit (CUP) for a development plan to construct a 256,614 square foot retail and commercial center on approximately 32.97 acres. The center will be anchored by a 196,114 square foot Walmart store and contain nine (9) out-parcel located around the perimeter of the project site with a potential of 60,500 square feet of retail,

restaurant, fast food, service station and commercial uses. The site design provides approximately 1,349 parking spaces, and a 0.56 acre detention basin to capture site runoff.

The project will construct two new roadways. Pennsylvania Avenue is proposed to be extended west from Tennessee Street and link with a new segment of New York Street that will connect to San Bernardino Avenue. Access to the site is provided at six locations. A full access point on San Bernardino Avenue is located at the existing intersection of the northern leg of Tennessee Street. Two full access points are located on the southern leg of Tennessee Street. Two full access points are located on the future extension of Pennsylvania Avenue, and one full access point on the future segment of New York Street.

The project also includes a Tentative Parcel Map to create eleven (11) parcels on the entire 45 acres under the ownership of Walmart Stores, Inc. Parcel 11 is approximately 7.78 acres and is located between the extension of New York Street and existing Karon Street. Parcel 11 is not part of this project and is outside the scope of the EIR as there are no plans to develop this parcel in the foreseeable future. Activities near Parcel 11 will consist of mass-grading and off-site infrastructure improvements that are to support development of the Redlands Crossing Project. Off-site improvements within this area include storm drain facilities related to the construction of New York Street, a block wall immediately to the west of Karon Street and mass-grading to match grade elevations between Karon Street and the new segment of New York Street. In addition, a landscape buffer will be located on the west side of Karon Street, which is part of the off-site improvements as proposed by the project. The landscape buffer is a requirement of Concept Plan No. 4 and the East Valley Corridor Specific Plan; and in combination with the block wall serves to buffer the project from the residences on the east side of Karon Street. A copy of the project's plans is included in the Agenda packet for the Planning Commission's advanced review.

Walmart Store (Parcel 10)

The proposed Redlands Crossing Walmart Store is approximately 196,114 square feet. The Draft EIR analyzed, as a worst case scenario, the total square footage of the Walmart Store to be 215,000 square feet, which is approximately nine (9) percent larger than the actual size of the store. The Walmart Store will offer groceries and general retail merchandise including but limited to alcohol for off-site consumption, pool chemicals, petroleum products, pesticides, and paint products. The store will operate 24-hours per day seven (7) days per week. The

store will contain a garden center with an exterior customer pick-up facility for pre-paid garden supplies. The store will also include a tire & lube express that will provide routine servicing and preventative maintenance of vehicles. The tire & lube facility will have limited hours of operation which would be Monday through Sunday from 8:00 a.m. to 10:00 p.m. The store will also include a pharmacy and possibly a vision, hearing and medical care center, food service, a photo studio and photo finishing center, a banking center and other similar services inside the store.

Parcels 1 to 9

As indicated previously, the Redlands Crossing Project will include nine (9) outparcels with a potential for approximately 60,500 square feet. The outparcels will consist of three (3) parcels for fast food restaurants with drive-through facilities, three (3) parcels for retail uses which includes a service station, one parcel that will be a food court area for retail and fast food restaurants without drive-through facilities, one parcel for retail with a drive-through facility and one parcel that will contain a sit-down restaurant. Development of the outparcels will be done subsequent to construction of the Walmart Store and completion of all on-site improvements. The building pads will require subsequent approvals by the Planning Commission of either a Commission Review and Approval or a Conditional Use Permit depending on the use and/or drive-through facilities.

8. Surrounding Land Uses and Setting:

The project site is located on the east side of the 210 Freeway at the San Bernardino Avenue Interchange. The project site is surrounded by the following land uses: to the north and south is vacant land; to the east are existing residential neighborhoods and vacant land within Concept Plan No. 4; and to the west are the 210 Freeway and Citrus Plaza Shopping Center beyond. All utilities and public infrastructure are existing and within the project vicinity.

COST BENEFIT FACTORS:

The cost benefit factors are evaluated independently using the cost benefit model. A positive or negative cost/benefit ratio will be derived by evaluating projects. A complete model used to evaluate the project is available in the Community Development Department. A summary of that analysis is provided here:

Fiscal Impact Analysis of the project is projected to result in annual "new net" non-residential revenues of \$459,936 to the City upon operation, and annual ongoing costs

of approximately \$178,080. This equates to a revenue/cost ratio of a positive factor of 2.56. Staff used a "worst case" scenario and only inputted the annual "new net sales" that the project would generate over the existing Walmart store. This was calculated by subtracting the sales revenue for 2011 from the existing Walmart on Redlands Boulevard from the projected annual sales for the Redlands Crossing Project. The complete Cost/Benefit Model results are attached herein as Exhibit "A".

PUBLIC INFRASTRUCTURE AND EFFECT ON THE CITY OF REDLANDS:

Identify the public infrastructure required for development of this project and identify the source(s) of funding for these improvements. Identify the effects of such development upon the City of Redlands.

List of public infrastructure required for the project:

The project is projected to construct an extensive network of public infrastructure located along the project site's four frontages and within the vicinity of the project site which is estimated at approximately \$4,856,191. The project will also pay the City's Development Impact Fees (DIF) that have been estimated to be approximately \$5,613,082; or will get appropriate credit for the installation of public infrastructure within a DIF program. Cumulatively, this project will significantly enhance the public infrastructure within this area and contribute toward upgrading the existing public improvements within the vicinity of the project site. Attached to this report is an estimate by the Project's Engineer of the public infrastructure that will be constructed by the project (See Exhibit "B").

Sources of funding for these improvements to include developer installed payment of impact fees, assessment districts, etc.:

The required public improvements will be installed with the development of the project and prior to occupancy, as required by the Redlands Municipal Code. In addition, to ensure construction of the required public improvements, the project will be required to post a bond as a guarantee of performance. The project's impact on off-site sewer, water and solid waste due to any increased demand will be offset by the payment of development impact fees which is estimated to be approximately \$5,613,082; as well as any appropriate credit.

The effect of the project upon the City of Redlands relative to public infrastructure is as follows:

The project will have a positive impact as the street frontage along San Bernardino

Avenue, Tennessee Street, Pennsylvania Avenue and New York Street will either be improved to its ultimate half width locations, or constructed in the case of Pennsylvania Avenue and New York Street. The project will enhance the traffic circulation in this area with the construction of public infrastructure including the installation of five (5) traffic signals. Two signals will be installed along Tennessee Street at the project entrance and at Pennsylvania Avenue, two signals along San Bernardino Avenue at the project entrance and at New York Street, and the fifth at San Bernardino Avenue and Church Street. The developer will offset any "direct" project impacts to the City's local public infrastructure by constructing an extensive amount of new public infrastructure and the payment of development impact fees.

BENEFITS OF THE PROJECT TO THE CITY OF REDLANDS

The following is a list of benefits that can be attributed to the proposed project. The benefits may fall into the categories identified or a miscellaneous category. Each benefit identified will be described in detail with supporting reasons as to how the item benefits the community.

A. Citrus Enhancements or Preservation. Does the project preserve citrus? The following are accepted ways to enhance or preserve citrus which may be determined to be a benefit to the City of Redlands.

1. Provide conservation easement(s) on citrus groves the City hopes to preserve.
2. Acquire citrus grove(s) and donate all or a portion of the grove to the City.
3. Enhance viability and productivity of existing groves by enhancing irrigation or adding frost water.
4. Maintain a viable buffer of citrus around the project (at least 3 rows).
5. Other ways to preserve citrus.

If this project provides benefit(s) that apply to citrus enhancement or preservation, describe in detail the benefit(s) with supporting reasons as to how the item(s) benefits the community.

The project site is undeveloped property which has existed as fallow land for over 10 years. The site is within an urban environment near the 210 Freeway & San Bernardino Avenue Interchange. The project's landscape design provides an entry feature at each of the four corners of the shopping center consisting of a stone wall and landscaping that includes the planting of citrus trees. The corner feature at San Bernardino Avenue and New York Street will contain a small grove.

B. Cultural Enhancements or Preservation. Does the project enhance or preserve cultural aspects of the community? The following are accepted ways to enhance and/or preserve cultural aspects of the community which may be determined to be a benefit to the City of Redlands.

1. Contributes to "art in public places" concept to a minimum of 1% of total project value.
2. Contributes to the alleviation of problems at cultural sites.
3. Provides an electronic library available to the public.
4. Enhances or contributes to current services or cultural resources.
5. Contribute to performing arts venues.

If this project provides benefit(s) that apply to cultural enhancements or preservation, describe in detail the benefit(s) with supporting reasons as to how the item(s) benefits the community.

The project does not propose contributions or enhancements to cultural aspects of the community as listed above. The project will pay City established Development Impact Fees and provide additional revenue from increased property tax assessment, net new sales tax, business license tax, and other revenue sources that will indirectly provide funding which will contribute to enhancing and/or maintaining some of the cultural facilities within the City.

C. Heritage Enhancements or Preservation. Does the project enhance or preserve heritage aspects of the community? The following are accepted ways to enhance and/or preserve heritage aspects of the community which may be determined to be a benefit to the City of Redlands.

1. Renovates existing historic homes.
2. The project has design features which include garage doors do not face street; 50% wrap around porch on 1-1/2 sides; broad overhangs on roof; driveway located on the side of house or a circular drive; decorative wood, masonry or wrought iron fence.
3. Adaptive reuse of historic structures in appropriate zones.
4. Forming a new or annexing to an existing historic district.
5. Designation of a structure as an individual historic resource.

If this project provides benefit(s) that apply to heritage enhancements or preservation,

describe in detail the benefit(s) with supporting reasons as to how the item(s) benefits the community.

The project site is 32.97 acres of vacant, fallow land that does not contain any heritage resources that would afford the project an opportunity to preserve or enhance.

D. Architectural Enhancements. Does the project enhance architectural aspects of the community? The following are accepted ways to enhance architectural aspects of the community which may be determined to be a benefit to the City of Redlands.

1. Provide architectural or decorative enhancements to the project which exceed normal architectural standards.
2. Trees or other landscaping amenities that exceed minimum requirements.
3. Contribution of off-site enhancements in the public right-of-way, such as sidewalk installation and street tree replacement.
4. Assisting in undergrounding of utility lines.

If this project provides benefit(s) that apply to architectural enhancements, describe in detail the benefit(s) with supporting reasons as to how the item(s) benefits the community.

The proposed development will greatly enhance the aesthetics of the project area by developing an attractive commercial/retail center at the northern gateway into the City from the 210 Freeway. The project depicts a contemporary design that utilizes a variety of architectural elements and building materials; as well as a substantial amount of landscaping that will cover 7.25 acres (22%) of the 32.97 acre site; including the planting of 1,065 trees that will add greatly to the City's urban forest. The color scheme of the project is an earth tone palette and when considering the architectural elements, building materials, and significant landscaping, the project will create an attractive portal into the City.

E. Historic Downtown Enhancements or Preservation. Does the project enhance or preserve the historic downtown of the community? The following are accepted ways to enhance and/or preserve the historic downtown of the community which may be determined to be a benefit to the City of Redlands.

1. Contributes financially to viability of core downtown within expanded downtown.
2. Renovate old buildings.

3. Within an expanded downtown extends DRBA streetscape enhancements.
4. Contributing to the restoration of original building facades of existing structures
5. Re-establishing historical "pedestrian oriented" street frontages where original buildings have been removed.
6. Provides unique adaptive use of historic building.
7. Contributes to alternative means of transportation.

If this project provides benefit(s) that apply to historic downtown enhancements or preservation, describe in detail the benefit(s) with supporting reasons as to how the item(s) benefits the community.

The project is not located within the historic downtown district. The project will pay City established Development Impact Fees and provide significant additional revenue from increased property tax assessment, new net sales tax, business license tax, and other revenue sources that will indirectly provide funding that could be utilized to enhance and/or maintain the downtown infrastructure and public amenities. In addition, the project represents a regional development that will attract patrons from surrounding communities within a 15 to 20 minutes drive that may encourage the opportunity to generate business within the downtown area as these shoppers explore other areas of Redlands for dining, fuel, entertainment, shopping, etc.

F. Job Enhancements. Does the project enhance jobs for the community? The following are accepted ways to enhance jobs for the community which may be determined to be a benefit to the City of Redlands.

1. Provides jobs for the community.
2. Brings in revenue from outside the city.
3. Internship opportunities for students at universities, high school and colleges.

If this project provides benefit(s) that apply to job enhancements, describe in detail the benefit(s) with supporting reasons as to how the item(s) benefits the community.

The project consists of a 256,614 square foot commercial/retail center that will contain a Walmart Supercenter and approximately 60,500 square feet of outparcel development that will contain restaurants, retail, and commercial uses. The project when completed and occupied is anticipated to create a total of 206 permanent new jobs; this includes 85 new jobs at the Redlands Crossing Walmart to go with the 230 jobs that will be relocated from the existing Walmart on Redlands Boulevard, and 121

jobs from the development of the nine outparcels. In addition, construction of the project will create a substantial number of jobs which will bring additional revenue to the City. The location of the project site off the 210 Freeway and the regional nature of the Walmart Supercenter will significantly capture revenue from the surrounding communities of Highland, San Bernardino, Loma Linda and Yucaipa. The development will also enable the City of Redlands to capture revenue that is being lost within the City from its residents which are traveling outside of the City to purchase goods and services, such as electronics, that are not available with in-town businesses.

G. Open Space Enhancements or Preservation. Does the project enhance or preserve open space aspects of the community? The following are accepted ways to enhance and/or preserve open space within the community which may be determined to be a benefit to the City of Redlands.

1. Hardscape feature that enhances wildlife- water/food/ shelter.
2. Enhanced landscape on commercial project which conceals infrastructure.
3. Waterscaping which increases illusion of open space.
4. Provides open space in addition to zoning requirement.
5. Provides a Planned Residential Development
6. Provides a usable conservation easement across open space in perpetuity.
7. Preserves access for wildlife migration corridor.
8. Provides undisturbed refuge area for wildlife.

If this project provides benefit(s) that apply to open space enhancements or preservation, describe in detail the benefit(s) with supporting reasons as to how the item(s) benefits the community.

The project complies with the required open setbacks and lot coverage in accordance with the EVCSP. Approximately 22%, or 7.25 acres of the 32.97 acres will be fully landscaped that will include the planting of 1,065 trees that will substantially add to the City's urban forest.

H. Park Enhancements or Preservation. Does the project enhance or preserve parks of the community? The following are accepted ways to enhance and/or preserve parks within the community which may be determined to be a benefit to the City of Redlands.

1. Adds improved parkland.

2. Adds parkland beyond requirements.
3. Provides pedestrian and/or bike trails to parks or provides extension of existing pedestrian and/or bike trails from the project site.
4. Adds meeting rooms accessible to local groups on a frequent basis.
5. Improves or adds to existing landscape and/or streetscape at or near the project site.

If this project provides benefit(s) that apply to park enhancements or preservation, describe in detail the benefit(s) with supporting reasons as to how the item(s) benefits the community.

The project entails the development of an attractive 256,614 square foot regional commercial/retail center that is adjacent to the 210 Freeway and San Bernardino Avenue Interchange. This type of development and location do not afford the project any opportunities to provide park enhancement or preservation. The project will pay City established Development Impact Fees and provide additional revenue from increased property tax assessment, net new sales tax, business license tax, and other revenue sources that will indirectly provide funding that may be used to benefit City parks.

I. Public Safety Enhancements. Does the project enhance public safety aspects of the community? The following are accepted ways to enhance public safety within the community which may be determined to be a benefit to the City of Redlands.

1. Security infrastructure is provided in an architecturally acceptable manner.
2. Exterior television monitoring on commercial project.
3. Provide a building site or fully equipped fire station or contributes to dedicated City account for future construction.
4. Provides significant additional fire equipment as determined by the Fire Department.
5. Provides for a police substation (subject to City approval).
6. Provides for a building site for a new facility.

If this project provides benefit(s) that apply to public safety enhancements, describe in detail the benefit(s) with supporting reasons as to how the item(s) benefits the community.

The project will be required to install a number of surveillance cameras within the

parking area and at the entrance into the store which will enhance public safety in responding to calls for service from this development. The project will also pay approximately \$5,613,082 of Development Impact Fees which have been established by the City to fund various public facilities, including police. The project will also provide additional revenue from increased property tax assessment, new net sales tax, business license tax, and other revenue sources that may assist in funding police services.

J. School Enhancements. Does the project enhance schools or their operations within the community? The following are accepted ways to enhance schools within the community which may be determined to be a benefit to the City of Redlands.

1. Senior citizen development adds revenue but no impact.
2. Provides day care and after school program(s).
3. Project is close to schools serving the project.
4. Contributes equipment or other enhancements to existing day care and after school programs.
5. Assist schools with land or financing (such as Mello Roos).

If this project provides benefit(s) that apply to schools, describe in detail the benefit(s) with supporting reasons as to how the item(s) benefits the community.

The project is not a residential development and is not considered growth inducing in nature, either directly or indirectly. The project will pay State established school fees based on commercial building square footage rates prior to building permit issuance that is estimated to be approximately \$129,485 and will assist in funding school facilities.

K. Traffic. Does the project reduce traffic, enhance systems to improve traffic conditions or otherwise improve traffic within the community? The following are accepted ways to improve traffic within the community which may be determined to be a benefit to the City of Redlands.

1. Provide financial mitigation which helps alleviate parking problems in town i.e. by contributing to the parking district.
2. Incorporate "traffic calming" elements into the design of the circulation system.
3. Support for alternative forms of public transportation or public transportation facilities.
4. Add biking and pedestrian access to off campus intellectual or entertainment resources.

5. Have a unique method of product/inventory delivery.

If this project provides benefit(s) that apply to traffic, describe in detail the benefit(s) with supporting reasons as to how the item(s) benefits the community.

The project will construct a new bus stop/turn-out for Omnitrans along the site's San Bernardino Avenue frontage which directly supports an alternate form of public transportation. In addition, the project will construct an extensive network of public infrastructure located along the project site's four frontages and within the vicinity that is estimated to cost approximately \$4,856,191. The project will also pay the City's Development Impact Fees that have been estimated to be approximately \$5,613,082. Cumulatively, this project will significantly enhance the public infrastructure within this area and contribute toward upgrading the area's existing public improvements.

L. Wastewater System Enhancements. Does the project enhance the wastewater system within the community? The following are accepted ways to improve the wastewater system within the community which may be determined to be a benefit to the City of Redlands.

1. Provide a dual system to use potable and non-potable water.
2. Provide financial contributions to tertiary facilities at the Wastewater Treatment Plant.
3. Improve water quality.

If this project provides benefit(s) that apply to the wastewater system, describe in detail the benefit(s) with supporting reasons as to how the item(s) benefits the community.

The project will construct a dual system for potable and non-potable water along the project's San Bernardino Avenue, and New York Street frontages. The project does not propose any further enhancements to the wastewater system, nor does the nature of the development within this area necessitate the need or requirement to provide additional wastewater system enhancements. The project will pay City established Development Impact Fees and provide additional revenue from increased property tax assessment, net new sales tax, business license tax, and other revenue sources that may assist in funding new public infrastructure to benefit the City's wastewater system.

M. Miscellaneous Preservation or Enhancements. Does the project enhance or preserve elements within the community?

If this project provides benefit(s) that apply to enhancement or preservation of elements that are important to the City, describe in detail the benefit(s) with supporting reasons as to how the item(s) benefits the community.

According to a Fiscal Impact Analysis prepared by Tierra West Advisors in February 2010 for Measure 0 (Initiative For Responsible Retail in Redlands), the project's trade area is approximately 3 to 6 miles, or a 15 to 20 minute drive. The project has the potential to capture a greater share of the retail leakage that is taking place within the City. Therefore, the project may capture larger sales tax revenue from taxable sales when compared with the existing Walmart on Redlands Boulevard. Tierra West Advisors estimates that the City experiences a leakage of approximately \$907 annually per capita. The total consumption within a five minute drive from the project is approximately \$239 million; this includes general merchandise, apparel, electronic, household goods, and vehicle maintenance, prepared food and groceries. The consumption for such items and services sharply increases to \$1.5 billion within a 10 minute drive, and to \$2.96 billion in a 15-minute drive from the proposed site. Thus, it is anticipated that the Redlands Crossing Project may realize a high sales volume due to its proximity to a large consumer spending base, and higher inventory levels than a non-supercenter Walmart. This will provide a substantial amount of long term revenue that will help fund essential City services.

SOCIAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED:

This project may create unmitigable physical blight or overburden public services for those social factors checked below within the "Potentially Significant," "Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation" or "Less Than Significant" as indicated by the checklist on the following pages.

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Agricultural/Citrus Removal	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Police Services	<input type="checkbox"/> Recreational Programs
<input type="checkbox"/> Wildlife/Habitat	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Downtown Impacts	<input type="checkbox"/> Land Use Compatibility
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Traffic	<input type="checkbox"/> Residential Design	<input type="checkbox"/> Schools
<input type="checkbox"/> Fire Services	<input type="checkbox"/> Cultural Facilities	
<input type="checkbox"/> Paramedic Services	<input type="checkbox"/> Park Facilities	

DETERMINATION

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

- I find that the proposed project will not create unmitigable physical blight or overburden public services in the community, and no additional information or evaluation is needed.

- ___ I find that although the proposed project could create unmitigable physical blight or overburden public services in the community, there will not be a significant effect in this case because the mitigation measures described on an attached sheet have been added to the project by the applicant.

- ___ I find that the proposed project may create unmitigable physical blight or overburden public services in the community, and additional information or evaluation is needed in the following areas:

- ___ I find that the proposed project has already been evaluated for socio-economic impacts and the prior evaluation adequately evaluated this project.

Signed: 
 Robert D. Dalquest, AICP
 Assistant Development Services Director
 City of Redlands
 March 15, 2012 (Revised March 19, 2012 at ERC Meeting)

EVALUATION OF SOCIAL FACTORS

Explanations of all "Potentially Significant," "Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated," "Less Than Significant Impact," and "No Impact" answers are provided on the attached sheets.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<small>Issues and Supporting Information Sources:</small>				
1. AGRICULTURAL/CITRUS REMOVAL. Would the proposal:				
a) Affect agricultural resources or operations (e.g. impacts to soils or farmlands, or impacts from incompatible land uses) ?	___	___	✓	___
b) Remove active citrus groves from production?	___	___	✓	___

Agricultural/Citrus Removal.

1.a,b) The project site contains soils designated by the California Department of

Conservation as "Prime Agricultural Lands", as identified in Figure 5.2 of the MEA/EIR. Conversion of important agricultural land to urban uses was identified as an unavoidable significant impact in the Final EIR prepared for the East Valley Corridor Specific Plan (EVCSP). In approval of the EVCSP, a statement of overriding considerations was adopted and acknowledged this unavoidable impact as acceptable because of the important benefits provided by the plan, particularly to increased employment opportunities and an improved jobs/housing balance. Thus, the potential impact to farmland would be considered less than significant. In terms of citrus grove removal, the project site does not contain any groves and has been fallow for over 10 years.

Issues and Supporting Information Sources:

Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------------	--	------------------------------------	--------------

2. WILDLIFE/HABITAT/OPEN SPACE PRESERVATION. Would the proposal:

- | | | | | |
|--|---|---|---|---|
| a) Eliminate or have negative impact upon wildlife corridors? | — | — | — | ✓ |
| b) Tend to urbanize open space impacting preservation and conservation of natural resources? | — | — | — | ✓ |
| c) Interfere with use of recognized trails used by joggers, hikers, equestrians or bicyclists? | — | — | — | ✓ |
| d) Eliminate, reduce, or have any negative impact upon wildlife habitat areas to include the protection of fringe or buffer areas? | — | — | — | ✓ |

Wildlife/Habitat/Open Space Preservation.

2.a) According to the Biotic Resources Map (Figure 7.1 of the MEA/EIR), the subject

site is not within a wildlife corridor.

- 2.b) The project site is within an urban area consisting of commercial, light industrial and residential uses. No part of this project would adversely impact open space.
- 2.c) According to the General Plan Trails Map (Figure 7.1) contained in the Open Space and Conservation Element, the project site is not near any designated trail.
- 2.d) According to the Biotic Resources Map (Figure 7.1 of the MEA/EIR), the subject site is not within or near a wildlife habitat area and does not have the potential to cause a negative impact to biotic resources.

Issues and Supporting Information Sources:

3. TRAFFIC. Would the proposal:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Result in increased vehicle trips or congestion?	—	—	<u>✓</u>	—
b.) Create additional traffic so as to be in conflict with the policies of the General Plan?	—	—	<u>✓</u>	—
c.) Does traffic impact livability of a residential neighborhood on streets which, due to design or terrain features, street side development or other factors, have greater than usual sensitivity to increased traffic?	—	—	—	<u>✓</u>
d.) Create additional traffic so as to increase the level of service on roadways that are adjacent to or in the vicinity of the project?	—	—	<u>✓</u>	—

Traffic Impacts.

- 3.a) According to the traffic study that was prepared, the project is anticipated to generate approximately 19,481 daily vehicle trips during the weekday, with 1,402 trips occurring during the PM peak hour, and 22,907 daily vehicle trips during

Saturday, with 1,941 trips occurring during the PM peak hour. Although the project will lower the existing level-of-service (Existing Plus Project) at several surrounding intersections, this will be mitigated to a less than significant level with implementation of five (5) mitigation measures contained in the EIR prepared for the project. In addition, the project will pay the City's Development Impact Fees, the CMP Regional Development Impact Fee and will pay a "fair share" contribution for those intersections requiring mitigation which are not in the City's Fee Program. Payment of these fees will mitigate cumulative impacts from the project's traffic for Opening year 2013 traffic conditions and 2030 traffic conditions.

- 3.b) Additional traffic generated by the development will not be in conflict with the policies of the General Plan. Section 5.20 of the Circulation Element establishes City standards for traffic levels-of-service which bases a significant impact of a project on the LOS C standard. In other words, a significant impact results when the LOS of a street or intersection drops below LOS C, or in the instance when the existing LOS is either D, E, or F, and drops to a lower LOS. The project will be required to construct improvements at five intersections that will result in a less than significant impact to the "existing" traffic conditions with the addition of the project's traffic.
- 3.c) The project site is within an area designated for commercial uses and is accessed from San Bernardino Avenue, which is a major arterial street, and is adjacent to the 210 Freeway northbound and southbound ramps at San Bernardino Avenue. Traffic generated by the project will not way impact the livability of residential neighborhoods or streets.
- 3.d) See 3(a) and (b) above.

Issues and Supporting Information Sources:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
4. FIRE AND PARAMEDIC SERVICES. Will the proposal result in:				
a) Requiring fire and paramedic services that are beyond the current capabilities of the Fire Department?	—	—	—	✓
b) An increase in response time for essential fire or paramedic services to the remainder of the community?	—	—	—	✓
c) The need for additional fire or paramedic facilities or equipment?	—	—	—	✓

Fire and paramedic services.

- 4.a) The Fire Department indicates that current capabilities are adequate to provide fire and paramedic service demands for this development. The project will incorporate fixed fire protection systems which will mitigate any impacts relative to this issue.
- 4.b) The development will not impact essential fire or paramedic services to the remainder of the community. The project would be served by Fire Station No. 263 located at Orange Street and Pennsylvania Avenue, and is below the minimum response time.
- 4.c) Present capabilities of the Fire Department will not require additional fire or paramedic facilities or equipment as a result of this project. The project will pay Development Impact Fees which have been established by the City to fund public facilities, including fire and paramedic services. In addition, the project will be assessed the Paramedic Assessment in accordance with Proposition P. Also, the project will provide additional revenue from increased property tax assessment, sales tax, franchise fees, business license tax, and other revenue sources that may assist in funding fire operations.

Issues and Supporting Information Sources:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
5. POLICE SERVICES. Would the proposal result in:				
a) Requiring police services that are beyond the current capabilities of the Police Department?	—	—	✓	—
b) An increase in response time for essential police services to the remainder of the community?	—	—	—	✓
c) The need for additional police facilities or equipment?	—	—	—	✓
d) Increase in crime as a result of the type of business?	—	—	✓	—

Police Services.

5.a-d) The project concerns a 256,614 square foot commercial/retail center. Present capabilities of the Redlands Police Department would not be adversely impacted with project development, however, cumulatively the project will along with future development under the General Plan, require increased police services. The project will pay Development Impact Fees which have been established by the City to fund public facilities, including police. The project will also provide additional revenue from increased property tax assessment, new net sales tax, franchise fees, business license tax, and other revenue sources that may assist in funding police services.

Issues and Supporting Information Sources:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
6. DOWNTOWN IMPACTS. Would the proposal result in:				
a) A reduction of the number or types of businesses located in the downtown?	—	—	✓	—
b) An unfair or unreasonable competitive disadvantage to existing businesses downtown?	—	—	—	✓
c) Creation of vacant buildings and the potential for blight?	—	—	✓	—
d) Cause an unreasonable increase in traffic downtown?	—	—	—	✓
e) Economic and social effects of businesses competing with downtown businesses?	—	—	—	✓

Downtown Impacts.

6.a-e) According to the Tierra West Advisors Fiscal Impact Analysis, the Downtown area retailers represent approximately 46% of the taxable sales in the City while the existing Walmart on Redlands Boulevard represents only 8.54% of the taxable sales. The project is located approximately one mile from the Downtown area. The project concerns the development of a 256,614 square foot retail/commercial center that will be anchored by a 196,114 square foot Walmart Store and 60,500 square feet of outparcel development with retail, restaurant, and commercial uses. The firm of The Natelson Dale Group, Inc. prepared an Urban Decay Study for the project's Environmental Impact Report to evaluate the potential economic impacts of a retail development project if such impacts have the potential to indirectly result in adverse physical changes to the environment that may manifest themselves in the form of urban decay. Based on the Urban Decay Study relative to the Downtown area, the study concluded that the project will not have a significant impact on the Downtown area based on the following factors:

- 1). Residual demand is anticipated to be sufficient to support the project without

diverting sales from existing General Merchandise, Apparel, Furniture, and Other/Specialty (GAFO) stores and restaurants.

2). Small merchants in the Downtown already face big box competition from the Citrus Plaza shopping center and the Redlands Town Center, and the project, in and of itself, will not significantly increase the market draw of these established centers as it relates to Downtown businesses.

3). The Downtown's existing vacancy rate at 8.2% is within the "normal vacancy" rate for relatively healthy retail markets (usually 5% to 10%), and there are no visible indications of urban decay (i.e., dilapidated buildings or marginal uses). And,

4). The Downtown has a strong representation of boutique retail, eating, and drinking establishments, and service-based businesses that offer a mix of merchandise and services that are not directly comparable to the type of goods available at the type of big box stores that would locate at the project, or at the Citrus Plaza Center and Redlands Town Center developments.

Issues and Supporting Information Sources:

Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------------	--	------------------------------------	--------------

7. RESIDENTIAL DESIGN. Would the proposal:

- | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|------------|
| a) Conflict with existing codes and or standards? | — | — | — | <u>N/A</u> |
| b) Meet minimum point standards of the Residential Development Allocation process? | — | — | — | <u>N/A</u> |

Residential Design.

7.a,b) The project is a 256,614 square foot retail/commercial development within an area designated for commercial uses. No part of this project contains a residential component.

Issues and Supporting Information Sources:	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
8. CULTURAL FACILITIES. Would the proposal result in:				
a) Impacts to an historic residential structure, neighborhood, or district?	—	—	—	✓
b) Impacts to an historic commercial structure or district?	—	—	—	✓
c) Impacts to cultural facilities such as the Smiley Library, Redlands Bowl, Lincoln Shrine, Joslyn Center, Community Center, etc?	—	—	—	✓
d) Have the potential to cause a physical change which would affect unique ethnic cultural values?	—	—	—	✓
e) Potential to disturb existing religious facilities?	—	—	—	✓
f) Impact or restrict religious or sacred uses?	—	—	—	✓

Cultural Facilities.

- 8.a-b) The project site is vacant land and does not contain any historic residential or commercial structures on the property.
- 8.c) The project will develop an attractive commercial/retail center at the gateway to the City from the north along the 210 freeway. The project will not be growth inducing and would not ultimately create an increase in demand upon the cultural facilities of the City. The project will pay Development Impact Fees and provide an increase in revenue to the City from increased property tax assessment, new net sales tax, franchise fees, business license tax, and other revenue sources that may assist in providing funding for existing cultural facilities. Thus, the project will not have an adverse impact to cultural facilities.
- 8.d) No part of this project has the potential to affect unique ethnic cultural values.

8.e-f) The project site is undeveloped land within an area designated for commercial uses and will not result in impacts to existing religious facilities or restrict religious uses.

Issues and Supporting Information Sources:

Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------------	--	------------------------------------	--------------

9. PARK FACILITIES AND RECREATIONAL PROGRAMS. Will the proposal result in:

- | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| a) Increases in use or demand for park facilities or programs to include manpower, facilities or equipment? | — | — | — | ✓ |
| b) A ratio of parkland to population which exceeds standards and or goals established by the General Plan? | — | — | — | ✓ |

Park Facilities and Recreational Programs.

9.a,b) Based upon the absence of a residential component, the project will neither adversely affect existing or planned park facilities or recreational programs within the City nor create a significant new demand for additional recreational facilities. The project will pay development impact fees and provide an increase in revenue to the City from increased property tax assessment, new net sales tax, franchise fees, business license tax, and other revenue sources that may assist in providing funding that could be used to benefit park facilities and recreational programs.

Issues and Supporting Information Sources:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
10. LAND USE COMPATIBILITY. Would the proposal result in:				
a) Land uses that are not compatible or consistent with the General Plan?	—	—	—	✓
b) Economic impacts on businesses and small property owners from a project	—	—	—	✓
c) Physical separation or division of an existing community	—	—	—	✓
d) Loss of jobs for the community?	—	—	—	✓
e) Overcrowding of housing?	—	—	—	✓

Land Use Compatibility.

- 10.a) The project is a commercial/retail development and is consistent with the Commercial designation of the General Plan. This designation is intended to provide areas suitable for a mixture of retail and commercial enterprises.
- 10.b) The project does not pose an economic impact on businesses and small property owners. The project will contain a new Walmart Supercenter, retail, restaurant and commercial establishments that are intended to serve a trade area of 3 to 6 miles.
- 10.c) The project is a retail development within an area designated for general commercial uses and adjacent to a regional and local transportation network. No part of this project has the potential to separate or divide an existing community.
- 10.d) The project when completed and occupied is anticipated to create a total of 206 permanent new jobs; this includes 85 new jobs at the Redlands Crossing Walmart to go with the 230 jobs that will be relocated from the existing Walmart on Redlands Boulevard, and 121 jobs from the development of the nine outparcels. This increase will not be at the expense of other businesses located within the City, as this project will contain retail, restaurant and commercial businesses.

10.e) Based upon the absence of a residential component, no part of this project has the potential to result in overcrowding of the current housing stock within the City.

Issues and Supporting Information Sources:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
11. SCHOOLS. Would the proposal result in:				
a) Creating an overcapacity in schools?	—	—	—	✓
b) The need for additional school facilities or equipment ?	—	—	—	✓
c) Land uses not consistent with or compatible with existing educational facilities in community?	—	—	—	✓
d) Social or academic impacts on students resulting from school closures.	—	—	—	✓

Schools.

11.a-d) Based on the absence of a residential component to this project and a determination that the project will not manifest a growth-inducing impact, the project does not have the potential to adversely impact schools. Any potential direct and/or indirect impacts attributable to the project will be offset through the payment of State established school fees assessed at the time of building permit issuance. The amount estimated that the School District will receive from the project is \$129,485.

Exhibit "A"

**TABLE 1
CITY OF REDLANDS : MODEL
LAND USE SUMMARY:
FISCAL IMPACT ANALYSIS**

LAND USE	YEAR 1 2006	YEAR 2 2007	YEAR 3 2008	YEAR 4 2009	YEAR 5 2010	YEAR 6 2011	YEAR 7 2012	YEAR 8 2013	YEAR 9 2014	YEAR 10 2015	TOTAL
RESIDENTIAL UNITS											
RURAL LIVING (0.2 - 0.4 du/acre)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
VERY-LOW-DENSITY RESIDENTIAL (0 - 2.7 du/acre)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
LOW-DENSITY RESIDENTIAL (0 - 6.0 du/acre)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
LOW-MEDIUM-DENSITY RESIDENTIAL (0 - 8.0 du/acre)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
MEDIUM-DENSITY RESIDENTIAL (0 - 15.0 du/acre)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
HIGH DENSITY (0 - 27.0 du/acre)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL, RESIDENTIAL UNITS	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
CUMULATIVE, RESIDENTIAL UNITS	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	NA
PROJECT RESIDENTS /1											
RURAL LIVING (0.4 - 0.2 du/acre)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
VERY-LOW-DENSITY RESIDENTIAL (0 - 2.7 du/acre)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
LOW-DENSITY RESIDENTIAL (0 - 6.0 du/acre)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
LOW-MEDIUM-DENSITY RESIDENTIAL (0 - 8.0 du/acre)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
MEDIUM-DENSITY RESIDENTIAL (0 - 15.0 du/acre)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
HIGH DENSITY (0 - 27 du/acre)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL, PROJECT RESIDENTS	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
CUMULATIVE, PROJECT RESIDENTS	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	NA
CUMULATIVE PROJECT ACREAGE /2											
RURAL LIVING (0.4 - 0.2 du/acre)	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	NA
VERY-LOW-DENSITY RESIDENTIAL (0 - 2.7 du/acre)	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	NA
LOW-DENSITY RESIDENTIAL (0 - 6.0 du/acre)	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	NA
LOW-MEDIUM-DENSITY RESIDENTIAL (0 - 8.0 du/acre)	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	NA
MEDIUM-DENSITY RESIDENTIAL (0 - 15.0 du/acre)	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	NA
HIGH DENSITY (0 - 27 du/acre)	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	NA
CUMULATIVE, PROJECT ACREAGE	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	NA
LAND NON-RESIDENTIAL ACRES, ANNUAL /3											
RETAIL	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	33.0	0.0	0.0	33.0
INDUSTRIAL	0.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
OTHER NON-RESIDENTIAL	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
ANNUAL TOTAL, NON-RESIDENTIAL	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	33.0	0.0	0.0	33.0
LAND NON-RESIDENTIAL ACRES, CUMULATIVE											
RETAIL	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	33.0	33.0	33.0	NA
INDUSTRIAL	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	NA
OTHER NON-RESIDENTIAL	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	NA
CUMULATIVE TOTAL, NON-RESIDENTIAL	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	33.0	33.0	33.0	NA
LAND NON-RESIDENTIAL EDU'S, CUMULATIVE /4											
RETAIL	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	296.7	296.7	296.7	NA
INDUSTRIAL	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	NA
OTHER NON-RESIDENTIAL	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	NA
CUMULATIVE TOTAL, NON-RESIDENTIAL EDU'S	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	296.7	296.7	296.7	NA
BUILDING NON-RESIDENTIAL SQ.FT., ANNUAL											
RETAIL	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	256,614	0	0	256,614
INDUSTRIAL	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
OTHER NON-RESIDENTIAL	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
ANNUAL TOTAL, NON-RESIDENTIAL	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	256,614	0	0	256,614
BUILDING NON-RESIDENTIAL SQ.FT., CUMULATIVE											
RETAIL	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	256,614	256,614	256,614	NA
INDUSTRIAL	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	NA
OTHER NON-RESIDENTIAL	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	NA
CUMULATIVE TOTAL, NON-RESIDENTIAL	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	256,614	256,614	256,614	NA

SHADED CELLS ARE VARIABLE ASSUMPTIONS OR INPUTS UNIQUE TO THE PROJECT.

NOTES:

1. Average number of residents per Dwelling Unit ("DU") provided by the California Department of Finance.
Residents per DU = OTHER

2. Assumes residential acreage per unit of the following:

Rural Living (less than 0.2 - 0.4 du/acre)	NA
Very-Low-Density Residential (0 - 2.7 du/acre)	NA
Low-Density Residential (0 - 6.0 du/acre)	NA
Low-Medium-Density Residential (0 - 8.0 du/acre)	NA DEVELOPER
Medium-Density Residential (0 - 15.0 du/acre)	NA
High Density (0 - 27.0 du/acre)	NA

3. Assumes average non-residential site coverage of the following (based on the General Plan):

Retail	18.0%
Industrial	0.0%
Other Non-Residential	0.0% DEVELOPER

4. Assumes non-residential equivalent dwelling units of the following:

EDUs per acre = OTHER

GENERAL PLAN BUILDOUT	PROJ. Sq. Ft.*	F.A.R.*	Projected Acreage
RETAIL	8,646,200	0.30	661.63
INDUSTRIAL	10,048,400	0.40	576.70 OTHER
OTHER NON-RESIDENTIAL	21,641,990	0.45	1,104.07
	40,336,590		2,342.40

*As disclosed in the General Plan

Typical Home Size: OTHER
Estimated Equivalency: 9.06

**TABLE 2
CITY OF REDLANDS : MODEL
LAND USE SUMMARY:
FISCAL IMPACT ANALYSIS**

ASSESSED VALUATION ASSUMPTIONS		SECURED PROPERTY TAX ASSUMPTIONS	
RESIDENTIAL		NET APPORTIONMENT FACTORS AS A FRACTION OF 1.0% TAX RATE	
RURAL LIVING ASSESSED VALUE	\$0	PROPERTY TAXES PASSED THROUGH TO CITY /1	21.00% CITY
VERY-LOW-DENSITY ASSESSED VALUE	\$0		
LOW-DENSITY ASSESSED VALUE	\$0	1. Based on amount disclosed in the adopted 1998-99 budget.	
LOW-MEDIUM-DENSITY ASSESSED VALUE	\$0		
MEDIUM-DENSITY ASSESSED VALUE	\$0		
HIGH DENSITY ASSESSED VALUE	\$0		
DEVELOPER			
NON-RESIDENTIAL		UNSECURED PROPERTY TAX ASSUMPTIONS	
RETAIL ASSESSED VALUE	\$245.50	RESIDENTIAL:	
INDUSTRIAL ASSESSED VALUE	\$0.00	UNSECURED TAXES AS A % OF SECURED	2.75% CITY
OTHER NON-RESIDENTIAL ASSESSED VALUE	\$0.00	NON-RESIDENTIAL:	
DEVELOPER		UNSECURED TAXES AS A % OF SECURED	10.00%

FISCAL YEAR	(\$s x1,000)	end of:	YEAR 1 2006	YEAR 2 2007	YEAR 3 2008	YEAR 4 2009	YEAR 5 2010	YEAR 6 2011	YEAR 7 2012	YEAR 8 2013	YEAR 9 2014	YEAR 10 2015
SECURED ASSESSED VALUE CALCULATION:												
ANNUAL ASSESSED VALUES (YEARLY INCREASE)												
RESIDENTIAL												
RURAL LIVING		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
VERY-LOW-DENSITY RESIDENTIAL		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
LOW-DENSITY RESIDENTIAL		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
LOW-MEDIUM-DENSITY RESIDENTIAL		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
MEDIUM-DENSITY RESIDENTIAL		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
HIGH DENSITY RESIDENTIAL		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
TOTAL RESIDENTIAL		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
NON-RESIDENTIAL												
RETAIL		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$62,999	\$0	\$0
INDUSTRIAL		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
OTHER NON-RESIDENTIAL		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
TOTAL NON-RESIDENTIAL		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$62,999	\$0	\$0
TOTAL YEARLY VALUATION INCREASE:		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$62,999	\$0	\$0
CUMULATIVE ASSESSED VALUES												
RESIDENTIAL												
RURAL LIVING		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
VERY-LOW-DENSITY RESIDENTIAL		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
LOW-DENSITY RESIDENTIAL		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
LOW-MEDIUM-DENSITY RESIDENTIAL		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
MEDIUM-DENSITY RESIDENTIAL		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
HIGH DENSITY RESIDENTIAL		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
TOTAL RESIDENTIAL		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
NON-RESIDENTIAL												
RETAIL		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$62,999	\$62,999	\$62,999
INDUSTRIAL		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
OTHER NON-RESIDENTIAL		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
TOTAL NON-RESIDENTIAL		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$62,999	\$62,999	\$62,999
TOTAL CUMULATIVE ASSESSED VALUE		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$62,999	\$62,999	\$62,999
SECURED PROPERTY TAX REVENUE CALCULATION:												
CITY OF REDLANDS												
RESIDENTIAL		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
NON-RESIDENTIAL		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$132	\$132	\$132
TOTAL SECURED TAX REVENUES TO CITY		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$132	\$132	\$132
UNSECURED PROPERTY TAX REVENUE CALCULATION:												
CITY OF REDLANDS												
RESIDENTIAL		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
NON-RESIDENTIAL		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$13	\$13	\$13
TOTAL UNSECURED TAX REVENUES TO CITY		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$13	\$13	\$13
TOTAL PROPERTY TAXES TO CITY		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$146	\$146	\$146

TABLE 3
CITY OF REDLANDS : MODEL
LAND USE SUMMARY:
FISCAL IMPACT ANALYSIS

RESIDENTIAL INDIRECT SALES TAX GENERATION ASSUMPTIONS		BUSINESS DIRECT SALES & USE TAX GENERATION ASSUMPTIONS		PROPERTY TRANSFER TAX ASSUMPTIONS	
AVERAGE HOUSEHOLD INCOME ASSUMPTIONS:		SALES TAXES PASSED THROUGH TO CITY, APPLIED TO COSTS: 1.00% CITY		RESIDENTIAL PROPERTY TURNOVER RATE 10.00% CITY	
WEIGHTED AVERAGE RESIDENTIAL PRICE	\$0	MEASURE T TAXES PASSED THROUGH TO TRANSIT AUTHORITY	0.00%	BUS & COM PROPERTY TURNOVER RATE	5.00%
AVERAGE RESIDENTIAL MORTGAGE (20% DOWN)	\$0	LOCAL TRANSPORTATION SALES TAXES	0.00%	TRANSFER TAX AS A % OF RESALE DOLLAR	0.11%
ANNUAL MORTGAGE PAYMENTS @ 6.50% & 30 YEARS	\$0 CITY	DISPLACED EXISTING CITY SALES TAX	33.33%	PROPERTY TRANSFER TAX PASSED THROUGH TO CITY	50.00%
AVG. HOUSEHOLD INCOME (3:1 INCOME/PAYMENT RATIO):	\$0	PROJECT RETAIL TAXABLE SALES PER SQ. FT.:			
RETAIL TAXABLE EXPENDITURE (% OF INCOME):	25.0%	RETAIL	\$159.00		
PROJECT RESIDENTS' PURCHASES OUTSIDE PROJECT AND WITHIN INCORPORATED CITY:	50.0%	INDUSTRIAL	\$0.00		
		OTHER NON-RESIDENTIAL	\$0.00		

1. Based on amount passed through to city in the adopted 1997-98 budget.

FISCAL YEAR	(\$ x1,000)	end of:	YEAR 1 2006	YEAR 2 2007	YEAR 3 2008	YEAR 4 2009	YEAR 5 2010	YEAR 6 2011	YEAR 7 2012	YEAR 8 2013	YEAR 9 2014	YEAR 10 2015
SALES & USE TAX REVENUE CALCULATION (CUMULATIVE):												
INDIRECT SALES TAX GENERATION												
RESIDENTIAL TAXABLE EXPENDITURES			\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
TOTAL TAXABLE PURCHASES WITHIN CITY			\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
RESIDENTIAL SALES TAX GENERATION			\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
DIRECT SALES TAX GENERATION												
RETAIL TAXABLE SALES			\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$40,802	\$40,802	\$40,802
INDUSTRIAL TAXABLE SALES			\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
OTHER NON-RESIDENTIAL TAXABLE SALES			\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
SUB-TOTAL DIRECT TAXABLE SALES			\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$40,802	\$40,802	\$40,802
LESS: DISPLACED EXISTING CITY SALES TAX			\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$13,601	\$13,601	\$13,601
TOTAL DIRECT TAXABLE SALES			\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$27,201	\$27,201	\$27,201
TOTAL DIRECT SALES TAX GENERATION			\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$272	\$272	\$272
TOTAL PROJECT SALES & USE TAX REVENUES, APPLIED TO COSTS			\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$272	\$272	\$272
RESIDENTIAL MEASURE T SALES TAXES												
RESIDENTIAL MEASURE T SALES TAXES			\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
NON-RESIDENTIAL MEASURE T SALES TAXES			\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
RESIDENTIAL LOCAL TRANSPORTATION SALES TAXES												
RESIDENTIAL LOCAL TRANSPORTATION SALES TAXES			\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
NON-RESIDENTIAL LOCAL TRANSPORTATION SALES TAXES			\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
TOTAL PROJECT SALES & USE TAX REVENUES, FOR TRANSPORTATION			\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
PROPERTY TRANSFER TAX CALCULATION (CUMULATIVE):												
RESIDENTIAL PROPERTY TRANSFER TAXES			\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
NON-RESIDENTIAL PROPERTY TRANSFER TAXES			\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$1.73	\$1.73	\$1.73
TOTAL ANNUAL PROPERTY TRANSFER TAXES			\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$2	\$2	\$2

SHADED CELLS ARE VARIABLE ASSUMPTIONS OR INPUTS UNIQUE TO THE PROJECT.

TABLE 4
CITY OF REDLANDS : MODEL
LAND USE SUMMARY:
FISCAL IMPACT ANALYSIS

BUSINESS LICENSE FEE REVENUE			FRANCHISE FEES (PER CAPITA)						TRANSIENT OCCUPANCY TAX						
RESIDENTIAL	NA		TOTAL FRANCHISE						RESIDENTIAL	NON-RESIDENTIAL	NUMBER OF AVAILABLE HOTEL ROOMS				
NON-RESIDENTIAL									\$16.71	\$16.71	OCCUPANCY RATE				
BUSINESS LICENSE FEES ARE CHARGED AT A RATE EQUAL TO \$12 FOR THE FIRST \$5,000 IN GROSS SALES, PLUS \$3 FOR EACH ADDITIONAL \$5,000 INCREMENT IN GROSS SALES.															
									% PASSED THROUGH TO CITY :						
									AVERAGE YEARLY OCCUPANCY REVENUES TO CITY						
FISCAL YEAR	(\$x1,000)	end of:	YEAR 1 2006	YEAR 2 2007	YEAR 3 2008	YEAR 4 2009	YEAR 5 2010	YEAR 6 2011	YEAR 7 2012	YEAR 8 2013	YEAR 9 2014	YEAR 10 2015			
BUSINESS LICENSE FEE REVENUE															
RESIDENTIAL															
RURAL LIVING			NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA			
VERY-LOW-DENSITY RESIDENTIAL			NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA			
LOW-DENSITY RESIDENTIAL			NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA			
LOW-MEDIUM-DENSITY RESIDENTIAL			NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA			
MEDIUM-DENSITY RESIDENTIAL			NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA			
HIGH DENSITY RESIDENTIAL			NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA			
TOTAL RESIDENTIAL			NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA			
NON-RESIDENTIAL															
RETAIL			\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$24	\$24	\$24			
INDUSTRIAL			\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0			
OTHER NON-RESIDENTIAL			\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0			
TOTAL NON-RESIDENTIAL			\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$24	\$24	\$24			
TOTAL, BUSINESS LICENSE FEE REVENUE			\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$24	\$24	\$24			
FRANCHISE FEE REVENUE															
RESIDENTIAL FRANCHISE FEES			\$0.000	\$0.000	\$0.000	\$0.000	\$0.000	\$0.000	\$0.000	\$0.000	\$0.000	\$0.000			
NON-RESIDENTIAL FRANCHISE FEES			\$0.000	\$0.000	\$0.000	\$0.000	\$0.000	\$0.000	\$0.000	\$4.959	\$4.959	\$4.959			
TOTAL, FRANCHISE FEE REVENUE			\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$5	\$5	\$5			
TRANSIENT OCCUPANCY TAX REVENUE															
TOTAL, TRANSIENT OCCUPANCY TAX REVENUE			\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0			

SHADED CELLS ARE VARIABLE ASSUMPTIONS OR INPUTS UNIQUE TO THE PROJECT.

**TABLE 5
CITY OF REDLANDS : MODEL
OTHER REVENUE AND REVENUE SUMMARY
FISCAL IMPACT ANALYSIS**

OTHER GENERAL REVENUES (PER CAPITA METHOD) /1		INCOME FROM INVESTMENTS	
OTHER TAXES /2	\$10.86	EFFECTIVE INTEREST	2.50% OTHER
OTHER REVENUES	\$6.96		
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT	NA		
LIBRARY	NA		
POLICE DEPARTMENT	NA		
POLICE - ANIMAL CONTROL	NA		
POLICE - RECREATION	NA		
POLICE - SENIOR SERVICES	NA		
FIRE	NA		
PUBLIC WORKS	NA		
SUBTOTAL, OTHER REVENUES PER CAPITA:	\$17.83		

1. See Appendix for calculation of per capita multipliers. For items without values, a net cost technique is being employed.
2. Other Taxes includes Public Safety Sales Tax.

FISCAL YEAR	(\$s x1,000)	end of:	YEAR 1 2006	YEAR 2 2007	YEAR 3 2008	YEAR 4 2009	YEAR 5 2010	YEAR 6 2011	YEAR 7 2012	YEAR 8 2013	YEAR 9 2014	YEAR 10 2015
PER CAPITA REVENUES												
OTHER TAXES												
RESIDENTIAL			\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
NON-RESIDENTIAL			\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
TOTAL, OTHER TAXES			\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
OTHER REVENUES												
RESIDENTIAL			\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
NON-RESIDENTIAL			\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
TOTAL, OTHER LICENSES, PERMITS & FINES			\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT												
RESIDENTIAL			\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
NON-RESIDENTIAL			\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
TOTAL, STATE REVENUES			\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
LIBRARY												
RESIDENTIAL			\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
NON-RESIDENTIAL			\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
TOTAL, FEDERAL REVENUES			\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
POLICE DEPARTMENT												
RESIDENTIAL			\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
NON-RESIDENTIAL			\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
TOTAL, CITY ATTORNEY			\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
POLICE - ANIMAL CONTROL												
RESIDENTIAL			\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
NON-RESIDENTIAL			\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
TOTAL, ENGINEERING SERVICES			\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
POLICE - RECREATION												
RESIDENTIAL			\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
NON-RESIDENTIAL			\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
TOTAL, FIRE DEPARTMENT			\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
POLICE - SENIOR SERVICES												
RESIDENTIAL			\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
NON-RESIDENTIAL			\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
TOTAL, JOSLYN CENTER			\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
FIRE												
RESIDENTIAL			\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
NON-RESIDENTIAL			\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
TOTAL, LIBRARY			\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
PUBLIC WORKS												
RESIDENTIAL			\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
NON-RESIDENTIAL			\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
TOTAL, PARKS			\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
TOTAL RESIDENTIAL PER CAPITA REVENUES			\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
TOTAL NON-RESIDENTIAL PER CAPITA REVENUES			\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
TOTAL PER CAPITA REVENUES			\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
TOTAL RESIDENTIAL CASE STUDY REVENUES			\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
TOTAL NON-RESIDENTIAL CASE STUDY REVENUES			\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$449	\$449	\$449
TOTAL CASE STUDY REVENUES			\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$449	\$449	\$449
RESIDENTIAL REV AVAILABLE FOR INV. INCOME			\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
NON-RESIDENTIAL REV AVAILABLE FOR INV. INCOME			\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$449	\$449	\$449
TOTAL REVENUES AVAILABLE FOR INVESTMENT INCOME			\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$449	\$449	\$449
RESIDENTIAL INVESTMENT INCOME			\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
NON-RESIDENTIAL INVESTMENT INCOME			\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$11	\$11	\$11
TOTAL INVESTMENT INCOME			\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$11	\$11	\$11

SHADED CELLS ARE VARIABLE ASSUMPTIONS OR INPUTS UNIQUE TO THE PROJECT.

TABLE 6
CITY OF REDLANDS : MODEL
POLICE DEPARTMENT, FIRE DEPARTMENT, PUBLIC WORKS & PER CAPITA COSTS
FISCAL IMPACT ANALYSIS

POLICE DEPARTMENT COSTS	
RESIDENTIAL CALLS	16,562 CITY
COST PER DWELLING UNIT	\$295
NON-RESIDENTIAL RETAIL CALLS	8,987
COST PER BUILDING SQUARE FOOT	\$0.47
NON-RESIDENTIAL INDUSTRIAL CALLS	344
COST PER BUILDING SQUARE FOOT	\$0.02
OTHER NON-RESIDENTIAL CALLS	7,948
COST PER BUILDING SQUARE FOOT	\$0.42
MISCELLANEOUS CALLS /2	17,828
TOTAL CALLS	51,469

1. Based on Net Cost and number of calls to residential or non-residential properties.
 2. Based on conversations with the Police Chief, these incidences are not related to residences or businesses in the City.

EXISTING DWELLING UNITS	25,884 CITY
EXISTING NON-RESIDENTIAL SQUARE FOOTAGE	8,824,690

RESIDENTIAL FIRE DEPARTMENT COSTS (1)	
RESIDENTIAL CALLS	3,579 CITY
COST PER DWELLING UNIT	\$168
NON-RESIDENTIAL RETAIL CALLS	446
COST PER BUILDING SQUARE FOOT	\$0.66
NON-RESIDENTIAL INDUSTRIAL CALLS	155
COST PER BUILDING SQUARE FOOT	\$0.02
OTHER NON-RESIDENTIAL CALLS	1,459
COST PER BUILDING SQUARE FOOT	\$0.20
MISCELLANEOUS CALLS /2	1,688
TOTAL CALLS	7,627

1. Based on Net Cost and number of calls to residential or non-residential properties.
 2. Based on information from Fire Chief, these incidences are not related to residences or businesses in the City.

PUBLIC INFRASTRUCTURE REQUIREMENTS /1	
ROADS (LANE MILES)	1.7
TRAFFIC INTERSECTIONS REQUIRING SIGNALS	5.0
AGGREGATE LANDSCAPING (ACRES)	0.0
PARK ADREAGE (GROSS)	0.0
STREET LIGHTS	20.0
OPEN SPACE (ACRES)	0.0
TRAILS (LINEAL MILE)	0.0
STORM DRAINS (MILES)	0.4

1. Infrastructure should exclude privately maintained facilities.

PUBLIC WORKS MAINTENANCE COSTS	
PAVEMENT MAINTENANCE PER LANE MILE /1	\$5,000 CITY
STREET SWEEPING PER CURB MILE - ALL STREETS /1	\$0
TRAFFIC SIGNAL OPERATIONS & MAINTENANCE PER INTERSECTION /1	\$2,580
LANDSCAPE MAINTENANCE PER ACRE /1	\$12,500
PARK MAINTENANCE PER ACRE /1	\$7,000
STREET LIGHT MAINTENANCE COST PER LIGHT /1	\$125
OPEN SPACE MAINTENANCE PER ACRE /2	\$125
TRAIL MAINTENANCE PER LINEAL MILE /2	\$500
STORM DRAIN MAINTENANCE PER MILE /2	\$750

1. Based on consultations with the City of Redlands Public Works Department.
 2. Based on consultant's experience.

CITY GENERAL GOVERNMENT COSTS*	
CITY COUNCIL	\$174,090
CITY CLERK	\$265,209
CITY MANAGER	\$314,819
FINANCE	\$805,155
CITY TREASURER	\$2,875,064
CITY ATTORNEY	\$1,159,167
TOTAL CITY GENERAL GOVERNMENT COSTS	\$5,414,234

*Costs have been reduced to reflect department specific revenues.

CITY GENERAL GOVERNMENT COSTS CONTINUED	
TOTAL CITY OPERATING BUDGET*	#####
*Excludes Debt Service, Utilities and Capital Improvements.	
OVERHEAD AS A % OF OPERATING BUDGET	11.04%
OVERHEAD AS A % OF DIRECT COSTS	12.41%
OVERHEAD BY DEFINITION CAUSING NO COST	0.00%
OVERHEAD AS % OF DIRECT, AVERAGE	6.20%

OTHER NET COSTS (PER CAPITA METHOD) /1	
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT	\$28.49
LIBRARY	\$28.43

1. See Appendix for calculation of per capita multipliers.

FISCAL YEAR	(\$ x1,000)	end of:	YEAR 1	YEAR 2	YEAR 3	YEAR 4	YEAR 5	YEAR 6	YEAR 7	YEAR 8	YEAR 9	YEAR 10
			2008	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015
CITY DIRECT COSTS												
POLICE DEPARTMENT COSTS												
RESIDENTIAL	\$0.000	\$0.000	\$0.000	\$0.000	\$0.000	\$0.000	\$0.000	\$0.000	\$0.000	\$0.000	\$0.000	\$0.000
NON-RESIDENTIAL RETAIL	\$0.000	\$0.000	\$0.000	\$0.000	\$0.000	\$0.000	\$0.000	\$0.000	\$0.000	\$120.952	\$120.952	\$120.952
NON-RESIDENTIAL INDUSTRIAL	\$0.000	\$0.000	\$0.000	\$0.000	\$0.000	\$0.000	\$0.000	\$0.000	\$0.000	\$0.000	\$0.000	\$0.000
OTHER NON-RESIDENTIAL	\$0.000	\$0.000	\$0.000	\$0.000	\$0.000	\$0.000	\$0.000	\$0.000	\$0.000	\$0.000	\$0.000	\$0.000
TOTAL POLICE DEPARTMENT COSTS	\$0.000	\$0.000	\$0.000	\$0.000	\$0.000	\$0.000	\$0.000	\$0.000	\$0.000	\$120.952	\$120.952	\$120.952
FIRE DEPARTMENT COSTS												
RESIDENTIAL	\$0.000	\$0.000	\$0.000	\$0.000	\$0.000	\$0.000	\$0.000	\$0.000	\$0.000	\$0.000	\$0.000	\$0.000
NON-RESIDENTIAL RETAIL	\$0.000	\$0.000	\$0.000	\$0.000	\$0.000	\$0.000	\$0.000	\$0.000	\$0.000	\$15.638	\$15.638	\$15.638
NON-RESIDENTIAL INDUSTRIAL	\$0.000	\$0.000	\$0.000	\$0.000	\$0.000	\$0.000	\$0.000	\$0.000	\$0.000	\$0.000	\$0.000	\$0.000
OTHER NON-RESIDENTIAL	\$0.000	\$0.000	\$0.000	\$0.000	\$0.000	\$0.000	\$0.000	\$0.000	\$0.000	\$0.000	\$0.000	\$0.000
TOTAL FIRE DEPARTMENT COSTS	\$0.000	\$0.000	\$0.000	\$0.000	\$0.000	\$0.000	\$0.000	\$0.000	\$0.000	\$15.638	\$15.638	\$15.638
PUBLIC WORKS COSTS												
PAVEMENT MAINTENANCE	\$0.000	\$0.000	\$0.000	\$0.000	\$0.000	\$0.000	\$0.000	\$0.000	\$0.000	\$8.250	\$8.250	\$8.250
STREET SWEEPING	\$0.000	\$0.000	\$0.000	\$0.000	\$0.000	\$0.000	\$0.000	\$0.000	\$0.000	\$0.014	\$0.014	\$0.014
TRAFFIC SIGNAL OPERATION	\$0.000	\$0.000	\$0.000	\$0.000	\$0.000	\$0.000	\$0.000	\$0.000	\$0.000	\$27.800	\$27.800	\$27.800
LANDSCAPE MAINTENANCE	\$0.000	\$0.000	\$0.000	\$0.000	\$0.000	\$0.000	\$0.000	\$0.000	\$0.000	\$0.000	\$0.000	\$0.000
PARK MAINTENANCE	\$0.000	\$0.000	\$0.000	\$0.000	\$0.000	\$0.000	\$0.000	\$0.000	\$0.000	\$0.000	\$0.000	\$0.000
STREET LIGHT MAINTENANCE	\$0.000	\$0.000	\$0.000	\$0.000	\$0.000	\$0.000	\$0.000	\$0.000	\$0.000	\$2.500	\$2.500	\$2.500
OPEN SPACE MAINTENANCE	\$0.000	\$0.000	\$0.000	\$0.000	\$0.000	\$0.000	\$0.000	\$0.000	\$0.000	\$0.000	\$0.000	\$0.000
TRAIL MAINTENANCE	\$0.000	\$0.000	\$0.000	\$0.000	\$0.000	\$0.000	\$0.000	\$0.000	\$0.000	\$0.000	\$0.000	\$0.000
STORM DRAIN MAINTENANCE	\$0.000	\$0.000	\$0.000	\$0.000	\$0.000	\$0.000	\$0.000	\$0.000	\$0.000	\$0.315	\$0.315	\$0.315
TOTAL PUBLIC WORKS COSTS	\$0.000	\$0.000	\$0.000	\$0.000	\$0.000	\$0.000	\$0.000	\$0.000	\$0.000	\$38.879	\$38.879	\$38.879
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT												
RESIDENTIAL	\$0.000	\$0.000	\$0.000	\$0.000	\$0.000	\$0.000	\$0.000	\$0.000	\$0.000	\$0.000	\$0.000	\$0.000
NON-RESIDENTIAL	\$0.000	\$0.000	\$0.000	\$0.000	\$0.000	\$0.000	\$0.000	\$0.000	\$0.000	\$0.000	\$0.000	\$0.000
TOTAL COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT	\$0.000	\$0.000	\$0.000	\$0.000	\$0.000	\$0.000	\$0.000	\$0.000	\$0.000	\$0.000	\$0.000	\$0.000
LIBRARY												
RESIDENTIAL	\$0.000	\$0.000	\$0.000	\$0.000	\$0.000	\$0.000	\$0.000	\$0.000	\$0.000	\$0.000	\$0.000	\$0.000
NON-RESIDENTIAL	\$0.000	\$0.000	\$0.000	\$0.000	\$0.000	\$0.000	\$0.000	\$0.000	\$0.000	\$0.000	\$0.000	\$0.000
TOTAL LIBRARY	\$0.000	\$0.000	\$0.000	\$0.000	\$0.000	\$0.000	\$0.000	\$0.000	\$0.000	\$0.000	\$0.000	\$0.000
CITY DIRECT COSTS												
RESIDENTIAL	\$0.000	\$0.000	\$0.000	\$0.000	\$0.000	\$0.000	\$0.000	\$0.000	\$0.000	\$0.000	\$0.000	\$0.000
NON-RESIDENTIAL	\$0.000	\$0.000	\$0.000	\$0.000	\$0.000	\$0.000	\$0.000	\$0.000	\$0.000	\$38.879	\$38.879	\$38.879
TOTAL CITY DIRECT COSTS	\$0.000	\$0.000	\$0.000	\$0.000	\$0.000	\$0.000	\$0.000	\$0.000	\$0.000	\$38.879	\$38.879	\$38.879
CITY GENERAL GOVERNMENT COSTS												
RESIDENTIAL	\$0.000	\$0.000	\$0.000	\$0.000	\$0.000	\$0.000	\$0.000	\$0.000	\$0.000	\$0.000	\$0.000	\$0.000
NON-RESIDENTIAL	\$0.000	\$0.000	\$0.000	\$0.000	\$0.000	\$0.000	\$0.000	\$0.000	\$0.000	\$2.412	\$2.412	\$2.412
TOTAL CITY GENERAL GOVERNMENT COSTS	\$0.000	\$0.000	\$0.000	\$0.000	\$0.000	\$0.000	\$0.000	\$0.000	\$0.000	\$2.412	\$2.412	\$2.412

SHADED CELLS ARE VARIABLE ASSUMPTIONS OR INPUTS UNIQUE TO THE PROJECT.

**TABLE 7
CITY OF REDLANDS : MODEL
FISCAL IMPACT ANALYSIS DETAILED SUMMARY**

FISCAL YEAR	(\$x1,000)	end of:	YEAR 1 2006	YEAR 2 2007	YEAR 3 2008	YEAR 4 2009	YEAR 5 2010	YEAR 6 2011	YEAR 7 2012	YEAR 8 2013	YEAR 9 2014	YEAR 10 2015	% OF TOTAL
ONGOING REVENUES													
SECURED PROPERTY TAXES													
RESIDENTIAL			\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	0.00%
NON-RESIDENTIAL			\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$132	\$132	\$132	28.76%
UNSECURED PROPERTY TAXES													
RESIDENTIAL			\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	0.00%
NON-RESIDENTIAL			\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$13	\$13	\$13	2.88%
TRANSFER PROPERTY TAXES													
RESIDENTIAL			\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	0.00%
NON-RESIDENTIAL			\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$2	\$2	\$2	0.38%
SALES TAXES													
RESIDENTIAL			\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	0.00%
NON-RESIDENTIAL			\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$272	\$272	\$272	59.14%
MEASURE T SALES TAXES													
RESIDENTIAL			\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	0.00%
NON-RESIDENTIAL			\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	0.00%
LOCAL TRANSPORTATION SALES TAXES													
RESIDENTIAL			\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	0.00%
NON-RESIDENTIAL			\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	0.00%
TRANSIENT OCCUPANCY TAX													
RESIDENTIAL			\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	0.00%
NON-RESIDENTIAL			\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	0.00%
FRANCHISE FEE REVENUES													
RESIDENTIAL			\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	0.00%
NON-RESIDENTIAL			\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$5	\$5	\$5	1.08%
BUSINESS LICENSE REVENUES													
RESIDENTIAL			NA	0.00%									
NON-RESIDENTIAL			\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$24	\$24	\$24	5.32%
OTHER TAXES													
RESIDENTIAL			\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	0.00%
NON-RESIDENTIAL			\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	0.00%
OTHER REVENUES													
RESIDENTIAL			\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	0.00%
NON-RESIDENTIAL			\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	0.00%
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT													
RESIDENTIAL			\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	0.00%
NON-RESIDENTIAL			\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	0.00%
LIBRARY													
RESIDENTIAL			\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	0.00%
NON-RESIDENTIAL			\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	0.00%
POLICE DEPARTMENT													
RESIDENTIAL			\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	0.00%
NON-RESIDENTIAL			\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	0.00%
POLICE - ANIMAL CONTROL													
RESIDENTIAL			\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	0.00%
NON-RESIDENTIAL			\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	0.00%
POLICE - RECREATION													
RESIDENTIAL			\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	0.00%
NON-RESIDENTIAL			\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	0.00%
POLICE - SENIOR SERVICES													
RESIDENTIAL			\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	0.00%
NON-RESIDENTIAL			\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	0.00%
FIRE													
RESIDENTIAL			\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	0.00%
NON-RESIDENTIAL			\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	0.00%
PUBLIC WORKS													
RESIDENTIAL			\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	0.00%
NON-RESIDENTIAL			\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	0.00%
INVESTMENT INCOME REVENUES													
RESIDENTIAL			\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	0.00%
NON-RESIDENTIAL			\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$11	\$11	\$11	2.44%
TOTAL RESIDENTIAL REVENUES			\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	0.00%
TOTAL NON-RESIDENTIAL REVENUES			\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$480	\$480	\$480	100.00%
TOTAL ON-GOING REVENUES			\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$480	\$480	\$480	
ONGOING COSTS													
POLICE DEPARTMENT COSTS													
RESIDENTIAL			\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	0.00%
NON-RESIDENTIAL			\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$121	\$121	\$121	67.92%
FIRE DEPARTMENT COSTS													
RESIDENTIAL			\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	0.00%
NON-RESIDENTIAL			\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$16	\$16	\$16	8.89%
PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT COST													
RESIDENTIAL			\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	0.00%
NON-RESIDENTIAL			\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$39	\$39	\$39	21.83%
GENERAL GOVERNMENT COSTS													
RESIDENTIAL			\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	0.00%
NON-RESIDENTIAL			\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$2	\$2	\$2	1.35%
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT COSTS													
RESIDENTIAL			\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	0.00%
NON-RESIDENTIAL			\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	0.00%
LIBRARY COSTS													
RESIDENTIAL			\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	0.00%
NON-RESIDENTIAL			\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	0.00%
TOTAL RESIDENTIAL COSTS			\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	0.00%
TOTAL NON-RESIDENTIAL COSTS			\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$178	\$178	\$178	100.00%
TOTAL ON-GOING COSTS			\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$178	\$178	\$178	
ANNUAL RESIDENTIAL ONGOING SURPLUS/(DEFICIT)			\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	
ANNUAL NON-RESIDENTIAL ONGOING SURPLUS/(DEFICIT)			\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$282	\$282	\$282	
TOTAL ANNUAL ONGOING SURPLUS/(DEFICIT)			\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$282	\$282	\$282	
ANNUAL RESIDENTIAL REVENUE/COST RATIO			0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	
ANNUAL NON-RESIDENTIAL REVENUE/COST RATIO			0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	2.58	2.58	2.58	
TOTAL ANNUAL REVENUE/COST RATIO			0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	2.58	2.58	2.58	

TABLE 8b
LAND USE SUMMARY:
FISCAL IMPACT ANALYSIS SUMMARY (Commercial Only)

FISCAL YEAR	(\$s x1,000)	end of:	YEAR 1 2006	YEAR 2 2007	YEAR 3 2008	YEAR 4 2009	YEAR 5 2010	YEAR 6 2011	YEAR 7 2012	YEAR 8 2013	YEAR 9 2014	YEAR 10 2015
ONGOING REVENUES												
TOTAL NON-RESIDENTIAL REVENUES			\$0.0000	\$0.0000	\$0.0000	\$0.0000	\$0.0000	\$0.0000	\$0.0000	\$459.9361	\$459.9361	\$459.9361
ONGOING COSTS												
TOTAL NON-RESIDENTIAL COSTS			\$0.0000	\$0.0000	\$0.0000	\$0.0000	\$0.0000	\$0.0000	\$0.0000	\$178.0800	\$178.0800	\$178.0800
ANNUAL NON-RESIDENTIAL ONGOING SURPLUS/(DEFICIT)			\$0.0000	\$0.0000	\$0.0000	\$0.0000	\$0.0000	\$0.0000	\$0.0000	\$281.8561	\$281.8561	\$281.8561
ANNUAL NON-RESIDENTIAL REVENUE/COST RATIO			0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	2.58	2.58	2.58

**TABLE 8c
CITY OF REDLANDS : MODEL
FISCAL IMPACT ANALYSIS SUMMARY (MIXED)**

FISCAL YEAR	(\$s x1,000)	end of:	YEAR 1 2006	YEAR 2 2007	YEAR 3 2008	YEAR 4 2009	YEAR 5 2010	YEAR 6 2011	YEAR 7 2012	YEAR 8 2013	YEAR 9 2014	YEAR 10 2015	% OF TOTAL
ONGOING REVENUES													
TOTAL RESIDENTIAL REVENUES			\$0.0000	\$0.0000	\$0.0000	\$0.0000	\$0.0000	\$0.0000	\$0.0000	\$0.0000	\$0.0000	\$0.0000	0.00%
TOTAL NON-RESIDENTIAL REVENUES			\$0.0000	\$0.0000	\$0.0000	\$0.0000	\$0.0000	\$0.0000	\$0.0000	\$459.9361	\$459.9361	\$459.9361	100.00%
TOTAL ON-GOING REVENUES			\$0.0000	\$0.0000	\$0.0000	\$0.0000	\$0.0000	\$0.0000	\$0.0000	\$459.9361	\$459.9361	\$459.9361	
ONGOING COSTS													
TOTAL RESIDENTIAL COSTS			\$0.0000	\$0.0000	\$0.0000	\$0.0000	\$0.0000	\$0.0000	\$0.0000	\$0.0000	\$0.0000	\$0.0000	0.00%
TOTAL NON-RESIDENTIAL COSTS			\$0.0000	\$0.0000	\$0.0000	\$0.0000	\$0.0000	\$0.0000	\$0.0000	\$178.0800	\$178.0800	\$178.0800	100.00%
TOTAL ON-GOING COSTS			\$0.0000	\$0.0000	\$0.0000	\$0.0000	\$0.0000	\$0.0000	\$0.0000	\$178.0800	\$178.0800	\$178.0800	
ANNUAL RESIDENTIAL ONGOING SURPLUS/(DEFICIT)													
ANNUAL RESIDENTIAL ONGOING SURPLUS/(DEFICIT)			\$0.0000	\$0.0000	\$0.0000	\$0.0000	\$0.0000	\$0.0000	\$0.0000	\$0.0000	\$0.0000	\$0.0000	
ANNUAL NON-RESIDENTIAL ONGOING SURPLUS/(DEFICIT)			\$0.0000	\$0.0000	\$0.0000	\$0.0000	\$0.0000	\$0.0000	\$0.0000	\$281.8561	\$281.8561	\$281.8561	
TOTAL ANNUAL ONGOING SURPLUS/(DEFICIT)			\$0.0000	\$0.0000	\$0.0000	\$0.0000	\$0.0000	\$0.0000	\$0.0000	\$281.8561	\$281.8561	\$281.8561	
ANNUAL RESIDENTIAL REVENUE/COST RATIO													
ANNUAL RESIDENTIAL REVENUE/COST RATIO			0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	
ANNUAL NON-RESIDENTIAL REVENUE/COST RATIO			0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	2.58	2.58	2.58	
TOTAL ANNUAL REVENUE/COST RATIO			0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	2.58	2.58	2.58	

OFF-SITE IMPROVEMENTS

Item	Quantity	Unit	Unit Cost	Total
Tennessee St				
a) Demo of existing roadway	5500	SY	\$12.00	\$66,000
b) Earthwork Cut / Fill / Grading and Compaction	30000	CY	\$6.50	\$195,000
c) Sub base and paving "Wear / " Binder / " S.B.	4500	SY	\$42.40	\$190,800
d) Markings striping and signs	4000	LF	\$0.52	\$2,080
e) Curbs and Gutters	1400	LF	\$15.71	\$21,994
f) Off site water lines	1300	LF	\$36.20	\$47,060
g) Off site San. Sewer lines	1300	LF	\$33.20	\$43,160
h) Misc highway items not listed above		Lump Sum		\$0
Creek Relocation/wetlands creation		Lump Sum		\$0
Off-Site Fences		SF		\$0
Entrance Drive Improvements at parking lot		SY		\$0
Storm Drain (36" RCP)	310	LF	\$70.57	\$21,877
Curb Inlets	4	Each	\$7,700.00	\$30,800
Other Off Site Reclaimed Water (12" Pvc)	1300	LF	\$70.00	\$91,000
Other-Offsite improvements (Fire Hydrants)	4	Each	\$1,341.00	\$5,364
Other-Offsite improvements (Street lights)	4	Each	\$2,500.00	\$10,000
Other-Offsite improvements (Art in Public Places)	1	Lump Sum	\$250,000.00	\$250,000
Sub-total				\$975,135

Traffic signal 4 way	1	Qty signals	\$350,000.00	\$350,000
Traffic signal - 3-way		Qty signals		\$0
Other-Traffic signal Modification		Lump Sum		\$0
Sub-total				\$350,000

San Bernardino				
a) Demo of existing roadway	7000	SY	\$12.00	\$84,000
b) Earthwork Cut / Fill / Grading and Compaction	40000	CY	\$6.50	\$260,000
c) Sub base and paving "Wear / " Binder / " S.B.	12500	SY	\$42.40	\$530,000
d) Markings striping and signs	5500	lot	\$0.52	\$2,860
e) Curbs and Gutters	1100	LF	\$15.71	\$17,281
f) Off site water lines	3000	LF	\$36.20	\$108,600
g) Off site San. Sewer lines		LF		\$0
h) Misc highway items not listed above		lot		\$0
Creek Relocation/wetlands creation		Lump Sum		\$0
Off-Site Fences		SF		\$0
Entrance Drive Improvements at parking lot		SY		\$0
Storm Drain (42" RCP)	370	LF	\$81.49	\$30,151
Storm Drain (48" RCP)	1300	LF	\$94.71	\$123,123
Curb Inlets	5	Each	\$7,700.00	\$38,500
Off Site Reclaimed Water (12" Pvc)	2500	LF	\$70.00	\$175,000
Overhead Transmision poles	14	Each	\$10,000.00	\$140,000
Other-Offsite improvements (Fire Hydrants)	6	Each	\$1,341.00	\$8,046
Other-Offsite improvements (Street lights)	6	Each	\$3,500.00	\$21,000
Other				\$0
Sub-total				\$1,538,561

Traffic signal 4 way	2	Qty signals	\$250,000.00	\$500,000
Traffic signal - 3-way		Qty signals		\$0
Other-Traffic signal Modification		Lump Sum		\$0
Sub-total				\$500,000

New York Ave/Karon

a) Demo of existing roadway		SY		\$0
b) Earthwork Cut / Fill / Grading and Compaction	23000	CY	\$6.50	\$149,500
c) Sub base and paving _____" Wear / _____" Binder / _____" S.B.	6100	SY	\$42.40	\$258,640
d) Markings striping and signs		lot		\$0
e) Curbs and Gutters	3300	LF	\$15.71	\$51,843
Traffic signal 4 way		Qty signals		\$0
Traffic signal - 3-way		Qty signals		\$0
Other-Traffic signal Modification		Lump Sum		\$0
Sub-total				\$0

Pennsylvania

a) Demo of existing roadway		SY		\$0
b) Earthwork Cut / Fill / Grading and Compaction	75000	CY	\$4.57	\$342,750
c) Sub base and paving _____" Wear / _____" Binder / _____" S.B.	7000	SY	\$42.40	\$296,800
d) Markings striping and signs		lot		\$0
e) Curbs and Gutters	1250	LF	\$15.71	\$19,638
f) Off site water lines	1250	LF	\$36.20	\$45,250
g) Off site San. Sewer lines		LF		\$0
h) Misc highway items not listed above		lot		\$0
Creek Relocation/wetlands creation		Lump Sum		\$0
Off-Site Fences		SF		\$0
Entrance Drive Improvements at parking lot		SY		\$0
Storm Drain (24" RCP)	200	LF	\$110.00	\$22,000
Curb Inlets	2	Each	\$7,700.00	\$15,400
Other-Offsite improvements (Fire Hydrants)	3	Each	\$1,341.00	\$4,023
Other-Offsite improvements (Street lights)	3	Each	\$2,500.00	\$7,500
Other-Offsite improvements		Lump Sum		\$0
Sub-total				\$753,361

Traffic signal 4 way		Qty signals		\$0
Traffic signal - 3-way		Qty signals		\$0
Other-Traffic signal Modification		Lump Sum		\$0
Sub-total				\$0

\$4,856,191