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# TECHNICAL APPENDIX FOR DEVELOPMENT FEASIBILITY AND VALUE CAPTURE ANALYSIS 

## PURPOSE

This appendix supplements the report by Hausrath Economics Group released in August 2022 entitled:
"Economic Analysis for DOSP Zoning Incentive Program". The appendix does the following.

- Summarizes and highlights key findings and considerations regarding development feasibility and the potential capture of real estate value for community benefits.
- Provides more detail on the methodology and assumptions for assessing development feasibility, the real estate value created by higher intensity development, and potential value capture for community benefits.
- Presents the real estate pro forma analyses and related tables for representative residential and office development projects covering the range of combinations of base zoning and higher intensity zoning proposed throughout the DOSP area under the Zoning Incentive Program (ZIP).


## ORGANIZATION

The appendix is organized into five sections.
I. Highlights of key findings and considerations regarding development feasibility and the potential capture of real estate value for community benefits.
II. Explanation of the methodology and key components of the analysis.
III. Overview of appendix material for representative development prototypes presented in Section IV and Section V.
IV. Documentation for the analysis of downtown Residential Development Projects: tables, map of benefit areas, and representative real estate pro formas.
V. Documentation for the analysis of downtown Office Development Projects: tables, map of benefit areas, and representative real estate pro formas.

## SECTION I

## KEY FINDINGS AND CONSIDERATIONS REGRADING DEVELOPMENT FEASIBILITY AND VALUE CAPTURE FOR COMMUNITY BENEFITS

The following key findings from the economic analysis of the DOSP Zoning Incentive Program (ZIP) address development feasibility in downtown Oakland, what these development economics mean for higher-intensity development desired downtown, and how they serve as the foundation for a value capture program for community benefits under the ZIP. The findings have implications for structuring the value capture program and for the success of the ZIP program over time.

- Finding: Higher-intensity development is not feasible under current economic conditions. Thus, higher-intensity development under the ZIP and the potential capture of additional value for community benefits will only occur in the FUTURE when development conditions improve and projects become feasible. The timing for the return of feasibility is uncertain.

The real estate pro forma analyses identify that higher-intensity residential and office development in downtown Oakland are not feasible under current real estate market and development cost conditions. These findings are consistent with a slowing of real estate development activity. Construction costs are high and have increased substantially, while rents declined and vacancies increased during and following the COVID-19 Pandemic. The timing for economic recovery is uncertain. Furthermore, it is not certain how pandemic-related adaptations in workplace and residence locations will play out over the long term in the regional real estate market.

Finding that developments are not now feasible, this analysis proceeded to identify conditions when projects could become feasible in the future as real estate economics improve and the gap between costs and revenues closes. The analysis identifies both the likely thresholds for feasibility and the potential increases in value from higher-intensity development under the ZIP once feasibility is restored. However, the timing for return to feasibility remains uncertain.

For higher-intensity residential and office development projects, the analysis identifies a feasibility threshold of approximately +20 percent over current conditions. For ease of analysis, the pro forma analysis models feasibility by testing percentage increases in rents/revenues until feasibility is reached. This is a proxy for a more complex set of changes in various development revenue and cost factors that would support feasibility over time. The larger the threshold for feasibility, the longer the time it could take for project feasibility to be reached.

- Finding: The success of the ZIP in facilitating higher-intensity development and providing community benefits depends on the feasibility of higher-intensity development, the timing for return of feasibility, and the strength of the real estate market. The specifics of the value capture program itself could affect the timing for return of feasibility and even the density of development built, as well as the overall success of the ZIP program over time.

Reaching project feasibility for downtown development projects requires closing the gap between development costs and revenues. The timing and the nature of the value capture program have both positive and negative implications for the ability to close this gap.

- Allowing additional density under the ZIP can provide an incentive for higher-intensity development downtown.
- However, additional development costs to achieve that density can offset some of that incentive.
- Within the current market context, costs of community benefits under the value capture program could increase the time needed to achieve project feasibility. The costs also could lead to development at lower density than would otherwise occur.
- Within the current market context, amounts of value capture for community benefits should be at levels that support the return of project feasibility and provide incentives for higher-intensity development.
- The timing for implementation of a value capture program should also be considered. There could be benefits of delaying implementation until real estate market conditions improve and show signs of approaching feasibility.

Differences in the types and extent of upzoning proposed under the ZIP also affect development outcomes, feasibility, and the timing of higher intensity development.

- In many locations, the base zoning supports mid-rise/low-rise development, and the higher-intensity zoning encourages larger high-rise development. The increase in density in these situations requires changes to more costly types of construction, there are higher financing/holding costs for the larger buildings, and their feasibility requires higher rents. Thus, these types of projects typically take longer to reach feasibility and to be built, particularly in locations without existing high-density development nearby. As a result, development feasibility for these upzoning situations is likely to be more sensitive to the costs and timing of a value capture program for community benefits as well as to the broader real estate market context affecting feasibility.
- Other increases in density under the ZIP allow larger, taller high-rises in areas where the base zoning already allows high-rise construction, and allow larger, taller mid-rise development where base zoning supports lower mid-rise or low-rise development. Both situations generally involve smaller changes in density than those described above, and there are fewer changes required in underlying development economics. For these rezoning situations, issues of development feasibility and timing are primarily those of the local and regional real estate market context.
- Finding: For a successful zoning incentive program to provide community benefits, the additional value from higher-intensity development needs to be shared among the developer, the landowner, and the community.

The economic analysis identifies one-third of the additional value from higher-density development as a reasonable "value capture" for community benefits. The intent is to provide
community benefits and retain incentives for developers and landowners to undertake higherintensity development projects. The successful capture of value for community benefits from higher intensity development is only possible with:

- Incentives for developers to gain value from building larger buildings (that are more costly and more risky); and
- Incentives for landowners to gain value from selling their properties for larger developments (without holding on to them to capture perceived higher/speculative values).

The economic analysis estimates "value capture" for community benefits under the ZIP based on the economics of feasible development projects in the future. There is no value to capture until higher-intensity projects are feasible to build in the future. Until development feasibility is restored, the assumed one-third share of additional value from higher density development could be aggressive when/where market conditions remain weak and feasibility is marginal.

Even in the future with return of stronger real estate market conditions, a more aggressive value capture program could have adverse effects on incentives for building the types of high-density projects desired under the DOSP, resulting in less development than would otherwise be the case. This outcome would have negative implications for the broad range of benefits provided by highintensity development in downtown Oakland that are behind the higher densities in the DOSP. These include benefits for the local community as well as the larger region, including growth of jobs and local business activity, increased housing opportunities, increased tax base providing services and other benefits citywide, greater efficiency of local and regional transportation, and environmental and air quality benefits from the concentration of population and business activity in a high-density urban core at the center of the region.

## SECTION II

## METHODOLOGY AND KEY COMPONENTS OF ANALYSIS TO ASSESS FEASIBILIITY AND ESTIMATE INCREASED VALUE FROM HIGHER-INTENSITY DEVELOPMENT UNDER THE ZIP

This section describes the methodology for the key components of the economic analysis of the ZIP. It provides more detail than covered in the Economic Analysis report.

## Development of pro forma financial feasibility models and identification of representative development prototypes

The economic analysis developed pro forma financial feasibility models and representative development prototypes for each of the proposed combinations of base zoning and maximum intensity zoning.

- Prototype developments were defined spatially considering physical site characteristics and market factors appropriate in the DOSP and its subareas, along with proposed densities of development.
- Cost and economic variables were quantified specific to development types, maximum development intensities, and locations within the DOSP subareas, including costs, rents, and financial parameters. Sources included data from major Oakland development projects, analysis from the earlier EPS study ${ }^{1}$, consultation with a cost estimator for a large construction contractor focused on the costs of higher intensity development, and rent data for downtown Oakland development projects. ${ }^{2}$
- Pro forma financial feasibility models and development prototypes were created for residential developments and for office developments in the DOSP subareas.


## Analysis to Estimate Increased Real Estate Value from Higher-Intensity Development

Figure A-1 outlines the step-by-step methodology for this analysis.

- First, the value created by development at the base zoning is calculated.
- Second, the value created by development at the maximum intensity zoning is calculated.

[^0]
## Figure A-1:

## Methodology for Estimating Increased Real Estate Value from Higher-Intensity Development under the ZIP

A. Use pro forma feasibility models with Oakland costs and revenues to identify:

- Value created by development at Base Zoning
- Value created by development at Maximum Intensity Zoning
B. Assess feasibility
- If not now feasible, adjust to identify feasible projects
C. Calculate increase in value from higher intensity development as difference between Base Zoning and Maximum Intensity Zoning cases (assuming feasible projects)
- \$ per additional building sq. ft.
- \$ per additional dwelling unit
D. Identify value capture for community benefits as share of additional real estate value that could be contributed while retaining incentives for developers and landowners to build at higher intensity
E. Do large number of analyses due to large number of zoning combinations proposed
F. Generalize results to facilitate implementation
- Each of the above results is evaluated to assess feasibility based on development costs and revenues at the time of analysis. ${ }^{3}$ If the development is not feasible with current revenues and costs, the analysis iterates to identify a feasible project and identifies the percentage change in revenues over costs needed for feasibility. The pro forma models assess feasibility by solving for residual land value, a common measure of real estate development feasibility.
- Then, the increase in value from the additional, higher-intensity development is calculated as the difference in the value of development under maximum intensity zoning compared to base zoning, assuming feasibility in both cases.
- The value creation from higher-intensity development is expressed as "dollars per building square foot of added development". For residential development, the results are reported as "dollars per dwelling unit added". In that way, the results expressed per unit of additional development can be applied over a range of actual projects with similar development characteristics but different amounts of additional development.
- The estimate of "value capture" available for community benefits is then identified as one-third of the increase in value from the higher-intensity development. As discussed above, for a successful zoning incentive program to provide community benefits, the additional value from higherintensity development needs to be shared among the developer, the landowner, and the community so as to retain incentives for developers and landowners to build larger projects that are more costly and more risky to develop.

Following the steps outlined above, four pro formas are run for each proposed combination of base zoning and maximum intensity zoning, one set (base and maximum intensity) assuming 2021/2022 revenues and costs and one set (base and maximum intensity) adjusted to reflect feasible projects in the future.

## Results are Generalized for Implementation

The economic analysis described above provides the basis for generalizations as to the amounts of increased real estate value from greater intensity development that could be allocated for community benefits in exchange for approval to build at a higher intensity than otherwise allowed. A location-based approach was used to identify locations where outcomes are relatively similar based on proposed zoning, market factors, and land use/site characteristics. Summary results identified groups of locations that can be combined for implementation. The generalized results reflect the fact that the estimates of value capture for community benefits are approximate and future development outcomes will vary around the values identified for proposed ZIP intensities in different parts of the downtown.
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## SECTION III OVERVIEW OF DOCUMENTATION FOR REAL ESTATE ANALYSIS IN SECTION IV AND SECTION V

The last two sections of this appendix provide documentation for the real estate analyses of residential development projects and office development projects covering the range of base and maximum intensity zoning combinations proposed throughout the DOSP area.

- Section IV provides documentation for the analysis of Residential Development, presenting the real estate pro formas and related data for 10 development cases representative of the 26 combinations of base zoning and maximum-intensity zoning under the ZIP.
- Section V provides documentation for the analysis of Office Development, presenting the real estate pro formas and related data for 10 development cases representative of the 27 combinations of base zoning and maximum-intensity zoning under the ZIP.

Each section includes documentation for the following components of the real estate analysis in the order listed:

- Summary table of estimated value capture for community benefits for all cases with the option of building higher-intensity development under the ZIP, identifying the_Representative Development Cases_with detailed results presented in this appendix.
- Map of community benefit areas identified for use in implementation of the ZIP. Three Benefit Areas or zones are identified for residential development and three Benefit Areas or zones for office/commercial development. The maps also identify the value of community benefits per additional unit of development in each Benefit Area to be required in exchange for the right to build higher-intensity development under the ZIP. These results are based on generalizations of value capture outcomes for all cases as reported in the first table identified above.
- Summaries of the pro forma analyses of project feasibility for the Representative Development Cases under current market conditions and under feasible market conditions in the future. Separate tables are presented for the development cases under base zoning and under maximum intensity zoning.
- Table identifying the development program assumptions for Representative Development Prototypes/Cases.
- Pro formas for_Representative Development Cases assuming feasible projects in the future:
- Pro forma under base zoning
- Pro forma with maximum intensity zoning, showing estimated increase in real estate value under upzoning, and estimated value capture for community benefits.
- Table of key revenue and cost inputs for Representative Development Prototypes/Cases.
- Table of parking assumptions for development projects.


## SECTION IV

## DOCUMENTATION FOR REAL ESTATE ANALYSIS OF RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT

DEVELOPMENT FEASIBILITY AND VALUE CAPTURE ANALYSIS DOSP ZONING INCENTIVE PROGRAM

## LIST OF TABLES AND FIGURES

Appendix Table A-1: DOSP Zoning Incentive Program - Summary of Estimated Value Capture for Community Benefits from Higher-Intensity RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT, by Development Type, Intensity Increase, and Subarea

Figure A-2: Zoning Incentive Program Residential Development Zone / Benefit Areas
Appendix Table A-2.1: Summary Pro Forma Analysis - Current Market Conditions Compared to Feasible Market Conditions - Residential Development Under BASE ZONING

Appendix Table A-2.2: Summary Pro Forma Analysis - Current Market Conditions Compared to Feasible Market Conditions - Residential Development Under UPZONING

Appendix Table A-3: Development Program Assumptions for Representative RESIDENTIAL Development Prototypes / Cases

Detailed Pro Forma Analysis of Representative Residential Development
Appendix Table R.1: Development Case I-1
Appendix Table R.2: Development Case I-6
Appendix Table R.3: Development Case II-1
Appendix Table R.4: Development Case II-3
Appendix Table R.5: Development Case II-5
Appendix Table R.6: Development Case II-9
Appendix Table R.7: Development Case II-10B
Appendix Table R.8: Development Case II-11
Appendix Table R.9: Development Case III-1
Appendix Table R.10: Development Case III-4
Appendix Table A-4: Key Revenue and Cost Inputs for Representative RESIDENTIAL
Development Prototypes / Cases
Appendix Table A-5: Parking Assumptions for Residential Development Cases

APPENDIX TABLE A-1: DOSP Zoning Intensity Program
Summary of Estimated Value Capture for Community Benefits from Higher-Intensity RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT
By Development Type, Intensity Increase, and Subarea
I. Downtown CBD Intensity Areas

| Intensity Type for Residential Development | $\begin{gathered} \text { Development } \\ \text { Case No. } \end{gathered}$ | VALUE CAPTURE for Community Benefits |  | Base Density |  | ZIP <br> Maximum Density |  | Increase in Density | Intensity Subarea(s) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Greater Intensity High-Rise <br> Type I construction | - I-1 | per add’l <br> bldg. SF | $\begin{gathered} \text { per add'l } \\ \text { DU } \end{gathered}$ | SF per DU | DU per acre | $\begin{array}{cc} \text { SF per } & \text { DU per } \\ \text { DU } & \text { acre } \end{array}$ |  | +38\% | Lake Merritt Office Broadway City Center |
|  |  | \$23 | \$23,000 | 90 | 484 | 65 | 670 |  |  |
|  | I-2 | \$23 | \$23,000 | 90 | 484 | 80 | 545 | +13\% | Broadway <br> City Center <br> $14^{\text {th }}$ Street West |
|  | I-3 | \$23 | \$23,000 | 100 | 436 | 90 | 484 | +11\% | City Center <br> $14^{\text {th }}$ Street West |
|  | I-4 | \$23 | \$23,000 | 110 | 396 | 90 | 484 | $+22 \%$ | $14^{\text {th }}$ Street East |
| Low-/Mid-Rise to | I-5 | \$18 | \$18,000 | 450 | 97 | 110 | 396 | +308\% | $14^{\text {th }}$ Street East |
| Type V/III to Type I construction | - I-6 | \$18 | \$18,000 | 225 | 194 | 110 | 396 | +104\% | City Center $/ 11^{\text {th }}$ St. West <br> 14 ${ }^{\text {th }}$ Street East <br> $14^{\text {th }}$ Street West |
| No Change in Density | - | - | - | 110 | 396 | 110 | 396 | 0 | $14^{\text {th }}$ Street East |

APPENDIX TABLE A-1: DOSP Zoning Intensity Program (continued)
Summary of Estimated Value Capture for Community Benefits from Higher Intensity RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT By Development Type, Intensity Increase, and Subarea
II. Jack London/Victory Court Intensity Areas

| Intensity Type for Residential Development | Development Case No. | VALUE CAPTURE for Community Benefits |  | Base Density |  | ZIP <br> Maximum Density |  | Increase in Density | Intensity Subarea(s) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Low-Rise to High-Rise Development <br> Type V to Type I construction | $\begin{array}{r} \mathrm{II}-1 \\ \mathrm{II}-2 \\ \mathrm{II}-3 \\ \mathrm{II}-4 \end{array}$ | per add'l <br> bldg. SF | per add'l DU | SF per DU | $\begin{aligned} & \text { DU per } \\ & \text { acre } \end{aligned}$ | SF per DU | DU per acre |  |  |
|  |  | \$15 | \$15,000 | 1000 | 44 | 110 | 396 | +800\% | Jack London West |
|  |  | \$10-12 | \$10K-12K | 900 | 48 | 100 | 436 | +808\% | Jack London West |
|  |  | \$10 | \$10,000 | 900 | 48 | 110 | 396 | +725\% | Jack London West |
|  |  | \$15 | \$15,000 | 900 | 48 | 110 | 396 | +725\% | JL East - Waterfront |
| Mid-Rise to High-Rise Development <br> Type III to Type I | - II-5 | \$12 | \$12,000 | 250 | 174 | 90 | 484 | +178\% | Victory Court |
|  | II-6 | \$15 | \$15,000 | 260 | 168 | 100 | 436 | +160\% | Jack London West |
|  | II-7 | \$12 | \$12,000 | 250 | 174 | 100 | 436 | +150\% | Jack London East |
|  | II-8 | \$11 | \$11,000 | 250 | 174 | 100 | 436 | +150\% | Victory Court |
|  | - II-9 | \$13 | \$13,000 | 250 | 174 | 110 | 396 | +128\% | Jack London East Victory Court |
| Greater Intensity High-Rise | II-10A | \$24 | \$24,000 | 100 | 436 | 90 | 484 | +11\% | Jack London West |
|  | - II-10B | \$19 | \$19,000 | 100 | 436 | 90 | 484 | +11\% | Victory Court |
| Greater Intensity Mid-Rise | - II-11 | \$12 | \$12,000 | 250 | 174 | 200 | 218 | +25\% | Jack London East |
| Low-Rise to Mid-Rise Development - Waterfront | II-12 | \$15 | \$15,000 | 1000 | 44 | 200 | 218 | +395\% | JL East \& West Waterfront |
|  | II-13 | \$15 | \$15,000 | 900 | 48 | 200 | 218 | +355\% | JL East - Waterfront |
| Greater Intensity Mid-Rise -Waterfront | II-14 | \$21 | \$21,000 | 250 | 174 | 200 | 218 | +25\% | JL East - Waterfront |

## APPENDIX TABLE A-1: DOSP Zoning Intensity Program (continued)

Summary of Estimated Value Capture for Community Benefits from Higher Intensity RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT By Development Type, Intensity Increase, and Subarea
III. KONO/Art \& Garage District Intensity Areas

| Intensity Type for Residential Development | Development Case No. | VALUE CAPTURE for Community Benefits |  | Base Density |  | ZIPMaximum Density |  | Increase in Density | Intensity Subarea(s) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | per add'l bldg. SF | $\begin{aligned} & \text { per add'l } \\ & \text { DU } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { SF per } \\ & \text { DU } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { DU per } \\ & \text { acre } \end{aligned}$ | SF per DU | $\begin{aligned} & \text { DU per } \\ & \text { acre } \end{aligned}$ |  |  |
| Low-/Mid-Rise to HighRise Development | - III-1 | \$9.40 | \$9,400 | 450 | 97 | 110 | 396 | +308\% | KONO - <br> West of Telegraph |
| Type V/III to Type I construction | III-2 | \$13.50 | \$13,500 | 450 | 97 | 110 | 396 | +308\% | KONO - Telegraph \& East |
| Mid-Rise to High-Rise Development | III-3 | \$14.30 | \$14,300 | 225 | 194 | 110 | 396 | +104\% | KONO - <br> larger sites / higher heights |
| construction | - III-4 | \$15.70 | \$15,700 | 225 | 194 | 110 | 396 | +104\% | KONO - Rest; primarily east of Telegraph |
| Greater Intensity Mid-Rise | III-5 | \$15.00 | \$15,000 | 450 | 97 | 250 | 174 | +79\% | Garage District and KONO |

- Indicates this is one of the 10 Representative Development Cases documented in Section IV of the Technical Appendix.



NOTE: The economic analysis found that higher-intensity development is not feasible under current real estate market and development cost conditions. The analysis then proceeded to identify and evaluate future scenarios when real estate economics improve and developments become feasible. For ease of analysis, the pro forma models tested percentage increases in rents/revenues until feasibility was reached. This is a proxy for the more complex set of changes in various development revenue and cost factors more likely to occur to support feasibility over time. For the residential development prototypes, feasibility was achieved at rent levels approximately $20 \%$ higher than current rents.
/a/ Detailed real estate pro forma analysis was prepared for these current revenue factor assumptions and the conclusions are summarized here. All of the other assumptions in the pro forma analysis for each development case are the same as those detailed in Appendix Tables R.1-R.10.
/b/ See Appendix Tables R. 1 - R. 10 for the detailed pro forma real estate analysis under these revenue assumptions.


NOTE: The economic analysis found that higher-intensity development is not feasible under current real estate market and development cost conditions. The analysis then proceeded to identify and evaluate future scenarios when real estate economics improve and developments become feasible. For ease of analysis, the pro forma models tested percentage increases in rents/revenues until feasibility was reached. This is a proxy for the more complex set of changes in various development revenue and cost factors more likely to occur to support feasibility over time. For the residential development prototypes, feasibility was achieved at rent levels approximately $20 \%$ higher than current rents.
/a/ Detailed real estate pro forma analysis was prepared for these current revenue factor assumptions and the conclusions are summarized here. All of the other assumptions in the pro forma analysis for each development case are the same as those detailed in Appendix Tables R. 1 - R.10.
/b/ See Appendix Tables R. 1 - R. 10 for the detailed pro forma real estate analysis under these revenue assumptions.

APPENDIX TABLE A-2.2: Summary Pro Forma Analysis - Current Market Conditions Compared to Feasible Market Conditions - Residential Development Under UPZONING


NOTE: The economic analysis found that higher-intensity development is not feasible under current real estate market and development cost conditions. The analysis then proceeded to identify and evaluate future scenarios when real estate economics improve and developments become feasible. For ease of analysis, the pro forma models tested percentage increases in rents/revenues until feasibility was reached. This is a proxy for the more complex set of changes in various development revenue and cost factors more likely to occur to support feasibility over time. For the residential development prototypes, feasibility was achieved at rent levels approximately $20 \%$ higher than current rents.
/a/ Detailed real estate pro forma analysis was prepared for these current revenue factor assumptions and the conclusions are summarized here. All of the other assumptions in the pro forma analysis for each development case are the same as those detailed in Appendix Tables R. 1 - R.10.
/b/ See Appendix Tables R. 1 - R. 10 for the detailed pro forma real estate analysis under these revenue assumptions.

APPENDIX TABLE A-2.2: Summary Pro Forma Analysis - Current Market Conditions Compared to Feasible Market Conditions - Residential Development Under UPZONING


NOTE: The economic analysis found that higher-intensity development is not feasible under current real estate market and development cost conditions. The analysis then proceeded to identify and evaluate future scenarios when real estate economics improve and developments become feasible. For ease of analysis, the pro forma models tested percentage increases in rents/revenues until feasibility was reached. This is a proxy for the more complex set of changes in various development revenue and cost factors more likely to occur to support feasibility over time. For the residential development prototypes, feasibility was achieved at rent levels approximately $20 \%$ higher than current rents.
/a/ Detailed real estate pro forma analysis was prepared for these current revenue factor assumptions and the conclusions are summarized here. All of the other assumptions in the pro forma analysis for each development case are the same as those detailed in Appendix Tables R.1-R.10.
/b/ See Appendix Tables R. 1 - R. 10 for the detailed pro forma real estate analysis under these revenue assumptions.

| Development Case HEG Prototype | $\begin{gathered} \hline 1-1 \\ 2 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 1-6 \\ & 20 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \mathrm{II}-1 \\ & 4 \mathrm{~A} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 11-3 \\ & 4 B \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 11-5 \\ 25 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 11-9 \\ 6 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline \mathrm{II}-10 \mathrm{~B} \\ 22 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 11-11 \\ 24 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 111-1 \\ 3 A \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 111-4 \\ 3 \mathrm{BB} \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Intensity Area | CBD | CBD | JL/VC | JL/VC | JL/VC | JL/VC | JL/VC | JL/VC | KONO | KONO |
| Subarea(s) | Lake Merritt Office, Broadway, City Center | 14th St. East and West | Jack London West | Jack London West | Victory Court | Jack London East, Victory Court | Victory Court | Jack London East | KONO | KONO |
| Intensity Type | Greater intensity high-rise | Mid-rise to highrise | Low-rise to high-rise | Low-rise to high-rise | Mid-rise to high-rise | Mid-rise to highrise | Greater intensity highrise | Greater intensity midrise | Low-rise to high-rise | Mid-rise to highrise |
|  |  |  | Waterfront and nearby locations | Inland locations |  |  |  | Inland locations | Largely west of Telegraph | Largely east of Telegraph |
| Benefit Area | R-A | R-B | R-B | R-C | R-C | R-C | R-B | R-C | R-C | R-B |
| Lot Area (sq. ft., rounded) | 44,720 | 20,400 | 60,000 | 60,000 | 60,000 | 55,000 | 45,000 | 60,060 | 40,000 | 20,000 |
| Acres | 1.03 | 0.47 | 1.38 | 1.38 | 1.38 | 1.26 | 1.03 | 1.38 | 0.92 | 0.46 |
| BASE ZONING |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Construction Type | Type I | Type III | Type V | Type V | Type III | Type III | Type I | Type III | Type V | Type III |
| Building Height Maximum | no limit | 85' | $45^{\prime}$ | 45' | 135' | $65^{\prime}$ | 275' | 65' | $45^{\prime}$ | $90^{\prime}$ |
| Building Height Estimated (\# of stories) | 15+ | 6 | 2 | 2 | 6 | 5 | 12+ | 5 | 3 | 6 |
| Residential Density (min. lotarea per unit) | 90 | 225 | 1,000 | 900 | 250 | 250 | 100 | 250 | 450 | 225 |
| Residential Density (units per acre) | 484 | 194 | 44 | 49 | 174 | 174 | 436 |  | 97 | 194 |
| Gross Floor Area per Unit | 1,000 | 1,000 | 1,000 | 1,000 | 1,000 | 1,000 | 1,000 | 1,000 | 1,000 | 1,000 |
| Total Gross Floor Area (w/o pkg.) sq. ft. | 517,000 | 105,000 | 78,000 | 85,000 | 252,000 | 236,500 | 462,000 | 252,000 | 104,000 | 104,000 |
| Office | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Retail | 20,000 | 14,000 | 18,000 | 18,000 | 12,000 | 16,500 | 12,000 | 12,000 | 15,000 | 15,000 |
| Residential | 497,000 | 91,000 | 60,000 | 67,000 | 240,000 | 220,000 | 450,000 | 240,000 | 89,000 | 89,000 |
| Residential Units | 497 | 91 | 60 | 67 | 240 | 220 | 450 | 240 | 89 | 89 |
| Residential Efficiency Ratio | 78\% | 78\% | 78\% | 78\% | 78\% | 78\% | 78\% | 78\% | 78\% | 78\% |
| Retail Efficiency Ratio | 90\% | 90\% | 90\% | 90\% | 90\% | 90\% | 90\% | 90\% | 90\% | 90\% |
| Total Net Floor Area (w/o pkg.) sq. ft. | 405,660 | 83,580 | 63,000 | 68,460 | 198,000 | 186,450 | 361,800 | 198,000 | 82,920 | 82,920 |
| Office | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Retail | 18,000 | 12,600 | 16,200 | 16,200 | 10,800 | 14,850 | 10,800 | 10,800 | 13,500 | 13,500 |
| Residential | 387,660 | 70,980 | 46,800 | 52,260 | 187,200 | 171,600 | 351,000 | 187,200 | 69,420 | 69,420 |
| Parking Spaces | 343 | 96 | 78 | 85 | 252 | 237 | 462 | 252 | 95 | 95 |
| UPZONING |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Construction Type | Type I | Type I | Type I | Type I | Type 1 | Type I | Type I | Type III | Type I | Type I |
| Building Height Maximum | no limit | 85' | 175' | 175' | 275'/450' | 175' | 275' | 901 | $90^{\prime}$ | 175' |
| Building Height Estimated (\# of stories) | 20+ | 12 | 12 | 12 | 14-18 | 12 | 15+ | 6 | 10 | 10-12 |
| Residential Density (min. lot area per unit) | 65 | 110 | 110 | 110 | 90 | 110 | 90 | 200 | 110 | 110 |
| Residential Density (units per acre) | 670 | 394 | 396 | 396 | 484 | 396 | 484 | 218 | 396 | 396 |
| Gross Floor Area per Unit | 1,000 | 1,000 | 1,000 | 1,000 | 1,000 | 1,000 | 1,000 | 1,000 | 1,000 | 1,000 |
| Total Gross Floor Area (w/o pkg.) sq. ft. | 708,000 | 200,000 | 563,000 | 563,000 | 675,000 | 516,500 | 512,000 | 312,000 | 379,000 | 197,000 |
| Office | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Retail | 20,000 | 15,000 | 18,000 | 18,000 | 8,000 | 16,500 | 12,000 | 12,000 | 15,000 | 15,000 |
| Residential | 688,000 | 185,000 | 545,000 | 545,000 | 667,000 | 500,000 | 500,000 | 300,000 | 364,000 | 182,000 |
| Residential Units | 688 | 185 | 545 | 545 | 667 | 500 | 500 | 300 | 364 | 182 |
| Residential Efficiency Ratio | 78\% | 78\% | 78\% | 78\% | 78\% | 78\% | 78\% | 78\% | 78\% | 78\% |
| Retail Efficiency Ratio | 90\% | 90\% | 90\% | 90\% | 90\% | 90\% | 90\% | 90\% | 90\% | 90\% |
| Total Net Floor Area (w/o pkg.) sq. ft. | 554,640 | 157,800 | 441,300 | 441,300 | 527,460 | 404,850 | 400,800 | 244,800 | 297,420 | 155,460 |
| Office | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Retail | 18,000 | 13,500 | 16,200 | 16,200 | 7,200 | 14,850 | 10,800 | 10,800 | 13,500 | 13,500 |
| Residential | 536,640 | 144,300 | 425,100 | 425,100 | 520,260 | 390,000 | 390,000 | 234,000 | 283,920 | 141,960 |
| Parking Spaces | 467 | 135 | 481 | 481 | 575 | 442 | 437 | 312 | 288 | 152 |
| Increase in Residential Units | 191 | 94 | 485 | 478 | 427 | 280 | 50 | 60 | 275 | 93 |
| Percent Increase in Residential Density | 38\% | 105\% | 809\% | 718\% | 178\% | 127\% |  |  | 309\% | 105\% |

APPENDIX TABLE R. 1

## Development Case I-1 (HEG Prototype 2)

BASE ZONING
Intensity Area: CBD - Lake Merritt Office, Broadway, and City Center subareas

|  | Assumption |  | Total |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM |  |  |  |  |
| Lot Size | 1.03 acres |  | 44,720 sq. ft. |  |
| Construction Type | Type I | (not used in calculations) |  |  |
| Building Height | no limit | (not used in calculations) |  |  |
| Building Height Estimated Actual (\# of stories) | 15+ | (not used in calculations) |  |  |
| Residential Density (min. lot area per unit) | 90 | (not used in calculations) units | 484 DU per acre |  |
| Total Units | 497 |  |  |  |
| Total Building Area | 1,040 | sq. ft. per unit, calculated | 517,000 | sq. ft. |
| Net Residential Unit Area | 78\% | efficiency ratio | 387,660 | sq. ft. |
| Average Unit Size (net sq. ft.) | 780 | net sq. ft. per unit |  |  |
| Net Retail Area |  |  | 18,000 | sq. ft. |
| Podium Parking Spaces |  |  | 343 | spaces |
| Spaces Excluding Retail |  |  | 323 | spaces |
| REVENUE |  |  |  |  |
| Gross Residential Rental Revenue (less) Operating Expenses (Residential) (less) Vacancy | \$6.45 | per net sq. ft. per month of residential revenue of gross annual revenue per net sq. ft. | \$30,004,884 |  |
|  | 27.5\% |  | $(\$ 8,251,343)$ |  |
|  | 4.0\% |  | $(\$ 1,200,195)$ |  |
| (less) Capital Reserves | \$0.50 |  | (\$193,830) |  |
| Residential NOI |  |  | \$20,359,516 |  |
| Gross Retail Revenue | \$38.40 | per net sq. ft. per year of gross annual revenue per net sq. ft. |  |  |
| (less) Vacancy | 5.0\% |  | $\begin{array}{r} (\$ 34,560) \\ (\$ 9,000) \end{array}$ |  |
| (less) Capital Reserves | \$0.50 |  |  |  |  |
| Retail NOI |  |  | \$647,640 |  |
| Net Parking Revenue (without retail parking) | \$150 | per space per month | \$581,400 |  |
| Total NOI |  |  | \$21,588,556 |  |
| Capitalized Value (less) Cost of Sale/Marketing | 4.50\% | cap rate | $\begin{gathered} \$ 479,745,689 \\ (\$ 14,392,371) \end{gathered}$ |  |
|  | 3.0\% |  |  |  |
| Net Project Value |  |  | \$465,353,318 |  |
| DEVELOPMENT COST |  |  |  |  |
| Direct Costs |  |  |  |  |
| Building Construction Cost | \$472 | per gross sq. ft. per space per land sq. ft. | \$244,024,000 |  |
| Parking Construction Cost | \$60,000 |  | \$20,580,000 |  |
| Demo/Site Improvement Cost | \$10 |  | \$447,200 |  |
| Total Direct Costs |  | per land sq. ft. | \$265,051,200 |  |
| Indirect Costs |  |  |  |  |
| Tenant Improvements | \$100 | per retail sq. ft. | \$1,800,000 |  |
| Architecture and Engineering | 6.0\% | of direct costs | \$15,903,072 |  |
| Other Expenses | 3.0\% | of direct costs | \$7,951,536 |  |
| General and Administrative | 3.0\% | of direct costs of direct costs of direct costs | \$7,951,536 |  |
| Property Tax During Construction | 2.5\% |  | \$6,626,280 |  |
| Financing | 6.0\% |  | \$15,903,072 |  |
| Subtotal Indirect Costs excluding Fees |  |  | \$56,135,496 |  |
| Fees |  |  |  |  |
| Affordable Housing Fee | \$22,000 | per unit | \$10,934,000 |  |
| Capital Improvements | \$1,250 | per unit | \$621,250 |  |
| Transportation - Residential | \$750 | per unit per retail sq. ft. | \$372,750 |  |
| Transportation - Retail | \$0.75 |  | \$15,000 |  |
| School Impact FeeOther Fees | \$3.48 | per gross sq. ft. per gross sq. ft. | \$1,799,160 |  |
|  | \$30.00 |  | \$15,510,000 |  |
| Subtotal Fees |  |  | \$29,252,160 |  |
| Total Indirect Costs |  |  | \$85,387,656 |  |
| Subtotal, Direct and Indirect Costs |  |  | \$350,438,856 |  |
| Contingency 5.0\% of direct and indirect costs |  |  | \$17,521,943 |  |
| Required Return on Investment $\quad 16.0 \%$ of direct and indirect costs |  |  | \$56,070,217 |  |
| Total Costs |  |  | \$424,031,016 |  |
| Residual Land Value (Net Project Value - Total Costs) |  |  | $\$ 41,322,302$ |  |
| (less) Return on Residual Land Value | 16.0\% |  | $(\$ 6,611,568)$ |  |
| Net Residual Land Value |  |  | \$34,710,734 |  |

# APPENDIX TABLE R. 1 <br> Development Case I-1 (HEG Prototype 2) UPZONING 

Intensity Area: CBD - Lake Merritt Office, Broadway, and City Center subareas


APPENDIX TABLE R. 2
Development Case I-6 (HEG Prototype 20)

## BASE ZONING

Intensity Area: CBD - 14th Street East and West subareas

| Generalized Location: 14th Street East \& West | Assumption |  | Total |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM |  |  |  |  |
| Lot Size | 0.47 | acres | 20,400 | sq. ft. |
| Construction Type | Type III | (not used in calculations) |  |  |
| Building Height | 90' | (not used in calculations) |  |  |
| Building Height Estimated Actual (\# of stories) | 6.00 | (not used in calculations) |  |  |
| Residential Density (min. lot area per unit) | 225 | (not used in calculations) | 194 DU per acre |  |
| Total Units | 91 | units |  |  |
| Total Building Area | 1,154 | sq. ft. per unit, calculated | 105,000 | sq. ft. |
| Net Residential Unit Area | 78\% | efficiency ratio | 70,980 | sq. ft. |
| Average Unit Size (net sq. ft.) | 780 | net sq. ft. per unit |  |  |
| Net Retail Area |  |  | 12,600 | sq. ft. |
| Podium Parking Spaces |  |  | 96 | spaces |
| Spaces Excluding Retail |  |  | 82 | spaces |
| REVENUE |  |  |  |  |
| Gross Residential Rental Revenue | \$5.88 | per net sq. ft. per month | \$5,008,349 |  |
| (less) Operating Expenses (Residential) | 30.0\% | of residential revenue | (\$1,502,505) |  |
| (less) Vacancy | 4.0\% | of gross annual revenue | $(\$ 200,334)$ |  |
| (less) Capital Reserves | \$0.50 | per net sq. ft. | $(\$ 35,490)$ |  |
| Residential NOI |  |  | \$3,270,020 |  |
| Gross Retail Revenue | \$38.40 | 40 | \$483,840 |  |
| (less) Vacancy | 5.0\% | of gross annual revenue | $(\$ 24,192)$ |  |
| (less) Capital Reserves | \$0.50 | per net sq. ft. | (\$6,300) |  |
| Retail NOI |  |  | \$453,348 |  |
| Net Parking Revenue (without retail parking) | \$150 | per space per month | \$147,600 |  |
| Total NOI |  |  | \$3,870,968 |  |
| Capitalized Value | 4.50\% | cap rate | \$86,021,511 |  |
| (less) Cost of Sale/Marketing | 3.0\% |  | (\$2,580,645) |  |
| Net Project Value |  |  | \$83,440,866 |  |
| DEVELOPMENT COST |  |  |  |  |
| Direct Costs |  |  |  |  |
| Building Construction Cost | \$420 | per gross sq. ft. | \$44,100,000 |  |
| Parking Construction Cost | \$60,000 | per space | \$5,760,000 |  |
| Demo/Site Improvement Cost | \$10 | per land sq. ft. | \$204,000 |  |
| Total Direct Costs |  |  | \$50,064,000 |  |
| Indirect Costs |  |  |  |  |
| Tenant Improvements | \$100 | per retail sq. ft. | \$1,260,000 |  |
| Architecture and Engineering | 6.0\% | of direct costs | \$3,003,840 |  |
| Other Expenses | 3.0\% | of direct costs | \$1,501,920 |  |
| General and Administrative | 3.0\% | of direct costs | \$1,501,920 |  |
| Property Tax During Construction | 2.0\% | of direct costs | \$1,001,280 |  |
| Financing | 5.0\% | of direct costs | \$2,503,200 |  |
| Subtotal Indirect Costs excluding Fees |  |  | \$10,772,160 |  |
| Fees |  |  |  |  |
| Affordable Housing Fee | \$22,000 | per unit | \$2,002,000 |  |
| Capital Improvements | \$1,250 | per unit | \$113,750 |  |
| Transportation - Residential | \$750 | per unit | \$68,250 |  |
| Transportation - Retail | \$0.75 | per retail sq. ft. | \$10,500 |  |
| School Impact Fee | \$3.48 | per gross sq. ft. | \$365,400 |  |
| Other Fees | \$30.00 | per gross sq. ft. | \$3,150,000 |  |
| Subtotal Fees |  |  | \$5,709,900 |  |
| Total Indirect Costs |  |  | \$16,482,060 |  |
| Subtotal, Direct and Indirect Costs |  |  | \$66,546,060 |  |
| Contingency | 5.0\% | of direct and indirect costs | \$3,327,303 |  |
| Required Return on Investment | 14.0\% | of direct and indirect costs | \$9,316,448 |  |
| Total Costs |  |  | \$79,189,811 |  |
| Residual Land Value (Net Project Value - Total | sts) |  | \$4,251,055 |  |
| (less) Return on Residual Land Value | 14.0\% |  | $(\$ 595,148)$ |  |
| Net Residual Land Value |  |  | \$3,655,907 |  |

## APPENDIX TABLE R. 2

## Development Case I-6 (HEG Prototype 20) UPZONING

Intensity Area: CBD - 14th Street East and West subareas


APPENDIX TABLE R. 3
Development Case II-1 (HEG Prototype 4A)

## BASE ZONING

Intensity Area: JL/VC - Jack London West subarea
Generalized Location: JLWest Blocks on


## APPENDIX TABLE R. 3

## Development Case II-1 (HEG Prototype 4A) UPZONING <br> Intensity Area: JL/VC - Jack London West subarea



APPENDIX TABLE R. 4
Development Case II-3 (HEG Prototype 4B) BASE ZONING
Intensity Area: JL/VC - Jack London West subarea


APPENDIX TABLE R. 4

## Development Case II-3 (HEG Prototype 4B) UPZONING <br> Intensity Area: JL/VC - Jack London West subarea



# APPENDIX TABLE R. 5 

Development Case II-5 (HEG Prototype 25)

## BASE ZONING

Intensity Area: JL/VC - Victory Court subarea

| Generalized Location: Near Fallon and 4th | Assumption |  | Total |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM |  |  |  |  |
| Lot Size | 1.38 acres |  | 60,000 sq. ft. |  |
| Construction Type | Type III | (not used in calculations) |  |  |
| Building Height | 65'-135' | (not used in calculations) |  |  |
| Building Height Estimated Actual (\# of stories) | 6.00 | (not used in calculations) |  |  |
| Residential Density (min. lot area per unit) | 250 | (not used in calculations) units | 174 DU per acre |  |
| Total Units | 240 |  |  |  |
| Total Building Area | 1,050 | sq. ft. per unit, calculatedefficiency ratio | 252,000 | sq. ft. sq. ft. |
| Net Residential Unit Area | 78\% |  | 187,200 |  |
| Average Unit Size (net sq. ft.) | 780 | net sq. ft. per unit |  |  |
| Net Retail Area |  |  | 10,800 | sq. ft. |
| Podium Parking Spaces |  |  | 252 | spaces |
| Spaces Excluding Retail |  |  | 240 | spaces |
| REVENUE |  |  |  |  |
| Gross Residential Rental Revenue | \$5.70 | per net sq. ft. per month of residential revenue | \$12,804,480 |  |
| (less) Operating Expenses (Residential) | 30.0\% |  | (\$3,841,344) |  |
| (less) Vacancy | 4.0\% | of residential revenue of gross annual revenue per net sq. ft. | $(\$ 512,179)$ |  |
| (less) Capital Reserves | \$0.50 |  | (\$93,600) |  |
| Residential NOI |  |  | \$8,357,357 |  |
| Gross Retail Revenue | \$38.40 | per net sq. ft. per year of gross annual revenue per net sq. ft. |  |  |
| (less) Vacancy | 5.0\% |  | $(\$ 20,736)$ |  |
| (less) Capital Reserves | \$0.50 |  |  |  |
| Retail NOI |  |  | \$388,584 |  |
| Net Parking Revenue (without retail parking) | \$140 | per space per month | \$403,200 |  |
| Total NOI |  |  | \$9,149,141 |  |
| Capitalized Value (less) Cost of Sale/Marketing | 4.50\% | cap rate | $\begin{array}{r} \$ 203,314,244 \\ (\$ 6,099,427) \end{array}$ |  |
|  | 3.0\% |  |  |  |  |
| Net Project Value |  |  | \$197,214,817 |  |
| DEVELOPMENT COST |  |  |  |  |
| Direct Costs |  |  |  |  |
| Building Construction Cost | \$420 | per gross sq. ft. per space per land sq. ft. | \$105,840,000 |  |
| Parking Construction Cost | \$60,000 |  | \$15,120,000 |  |
| Demo/Site Improvement Cost | \$10 |  | \$600,000 |  |
| Total Direct Costs |  | \$121,560,000 |  |  |
| Indirect Costs |  |  |  |  |
| Tenant Improvements | \$100 | per retail sq. ft. | \$1,080,000 |  |
| Architecture and Engineering | 6.0\% | of direct costs | \$7,293,600 |  |
| Other Expenses | 3.0\% |  | \$3,646,800 |  |
| General and Administrative | 3.0\% | of direct costs | \$3,646,800 |  |
| Property Tax During Construction | 2.0\% | of direct costs | \$2,431,200 |  |
| Financing | 5.0\% | of direct costs of direct costs | \$6,078,000 |  |
| Subtotal Indirect Costs excluding Fees |  |  | \$24,176,400 |  |
| Fees |  |  |  |  |
| Affordable Housing Fee | \$22,000 | per unit | \$5,280,000 |  |
| Capital Improvements | \$1,250 | per unit | \$300,000 |  |
| Transportation - Residential | \$750 |  | \$180,000 |  |
| Transportation - Retail | \$0.75 | per unit per retail sq. ft. | \$9,000$\$ 876,960$ |  |
| School Impact Fee | \$3.48 | per gross sq. ft. per gross sq. ft. |  |  |  |
| Other Fees | \$30.00 |  | \$7,560,000 |  |
| Subtotal Fees |  |  | \$14,205,960 |  |
| Total Indirect Costs |  |  | \$38,382,360 |  |
| Subtotal, Direct and Indirect Costs |  |  | \$159,942,360 |  |
| Contingency | 5.0\% | of direct and indirect costs of direct and indirect costs | $\begin{array}{r} \$ 7,997,118 \\ \$ 22,391,930 \end{array}$ |  |
| Required Return on Investment | 14.0\% |  |  |  |  |
| Total Costs |  |  | \$190,331,408 |  |
| Residual Land Value (Net Project Value - Total Costs) |  |  | $\$ 6,883,409$ |  |
| (less) Return on Residual Land Value | 14.0\% |  | $\$ 5,919,732$ |  |
| Net Residual Land Value |  |  |  |  |  |

APPENDIX TABLE R. 5

## Development Case II-5 (HEG Prototype 25) UPZONING <br> Intensity Area: JL/VC - Victory Court subarea

| Generalized Location: Near Fallon and 4th |  | Assumption | Total |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM |  | acres | 60,000 | sq. ft. |  |  |
| Lot Size | 1.38 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Construction Type | Type 1 | (not used in calculations) |  |  |  |  |
| Building Height | 275-450' | (not used in calculations) |  |  |  |  |
| Building Height Estimated Actual (\# of stories) | 14-18 | (not used in calculations) |  |  |  |  |
| Residential Density (min. lot area per unit) | 90 | (not used in calculations) | 484 DU per acre |  |  |  |
| Total Units | 667 | units |  |  |  |  |
| Total Building Area | 1,012 | sq. ft. per unit, calculated | 675,000 | ft. |  |  |
| Net Residential Unit Area | 78\% | efficiency ratio | 520,260 | sq. ft. |  |  |
| Average Unit Size (net sq. ft.) | 780 | net sq. ft. per unit |  |  |  |  |
| Net Retail Area |  |  | 7,200 | sq. ft. |  |  |
| Podium Parking Spaces |  |  | 575 | spaces |  |  |
| Spaces Excluding Retail |  |  | 567 | spaces |  |  |
| ReVENUE |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Gross Residential Rental Revenue | \$6.18 | per net sq. ft. per month | \$38,582,482 |  |  |  |
|  | 27.5\% | of residential revenue | (\$10,610,183) |  |  |  |
| (less) Vacancy | 4.0\% | of gross annual revenue | (\$1,543,299) |  |  |  |
| (less) Capital Reserves | \$0.50 | per net sq. ft. | $(\$ 260,130)$ |  |  |  |
| Residential NOI |  |  | \$26,168,870 |  |  |  |
| Gross Retail Revenue | \$38.40 | per net sq. ft. per year | \$276,480 |  |  |  |
| (less) Vacancy | 5.0\% | of gross annual revenue | $(\$ 13,824)$ |  |  |  |
| (less) Capital Reserves | \$0.50 | per net sq. ft. | $(\$ 3,600)$ |  |  |  |
| Retail NOI |  |  | \$259,056 |  |  |  |
| Net Parking Revenue (without retail parking) | \$140 | per space per month | \$952,560 |  |  |  |
| Total NOI |  |  | \$27,380,486 |  |  |  |
| Capitalized Value (less) Cost of Sale/Marketing | 4.50\% | cap rate | \$608,455,244 |  |  |  |
|  | 3.0\% |  | ( $\$ 18,253,657$ ) |  |  |  |
| Net Project Value |  |  | \$590,201,587 |  |  |  |
| DEVELOPMENT COST |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Direct Costs |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Building Construction Cost | \$472 | per gross sq. ft. | \$318,600,000 |  |  |  |
| Parking Construction Cost | \$60,000 | per space | \$34,500,000 |  |  |  |
| Demo/Site Improvement Cost | \$10 | per land sq. ft. | \$600,000 |  |  |  |
| Total Direct Costs |  |  | \$353,700,000 |  |  |  |
| Indirect Costs |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Tenant Improvements | \$100 | per retail sq. ft. | \$720,000 |  |  |  |
| Architecture and Engineering | 6.0\% | of direct costs | \$21,222,000 |  |  |  |
| Other Expenses | 3.0\% | of direct costs | \$10,611,000 |  |  |  |
| General and Administrative | 3.0\% | of direct costs | \$10,611,000 |  |  |  |
| Property Tax During Construction | 2.5\% | of direct costs | \$8,842,500 |  |  |  |
| Financing | 6.0\% | of direct costs | \$21,222,000 |  |  |  |
| Subtotal Indirect Costs excluding Fees |  |  | \$73,228,500 |  |  |  |
| Fees |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Affordable Housing Fee | \$22,000 | per unit | \$14,674,000 |  |  |  |
| Capital Improvements | \$1,250 | per unit | \$833,750 |  |  |  |
| Transportation-Residential | \$750 | per unit | \$500,250 |  |  |  |
| Transportation - Retail | \$0.75 | per retail sq. ft . | \$6,000 |  |  |  |
| School Impact Fee | \$3.48 | per gross sq. ft. | \$2,349,000 |  |  |  |
| Other Fees | \$30.00 | per gross sq. ft. | \$20,250,000 |  |  |  |
| Subtotal Fees |  |  | \$38,613,000 |  |  |  |
| Total Indirect Costs |  |  | \$111,841,500 |  |  |  |
| Subtotal, Direct and Indirect Costs |  |  | \$465,541,500 |  |  |  |
| Contingency | 5.0\% | of direct and indirect costs | \$23,277,075 |  |  |  |
| Required Return on Investment | 16.0\% | of direct and indirect costs | \$74,486,640 |  |  |  |
| Total Costs |  |  | \$563,305,215 |  |  |  |
| Residual Land Value (Net Project Value - Total Costs) |  |  | $\$ 26,896,372$ |  |  |  |
| (less) Return on Residual Land Value | 16.0\% |  | (\$4,303,420) |  |  |  |
| Net Residual Land Value |  |  | \$22,592,952 |  |  |  |
| $\begin{array}{ll}\text { Incremental Development } \\ & \text { Building Space } \\ \text { Dwelling Units }\end{array}$ |  | Net Residual Land Value |  |  |  |  |
|  | 423,000 | Base Case | \$5,919,732 | \$99 per sf land | \$24,666 | per DU |
|  | 427 | Upzoning | \$22,592,952 | \$377 per sf land | \$33,872 | per DU |
|  |  | Increase | \$16,673,220 | \$39.42 per add'l bldg SF | \$39,047 | per add'I DU |
|  |  | 1/3 of Increase | \$5,557,740 | \$13.14 per add'l bldg SF | \$13,016 | per add'I DU |

APPENDIX TABLE R. 6
Development Case II-9 (HEG Prototype 6)
BASE ZONING
Intensity Area: JL/VC - Jack London East and Victory Court subareas
Generalized Location: Madison, Oak, Fallon, VC

| below fwy. | Assumption |  | Total |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM |  |  |  |  |
| Lot Size | 1.26 | acres | 55,000 | sq. ft. |
| Construction Type | Type III | (not used in calculations) |  |  |
| Building Height | 65' | (not used in calculations) |  |  |
| Building Height Estimated Actual (\# of stories) | 5.00 | (not used in calculations) |  |  |
| Residential Density (min. lot area per unit) | 250 | (not used in calculations) 174 DU per acre |  |  |
| Total Units | 220 | units |  |  |
| Total Building Area | 1,075 | sq. ft. per unit, calculated | 236,500 | sq. ft. |
| Net Residential Unit Area |  | efficiency ratio | 171,600 | sq. ft. |
| Average Unit Size (net sq. ft.) |  | net sq. ft. per unit |  |  |
| Net Retail Area |  |  | 14,850 | sq. ft. |
| Podium Parking Spaces |  |  | 237 | spaces |
| Spaces Excluding Retail |  |  | 220 | spaces |
| REVENUE |  |  |  |  |


| REVENUE |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Gross Residential Rental Revenue | \$5.70 | per net sq. ft. per month | \$11,737,440 |
| (less) Operating Expenses (Residential) | 30.0\% | of residential revenue | (\$3,521,232) |
| (less) Vacancy | 4.0\% | of gross annual revenue | $(\$ 469,498)$ |
| (less) Capital Reserves | \$0.50 | per net sq. ft. | (\$85,800) |
| Residential NOI |  |  | \$7,660,910 |
| Gross Retail Revenue | \$38.40 | per net sq. ft. per year | \$570,240 |
| (less) Vacancy | 5.0\% | of gross annual revenue | $(\$ 28,512)$ |
| (less) Capital Reserves | \$0.50 | per net sq. ft. | (\$7,425) |
| Retail NOI |  |  | \$534,303 |
| Net Parking Revenue (without retail parking) | \$140 | per space per month | \$369,600 |
| Total NOI |  |  | \$8,564,813 |
| Capitalized Value | 4.50\% | cap rate | \$190,329,178 |
| (less) Cost of Sale/Marketing | 3.0\% |  | (\$5,709,875) |
| Net Project Value |  |  | \$184,619,303 |
| DEVELOPMENT COST |  |  |  |
| Direct Costs |  |  |  |
| Building Construction Cost | \$420 | per gross sq. ft. | \$99,330,000 |
| Parking Construction Cost | \$60,000 | per space | \$14,220,000 |
| Demo/Site Improvement Cost | \$10 | per land sq. ft . | \$550,000 |
| Total Direct Costs |  |  | \$114,100,000 |
| Indirect Costs |  |  |  |
| Tenant Improvements | \$100 | per retail sq. ft. | \$1,485,000 |
| Architecture and Engineering | 6.0\% | of direct costs | \$6,846,000 |
| Other Expenses | 3.0\% | of direct costs | \$3,423,000 |
| General and Administrative | 3.0\% | of direct costs | \$3,423,000 |
| Property Tax During Construction | 2.0\% | of direct costs | \$2,282,000 |
| Financing | 5.0\% | of direct costs | \$5,705,000 |
| Subtotal Indirect Costs excluding Fees |  |  | \$23,164,000 |
| Fees |  |  |  |
| Affordable Housing Fee | \$22,000 | per unit | \$4,840,000 |
| Capital Improvements | \$1,250 | per unit | \$275,000 |
| Transportation - Residential | \$750 | per unit | \$165,000 |
| Transportation - Retail | \$0.75 | per retail sq. ft. | \$12,375 |
| School Impact Fee | \$3.48 | per gross sq. ft. | \$823,020 |
| Other Fees | \$30.00 | per gross sq. ft. | \$7,095,000 |
| Subtotal Fees |  |  | \$13,210,395 |
| Total Indirect Costs |  |  | \$36,374,395 |
| Subtotal, Direct and Indirect Costs |  |  | \$150,474,395 |
| Contingency | 5.0\% | of direct and indirect costs | \$7,523,720 |
| Required Return on Investment | 14.0\% | of direct and indirect costs | \$21,066,415 |
| Total Costs |  |  | \$179,064,530 |
| Residual Land Value (Net Project Value - Total Costs) |  |  | \$5,554,773 |
| (less) Return on Residual Land Value | 14.0\% |  | $(\$ 777,668)$ |
| Net Residual Land Value |  |  | \$4,777,105 |

APPENDIX TABLE R. 6

## Development Case II-9 (HEG Prototype 6)

 UPZONINGIntensity Area: JL/VC - Jack London East and Victory Court subareas


APPENDIX TABLE R. 7

## Development Case II-10B (HEG Prototype 22) <br> BASE ZONING <br> Intensity Area: JL/VC - Victory Court subarea

Generalized Location: Victory Court - Fwy to


## APPENDIX TABLE R. 7

## Development Case II-10B (HEG Prototype 22) UPZONING <br> Intensity Area: JL/VC - Victory Court subarea

Generalized Location: Victory Court - Fwy to 7th;

| Fallon to 5th |  | Assumption | Total |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM |  |  |  |  |
| Lot Size | 1.03 | acres | 45,000 | sq. ft. |
| Construction Type | Type I | (not used in calculations) |  |  |
| Building Height | 275' | (not used in calculations) |  |  |
| Building Height Estimated Actual (\# of stories) | 15+ | (not used in calculations) |  |  |
| Residential Density (min. lot area per unit) | 90 | (not used in calculations) units | 484 DU per acre |  |
| Total Units | 500 |  |  |  |
| Total Building Area | 1,024 | sq. ft. per unit, calculated efficiency ratio | 512,000 | sq. ft. |
| Net Residential Unit Area | 78\% |  | 390,000 |  |
| Average Unit Size (net sq. ft.) | 780 | net sq. ft. per unit |  |  |
| Net Retail Area |  |  | 10,800 | sq. ft. |
| Podium Parking Spaces |  |  | 437 | spaces |
| Spaces Excluding Retail |  |  | 425 | spaces |
| REVENUE |  |  |  |  |
| Gross Residential Rental Revenue | \$6.25 | per net sq. ft. per month of residential revenue | \$29,250,000 |  |
| (less) Operating Expenses (Residential) | 27.5\% |  | (\$8,043,750) |  |
| (less) Vacancy | 4.0\% | of gross annual revenue | (\$1,170,000) |  |
| (less) Capital Reserves | \$0.50 |  | (\$195,000) |  |
| Residential NOI |  |  | \$19,841,250 |  |
| Gross Retail Revenue | \$38.40 | per net sq. ft. per year of gross annual revenue per net sq. ft. | \$414,720 |  |
| (less) Vacancy | 5.0\% |  | (\$20,736) |  |
| (less) Capital Reserves | \$0.50 |  | $(\$ 5,400)$ |  |
| Retail NOI |  |  | \$388,584 |  |
| Net Parking Revenue (without retail parking) | \$140 | per space per month | \$714,000 |  |
| Total NOI |  |  | \$20,943,834 |  |
| Capitalized Value | 4.50\% | cap rate | \$465,418,533 |  |
| (less) Cost of Sale/Marketing | 3.0\% |  | (\$13,962,556) |  |
| Net Project Value |  |  | \$451,455,977 |  |

development cost
Direct Costs
Building Construction Cost
Parking Construction Cost
Demo/Site Improvement Cost
Total Direct Costs

| $\$ 472$ | per gross sq. ft. | $\$ 241,664,000$ |
| ---: | ---: | ---: |
| $\mathbf{\$ 6 0 , 0 0 0}$ | per space | $\$ 26,220,000$ |
| $\$ 10$ | per land sq. ft. | $\$ 450,000$ |

Indirect Costs
Tenant Improvements
Architecture and Engineering
Other Expenses
General and Administrative
Property Tax During Construction
Financing
Subtotal Indirect Costs excluding Fees
Fees
Affordable Housing Fee
Capital Improvements
Transportation - Residential
Transportation - Retail
School Impact Fee
Other Fees
Subtotal Fees

| $\$ 100$ | per retail sq. ft. | $\$ 1,080,000$ |
| ---: | ---: | ---: |
| $6.0 \%$ | of direct costs | $\$ 16,100,040$ |
| $3.0 \%$ | of direct costs | $\$ 8,050,020$ |
| $3.0 \%$ | of direct costs | $\$ 8,050,020$ |
| $2.5 \%$ | of direct costs | $\$ 6,708,350$ |
| $6.0 \%$ | of direct costs | $\$ 16,100,040$ |

$\$ 22,000$ per unit $\quad \$ 11,000,000$
\$625,000
\$375,000
\$9,000
\$1,781,760
\$15,360,000
\$29,150,760
Total Indirect Costs
\$85,239,230
Subtotal, Direct and Indirect Costs
Contingency
Required Return on Investment

| $5.0 \%$ | of direct and indirect costs |
| ---: | :--- |
| $16.0 \%$ | of direct and indirect costs |

\$353,573,230

Total Costs
\$17,678,662
\$56,571,717

Residual Land Value (Net Project Value - Total Costs)
(less) Return on Residual Land Value $\quad 16.0 \%$ (\$3,781,179)

Net Residual Land Value

APPENDIX TABLE R. 8
Development Case II-11 (HEG Prototype 24)
BASE ZONING
Intensity Area: JL/VC - Jack London East subarea


## APPENDIX TABLE R. 8

## Development Case II-11 (HEG Prototype 24) UPZONING <br> Intensity Area: JL/VC - Jack London East subarea



APPENDIX TABLE R. 9
Development Case III-1 (HEG Prototype 3A)
BASE ZONING
Intensity Area: KONO - KONO subarea
Generalized Location: KONO, largely west of


APPENDIX TABLE R. 9
Development Case III-1 (HEG Prototype 3A) UPZONING
Intensity Area: KONO - KONO subarea


APPENDIX TABLE R. 10

## Development Case III-4 (HEG Prototype 3b)

BASE ZONING
Intensity Area: KONO - KONO subarea
Generalized Location: KONO, largely east of

| Telegraph | Assumption |  | Total |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM |  |  |  |  |
| Lot Size | 0.46 | acres | 20,000 | sq. ft. |
| Construction Type | Type III | (not used in calculations) |  |  |
| Building Height | 90' | (not used in calculations) |  |  |
| Building Height Estimated Actual (\# of stories) | 6.00 | (not used in calculations) |  |  |
| Residential Density (min. lot area per unit) | 225 | (not used in calculations) | 194 DU per acre |  |
| Total Units | 89 | units |  |  |
| Total Building Area | 1,169 | sq. ft. per unit, calculated | 104,000 | sq. ft. |
| Net Residential Unit Area |  | efficiency ratio | 69,420 | sq. ft. |
| Average Unit Size (net sq. ft.) | 780 | net sq. ft. per unit |  |  |
| Net Retail Area |  |  | 13,500 | sq. ft. |
| Podium Parking Spaces |  |  | 95 | spaces |
| Spaces Excluding Retail |  |  | 80 | spaces |

REVENUE

| \$5.82 | per net sq. ft. per month | \$4,848,293 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 30.0\% | of residential revenue | (\$1,454,488) |
| 4.0\% | of gross annual revenue | (\$193,932) |
| \$0.50 | per net sq. ft. | (\$34,710) |
|  |  | \$3,165,163 |

Gross Retail Revenue

| $\$ 38.40$ | per net sq. ft. per year | $\$ 518,400$ |
| ---: | ---: | ---: |
| $5.0 \%$ | of gross annual revenue | $(\$ 25,920)$ |
| $\$ 0.50$ | per net sq. ft. | $(\$ 6,750)$ |
|  | $\$ 485,730$ |  |
| $\$ 140$ | per space per month | $\$ 134,400$ |

\$3,785,293
\$84,117,622
(\$2,523,529)

## Net Project Value

\$81,594,093

## DEVELOPMENT COST

Direct Costs

| Building Construction Cost | \$425 | per gross sq. ft. per space per land sq. ft. | \$44,200,000 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Parking Construction Cost | \$60,000 |  | \$5,700,000 |
| Demo/Site Improvement Cost | \$10 |  | \$200,000 |
| Total Direct Costs |  |  | \$50,100,000 |
| Indirect Costs |  |  |  |
| Tenant Improvements | \$100 | per retail sq. ft. | \$1,350,000 |
| Architecture and Engineering | 6.0\% | of direct costs | \$3,006,000 |
| Other Expenses | 3.0\% | of direct costs | \$1,503,000 |
| General and Administrative | 3.0\% | of direct costs | \$1,503,000 |
| Property Tax During Construction | 2.0\% | of direct costs | \$1,002,000 |
| Financing | 5.0\% | of direct costs | \$2,505,000 |
| Subtotal Indirect Costs excluding Fees |  |  | \$10,869,000 |
| Fees |  |  |  |
| Affordable Housing Fee | \$22,000 | per unit | \$1,958,000 |
| Capital Improvements | \$1,250 | per unit | \$111,250 |
| Transportation - Residential | \$750 | per unit | \$66,750 |
| Transportation - Retail | \$0.75 | per retail sq. ft . | \$11,250 |
| School Impact Fee | \$3.48 | per gross sq. ft. | \$361,920 |
| Other Fees | \$30.00 | per gross sq. ft. | \$3,120,000 |
| Subtotal Fees |  |  | \$5,629,170 |
| Total Indirect Costs |  |  | \$16,498,170 |
| Subtotal, Direct and Indirect Costs |  |  | \$66,598,170 |
| Contingency | 5.0\% | of direct and indirect costs | \$3,329,909 |
| Required Return on Investment | 14.0\% | of direct and indirect costs | \$9,323,744 |
| Total Costs |  |  | \$79,251,823 |
| Residual Land Value (Net Project Value - T | sts) |  | \$2,342,270 |
| (less) Return on Residual Land Value | 14.0\% |  | $(\$ 327,918)$ |
| Net Residual Land Value |  |  | \$2,014,352 |

APPENDIX TABLE R. 10

## Development Case III-4 (HEG Prototype 3B)

 UPZONING
## Intensity Area: KONO - KONO subarea

Generalized Location: KONO, largely east of


## Cases

| Cases |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Residential Density | Intensity Area / Subarea | Residen | tial Rent | Building Construction Cost | Required Return on Investment |
| Minimum lot area per unit |  | Current rent per net sq. ft. per month | Current rent + 20\% as proxy for achieving feasibility | Cost per gross sq. ft. |  |
| High Density Development |  |  |  |  |  |
| 65 | CBD | \$5.45 | \$6.54 | \$475 | 17\% |
| 90 | CBD | \$5.38 | \$6.45 | \$472 | 16\% |
| 90 | VC | \$5.15-\$5.21 | \$6.18-\$6.25 | \$472 | 16\% |
| 100 | VC | \$5.17 | \$6.20 | \$470 | 16\% |
| 110 | CBD | \$5.25 | \$6.30 | \$470 | 16\% |
| 110 | JLW waterfront \& nearby | \$5.30 | \$6.36 | \$470 | 16\% |
| 110 | JLW Inland | \$5.20 | \$6.24 | \$470 | 16\% |
| 110 | KONO | \$5.13-\$5.21 | \$6.15-\$6.25 | \$470 | 16\% |
| 110 | JLE / VC | \$5.15 | \$6.18 | \$470 | 16\% |
| Medium Density Development |  |  |  |  |  |
| 200 | JLE | \$4.78 | \$5.73 | \$425 | 14\% |
| 225 | KONO | \$4.85 | \$5.82 | \$425 | 14\% |
| 225 | CBD | \$4.90 | \$5.88 | \$420 | 14\% |
| 250 | JLE | \$4.72 | \$5.66 | \$420 | 14\% |
| 250 | VC/JLE | \$4.75 | \$5.70 | \$420 | 14\% |
| 250 | VC | \$4.75 | \$5.70 | \$420 | 14\% |
| Lower Density Development |  |  |  |  |  |
| 450 | KONO | \$4.55 | \$5.46 | \$390 | 12\% |
| 900 | JLW inland | \$4.70 | \$5.65 | \$360 | 12\% |
| 1,000 | JLW waterfront \& nearby | \$4.80 | \$5.76 | \$360 | 12\% |

NOTE: The economic analysis found that higher-intensity development is not feasible under current real estate market and development cost conditions. The analysis then proceeded to identify and evaluate future scenarios when real estate economics improve amd developments become feasible. For ease of analysis, the pro forma models tested percentage increases in rents/revenues until feasibility was reached. This is a proxy for the more complex set of changes in various development revenue and cost factors more likely to occur to support feasibility over time. For the residential development prototypes, feasibility was achieved at rent levels approximately $20 \%$ higher than current rents.

## APPENDIX TABLE A-5: Parking Assumptions for RESIDENTIAL Development Cases

| Intensity Area/Subarea | CBD | 14th Street | KONO /Art + Garage District | Jack London / Victory Court | Jack London |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Development Cases | 1-1 | I-6 | III-1, III-4 | $\begin{gathered} \mathrm{II}-1, \mathrm{II}-3, \mathrm{II}-5, \mathrm{II}- \\ 9, \mathrm{II}-10 \mathrm{~B} \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | II-11 |
| Parking Ratios - BASE ZONING |  |  |  |  |  |
| Residential - per dwelling unit | 0.65 | 0.9 | 0.9 | 1.0 | 1.0 |
| Retail - per 1,000 gross sq. ft. | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 |
| Parking Ratios - UPZONING |  |  |  |  |  |
| Residential - per dwelling unit | 0.65 | 0.65 | 0.75 | 0.85 | 1.0 |
| Retail - per 1,000 gross sq. ft. | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 |

Source: City of Oakland and Hausrath Economics Group, May/June 2021
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## APPENDIX TABLE B-1: DOSP Zoning Intensity Program

## Summary of Estimated Value Capture for Community Benefits from Higher-Intensity OFFICE DEVELOPMENT By Development Type, Intensity Increase, and Subarea

I. Downtown CBD Intensity Areas

| Intensity Type for Office Development | Development Case No. | VALUE CAPTURE for Community Benefits | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Base } \\ & \text { FAR } \end{aligned}$ | tensity Com ZIP <br> Maximum FAR | ons <br> Increase in Density | Intensity Subarea(s) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Greater Intensity High-Rise Development | - I-1 | $\$ 22$ | 20 | 30 | +50\% | Lake Merritt Office <br> Broadway <br> City Center |
|  | - I-2 | \$29 | 20 | 22 | +10\% | Broadway <br> City Center <br> $14^{\text {th }}$ Street West |
|  | I-3 | \$22 | 14 | 17 | +21\% | City Center <br> $14^{\text {th }}$ Street West |
| Mid-Rise to High-Rise Development | I-4 | \$22 | 8 | 20 | +150\% | $14^{\text {th }}$ Street East |
|  | I-5 | \$22 | 8 | 12 | +67\% | 14 ${ }^{\text {th }}$ Street East |
|  | I-6 | \$15 | 5 | 12 | +140\% | $14^{\text {th }}$ Street West <br> $11^{\text {th }}$ St. West - City Center |
| Greater Intensity Mid-Rise Development | I-7 | \$18 | 5 | 7.5 | +50\% | $14^{\text {th }}$ Street East |
|  | I-8 | \$17 | 2.5 | 7.5 | +200\% | $14^{\text {th }}$ Street East |

APPENDIX TABLE B-1: DOSP Zoning Intensity Program (continued)
Summary of Estimated Value Capture for Community Benefits from Higher Intensity OFFICE DEVELOPMENT By Development Type, Intensity Increase, and Subarea
II. Jack London/Victory Court Intensity Areas


## APPENDIX TABLE B-1: DOSP Zoning Intensity Program (continued)

## Summary of Estimated Value Capture for Community Benefits from Higher Intensity OFFICE DEVELOPMENT By Development Type, Intensity Increase, and Subarea

## III. KONO/Art \& Garage District Intensity Areas

| Intensity Type for Office Development | Development Case No. | VALUE CAPTURE for Community Benefits | Intensity Combinations |  |  | Intensity Subarea(s) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Base } \\ & \text { FAR } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Maximum } \\ \text { FAR } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | Increase in Density |  |
| Mid-Rise/Low-Rise to Lower High-Rise Development | III-1 | per add'l bldg. sq. ft. $\$ 9-10$ | 5.0 | 12 | +140\% | $\mathrm{KONO} / 27^{\text {th }}-28^{\text {th }}$ |
| Greater Intensity Mid-Rise Development | III-2 | \$12-14/a/ | 2.5 | 7.5 | +200\% | KONO / Telegraph and east side |
|  | III-3 | \$12-14/a/ | 5.0 | 7.5 | +50\% | KONO / West of Telegraph |
| Greater Intensity Mid-Rise Garage District | - III-4 | \$18 | 2.5 | 5.0 | +100\% | Art + Garage District/KONO |

- Indicates this is one of the 10 Representative Development Cases documented in Section V of the Technical Appendix.
/a/ Higher end of range east of Telegraph Ave.; lower end of range west of Telegraph Ave.


Figure B-2: Zoning Incentive Program Office/Commercial Development Zones/ Benefit Areas


NOTE: The economic analysis found that higher-intensity development is not feasible under current real estate market and development cost conditions. The analysis then proceeded to identify and evaluate future scenarios when real estate economics improve and developments become feasible. For ease of analysis, the pro forma models tested percentage increases in rents/revenues until feasibility was reached. This is a proxy for the more complex set of changes in various development revenue and cost factors more likely to occur to support feasibility over time. For the office development prototypes, feasibility was achieved in most cases at rent levels approximately $10 \%$ higher than current rents at the time of this economic analysis in 2021 . Since then, office rents have declined due to ongoing uncertainties following the pandemic. Thus, rents/revenues that support feasibility as shown in this analysis are possibly closer to $15 \%$ or $20 \%$ higher than current rents in 2023 , for many of the development cases.
/a/ Detailed real estate pro forma analysis was prepared for these current revenue factor assumptions and the conclusions are summarized here. All of the other assumptions in the pro forma analysis for each development case are the same as those detailed in Appendix Tables C. 1 - C.10.
/b/ See Appendix Tables C. 1 - C. 10 for the detailed pro forma real estate analysis under these revenue assumptions.
/c/ Under Base Zoning, one of the development cases supports a small positive residual land value, below that sought for project feasibility.

APPENDIX TABLE B-2.1: Summary Pro Forma Analysis - Current Market Conditions Compared to Feasible Market Conditions - Office Development Under BASE ZONING


NOTE: The economic analysis found that higher-intensity development is not feasible under current real estate market and development cost conditions. The analysis then proceeded to identify and evaluate future scenarios when real estate economics improve and developments become feasible. For ease of analysis, the pro forma models tested percentage increases in rents/revenues until feasibility was reached. This is a proxy for the more complex set of changes in various development revenue and cost factors more likely to occur to support feasibility over time. For the office development prototypes, feasibility was achieved in most cases at rent levels approximately $10 \%$ higher than current rents at the time of this economic analysis in 2021 . Since then, office rents have declined due to ongoing uncertainties following the pandemic. Thus, rents/revenues that support feasibility as shown in this analysis are possibly closer to $15 \%$ or $20 \%$ higher than current rents in 2023 , for many of the development cases.
/a/ Detailed real estate pro forma analysis was prepared for these current revenue factor assumptions and the conclusions are summarized here. All of the other assumptions in the pro forma analysis for each development case are the same as those detailed in Appendix Tables C.1-C.10.
/b/ See Appendix Tables C. 1 - C. 10 for the detailed pro forma real estate analysis under these revenue assumptions.
/c/ Under Base Zoning, one of the development cases supports a small positive residual land value, below that sought for project feasibility.

APPENDIX TABLE B-2.2: Summary Pro Forma Analysis - Current Market Conditions Compared to Feasible Market Conditions - Office Development Under UPZONING


NOTE: The economic analysis found that higher-intensity development is not feasible under current real estate market and development cost conditions. The analysis then proceeded to identify and evaluate future scenarios when real estate economics improve and developments become feasible. For ease of analysis, the pro forma models tested percentage increases in rents/revenues until feasibility was reached. This is a proxy for the more complex set of changes in various development revenue and cost factors more likely to occur to support feasibility over time. For the office development prototypes, feasibility was achieved in most cases at rent levels approximately $10 \%$ higher than current rents at the time of this economic analysis in 2021. Since then, office rents have declined due to ongoing uncertainties following the pandemic. Thus, rents/revenues that support feasibility as shown in this analysis are possibly closer to $15 \%$ or $20 \%$ higher than current rents in 2023 , for many of the development cases.
/a/ Detailed real estate pro forma analysis was prepared for these current revenue factor assumptions and the conclusions are summarized here. All of the other assumptions in the pro forma analysis for each development case are the same as those detailed in Appendix Tables C. 1 - C.10.
/b/ See Appendix Tables C. 1 - C. 10 for the detailed pro forma real estate analysis under these revenue assumptions. Note that current rents increase by $20 \%$ in order to achieve feasibility under Upzoning for Development Case II-1.
/c/ Under Upzoning, two of the development cases support a small positive residual land value, below that sought for project feasibility.


NOTE: The economic analysis found that higher-intensity development is not feasible under current real estate market and development cost conditions. The analysis then proceeded to identify and evaluate future scenarios when real estate economics improve and developments become feasible. For ease of analysis, the pro forma models tested percentage increases in rents/revenues until feasibility was reached. This is a proxy for the more complex set of changes in various development revenue and cost factors more likely to occur to support feasibility over time. For the office development prototypes, feasibility was achieved in most cases at rent levels approximately $10 \%$ higher than current rents at the time of this economic analysis in 2021 . Since then, office rents have declined due to ongoing uncertainties following the pandemic. Thus, rents/revenues that support feasibility as shown in this analysis are possibly closer to $15 \%$ or $20 \%$ higher than current rents in 2023 , for many of the development cases.
/a/ Detailed real estate pro forma analysis was prepared for these current revenue factor assumptions and the conclusions are summarized here. All of the other assumptions in the pro forma analysis for each development case are the same as those detailed in Appendix Tables C.1-C.10.
/b/ See Appendix Tables C. 1 - C. 10 for the detailed pro forma real estate analysis under these revenue assumptions. Note that current rents increase by $20 \%$ in order to achieve feasibility under Upzoning for Development Case II-1.
/c/ Under Upzoning, two of the development cases support a small positive residual land value, below that sought for project feasibility.

APPENDIX TABLE B-3: Development Program Assumptions for Representative OFFICE Development Prototypes / Cases

|  $\begin{array}{r}\text { Development Case } \\ \text { HEG Protoype }\end{array}$ <br> Intensity Area  | I-1 | I-2 | I-5 | II-1 | II-6 | II-7 | II-10 | II-14 | II-12 | III-4 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1A | 1B | 10 | 11 | 18 | 17 | 14 | 13A | 13B | 12 |
|  | CBD | CBD | CBD | JLE/VC | JL/VC | JL/VC | JL/VC | JL/VC | JL/VC | KONO |
| Subarea(s) | Lake Merritt Office, Broadway, City Center | Broadway, City Center, 14th St. West | 14th Street East | Victory Court | Jack London West | Jack London West | Jack London East / Victory Court | Jack London West / Jack London East | Jack London East | Art+Garage District / KONO |
| Intensity Type | Greater intensity high-rise | Greater intensity highrise | Higher mid-rise to lower highrise | Mid-rise to high-rise | Mid-rise to high-rise | Low-rise to lower highrise | Mid-rise to lower high-rise | Greater intensity midrise <br> Waterfront and nearby locations | Greater intensity midrise | Greater intensity mid-rise |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Inland locations | East of Telegraph |
| Benefit Area | C-A | C-A | C-A | C-C | C-B | C-B | C-C | C-B | C-C | C-B |
| Lot Area (sq. ft., rounded) | 54,700 | 54,700 | 28,000 | 69,000 | 35,000 | 60,000 | 50,000 | 50,000 | 50,000 | 20,000 |
| Acres | ¢ 1.26 | 1.26 | 0.64 | 1.58 | 0.80 | 1.38 | 1.15 | 1.15 | 1.15 | 0.46 |
| BASE ZONING |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Construction Type | Type I | Type I | Type I | Type III | Type III | Type V/III | Type III | Type III | Type III | Type III |
| Building Height Maximum | no limit | no limit | 175' | 135' | $65^{\prime}$ | $45^{\prime}$ | $65^{\prime}$ | 55' | 65' | $45^{\prime}$ |
| Floor Area Ratio (FAR) | 20.0 | 20.0 | 8.0 | 5.0 | 7.0 | 2.0 | 5.0 | 3.5 | 5.0 2.5 |  |
| Total Gross Floor Area (w/o parking) sq. | 1,094,000 | 1,094,000 | 224,000 | 345,000 | 245,000 | 120,000 | 250,000 | 175,000 | 250,000 $\quad 50,000$ |  |
| Office | 1,069,500 | 1,069,500 | 212,000 | 335,000 | 235,000 | 105,000 | 241,000 | 169,000 |  |  |
| Retail | 24,500 | 24,500 | 12,000 | 10,000 | $\begin{array}{r}10,000 \\ \hline 90 \%\end{array}$ | 15,000 | 9,000 | 6,000 | 12,000 | 7,000 |
| Office Efficiency Ratio | 90\% | 90\% | 90\% | 90\% |  | 90\% | 90\% | 90\% | 90\% | 90\% |
| Retail Efficiency Ratio | 90\% | 90\% | 90\% | 90\% | 90\% | 90\% | 90\% | 90\% | 90\% | 90\% |
| Total Net Floor Area (w/o parking) sq. ft.Office | 984,600 | 984,600 | 201,600 | 310,500 | 220,500 | 108,000 | 225,000 | 157,500 | 225,000 | 45,000 |
|  | 962,550 |  | 190,800 | 301,500 | 211,500 | 94,500 | 216,900 | 152,100 | 214,200 | 38,700 |
| Retail | 22,050 | 22,050 | 10,800 | 9,000 | 9,000 | 13,500 | 8,100 | 5,400 | 10,800 | 6,300 |
| Parking Spaces | 559 | 559 | 118 | 345 | 245 | 120 | 250 | 175 | 250 | 50 |
| UPZONING |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Construction Type | Type I | Type I | Type I | Type I | Type I | Type I | Type I | Type I | Type I | Type III |
| Building Height Maximum | no limit | no limit | 175' | 4501 | 275' | 175' | 175' | $90^{\prime}$ | 90' | 65' |
| Floor Area Ratio (FAR) | 30.0 | 22.0 | 12.0 | 20.0 | 14.0 | 12.0 | 12.0 | 7.5 | 7.5 $\quad 5.0$ |  |
| Total Gross Floor Area (w/o parking) sq. | 1,641,000 | 1,203,400 | 336,000 | 1,380,000 | 490,000 | 720,000 | 600,000 | 375,000 | 7.5 5.0 <br> 375,000 100,000 |  |
| Office | 1,616,500 | 1,178,900 | 321,000 | 1,363,500 | 477,500 | 695,000 | 588,000 | 359,000 | 359,000 | 86,000 |
| Retail | 24,500 | 24,500 | 15,000 | 16,500 | 12,500 | 25,000 | 12,000 | 16,000 | 16,000 | 14,000 |
| Office Efficiency Ratio | 90\% | 90\% | 90\% | $90 \%$$90 \%$ | $\begin{aligned} & 90 \% \\ & 90 \% \end{aligned}$ | 90\%90\% | 90\% | 90\% | 90\% | 90\% |
| Retail Efficiency Ratio | 90\% | 90\% | 90\% |  |  |  | 90\% | 90\% | 90\% | 90\% |
| Total Net Floor Area (w/o parking) sq. ft. | 1,476,900 | 1,083,060 | 302,400 | 1,242,000 | 441,000 | 648,000 | 540,000 | 337,500 | 337,500 | 90,000 |
| Office | 1,454,850 | 1,061,010 | 288,900 | 1,227,150 | 429,750 | 625,500 | 529,200 | 323,100 | 323,100 | 77,400 |
| Retail | 22,050 | 22,050 | 13,500 | 14,850 | 11,250 | 22,500 | 10,800 | 14,400 | 14,400 | 12,600 |
| Parking Spaces | 752 | 555 | 176 | 1,107 | 395 | 581 | 482 | 303 | 303 | 83 |
| Percent Increase in Density | 50\% | 10\% | 50\% | 300\% | 100\% | 500\% | 140\% | 114\% | 50\% | 100\% |

## APPENDIX TABLE C. 1

## Development Case I-1 (HEG Prototype 1A)

BASE ZONING
Intensity Area: CBD - Lake Merritt Office, Broadway, City Center subareas


## APPENDIX TABLE C. 1

## Development Case I-1 (HEG Prototype 1A)

UPZONING
Intensity Area: CBD - Lake Merritt Office, Broadway, City Center subareas


## APPENDIX TABLE C. 2

## Development Case I-2 (HEG Prototype 1B)

 BASE ZONING
## Intensity Area: CBD - Broadway, City Center, 14th Street West subareas

| CBD - Between Telegraph and Broadway; peripheral City Center |  | Assumption | Total |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM |  |  |  |  |
| Lot Size | 1.26 | acres | 54,700 | sq. ft. |
| Construction Type | Type I | (not used in calculations) |  |  |
| Building Height | no limit | (not used in calculations) |  |  |
| Building Height Estimated Actual (\# of stories) | 25.00 | (not used in calculations) |  |  |
| FAR |  |  |  |  |
| Gross Building Area (excl. parking) |  |  | 1,094,000 | sq. ft. |
| Net Area | 90\% | efficiency ratio | 984,600 | sq. ft. |
| Office |  |  | 962,550 | sq. ft. |
| Retail |  |  | 22,050 | sq. ft. |
| Parking Spaces |  |  | 559 | spaces |
| Spaces Excluding Retail |  |  | 535 | spaces |
| REVENUE |  |  |  |  |
| Office (Full-Service) | \$82.50 | per net sq. ft. per year | \$79,410,375 |  |
| Retail (NNN) | \$35.20 | per net sq. ft. per year | \$776,160 |  |
| Gross Annual Revenue |  |  | \$80,186,535 |  |
| (less) Operating Expenses | 27.5\% | of office full-service revenue | (\$21,837,853) |  |
| (less) Vacancy Rate | 5.0\% | of gross annual revenue | $(\$ 4,009,327)$ |  |
| (less) Capital Reserves | \$0.50 | per net sq. ft. | $(\$ 492,300)$ |  |
| (less) Commissions | 2.5\% | of gross annual revenue | (\$2,004,663) |  |
| Net Operating Income |  |  | \$51,842,392 |  |
| Net Parking Revenue (without retail parking) | \$185 | per space per month | \$1,187,700 |  |
| Total NOI |  |  | \$53,030,092 |  |
| Capitalized Value | 5.50\% | cap rate | \$964,183,491 |  |
| (less) Cost of Sale/Marketing | 3.0\% |  | (\$28,925,505) |  |
| Net Project Value |  |  | \$935,257,986 |  |
| DEVELOPMENT COST |  |  |  |  |
| Direct Costs |  |  |  |  |
| Building Construction Cost | \$405 | per gross sq. ft. | \$443,070,000 |  |
| Parking Construction Cost | \$60,000 | per space | \$33,540,000 |  |
| Demo/Site Improvement Cost | \$10 | per land sq. ft . | \$547,000 |  |
| Total Direct Costs |  |  | \$477,157,000 |  |
| Indirect Costs |  |  |  |  |
| Tenant Improvements (office) | \$75 | per sq. ft . | \$72,191,250 |  |
| Tenant Improvements (retail) | \$100 | per sq. ft. | \$2,205,000 |  |
| Architecture and Engineering | 6.0\% | of direct costs | \$28,629,400 |  |
| Other Expenses | 3.0\% | of direct costs | \$14,314,700 |  |
| General and Administrative | 3.0\% | of direct costs | \$14,314,700 |  |
| Property Tax During Construction | 2.5\% | of direct costs | \$11,928,900 |  |
| Financing | 6.0\% | of direct costs | \$28,629,400 |  |
| Subtotal Indirect Costs excluding Fees |  |  | \$172,213,350 |  |
| Fees |  |  |  |  |
| Capital Improvements | \$2.00 | avg. per gross sq. ft. | \$2,139,000 |  |
| Jobs Housing Impact Fee | \$5.90 | avg. per gross sq. ft. | \$6,162,550 |  |
| Transportation - Office | \$2.00 | avg. per gross sq. ft. | \$2,139,000 |  |
| Transportation - Retail | \$0.75 | avg. per gross sq. ft. | \$18,375 |  |
| School Impact Fee | \$0.56 | avg. per gross sq. ft. | \$612,640 |  |
| Other Fees | \$25.00 | avg. per gross sq. ft. | \$27,350,000 |  |
| Subtotal Fees |  |  | \$38,421,565 |  |
| Total Indirect Costs |  |  | \$210,634,915 |  |
| Subtotal, Direct and Indirect Costs |  |  | \$687,791,915 |  |
| Contingency | 5.0\% | of direct and indirect costs | \$34,389,600 |  |
| Required Return on Investment | 22.0\% | of direct and indirect costs | \$151,314,200 |  |
| Total Costs |  |  | \$873,495,715 |  |
| Residual Land Value (Net Project Value - Total Costs) |  |  | \$61,762,271 |  |
| (less) Return on Residual Land Value | 22.0\% |  | (\$13,587,700) |  |
| Net Residual Land Value |  |  | \$48,174,571 |  |

APPENDIX TABLE C. 2

## Development Case I-2 (HEG Prototype 1B)

UPZONING
Intensity Area: CBD - Broadway, City Center, 14th Street West subareas
CBD - Between Telegraph and Broadway;


## APPENDIX TABLE C. 3

Development Case I-5 (HEG Prototype 10)
BASE ZONING
Intensity Area: CBD - 14th Street East subarea
14th Street, east of Franklin Street

| 14th Street, east of Frankiln Street |  | Assumption |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM |  |  |
| Lot Size | 0.64 | acres |
| Construction Type | Type 1 | (not used in calculations) |
| Building Height | 175' | (not used in calculations) |
| Building Height Estimated Actual (\# of stories) | 11.00 | (not used in calculations) |
| FAR | 8.00 |  |

28,000 sq. ft.
Net Area
Office
Retail

90\% efficiency ratio

Retail

| 224,000 | sq. ft. |
| :---: | :---: |
| 201,600 | sq. ft. |
| 190,800 | sq. ft. |
| 10,800 | sq. ft. |
| 118 | spaces |
| 106 | spaces |

Spaces Excluding Retail

## REVENUE

Office (Full-Service)

| $\$ 74.00$ | per net sq. ft. per year |
| :--- | :--- |
| $y$ |  |

\$14,119,200
Retail (NNN)
Gross Annual Revenue
(less) Operating Expenses
(less) Vacancy Rate
(less) Capital Reserves
(less) Commissions

| $\$ 35.20$ | per net sq. ft. per year |
| ---: | :--- |
| $27.5 \%$ | of office full-service revenue |
| $5.0 \%$ | of gross annual revenue |
| $\$ 0.50$ | per net sq. ft . |
| $2.5 \%$ | of gross annual revenue |

$\$ 380,160$
\$14,499,360
$(\$ 3,882,780)$
(\$724,968)
$(\$ 100,800)$
$(\$ 362,484)$
Net Operating Income
\$9,428,328
Net Parking Revenue (without retail parking)
$\$ 185$ per space per month
\$235,320
Total NOI
Capitalized Value (less) Cost of Sale/Marketing

| $5.50 \%$ | cap rate |
| ---: | ---: |
| $3.0 \%$ | $\$ 175,702,691$ |
|  | $(\$ 5,271,081)$ |

## Net Project Value

$\$ 170,431,610$
DEVELOPMENT COST

## Direct Costs

Building Construction Cost
Parking Construction Cost
Demo/Site Improvement Cost
Total Direct Costs

| $\$ 360$ | per gross sq. ft. |
| ---: | ---: | | $\$ 80,640,000$ |
| ---: |
| $\$ 60,000$ |
| per space |$\$ 7,080,000$

Indirect Costs
Tenant Improvements (office)
Tenant Improvements (retail)
Architecture and Engineering
Other Expenses
General and Administrative
Property Tax During Construction

## Financing

Subtotal Indirect Costs excluding Fees
Fees
Capital Improvements
Jobs Housing Impact Fee
Transportation - Office
Transportation - Retail
School Impact Fee
Other Fees
Subtotal Fees

| $\$ 75$ | per sq. ft. | $\$ 14,310,000$ |
| ---: | :--- | ---: |
| $\$ 100$ | per sq. ft. | $\$ 1,080,000$ |
| $.0 \%$ | of direct costs | $\$ 5,280,000$ |
| $3.0 \%$ | of direct costs | $\$ 2,640,000$ |
| $3.0 \%$ | of direct costs | $\$ 2,640,000$ |
| $2.0 \%$ | of direct costs | $\$ 1,760,000$ |
| $5.0 \%$ | of direct costs | $\$ 4,400,000$ |

otal Indirect Costs

| $\$ 2.00$ | avg. per gross sq. ft. | $\$ 424,000$ |
| ---: | ---: | ---: |
| $\$ 5.90$ | avg. per gross sq. ft. | $\$ 1,103,300$ |
| $\$ 2.00$ | avg. per gross sq. ft. | $\$ 424,000$ |
| $\$ 0.75$ | avg. per gross sq. ft. | $\$ 9,000$ |
| $\$ 0.56$ | avg. per gross sq. ft. | $\$ 125,440$ |
| $\$ 25.00$ | avg. per gross sq. ft. | $\$ 5,600,000$ |
|  | $\$ 7,685,740$ |  |
|  | $\$ 39,795,740$ |  |


| Subtotal, Direct and Indirect Costs |  |  | \$127,795,740 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Contingency | 5.0\% | of direct and indirect costs | \$6,389,800 |
| Required Return on Investment | 16.0\% | of direct and indirect costs | \$20,447,300 |
| Total Costs |  |  | \$154,632,840 |
| Residual Land Value (Net Project Value - Total Costs) |  |  | \$15,798,770 |
| (less) Return on Residual Land Value | 16.0\% |  | (\$2,527,803) |
| Net Residual Land Value |  |  | \$13,270,967 |

## APPENDIX TABLE C. 3

## Development Case I-5 (HEG Prototype 10) <br> UPZONING <br> Intensity Area: CBD - 14th Street East subarea



## APPENDIX TABLE C. 4

Development Case II-1 (HEG Prototype 11)

## BASE ZONING

Intensity Area: JL / VC - Victory Court subarea
Vicinity of Fallon Street, south of freeway

| Vicinity of Fallon Street, south of freeway |  | Assumption |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM |  |  |
| Lot Size | 1.58 | acres |
| Construction Type | Type III | (not used in calculations) |
| Building Height | 65' | (not used in calculations) |
| Building Height Estimated Actual (\# of stories) | 7.00 | (not used in calculations) |
| FAR | 5.00 |  |

69,000 sq. ft.

Gross Building Area (excl. parking
Net Area
90\% efficiency ratio
Office
Retail

| 345,000 | sq. ft. |
| :---: | :---: |
| 310,500 | sq. ft. |
| 301,500 | sq. ft. |
| 9,000 | sq. ft. |
| 345 | spaces |
| 335 | spaces |

Spaces Excluding Retail

## REVENUE

| Office (Full-Service) | \$68.20 | per net sq. ft. per year per net sq. ft. per year |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Retail (NNN) | \$35.20 |  |
| Gross Annual Revenue |  |  |
| (less) Operating Expenses | 27.5\% | of office full-service revenue |
| (less) Vacancy Rate | 5.0\% | of gross annual revenue |
| (less) Capital Reserves | \$0.50 | per net sq. ft. |
| (less) Commissions | 2.5\% | of gross annual revenue |

\$20,562,300
$\$ 316,800$
\$20,879,100
(\$5,654,633)
(\$1,043,955)
$(\$ 155,250)$
(\$521,978)
Net Operating Income
$\$ 13,503,284$
\$743,700
\$14,246,984
\$259,036,073
(\$7,771,082)

## Net Project Value

\$251,264,991

## DEVELOPMENT COST

## Direct Costs

Building Construction Cost
Parking Construction Cost
Demo/Site Improvement Cost
Total Direct Costs

| $\$ 345$ | per gross sq. ft. |
| ---: | :--- |
| $\$ 60,000$ | per space |
| \$10 | per land sq. ft. |

\$119,025,000
\$20,700,000 $\$ 690,000$
$\$ 140,415,000$
Indirect Costs
Tenant Improvements (office)
Tenant Improvements (retail)
Architecture and Engineering
Other Expenses
General and Administrative
Property Tax During Construction
Financing
Subtotal Indirect Costs excluding Fees
Fees
Capital Improvements
Jobs Housing Impact Fee
Transportation - Office
Transportation - Retail
School Impact Fee
Other Fees
Subtotal Fees

| \$75 | per sq. ft. per sq. ft. of direct costs of direct costs of direct costs of direct costs of direct costs |
| :---: | :---: |
| \$100 |  |
| 6.0\% |  |
| 3.0\% |  |
| 3.0\% |  |
| 2.0\% |  |
| 5.0\% |  |

\$22,612,500
\$900,000
\$8,424,900
\$4,212,500
\$4,212,500
\$2,808,300
\$7,020,800
\$50,191,500

Sul
\$670,000

| $\$ 2.00$ | avg. per gross sq. ft. | $\$ 670,000$ |
| ---: | ---: | ---: |
| $\$ 5.90$ | avg. per gross sq. ft. | $\$ 1,829,000$ |
| $\$ 2.00$ | avg. per gross sq. ft. | $\$ 670,000$ |
| $\$ 0.75$ | avg. per gross sq. ft. | $\$ 7,500$ |
| $\$ 0.56$ | avg. per gross sq. ft. | $\$ 193,200$ |
| $\$ 25.00$ | avg. per gross sq. ft. | $\$ 8,625,000$ |
|  | $\$ 11,994,700$ |  |
|  | $\$ 62,186,200$ |  |

Subtotal, Direct and Indirect Costs
\$202,601,200

| Contingency | 5.0\% | of direct and indirect costs of direct and indirect costs | \$10,130,100 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Required Return on Investment | 14.0\% |  | $\$ 28,364,200$ |
| Total Costs |  |  | \$241,095,500 |
| Residual Land Value (Net Project Value |  |  | \$10,169,491 |
| (less) Return on Residual Land Value | 14.0\% |  | (\$1,423,729) |
| Net Residual Land Value |  |  | \$8,745,762 |

APPENDIX TABLE C. 4

## Development Case II-1 (HEG Prototype 11) <br> UPZONING <br> Intensity Area: JL / VC - Victory Court subarea



APPENDIX TABLE C. 5
Development Case II-6 (HEG Prototype 18)

## BASE ZONING

Intensity Area: JL / VC - Jack London West subarea


| APPENDIX TABLE C. 5 <br> Development Case II-6 (HEG Prototype 18) <br> UPZONING <br> Intensity Area: JL / VC - Jack London West subarea |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 5th to 4th Street Blocks, east and west of Broadway |  | Assumption | Total |  |  |
| DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lot Size | 0.80 | acres | 35,000 | sq. ft. |  |
| Construction Type | Type I | (not used in calculations) |  |  |  |
| Building Height | 275' | (not used in calculations) |  |  |  |
| Building Height Estimated Actual (\# of stories) | 15.00 | (not used in calculations) |  |  |  |
| FAR | 14.00 |  |  |  |  |
| Gross Building Area (excl. parking) |  |  | 490,000 | sq. ft. |  |
| Net Area | 90\% | efficiency ratio | 441,000 | sq. ft. |  |
| Office |  |  | 429,750 | sq. ft. |  |
| Retail |  |  | 11,250 | sq. ft. |  |
| Parking Spaces |  |  | 395 | spaces |  |
| Spaces Excluding Retail |  |  | 382 | spaces |  |
| REVENUE |  |  |  |  |  |
| Office (Full-Service) | \$75.00 | per net sq. ft. per year | \$32,231,250 |  |  |
| Retail (NNN) | \$35.20 | per net sq. ft. per year | \$396,000 |  |  |
| Gross Annual Revenue |  |  | \$32,627,250 |  |  |
| (less) Operating Expenses | 27.5\% | of office full-service revenue | $(\$ 8,863,594)$ |  |  |
| (less) Vacancy Rate | 5.0\% | of gross annual revenue | $(\$ 1,631,363)$ |  |  |
| (less) Capital Reserves | \$0.50 | per net sq. ft . | $(\$ 220,500)$ |  |  |
| (less) Commissions | 2.5\% | of gross annual revenue | (\$815,681) |  |  |
| Net Operating Income |  |  | \$21,096,112 |  |  |
| Net Parking Revenue (without retail parking) | \$185 | per space per month | \$848,040 |  |  |
| Total NOI |  |  | \$21,944,152 |  |  |
| Capitalized Value (less) Cost of Sale/Marketing | 5.50\% | cap rate | \$398,984,582 |  |  |
|  | 3.0\% |  | (\$11,969,537) |  |  |
| Net Project Value |  |  | \$387,015,045 |  |  |
| DEVELOPMENT COST |  |  |  |  |  |
| Direct Costs |  |  |  |  |  |
| Building Construction Cost | \$370 | per gross sq. ft . | \$181,300,000 |  |  |
| Parking Construction Cost | \$60,000 | per space | \$23,700,000 |  |  |
| Demo/Site Improvement Cost | \$10 | per land sq. ft. | \$350,000 |  |  |
| Total Direct Costs |  |  | \$205,350,000 |  |  |
| Indirect Costs |  |  |  |  |  |
| Tenant Improvements (office) | \$75 | per sq. ft. | \$32,231,250 |  |  |
| Tenant Improvements (retail) | \$100 | per sq. ft. | \$1,125,000 |  |  |
| Architecture and Engineering | 6.0\% | of direct costs | \$12,321,000 |  |  |
| Other Expenses | 3.0\% | of direct costs | \$6,160,500 |  |  |
| General and Administrative | 3.0\% | of direct costs | \$6,160,500 |  |  |
| Property Tax During Construction | 2.5\% | of direct costs | \$5,133,800 |  |  |
| Financing | 5.5\% | of direct costs | \$11,294,300 |  |  |
| Subtotal Indirect Costs excluding Fees |  |  | \$74,426,350 |  |  |
| Fees |  |  |  |  |  |
| Capital Improvements | \$2.00 | avg. per gross sq. ft. | \$955,000 |  |  |
| Jobs Housing Impact Fee | \$5.90 | avg. per gross sq. ft. | \$2,669,750 |  |  |
| Transportation - Office | \$2.00 | avg. per gross sq. ft. | \$955,000 |  |  |
| Transportation-Retail | \$0.75 | avg. per gross sq. ft. | \$9,375 |  |  |
| School Impact Fee | \$0.56 | avg. per gross sq. ft. | \$274,400 |  |  |
| Other Fees | \$25.00 | avg. per gross sq. ft. | \$12,250,000 |  |  |
| Subtotal Fees |  |  | \$17,113,525 |  |  |
| Total Indirect Costs |  |  | \$91,539,875 |  |  |
| Subtotal, Direct and Indirect Costs |  |  | \$296,889,875 |  |  |
| Contingency | 5.0\% | of direct and indirect costs | \$14,844,494 |  |  |
| Required Return on Investment | 18.0\% | of direct and indirect costs | \$53,440,178 |  |  |
| Total Costs |  |  | \$365,174,547 |  |  |
| Residual Land Value (Net Project Value - Total Costs) |  |  | $\$ 21,840,498$ |  |  |
| (less) Return on Residual Land Value | 18.0\% |  | (\$3,931,290) |  |  |
| Net Residual Land Value |  |  | \$17,909,208 |  |  |
| Incremental Development |  | Net Residual Land Value |  |  |  |
| Gross Building Area (excl. parking) | 245,000 | Base Case | \$7,029,967 | \$201 | per sf land |
|  |  | Upzoning | \$17,909,208 | \$512 | per sf land |
|  |  | Increase | \$10,879,241 | \$44.41 | per add'l bldg SF |
|  |  | 1/3 of Increase | \$3,626,414 | \$14.80 | per add'l bldg SF |

## APPENDIX TABLE C. 6

## Development Case II-7 (HEG Prototype 17)

BASE ZONING
Intensity Area: JL / VC - Jack London West subarea
4th Street to Embarcadero; Washington, Clay,

| and Jefferson Streets | Assumption | Total |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM |  |  |  |
| Lot Size | 1.38 acres | 60,000 | sq. ft. |
| Construction Type | Type V/III (not used in calculations) |  |  |
| Building Height | $45^{\prime}$ (not used in calculations) |  |  |
| Building Height Estimated Actual (\# of stories) | 3.00 (not used in calculations) |  |  |
| FAR | 2.00 |  |  |
| Gross Building Area (excl. parking) |  | 120,000 | sq. ft. |
| Net Area | 90\% efficiency ratio | 108,000 | sq. ft. |
| Office |  | 94,500 | sq. ft. |
| Retail |  | 13,500 | sq. ft. |
| Parking Spaces |  | 120 | spaces |
| Spaces Excluding Retail |  | 105 | spaces |

## REVENUE

Office (Full-Service)
Retail (NNN)
Gross Annual Revenue
(less) Operating Expenses
(less) Vacancy Rate
(less) Capital Reserves
(less) Commissions

| \$66.00 | per net sq. ft. per year per net sq. ft. per year | \$6,237,000 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| \$35.20 |  | \$475,200 |
|  |  | \$6,712,200 |
| 27.5\% | of office full-service revenue of gross annual revenue per net sq. ft. of gross annual revenue | (\$1,715,175) |
| 5.0\% |  | (\$335,610) |
| \$0.50 |  | $(\$ 54,000)$ |
| 2.5\% |  | (\$167,805) |

Net Operating Income
\$4,439,610
Net Parking Revenue (without retail parking)
$\$ 185$ per space per month
$\$ 233,100$
Total NOI
Capitalized Value (less) Cost of Sale/Marketing

| $5.50 \%$ | cap rate |
| ---: | ---: |
| $3.0 \%$ | $\$ 84,958,364$ |
|  | $(\$ 2,548,751)$ |

## Net Project Value

$\$ 82,409,613$
DEVELOPMENT COST

## Direct Costs

Building Construction Cost
Parking Construction Cost
Demo/Site Improvement Cost
Total Direct Costs

| $\$ 330$ | per gross sq. ft. | $\$ 39,600,000$ |
| ---: | ---: | ---: |
| $\$ 60,000$ | per space | $\$ 7,200,000$ |
| $\$ 10$ | per land sq. ft. | $\$ 600,000$ |

Indirect Costs
Tenant Improvements (office)
Tenant Improvements (retail)
Architecture and Engineering
Other Expenses
General and Administrative
Property Tax During Construction
Financing
Subtotal Indirect Costs excluding Fees
Fees
Capital Improvements
Jobs Housing Impact Fee
Transportation-Office
Transportation - Retail
School Impact Fee
Other Fees
Subtotal Fees

| $\$ 75$ | per sq. ft. | $\$ 7,087,500$ |
| ---: | :--- | ---: |
| $\$ 100$ | per sq. ft. | $\$ 1,350,000$ |
| $6.0 \%$ | of direct costs | $\$ 2,844,000$ |
| $3.0 \%$ | of direct costs | $\$ 1,422,000$ |
| $3.0 \%$ | of direct costs | $\$ 1,422,000$ |
| $2.0 \%$ | of direct costs | $\$ 948,000$ |
| $4.0 \%$ | of direct costs | $\$ 1,896,000$ |

otal Indirect Costs

| $\$ 2.00$ | avg. per gross sq. ft. | $\$ 210,000$ |
| ---: | ---: | ---: |
| $\$ 5.90$ | avg. per gross sq. ft. | $\$ 472,000$ |
| $\$ 2.00$ | avg. per gross sq. ft. | $\$ 210,000$ |
| $\$ 0.75$ | avg. per gross sq. ft. | $\$ 11,250$ |
| $\$ 0.56$ | avg. per gross sq. ft. | $\$ 67,200$ |
| $\$ 25.00$ | avg. per gross sq. ft. | $\$ 3,000,000$ |
|  | $\$ 3,970,450$ |  |
|  | $\$ 20,939,950$ |  |


| Subtotal, Direct and Indirect Costs |  |  | \$68,339,950 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Contingency | 5.0\% | of direct and indirect costs | \$3,417,000 |
| Required Return on Investment | 12.0\% | of direct and indirect costs | \$8,200,800 |
| Total Costs |  |  | \$79,957,750 |

Residual Land Value (Net Project Value - Total Costs) \$2,451,863
(less) Return on Residual Land Value 12.0
(\$294,224)
Net Residual Land Value

| APPENDIX TABLE C. 6 |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Development Case II-7 (HEG Prototype 17) |  |  |  |  |  |
| UPZONING |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intensity Area: JL / VC - Jack London West subarea |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4th Street to Embarcadero; Washington, Clay, |  |  |  |  |  |
| DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lot Size | 1.38 | acres | 60,000 | sq. ft. |  |
| Construction Type $\quad$ Type I |  | (not used in calculations) |  |  |  |
| Building Height | 175' | (not used in calculations) |  |  |  |
| Building Height Estimated Actual (\# of stories) | 15.00 | (not used in calculations) |  |  |  |
| FAR | 12.00 |  |  |  |  |
| Gross Building Area (excl. parking) |  |  | 720,000 | sq. ft. |  |
| Net Area | 90\% | efficiency ratio | 648,000 | sq. ft. |  |
| Office |  |  | 625,500 | sq. ft. |  |
| Retail |  |  | 22,500 | sq. ft. |  |
| Parking Spaces |  |  | 581 | spaces |  |
| Spaces Excluding Retail |  |  | 556 | spaces |  |
| REVENUE |  |  |  |  |  |
| Office (Full-Service) | \$75.00 | per net sq. ft. per year | \$46,912,500 |  |  |
| Retail (NNN) | \$35.20 | per net sq. ft. per year | \$792,000 |  |  |
| Gross Annual Revenue |  |  | \$47,704,500 |  |  |
| (less) Operating Expenses | 27.5\% | of office full-service revenue | $(\$ 12,900,938)$ |  |  |
| (less) Vacancy Rate | 5.0\% | of gross annual revenue | (\$2,385,225) |  |  |
| (less) Capital Reserves | \$0.50 | per net sq. ft. | $(\$ 324,000)$ |  |  |
| (less) Commissions | 2.5\% | of gross annual revenue | (\$1,192,613) |  |  |
| Net Operating Income |  |  | \$30,901,724 |  |  |
| Net Parking Revenue (without retail parking) | \$185 | per space per month | \$1,234,320 |  |  |
| Total NOI |  |  | \$32,136,044 |  |  |
| Capitalized Value <br> (less) Cost of Sale/Marketing | 5.50\% | cap rate | \$584,291,709 |  |  |
|  | 3.0\% |  | (\$17,528,751) |  |  |
| Net Project Value |  |  | \$566,762,958 |  |  |
| DEVELOPMENT COST |  |  |  |  |  |
| Direct Costs |  |  |  |  |  |
| Building Construction Cost | \$365 | per gross sq. ft . | \$262,800,000 |  |  |
| Parking Construction Cost | \$60,000 | per space | \$34,860,000 |  |  |
| Demo/Site Improvement Cost | \$10 | per land sq. ft. | \$600,000 |  |  |
| Total Direct Costs |  |  | \$298,260,000 |  |  |
| Indirect Costs |  |  |  |  |  |
| Tenant Improvements (office) | \$75 | per sq. ft. | \$46,912,500 |  |  |
| Tenant Improvements (retail) | \$100 | per sq. ft. | \$2,250,000 |  |  |
| Architecture and Engineering | 6.0\% | of direct costs | \$17,895,600 |  |  |
| Other Expenses | 3.0\% | of direct costs | \$8,947,800 |  |  |
| General and Administrative | 3.0\% | of direct costs | \$8,947,800 |  |  |
| Property Tax During Construction | 2.5\% | of direct costs | \$7,456,500 |  |  |
| Financing | 5.5\% | of direct costs | \$16,404,300 |  |  |
| Subtotal Indirect Costs excluding Fees |  |  | \$108,814,500 |  |  |
| Fees |  |  |  |  |  |
| Capital Improvements | \$2.00 | avg. per gross sq. ft. | \$1,390,000 |  |  |
| Jobs Housing Impact Fee | \$5.90 | avg. per gross sq. ft. | \$3,953,000 |  |  |
| Transportation - Office | \$2.00 | avg. per gross sq. ft. | \$1,390,000 |  |  |
| Transportation - Retail | \$0.75 | avg. per gross sq. ft. | \$18,750 |  |  |
| School Impact Fee | \$0.56 | avg. per gross sq. ft. | \$403,200 |  |  |
| Other Fees | \$25.00 | avg. per gross sq. ft. | \$18,000,000 |  |  |
| Subtotal Fees |  |  | \$25,154,950 |  |  |
| Total Indirect Costs |  |  | \$133,969,450 |  |  |
| Subtotal, Direct and Indirect Costs |  |  | \$432,229,450 |  |  |
| Contingency | 5.0\% | of direct and indirect costs | \$21,611,473 |  |  |
| Required Return on Investment | 18.0\% | of direct and indirect costs | \$77,801,301 |  |  |
| Total Costs |  |  | \$531,642,224 |  |  |
| Residual Land Value (Net Project Value - Total Costs) |  |  | \$35,120,734 |  |  |
| (less) Return on Residual Land Value | 18.0\% |  | (\$6,321,732) |  |  |
| Net Residual Land Value |  |  | \$28,799,002 |  |  |
| Incremental Development |  | Net Residual Land Value |  |  |  |
| Gross Building Area (excl. parking) | 600,000 | Base Case | \$2,157,639 | \$36 | per sf land |
|  |  | Upzoning | \$28,799,002 | \$480 | per sf land |
|  |  | Increase | \$26,641,363 | \$44.40 | per add'l bldg SF |
|  |  | 1/3 of Increase | \$8,880,454 | \$14.80 | per add'I bldg SF |

# APPENDIX TABLE C. 7 

Development Case II-10 (HEG Prototype 14)
BASE ZONING
Intensity Area: JL / VC - Jack London East and Victory Court subareas
5th Street to Embarcadero; Madison and Oak

| Streets | Assumption |  | Total |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM |  |  |  |  |
| Lot Size | 1.15 | acres | 50,000 | sq. ft. |
| Construction Type | Type III | (not used in calculations) |  |  |
| Building Height | 65' | (not used in calculations) |  |  |
| Building Height Estimated Actual (\# of stories) | 7.00 | (not used in calculations) |  |  |
| FAR | 5.00 |  |  |  |

Gross Building Area (excl. parking)
Net Area
Office
Retail
Parking Spaces
Spaces Excluding Retail
REVENUE

| Office (Full-Service) |
| :--- |
| Retail (NNN) |
| Gross Annual Revenue |
| (less) Operating Expenses |
| (less) Vacancy Rate |
| (less) Capital Reserves |
| (less) Commissions |


| Net Operating Income |  | per space per month | \$9,766,412 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Net Parking Revenue (without retail parking) | \$185 |  | \$535,020 |
| Total NOI |  |  | \$10,301,432 |
| Capitalized Value | 5.50\% | cap rate | \$187,298,764 |
| (less) Cost of Sale/Marketing | 3.0\% |  | (\$5,618,963) |
| Net Project Value |  |  | \$181,679,801 |

## DEVELOPMENT COST

## Direct Costs

Building Construction Cost
Parking Construction Cost
Demo/Site Improvement Cost
Total Direct Costs

| $\$ 345$ | per gross sq. ft. | $\$ 86,250,000$ |
| ---: | ---: | ---: |
| $\$ 60,000$ | per space | $\$ 15,000,000$ |
| $\$ 10$ | per land sq. ft. | $\$ 500,000$ |

Indirect Costs
Tenant Improvements (office)
Tenant Improvements (retail)
Architecture and Engineering
Other Expenses
General and Administrative Property Tax During Construction Financing

Subtotal Indirect Costs excluding Fees Fees

Capital Improvements
Jobs Housing Impact Fee
Transportation-Office
Transportation - Retail
School Impact Fee
Other Fees
Subtotal Fees

| $\$ 75$ | per sq. ft. | $\$ 16,267,500$ |
| ---: | :--- | ---: |
| $\$ 100$ | per sq. ft. | $\$ 810,000$ |
| $6.0 \%$ | of direct costs | $\$ 6,105,000$ |
| $3.0 \%$ | of direct costs | $\$ 3,052,500$ |
| $3.0 \%$ | of direct costs | $\$ 3,052,500$ |
| $2.0 \%$ | of direct costs | $\$ 2,035,000$ |
| $5.0 \%$ | of direct costs | $\$ 5,087,500$ |

otal Indirect Costs

| \$2.00 | avg. per gross sq. ft. | \$482,000 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| \$5.90 | avg. per gross sq. ft. | \$1,274,400 |
| \$2.00 | avg. per gross sq. ft. | \$482,000 |
| \$0.75 | avg. per gross sq. ft. | \$6,750 |
| \$0.56 | avg. per gross sq. ft. | \$140,000 |
| \$25.00 | avg. per gross sq. ft. | \$6,250,000 |
|  |  | \$8,635,150 |
|  |  | \$45,045,150 |
|  |  | \$146,795,150 |
| 5.0\% | of direct and indirect costs | \$7,339,800 |
| 14.0\% | of direct and indirect costs | \$20,551,300 |
|  |  | \$174,686,250 |

Total Costs
\$174,686,250
Residual Land Value (Net Project Value - Total Costs)

# APPENDIX TABLE C. 7 <br> Development Case II-10 (HEG Prototype 14) <br> UPZONING <br> Intensity Area: JL / VC - Jack London East and Victory Court subareas 

5th Street to Embarcadero; Madison and Oak


APPENDIX TABLE C. 8
Development Case II-14 (HEG Prototype 13A)
BASE ZONING
Intensity Area: JL / VC - Jack London West and Jack London East subareas

| Along Embarcadero, between Washington and Harrison Streets |  | Assumption | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM |  |  |  |
| Lot Size | 1.15 | acres | 50,000 sq. ft. |
| Construction Type | Type III | (not used in calculations) |  |
| Building Height | 65' | (not used in calculations) |  |
| Building Height Estimated Actual (\# of stories) | 7.00 | (not used in calculations) |  |
| FAR | 3.50 |  |  |
| Gross Building Area (excl. parking) |  |  | 175,000 sq. ft. |
| Net Area |  | efficiency ratio | 157,500 sq. ft. |
| Office |  |  | 152,100 sq. ft. |
| Retail |  |  | 5,400 sq. ft. |
| Parking Spaces |  |  | 175 spaces |
| Spaces Excluding Retail |  |  | 169 spaces |
| REVENUE |  |  |  |
| Office (Full-Service) | \$69.00 | per net sq. ft. per year | \$10,494,900 |
| Retail (NNN) | \$35.20 | per net sq. ft. per year | \$190,080 |
| Gross Annual Revenue |  |  | \$10,684,980 |
| (less) Operating Expenses | 27.5\% | of office full-service revenue | (\$2,886,098) |
| (less) Vacancy Rate | 5.0\% | of gross annual revenue | $(\$ 534,249)$ |
| (less) Capital Reserves | \$0.50 | per net sq. ft. | $(\$ 78,750)$ |
| (less) Commissions | 2.5\% | of gross annual revenue | (\$267,125) |
| Net Operating Income |  |  | \$6,918,758 |
| Net Parking Revenue (without retail parking) | \$185 | per space per month | \$375,180 |
| Total NOI |  |  | \$7,293,938 |
| Capitalized Value | 5.50\% | cap rate | \$132,617,055 |
| (less) Cost of Sale/Marketing | 3.0\% |  | (\$3,978,512) |
| Net Project Value |  |  | \$128,638,543 |
| DEVELOPMENT COST |  |  |  |
| Direct Costs |  |  |  |
| Building Construction Cost | \$335 | per gross sq. ft. | \$58,625,000 |
| Parking Construction Cost | \$60,000 | per space | \$10,500,000 |
| Demo/Site Improvement Cost | \$10 | per land sq. ft. | \$500,000 |
| Total Direct Costs |  |  | \$69,625,000 |
| Indirect Costs |  |  |  |
| Tenant Improvements (office) | \$75 | per sq. ft. | \$11,407,500 |
| Tenant Improvements (retail) | \$100 | per sq. ft. | \$540,000 |
| Architecture and Engineering | 6.0\% | of direct costs | \$4,177,500 |
| Other Expenses | 3.0\% | of direct costs | \$2,088,800 |
| General and Administrative | 3.0\% | of direct costs | \$2,088,800 |
| Property Tax During Construction | 2.0\% | of direct costs | \$1,392,500 |
| Financing | 5.0\% | of direct costs | \$3,481,300 |
| Subtotal Indirect Costs excluding Fees |  |  | \$25,176,400 |
| Fees |  |  |  |
| Capital Improvements | \$2.00 | avg. per gross sq. ft. | \$338,000 |
| Jobs Housing Impact Fee | \$5.90 | avg. per gross sq. ft. | \$849,600 |
| Transportation - Office | \$2.00 | avg. per gross sq. ft. | \$338,000 |
| Transportation - Retail | \$0.75 | avg. per gross sq. ft. | \$4,500 |
| School Impact Fee | \$0.56 | avg. per gross sq. ft. | \$98,000 |
| Other Fees | \$25.00 | avg. per gross sq. ft. | \$4,375,000 |
| Subtotal Fees |  |  | \$6,003,100 |
| Total Indirect Costs |  |  | \$31,179,500 |
| Subtotal, Direct and Indirect Costs |  |  | \$100,804,500 |
| Contingency | 5.0\% | of direct and indirect costs | \$5,040,200 |
| Required Return on Investment | 13.0\% | of direct and indirect costs | \$13,104,600 |
| Total Costs |  |  | \$118,949,300 |
| Residual Land Value (Net Project Value - Total Costs) |  |  | \$9,689,243 |
| (less) Return on Residual Land Value | 13.0\% |  | (\$1,259,602) |
| Net Residual Land Value |  |  | \$8,429,641 |

# APPENDIX TABLE C. 8 <br> Development Case II-14 (HEG Prototype 13A) UPZONING <br> Intensity Area: JL / VC - Jack London West and Jack London East subareas 

Along Embarcadero, between Washington and


APPENDIX TABLE C. 9
Development Case II-12 (HEG Prototype 13B)

## BASE ZONING

Intensity Area: JL / VC - Jack London West and Jack London East subareas

| 2nd Street between Harrison and Madison |  | Assumption | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM |  |  |  |
| Lot Size | 1.15 | acres | 50,000 sq. ft. |
| Construction Type | Type III | (not used in calculations) |  |
| Building Height | 65' | (not used in calculations) |  |
| Building Height Estimated Actual (\# of stories) | 7.00 | (not used in calculations) |  |
| FAR | 5.00 |  |  |
| Gross Building Area (excl. parking) |  |  | 250,000 sq. ft. |
| Net Area |  | efficiency ratio | 225,000 sq. ft. |
| Office |  |  | 214,200 sq. ft. |
| Retail |  |  | 10,800 sq. ft. |
| Parking Spaces |  |  | 250 spaces |
| Spaces Excluding Retail |  |  | 238 spaces |
| REVENUE |  |  |  |
| Office (Full-Service) | \$68.20 | per net sq. ft. per year | \$14,608,440 |
| Retail (NNN) | \$35.20 | per net sq. ft. per year | \$380,160 |
| Gross Annual Revenue |  |  | \$14,988,600 |
| (less) Operating Expenses | 27.5\% | of office full-service revenue | (\$4,017,321) |
| (less) Vacancy Rate | 5.0\% | of gross annual revenue | $(\$ 749,430)$ |
| (less) Capital Reserves | \$0.50 | per net sq. ft. | $(\$ 112,500)$ |
| (less) Commissions | 2.5\% | of gross annual revenue | (\$374,715) |
| Net Operating Income |  |  | \$9,734,634 |
| Net Parking Revenue (without retail parking) | \$185 | per space per month | \$528,360 |
| Total NOI |  |  | \$10,262,994 |
| Capitalized Value | 5.50\% | cap rate | $\$ 186,599,891$ |
|  | 3.0\% |  | $(\$ 5,597,997)$ |
| Net Project Value |  |  | \$181,001,894 |
| DEVELOPMENT COST |  |  |  |
| Direct Costs |  |  |  |
| Building Construction Cost | \$345 | per gross sq. ft. | \$86,250,000 |
| Parking Construction Cost | \$60,000 | per space | \$15,000,000 |
| Demo/Site Improvement Cost | \$10 | per land sq. ft. | \$500,000 |
| Total Direct Costs |  |  | \$101,750,000 |
| Indirect Costs |  |  |  |
| Tenant Improvements (office) | \$75 | per sq. ft. | \$16,065,000 |
| Tenant Improvements (retail) | \$100 | per sq. ft. | \$1,080,000 |
| Architecture and Engineering | 6.0\% | of direct costs | \$6,105,000 |
| Other Expenses | 3.0\% | of direct costs | \$3,052,500 |
| General and Administrative | 3.0\% | of direct costs | \$3,052,500 |
| Property Tax During Construction | 2.0\% | of direct costs | \$2,035,000 |
| Financing | 5.0\% | of direct costs | \$5,087,500 |
| Subtotal Indirect Costs excluding Fees |  |  | \$36,477,500 |
| Fees |  |  |  |
| Capital Improvements | \$2.00 | avg. per gross sq. ft. | \$476,000 |
| Jobs Housing Impact Fee | \$5.90 | avg. per gross sq. ft. | \$1,256,700 |
| Transportation- Office | \$2.00 | avg. per gross sq. ft. | \$476,000 |
| Transportation - Retail | \$0.75 | avg. per gross sq. ft. | \$9,000 |
| School Impact Fee | \$0.56 | avg. per gross sq. ft. | \$140,000 |
| Other Fees | \$25.00 | avg. per gross sq. ft. | \$6,250,000 |
| Subtotal Fees |  |  | \$8,607,700 |
| Total Indirect Costs |  |  | \$45,085,200 |
| Subtotal, Direct and Indirect Costs |  |  | \$146,835,200 |
| Contingency | 5.0\% | of direct and indirect costs | \$7,341,800 |
| Required Return on Investment | 14.0\% | of direct and indirect costs | \$20,556,900 |
| Total Costs |  |  | \$174,733,900 |
| Residual Land Value (Net Project Value - Total Costs) |  |  | \$6,267,994 |
| (less) Return on Residual Land Value | 14.0\% |  | $(\$ 877,519)$ |
| Net Residual Land Value |  |  | \$5,390,475 |

# APPENDIX TABLE C. 9 Development Case II-12 (HEG Prototype 13B) UPZONING <br> Intensity Area: JL / VC - Jack London West and Jack London East subareas 



## APPENDIX TABLE C. 10

## Development Case III-4 (HEG Prototype 12)

BASE ZONING

## Intensity Area: KONO / Art + Garage District - Art + Garage District subarea

24th, 26th Streets, between Broadway and

| Telegraph | Assumption | Total |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM |  |  |  |
| Lot Size | 0.46 acres | 20,000 | sq. ft. |
| Construction Type | Type III (not used in calculations) |  |  |
| Building Height | $45^{\prime}$ (not used in calculations) |  |  |
| Building Height Estimated Actual (\# of stories) | 3.00 (not used in calculations) |  |  |
| FAR | 2.50 |  |  |
| Gross Building Area (excl. parking) |  | 50,000 | sq. ft. |
| Net Area | 90\% efficiency ratio | 45,000 | sq. ft. |
| Office |  | 38,700 | sq. ft. |
| Retail |  | 6,300 | sq. ft. |
| Parking Spaces |  | 50 | spaces |
| Spaces Excluding Retail |  | 43 | spaces |

Spaces Excluding Retail
REVENUE
Office (Full-Service)

| Retail (NNN) |
| :--- |
| Gross Annual Revenue |
| (less) Operating Expenses |
| (less) Vacancy Rate |
| (less) Capital Reserves |
| (less) Commissions |$\quad$| \$35.20 | per net sq. ft. per year sq. ft. per year |
| ---: | ---: |

Net Operating Income

Net Parking Revenue (without retail parking) \begin{tabular}{l}
$\$ 185$ per space per month <br>
Total NOI <br>

| Capitalized Value |  |
| :--- | ---: |
| (less) Cost of Sale/Marketing | $5.50 \%$ |
| cap rate |  |


 

$3.0 \%$ <br>
\hline
\end{tabular}

## Net Project Value

$\$ 2,894,760$
$\$ 221,760$
$\$ 3,116,520$
$(\$ 796,059)$
$(\$ 155,826)$
$(\$ 22,500)$
$(\$ 77,913)$
\$2,064,222
\$95,460
\$2,159,682
\$39,266,945
(\$1,178,008)
\$38,088,937

## DEVELOPMENT COST

## Direct Costs

| Building Construction Cost | \$330 | per gross sq. ft. | \$16,500,000 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Parking Construction Cost | \$50,000 | per space | \$2,500,000 |
| Demo/Site Improvement Cost | \$10 | per land sq. ft . | \$200,000 |
| Total Direct Costs |  |  | \$19,200,000 |
| Indirect Costs |  |  |  |
| Tenant Improvements (office) | \$75 | per sq. ft . | \$2,902,500 |
| Tenant Improvements (retail) | \$100 | per sq. ft. | \$630,000 |
| Architecture and Engineering | 6.0\% | of direct costs | \$1,152,000 |
| Other Expenses | 3.0\% | of direct costs | \$576,000 |
| General and Administrative | 3.0\% | of direct costs | \$576,000 |
| Property Tax During Construction | 2.0\% | of direct costs | \$384,000 |
| Financing | 5.0\% | of direct costs | \$960,000 |
| Subtotal Indirect Costs excluding Fees |  |  | \$7,180,500 |
| Fees |  |  |  |
| Capital Improvements | \$2.00 | avg. per gross sq. ft. | \$86,000 |
| Jobs Housing Impact Fee | \$5.90 | avg. per gross sq. ft. | \$106,200 |
| Transportation - Office | \$2.00 | avg. per gross sq. ft. | \$86,000 |
| Transportation - Retail | \$0.75 | avg. per gross sq. ft. | \$5,250 |
| School Impact Fee | \$0.56 | avg. per gross sq. ft. | \$28,000 |
| Other Fees | \$25.00 | avg. per gross sq. ft. | \$1,250,000 |
| Subtotal Fees |  |  | \$1,561,450 |
| Total Indirect Costs |  |  | \$8,741,950 |
| Subtotal, Direct and Indirect Costs |  |  | \$27,941,950 |
| Contingency | 5.0\% | of direct and indirect costs | \$1,397,100 |
| Required Return on Investment | 12.0\% | of direct and indirect costs | \$3,353,000 |
| Total Costs |  |  | \$32,692,050 |
| Residual Land Value (Net Project Value - Total Costs) |  |  | \$5,396,887 |
| (less) Return on Residual Land Value | 12.0\% |  | $(\$ 647,626)$ |
| Net Residual Land Value |  |  | \$4,749,261 |

APPENDIX TABLE C. 10

## Development Case III-4 (HEG Prototype 12)

UPZONING
Intensity Area: KONO / Art + Garage District - Art + Garage District subarea
24th, 26th Streets, between Broadway and


## APPENDIX TABLE B-4: Key Revenue and Cost Inputs for Representative OFFICE Development Prototypes / Cases

| Office Density | Intensity Area / Subarea |  | Office Rent | Building Construction Cost | Required Return on Investment |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Floor Area Ratio (FAR) |  | Current rent per net sq. <br> ft. peryear | Current rent $+10 \%$ as proxy for achieving feasibility | Cost per gross sq. ft. |  |
| High Rise Development |  |  |  |  |  |
| 30 | CBD | \$78 | \$85.80 | \$420 | 22\% |
| 22 | CBD | \$75.75 | \$83.33 | \$405 | 22\% |
| 20 | CBD | \$75 | \$82.50 | \$405 | 22\% |
| 20 | VC | \$69 | \$75.90 (+10\%), \$82.80 (+20\%) /a/ | \$405 | 22\% |
| 14 | JLW | \$68 | \$75.00 | \$370 | 18\% |
| 12 | CBD / 14th St. E | \$70 | \$77.00 | \$368 | 18\% |
| 12 | JLW | \$68 | \$75.00 | \$365 | 18\% |
| 12 | JLE / VC | \$67 | \$73.70 | \$365 | 18\% |
| Mid-Rise Development |  |  |  |  |  |
| 8 | CBD / 14th St. E | \$67 | \$74.00 | \$360 | 16\% |
| 7.5 | JLW / JLE waterfront \& nearby | \$65.50-\$66.50 | \$72.00-\$73.15 | \$355 | 16\% |
| 7.5 | JLE Inland | \$64 | \$70.40 | \$355 | 16\% |
| 7 | JLW | \$65 | \$71.50 | \$355 | 16\% |
| 5 | Garage District / KONO | \$70 | \$77.00 | \$355 | 14\% |
| 5 | VC | \$62 | \$68.20 | \$345 | 14\% |
| 5 | JLE / VC | \$62 | \$68.20 | \$345 | 14\% |
| 5 | JLE | \$62 | \$68.20 | \$345 | 14\% |
| Lower-Rise Development |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3.5 | JLW / JLE waterfront \& nearby | \$63 | \$69.00 | \$335 | 13\% |
| 2.5 | Garage District / KONO | \$68 | \$74.80 | \$330 | 12\% |
| 2 | JLW | \$60 | \$66.00 | \$330 | 12\% |
| 2 | JLE waterfront \& nearby | \$61 | \$67.00 | \$330 | 12\% |

NOTE: The economic analysis found that higher-intensity development is not feasible under current real estate market and development cost conditions. The analysis then proceeded to identify and evaluate future scenarios when real estate economics improve and developments become feasible. For ease of analysis, the pro forma models tested percentage increases in rents/revenues until feasibility was reached. This is a proxy for the more complex set of changes in various development revenue and cost factors more likely to occur to support feasibility over time. For the office development prototypes, feasibility was achieved in most cases at rent levels approximately $10 \%$ higher than current rents at the time of this economic analysis in 2021 . Since then, office rents have declined due to ongoing uncertainties following the pandemic. Thus, rents/revenues that support feasibility as shown in this analysis are possibly closer to $15 \%$ or $20 \%$ higher than current rents in 2023 , for many of the development cases.
/a/ High-rise office development, in an area without such development, will require larger percentage increases in rents/revenue to achieve feasibility.

## APPENDIX TABLE B-5: Parking Assumptions for OFFICE Development Cases

| Intensity Area/Subarea | CBD: Lake Merritt, Broadway, City Center | 14th Street | KONO /Art + Garage District | Jack London / Victory Court |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Development Cases | I-1, I-2 | I-5 | III-4 | $\begin{gathered} \mathrm{II}-1, \mathrm{II}-6, \mathrm{II}-7, \mathrm{II}-10 \\ \mathrm{II}-12, \mathrm{II}-14 \end{gathered}$ |
| Parking Ratios - BASE ZONING |  |  |  |  |
| Office - per 1,000 gross sq. ft . | 0.50 | 0.50 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Retail - per 1,000 gross sq. ft. | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Parking Ratios - UPZONING |  |  |  |  |
| Office - per 1,000 gros sq. ft. | 0.45 | 0.50 | 0.80 | 0.80 |
| Retail - per 1,000 gross sq. ft. | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |

Source: City of Oakland and Hausrath Economics Group, May/June 2021


[^0]:    ${ }^{1}$ Economic Planning \& Systems Inc., Downtown Oakland Specific Plan: Incentive Program Feasibility Study, July 10, 2020.
    ${ }^{2}$ While inputs for the costs and revenues of development are specific to downtown Oakland, the analysis does not include site or infrastructure costs specific to individual sites and locations. Examples include possible costs for site clean-up, flood control and resiliency improvements, or additional infrastructure and/or amenity improvements beyond those typical of downtown development more generally.

[^1]:    ${ }^{3}$ The economic analysis was originally done in 2021 and then expanded and modified as proposed base zoning and intensity area zoning were changed and refined over time during 2022.

