

TECHNICAL MEMORANDUM

To: City of Pleasanton

From: Jason Moody, Michael Nimon and Ben Sigman; EPS

Subject: EPSP Alternatives Infrastructure Cost Burden Review;
EPS #121090

Date: April 8, 2013

The City of Pleasanton requested that Economic & Planning Systems (EPS) assess the potential for the East Pleasanton Specific Plan (EPSP) program alternatives to support the infrastructure cost required for development. This review builds on the analysis of the initial EPSP alternatives presented to the Task Force on March 7. To provide an initial screen on the financial feasibility of the necessary infrastructure investments, EPS considered the estimated cost burden of infrastructure relative to the potential finished value of each program alternative. The analysis is based on the three revised EPSP program alternatives dated April 8th, 2013 and summarized in **Figure 1** prepared by Gates + Associates and updated infrastructure cost estimates prepared by Kier & Wright Civil Engineers Surveyors.

To conduct this broad-level financial feasibility screen, EPS studied the suite of land uses contained in each program alternative and estimated an aggregate "finished market value" for each. In EPS's experience, an infrastructure program cost burden of about 15 percent of the finished value of the real estate program is supportable. EPS also employs another infrastructure feasibility test that considers the potential annual cost burden, assuming that a Community Facility District is used to finance the EPSP infrastructure, to determine whether total tax burden (property tax and CFD together) might exceed a 2.0 percent threshold.

Figure 1 Land Use Alternatives

Land Use	Density (Units Per Acre / FAR)	Unit Size (sq.ft.)	Alternative 1			Alternative 2			Alternative 3		
			Units	Acres	Building Sq.Ft.	Units	Acres	Building Sq.Ft.	Units	Acres	Building Sq.Ft.
<u>Residential</u>											
VHDR (40 du/acre)	40	1,000	0	0	0	0	0	0	564	14.1	564,000
VHDR (30 du/acre)	30	1,200	626	20.9	751,200	750	25	900,000	0	0	0
HDR (23 Du/acre)	23	1,500	395	17.9	592,500	474	20.6	711,000	356	15.5	534,000
MDR (11 DU/acre)	11	1,800	110	10	198,000	110	10	198,000	0	0	0
LDR (3 DU/ac)	3	2,500	295	119	737,500	376	120.4	940,000	363	142	907,500
<u>Commercial</u>											
Campus Office	0.35			17.8	271,379		25.8	393,347		15.9	242,411
Industrial	0.31			103.4	1,396,272		89.4	1,207,222		105.3	1,421,929
Retail	0.35			6	91,476		6	91,476		6.1	93,001
Campus Office											
Retail	0.35			16	243,936		16	243,936		16	243,936
Total			1,426	311.0	4,282,263	1,710	313.2	4,684,981	1,283	314.9	4,006,777

Key Findings

The key findings from this preliminary financial feasibility review are summarized in **Figure 2** and further described below.

- The initial financial feasibility screen suggests that all three alternatives are marginally feasible from the perspective of a real estate developer(s) based on the relationship between potential finished building values and the required infrastructure investments and other costs necessary to create this value. Specifically, one feasibility measure suggests that all feasibility alternatives fall slightly above the acceptable range of 15 percent (infrastructure costs as a percent of total value). However, the alternatives perform more favorably based on the Tax Burden Threshold test. Given the relatively slim margins for development feasibility currently estimated for each alternative, further changes or factors that either increase project costs and/or decrease project values in a material will likely compromise the overall viability of the EPSP from an economic perspective.
- EPS finds that the overall economic viability of all three EPSP alternatives is relatively comparable, based on the relationship between finished project values and infrastructure costs. In other words, the three alternatives do not differ significantly in terms of total infrastructure costs and project value (i.e., type and amount of development.) While alternative 2 appears to be the most feasible due to the larger number of residential uses, larger differences between the alternatives are likely to depend on the relative market performance of specific product types, factors that have yet to be evaluated in detail. In addition, the likely success of all three alternatives from an economic perspective will require relatively positive market trends and that other unknown cost and risk factors fall within a reasonable range (e.g., infrastructure costs, entitlement changes, delays, etc.).
- While infrastructure cost estimates have been reduced from the March 7, 2013 draft of the analysis (due to changes in assumptions related to the incidence of park improvement and soil remediation costs), estimates of applicable development fees and connection charges have been included. These fees and charges are significant, especially for sewer and water

services, and combined represent between 66 and 70 percent of the total backbone infrastructure burden. Development impact fees and utility connection charges are typically paid for by vertical developers (e.g., home builders) and thus could be at least partially discounted from the “rule-of-thumb” feasibility tests included herein.¹ However, the size of these fees relative to typical development projects of this nature suggests that they should be considered as part of the assessment of overall project feasibility.

- The results of the Infrastructure Cost Burden Review are preliminary and provide a high-level screen for “fatal flaws” in the alternative program use mixes. The intent is to provide an early-stage assessment that helps to guide refinement of EPSP planning parameters. Future analysis should consider program phasing (e.g., market absorption relative to required infrastructure investment), more detailed assessments of specific real estate product types, and refined infrastructure cost analysis, including potential off-site costs, if any.

Figure 2 Summary of Findings

Program Alternative	“Finished” Market Value	Total Infrastructure Cost Estimate	Feasibility Potential
EPSP Alt. 1	\$1.02 B	\$187.5 M	Marginally Feasible
EPSP Alt. 2	\$1.19 B	\$200.8 M	Marginally Feasible
EPSP Alt. 3	\$0.97 B	\$180.0 M	Marginally Feasible

Methodology and Assumptions

Financing Feasibility Standards

For a large-scale development project, the infrastructure cost burden must bear a reasonable relationship to the value of the development being created and must not onerously impact the developer and/or the eventual property owners. Based on extensive experience with financing plans for major development projects, EPS recommends the following feasibility screening standards:

1. **“Cost/Value Ratio”** The total backbone infrastructure cost burden (including impact fees) should not exceed 15 percent of the total EPSP development value.
2. **“Tax Burden Threshold”** If a special tax on the new development (such as a Mello-Roos Community Facilities District) is used to finance backbone infrastructure, the combined tax burden (base tax rate plus special taxes) should not exceed 2.0 percent of the properties’ assessed value, meaning that the CFD alone should not exceed approximately one percent of value.

¹ The term “vertical” development, as used in this analysis, refers to the development of real estate products that are intended to be sold leased to consumers and/or tenants (e.g. residential and commercial buildings). In contrast, the term “horizontal” development refers to required improvements to the land necessary before vertical development can take place, such as the major transportation facilities, utilities (e.g. for sewer discharge and water provision), and other infrastructure.

The above feasibility tests are designed to provide a high-level first screen on the viability of each alternative from an economic and financial perspective. Both tests are relatively simplistic and may either overstate or understate the true financial performance of each alternative for a variety of reasons. For example, the development community is likely to pursue a variety of financing mechanisms to cover the infrastructure costs, including conventional debt, private equity, CFD proceeds, impact fees, and others. A more strategic approach to financing, for example, one that combines both CFD proceeds with developer equity and conventional debt, could increase the financial feasibility of the Program alternatives.

On the other hand, large-scale development projects of this nature often require “over-sizing” of backbone infrastructure in early phases. In such cases, the cost/value ratio and the tax burden thresholds may be exceeded in early phases, requiring the developers to make investments beyond what the immediate development can support. However, for this initial feasibility screen, EPS evaluates the EPSP alternatives as a snapshot in time, assuming full build out. Consequently, future analysis will also need to consider the role of market absorption and the phasing of infrastructure costs relative to the creation of real estate value over time.

Figure 3 presents detailed findings from the two tests of the three EPSP alternatives. As shown, all alternatives perform relatively poorly based on the Cost/Value Ratio test and relatively favorably based on the Tax Burden Threshold test. The main reason for the discrepancy between the two feasibility measures is the significant cost associated with development impact fees and connection charges. These fees and charges are substantial, especially for sewer and water service, and combined represent between 66 and 70 percent of the total backbone infrastructure burden. These fees are excluded from Tax Burden Threshold test since they are typically borne by vertical builders and seldom funded through land-based financing mechanisms such as a Mello-Roos bond. The **Appendix** to this memorandum presents detailed data and calculations, including the program alternatives use mix, development values (also discussed below), and impact fee calculations.

Figure 3 Finding from Feasibility Testing

Item	Alternative		
	1	2	3
Infrastructure Costs			
Backbone Infrastructure	\$60,185,020	\$59,015,228	\$59,148,274
Off-Site Utility Improvements ¹	\$2,000,000	\$2,000,000	\$2,000,000
Fees and Connection Charges ²	<u>\$125,272,173</u>	<u>\$139,827,865</u>	<u>\$118,897,478</u>
Total Infrastructure Cost Burden	\$187,457,193	\$200,843,094	\$180,045,752
Development Value	\$1,023,706,903	\$1,187,137,515	\$966,587,693
Infrastructure Cost/Value Ratio	18.3%	16.9%	18.6%
Tax Burden Threshold Test			
CFD Bond Proceeds and Issuance Cost ³	\$65,294,271	\$64,065,990	\$64,205,687
Proceeds Required for Annual Debt Service ⁴	\$5,925,873	\$5,814,398	\$5,827,077
Debt Coverage Factor	120%	120%	120%
Special Tax Revenue Required (Annual)	\$7,111,047	\$6,977,277.96	\$6,992,492
Potential Special Tax (% of Development Value)	0.69%	0.59%	0.72%

Source: Kier & Wright Civil Engineers Surveyors and EPS

¹ Reflects a conservative "place-holder" assumption to cover any upgrades to off-site sanitary sewer pipes, water systems and other utility systems.

² Include water, wastewater, impervious surface, public facilities, traffic development, Tri-Valley Transportation Committee, school, park dedication, and GIS fees based on the City's January 2013 fee schedule.

³ Assumes a Community Facilities District bond (CFD) is used to cover backbone and off-site infrastructure, but not fees (bond issuance costs assumed at 5 percent of bond value).

⁴ Assumes an Interest rate 6.5% for a 20-year term.

Development Value

The Cost Burden Review analysis considers the potential market value of various development types envisioned by the EPSP, including residential, retail, office, and industrial/flex uses (see

Appendix Figure 2 for detailed market value assumptions). EPS assumes real estate values that are typical of the Pleasanton real estate market. At this point, the alternatives do not specify detailed product types, formats, or market positioning. This analysis relies on value assumptions that are representative of new development projects. These values are generally conservative, with the analysis seeking to avoid overestimation of building values and supportable infrastructure cost. Additional valuation considerations were applied in the analysis of higher-density housing, affordable housing, industrial/flex uses, destination uses, and city service uses, as discussed below.

EPS relies on variety of sources to estimate real estate values, including current market data concerning residential and commercial transactions occurring in the City and surrounding areas. In particular, EPS reviewed residential sales data from The Gregory Group and commercial sales data from CoStar Group. EPS also considered real estate values developed as part of continuing

work on the Fiscal Impact Analysis of the City of Pleasanton General Plan, to ensure basic consistency.

The Specific Plan alternatives call for a significant component of the housing program to be developed at approximately 30 dwelling units per acre in Alternatives 1 and 2 and 40 dwelling units per acre in Alternative 3. Based on guidance from the EPSP team, EPS assumes that this portion of the housing program will be a rental product. In addition, the analysis assumes that affordable housing is provided within this residential category. The analysis assumes that the affordable units will represent 15 percent of the total residential program. For example, Alternative 1 assumes 214 BMR units to cover the 15 percent of the total 1,426 total residential units. To be conservative, EPS assumes that the affordable housing included in the EPSP alternatives will not contribute to funding of the infrastructure costs. That is, affordable housing is valued at zero for the purposes of this initial infrastructure cost burden screen.

The Specific Plan alternatives call for between 1.2 million and 1.4 million square feet of industrial/flex space. The relative magnitude of this particular use within the overall program makes it critical to the infrastructure feasibility evaluation. To the extent that certain real estate product types do not generate sufficient economic value to allow for a "fair share" contribution to project-wide infrastructure costs, the overall Project feasibility will be more challenging.

To address this issue, the EPS analysis conservatively assumes that industrial/flex value is at the lower end of the value spectrum, \$95 per square foot (the observed range of value is roughly \$95 to \$500 per square foot). The assumption of low-value industrial/flex reflects uncertainty associated with the specific nature of the industrial/flex space development as well as the probability that such a large amount of industrial/flex space could be developed over a longer-term time horizon. It also reflects additional soil mitigation cost that will likely be required to support new industrial/flex development.²

EPS also conservatively assumes that affordable housing and the destination uses do not contribute to program value. That is, these uses are not valued as part of the infrastructure feasibility tests. The analysis also assumes that the Operations Service Center and Transfer Station are relocated and land use densities for these areas have been included in the valuation. If these uses are not relocated, either total development would be reduced or density would need to increase. Both results are likely to negatively affect project-wide feasibility to some extent.

Development Cost

EPS relies on preliminary planning-level development cost estimates provided by Kier & Wright Civil Engineers Surveyors. These data are provided as part of the **Appendix** to this memorandum. Kier & Wright has estimated costs for the on-site planning area, including major roadway improvements, sewer improvements, and water line improvements. Additionally, Kier &

² In the previous EPS memo, soil mitigation was included as a project-wide cost at about \$8 million. However, given that the soil mitigation is likely to apply predominantly to land designated for industrial uses, it has been netted out of finished industrial value for the purpose of this analysis. In the subsequent more detailed analysis, this cost will be netted out of industrial land value.

Wright estimated development fees and connection charges for all three development alternatives.

Unlike the prior analysis, vertical development is assumed to pay applicable park fees, and dedicate any land necessary for these uses. In the previous analysis it was assumed that developers would cover all costs associated with the park improvements included in the Plan (including necessary land dedication) but would be exempt from park fees. This change actually reduces the cost borne by developers significantly since the on-site park improvement costs were estimated at \$35.3 million, compared to park fees that range from \$10.8 million (Alternative 3) to \$14.5 million (Alternative 2).³ Thus, under the current formulation, additional park improvement costs above and beyond those covered by required fees and land dedication would need to be financed through local, regional, or other non-EPSP sources (i.e. not be EPSP landowners or developers).

A critical point regarding the infrastructure cost estimates is that all three alternatives include costs associated with the future connection of El Charro Road to Stanley Boulevard. No fee credit to the traffic fees, regional or local, is assumed for traffic improvements. To the extent that any fee credit is granted by the City, the feasibility of the EPSP will improve.

The analysis also considers the cost burden associated with development impact fees and other off-site fees. While these fees are typically paid by vertical builders, the cost in EPSP is substantial and is therefore considered in this analysis.⁴ Fees include charges on development from water, wastewater, impervious surface, public facilities, traffic development, Tri-Valley Transportation Committee, schools, parks, and GIS fees, as estimated by Kier & Wright and EPS. Due to inclusion of park land dedication fees, park development costs are excluded from this analysis. Affordable housing requirements are assumed to be satisfied within the program.

³ The Specific Plan may need to include provisions that will allow Park Land Dedication fees to be used for on-site park improvements.

⁴ In the subsequent more detailed analysis, the fee cost will net out residual land value that vertical builders would pay to a horizontal developer.

APPENDIX

Appendix Figure 1 Program Alternatives

Use	EPSP Alternative Program		
	I	II	III
Residential (Dwelling Units)			
<u>Attached¹</u>			
40 du/ac (MR)	0	0	372
40 du/ac (BMR)	0	0	192
30 du/ac (MR)	412	493	0
30 du/ac (BMR)	214	257	0
23 du/ac	395	474	356
<u>Detached</u>			
11 du/ac	110	110	0
3 du/ac	<u>295</u>	<u>376</u>	<u>363</u>
Residential Total	1,426	1,710	1,283
Retail (Square Feet)			
0.35 FAR	91,476	91,476	93,001
Office Campus (Square Feet)			
0.35 FAR	515,315	637,283	486,347
Industrial/Flex (Square Feet)			
0.31 FAR	1,396,272	1,207,222	1,421,929
Destination Use²	Yes	Yes	Yes
OSC & TS²	Yes	Yes	Yes

Source: Gates + Associates and EPS

¹ Attached housing program includes a mix of Market Rate (MR) and Below Market Rate (BMR) units.

² EPS conservatively assumes that the destination use, Operations Service Center, and Transfer Station do not contribute to infrastructure feasibility.

Appendix Figure 2 Program Alternatives Market Value

Use	Value Unit/SF	EPSP Alternative Value		
		I	II	III
Residential				
<u>Attached¹</u>				
40 du/ac (MR)	\$350,000	\$0	\$0	\$130,200,000
40 du/ac (BMR)	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
30 du/ac (MR)	\$350,000	\$144,200,000	\$172,550,000	\$0
30 du/ac (BMR)	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
23 du/ac	\$500,000	\$197,500,000	\$237,000,000	\$178,000,000
<u>Detached</u>				
11 du/ac	\$750,000	\$82,500,000	\$82,500,000	\$0
3 du/ac	\$950,000	<u>\$280,250,000</u>	<u>\$357,200,000</u>	<u>\$344,850,000</u>
Residential Total		\$704,450,000	\$849,250,000	\$653,050,000
Retail				
0.35 FAR	\$350	\$32,016,600	\$32,016,600	\$32,550,210
Office Campus				
0.35 FAR	\$300	\$154,594,440	\$191,184,840	\$145,904,220
Industrial/Flex				
0.31 FAR	\$95	\$132,645,863	\$114,686,075	\$135,083,263
Destination Use²	-	-	-	-
OSC & TS²	-	-	-	-
Aggregate Program Alternative Value		\$1,023,706,903	\$1,187,137,515	\$966,587,693

Source: Gates + Associates and EPS

¹ Attached housing program includes a mix of Market Rate (MR) and Below Market Rate (BMR) units.

² EPS conservatively assumes that the destination use, Operations Service Center, and Transfer Station do not contribute to infrastructure feasibility.

Appendix Figure 3 Program Alternatives Development Impact Fee Schedule

Land Use	Water			Waste Water		Public Facilities	Traffic Development	Tri-Valley Transportation Committee Fee	Impervious Surface	In-lieu Park Dedication Fee	GIS Fee	School Impact Fee
	Meter Fee (per acre)	Potable - Distrib. System (per acre)	Potable - Water Supply (per acre)	Collection System (per unit / per sq.ft.)	DSRSD Treatment (per unit / per sq.ft.)	(per unit / per sq.ft.)	(per unit / per sq.ft.)	(per unit / per sq.ft.)	(per acre)	(per unit)	(0.002 per sq.ft. of site)	(per sq.ft.)
<u>Residential</u>												
VHDR (40 du/acre)	\$910	\$9,600	\$188,000	\$330	\$9,477	\$2,736	\$3,125	\$1,450	\$37,026	\$7,969	\$0.00	\$3.04
VHDR (30 du/acre)	\$910	\$9,600	\$188,000	\$330	\$9,477	\$2,736	\$3,125	\$1,450	\$37,026	\$7,969	\$0.00	\$3.04
HDR (23 Du/acre)	\$730	\$6,000	\$117,500	\$330	\$9,477	\$2,736	\$3,125	\$1,450	\$37,026	\$7,969	\$0.00	\$3.04
MDR (11 DU/acre)	\$4,620	\$13,200	\$258,500	\$500	\$14,381	\$3,351	\$4,465	\$2,279	\$34,848	\$9,707	\$0.00	\$6.74
LDR (3 DU/ac)	\$2,100	\$6,000	\$117,500	\$500	\$14,381	\$4,487	\$4,465	\$2,279	\$30,492	\$9,707	\$0.00	\$6.74
<u>Commercial</u>												
Campus Office	\$730	\$6,000	\$117,500	\$0.11	\$3.27	\$0.85	\$5.94	\$4.09	\$37,026	\$0	\$0.00	\$0.47
Industrial	\$730	\$6,000	\$117,500	\$0.11	\$3.27	\$0.51	\$4.46	\$2.76	\$37,026	\$0	\$0.00	\$0.47
Retail	\$730	\$6,000	\$117,500	\$0.11	\$3.27	\$0.56	\$12.49	\$1.52	\$37,026	\$0	\$0.00	\$0.47
Campus Office	\$730	\$6,000	\$117,500	\$0.11	\$3.27	\$0.79	\$7.25	\$3.58	\$37,026	\$0	\$0.00	\$0.47
Retail	\$730	\$6,000	\$117,500	\$0.11	\$3.27	\$0.79	\$7.25	\$3.58	\$37,026	\$0	\$0.00	\$0.47

Appendix Figure 4 Total Development Impact Fees by Alternative

Land Use	Water	Waste Water	Public Facilities	Traffic Development	Tri-Valley Transportation Committee Fee	Impervious Surface	In-lieu Park Dedication Fee	GIS Fee	School Impact Fee	TOTAL
Alternative 1	\$39,179,360	\$22,810,105	\$5,672,926	\$15,749,386	\$8,378,454	\$10,057,474	\$12,067,684	\$25,228	\$11,331,558	\$125,272,173
Alternative 2	\$43,072,391	\$25,779,549	\$6,599,038	\$16,626,751	\$8,834,473	\$10,938,819	\$14,471,658	\$27,717	\$13,477,471	\$139,827,865
Alternative 3	\$37,721,614	\$21,188,560	\$5,322,412	\$15,207,636	\$8,090,940	\$10,090,522	\$10,855,121	\$25,603	\$10,395,070	\$118,897,478

**ENGINEER'S ESTIMATE
SUMMARY FOR EAST PLEASANTON SPECIFIC PLAN
Alternative 1**

<u>Description</u>	<u>Estimate</u>
Overall Major Infrastructure	
El Charro/Stanley Blvd. Undercrossing	\$ 19,623,500.00
Boulder Road Improvements	\$ 1,874,496.00
Busch Road Improvements	\$ 3,577,600.00
Traffic Signals(Assumes 7 new and 4 modified)	\$ 2,250,000.00
Arroyo Mocho Bridges	\$ 3,726,000.00
El Charro Road Improvements	\$ 7,076,000.00
Gateways	\$ 300,000.00
Sewer Improvements	\$ 2,230,000.00
Recycled Water Lines	\$ 1,190,200.00
Water Improvements	\$ 1,484,200.00
Joint Trench Improvements	\$ 1,249,500.00
	<u>\$ 44,581,496.00</u>
	Total \$ 44,581,496.00
	15% Contingency \$ 6,687,224.40
	20% Softcosts \$ 8,916,299.20
	<u>\$ 60,185,019.60</u>

Notes:

- 1) Cost excludes interior two lane streets and offsite improvements outside of specific plan area.
- 2) Cost Excludes Citywide Infrastructure Fees
- 3) Cost for soil mitigation is excluded.
- 4) Assumes no water tanks or pump stations. This analysis will be done after finalizing landuse plan.
- 5) Includes two rail bridges

**ENGINEER'S ESTIMATE
SUMMARY FOR EAST PLEASANTON SPECIFIC PLAN
Alternative 2**

<u>Description</u>	<u>Estimate</u>
Overall Major Infrastructure	
El Charro/Stanley Blvd. Undercrossing	\$ 19,623,500.00
Boulder Road Improvements	\$ 1,257,984.00
Busch Road Improvements	\$ 3,577,600.00
Traffic Signals(assumes 6 new and and 4 modified)	\$ 2,000,000.00
Arroyo Mocho Bridges	\$ 3,726,000.00
El Charro Road Improvements	\$ 7,076,000.00
Gateways	\$ 300,000.00
Sewer Improvements	\$ 2,230,000.00
Recycled Water Lines	\$ 1,190,200.00
Water Improvements	\$ 1,484,200.00
Joint Trench Improvements	\$ 1,249,500.00
Total	\$ 43,714,984.00
15% Contingency	\$ 6,557,247.60
20% Softcosts	\$ 8,742,996.80
	<u>\$ 59,015,228.40</u>

Notes:

- 1) Cost excludes interior two lane streets and offsite improvements outside of specific plan area.
- 2) Cost Excludes Citywide Infrastructure Fees
- 3) Cost for soil mitigation is excluded.
- 4) Undercrossing Includes Stanley Blvd Improvements
- 5) Includes two rail bridges

**ENGINEER'S ESTIMATE
SUMMARY FOR EAST PLEASANTON SPECIFIC PLAN
Alternative 3**

<u>Description</u>	<u>Estimate</u>
Overall Major Infrastructure	
El Charro/Stanley Blvd. Undercrossing	\$ 19,623,500.00
Boulder Road Improvements	\$ 1,433,536.00
Busch Road Improvements	\$ 3,577,600.00
Traffic Signals(assumes 6 new and 3 modified)	\$ 1,975,000.00
Arroyo Mocho Bridges	\$ 3,726,000.00
El Charro Road Improvements	\$ 7,024,000.00
Gateways	\$ 300,000.00
Sewer Improvements	\$ 2,230,000.00
Recycled Water Lines	\$ 1,190,200.00
Water Improvements	\$ 1,484,200.00
Joint Trench Improvements	\$ 1,249,500.00
Total	\$ 43,813,536.00
15% Contingency	\$ 6,572,030.40
20% Softcosts	\$ 8,762,707.20
	\$ 59,148,273.60

Notes:

- 1) Cost excludes interior two lane streets and offsite improvements outside of specific plan area.
- 2) Cost Excludes Citywide Infrastructure Fees
- 3) Cost for soil mitigation is excluded.
- 4) Undercrossing Includes Stanley Blvd Improvements
- 5) Includes two rail bridges