# El Dorado County Traffic Impact Fee (TIF) Program Update Nexus & Funding Model 3-Zone Scenario: Merge Fee For Zones 2 and 3; Merge Fee For Zones 1, 4, 5, 6, and 7; Separate Fee For Zone 8 November 17, 2020

Page 1 of 39

### List of Tables and Model Notes

Section 1: New Development and Equivalent Dwelling Unit Projections	
Table 1: Existing and Future Land Use	
Table 2: Growth Projections by Fee Zone (2018-2040)	
Table 3: Land Use Categories, Trip Generation Rates & EDU Factors	
Table 4: New Equivalent Dwelling Units (2018-2040)	
Table 5: Local Serving Employment	
Section 2: TIF CIP Cost Estimates and Cost Allocation By Zone	
Table 6: Bridge Replacement Projects	
Table 7: Intersection and Safety Improvements	
Table 8: Transit Capital Projects	
Table 9: Program Administration	
Table 10: TIF Program Costs	
Table 11: Trip Allocation By Zone	
Table 12: Cost Allocation By Zone	
Section 3: Non-TIF Funding Estimates	
Table 13: State & Federal Funding for TIF Program	
Table 14: TIF Program Fund Balances	
Section 4: TIF Schedules and Budget Summaries	
Table 15: Hwy 50 TIF Cost Allocation, Cost Per Equivalent Dwelling Unit, and Revenue	
Table 16: Local Roads TIF Cost Allocation, Cost Per Equivalent Dwelling Unit, and Revenue	
Table 17: Total TIF Cost Allocation, Cost Per Equivalent Dwelling Unit, and Revenue	
Table 18: Hwy 50 TIF Schedule	
Table 19: Local Roads TIF Schedule	
Table 20: Total TIF Schedule	
Table 21: Allocation of State & Federal Funding	
Table 22: TIF Program Budget Summary	
Table 23: 2020 Update TIF and Current (FY 2020-21) Schedules	
Table 24: Difference Between 2020 Update TIF and Current (FY 2020-21) TIF	
Model Notes	
All data entries in BLUE are copied from external sources (see source in each table).	l
All other data is generated internally by the model.	ł

## **Section 1**

## New Development and Equivalent Dwelling Unit Projections

Page 3 of 39

20-1514 F 3 of 39

Land Use			2018			2040		Growt	h, 2018-2	040
		House-	Dwelling		House-	Dwelling		House-	Dwelling	
Residential		holds	Units	Share	holds	Units	Share	holds	Units	Share
Single Family		48,778	54,739	89%	56,630	63,127	89%	7,852	8,388	85%
Multi-Family		6,143	6,666	<u>11</u> %	7,457	8,101	<u>11</u> %	1,314	1,435	<u>15</u> %
Total		54,921	61,404	100%	64,087	71,228	100%	9,166	9,822	100%
			1,000			1,000			1,000	
	Sq. Ft.		Building			Building			Building	
Nonresidential	per Job	Jobs	Sq. Ft.	Share	Jobs	Sq. Ft.	Share	Jobs	Sq. Ft.	Share
Commercial	500	8,653	4,327	26%	10,140	5,071	26%	1,487	744	29%
Office	275	16,195	4,454	27%	18,758	5,159	27%	2,563	705	28%
Medical	312	305	95	1%	1,270	396	2%	965	301	12%
Industrial / Other <sup>1</sup>	1,000	7,769	7,769	<u>47</u> %	8,549	8,549	<u>45</u> %	780	780	<u>31</u> %
Total		32,922	16,644	100%	38,717	19,175	100%	5,795	2,529	100%

Note: Negative growth results by traffic analysis zone are excluded assuming that growth does not occur on redeveloped parcels resulting in a fee credit.

<sup>1</sup> Includes "manufacturing/other" and "education" job categories in travel demand model.

Sources: Kimley-Horn and Associates, Inc., (land use data for travel demand model based on Matt Kowta, BAE Associates memorandum to Natalie Porter, El Dorado County, March 17, 2020).

	Zone 1	Zone 2	Zone 3	Zone 4	Zone 5	Zone 6	Zone 7	Zone 8	Total
Residential				(dv	elling un	nits)			
Single Family									
Not Restricted	48	1,549	695	233	136	70	64	4,911	7,708
Age Restricted	-	50	50	-	-	-	-	580	680
Subtotal	48	1,599	745	233	136	70	64	5,491	8,388
Multi-family									
Not Restricted	-	755	64	-	2	-	-	1	823
Age Restricted	-	100	200	-	-	-	-	312	612
Subtotal	-	855	264	-	2	-	-	313	1,435
Total	48	2,454	1,009	233	139	70	64	5,804	9,822
Nonresidential				(1	,000 sq. 1	ft.)			
Commercial	-	304	144	4	97	-	-	195	744
Office	-	40	67	2	52	-		544	705
Medical	-	163	42	-	26	-	-	70	301
Industrial / Other	-	135	59	28	142	_	-	416	780
Total	-	642	312	34	317	_	-	1,224	2,529

Table 2: Growth Projections by Fee Zone (2018-2
---

Sources: Kimley-Horn and Associates, Inc. (Iand use inputs to El Dorado County travel demand model); Table 1 (employment densities).

Table 3: Land Use Cat	tegories, Trip Generation I	Rates & EDU	Factor	S			
	Institute for Transportation		Trip	New Trip	Average Trip	New VMT <sup>3</sup> per	EDU
Land Use	Engineers Category	Unit	Rate <sup>1</sup>	Ends	Length <sup>2</sup>	Unit	Factor <sup>4</sup>
Residential							
SFD Not Restricted							
Less than 1,000 SqFt	210: Single Family Detached	Dwelling Unit	EDU	ates adi	usted for p	ersons	0.82
1,000 to 1,499 SqFt	210: Single Family Detached	Dwelling Unit		-	old by unit		0.89
1,500 to 1,999 SqFt	210: Single Family Detached	Dwelling Unit	peri	lousent		3126.	0.95
2,000 to 2,999 SqFt	210: Single Family Detached	Dwelling Unit	0.99	100%	5.0	4.95	1.00
3,000 to 3,999 SqFt	210: Single Family Detached	Dwelling Unit	EDU ra	1.06			
4,000 SqFt or more	210: Single Family Detached	Dwelling Unit	per household by unit size.				1.10
MFD Not Restricted	220: Apartment	Dwelling Unit	0.56	100%	5.0	2.80	0.57
SFD Age Restricted	251: Senior Adult - Detached	Dwelling Unit	0.30	100%	5.0	1.50	0.30
MFD Age Restricted	252: Senior Adult - Attached	Dwelling Unit	0.26	100%	5.0	1.30	0.26
Nonresidential							
Commercial	820: Shopping Center	1,000 SqFt	6.51	47%	2.5	7.65	1.55
Hotel / Motel / B&B	320: Motel	Room	0.38	58%	6.4	1.41	0.28
Church	560: Church	1,000 SqFt	0.49	64%	3.9	1.22	0.25
Office / Medical	[Weighted avg. based	on office and m	edical gro	owth - S	ee Table 2	2]	1.28
Office	710: General Office	1,000 SqFt	1.15	77%	5.1	4.52	0.91
Medical	720: Medical-Dental Office	1,000 SqFt	3.46	60%	5.1	10.59	2.14
Industrial / Other	110: General Light Industrial	1,000 SqFt	0.63	79%	5.1	2.54	0.51
•.	nercial trip rate based on a 50,000 square fo h within El Dorado County. Factors are sin	-	other Sacarı	mento regio	on communitie	s for transp	ortation
<sup>3</sup> VMT = vehicle miles travelled.							

VMT = vehicle miles travelled.

The equivalent dwelling unit (EDU) factor is new VMT normalized so one single family unit, 2,000 to 2,999 square feet in size, is 1.00 EDU.

Sources: Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE), Trip Generation 10th Edition, Sept. 2017 (for trip rates); San Diego Association of Governments, Brief Guide of Vehicular Trip Generation Rates, April 2002 (for new trip ends factor); John P. Long, P.E. (for average trip length); John P. Long, P.E., memorandum to Rafael Martinez, El Dorado County Director of Transportation, August 4, 2020 (see Board of Supervisors agenda, August 25, 2020, item, 41) (for single family dwelling EDU factors by dwelling unit size); Table 2 (this model).

Table 4: New Equivalent Dwelling Un	nits (2018-2040)
-------------------------------------	------------------

			Growth - 2018-2040								
	Existing	Zone	Zone	Zone	Zone	Zone	Zone	Zone	Zone		Total
Land Use	2018 <sup>1</sup>	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Total	<b>2040</b> <sup>1</sup>
Residential											
SFD Not Restricted	54,739	48	1,549	695	233	136	70	64	4,911	7,708	62,650
MFD Not Restricted	3,799	-	430	36	-	1	-	-	1	469	4,427
SFD Age Restricted	NA	-	15	15	-	-	-	-	174	204	NA
MFD Age Restricted	NA	-	26	52	-	-	-	_	81	159	NA
Subtotal	58,538	48	2,021	798	233	138	70	64	5,167	8,540	67,077
Nonresidential											
Commercial	6,706	-	471	223	6	150	-	-	301	1,152	7,859
Office	4,053	-	37	61	2	47	-	-	495	641	4,694
Medical	204	-	349	91		56	-	-	149	644	848
Industrial	3,962	-	69	30	14	72	-	-	212	398	4,360
Subtotal	14,925	-	925	405	22	326		-	1,158	2,836	17,761
Total EDU, 2015-2035	73,463	48	2,946	1,203	255	463	70	64	6,325	11,375	84,838
Total EDU, 2015	86.59%							Growth S	hare >>>	13.41%	100.00%
<sup>1</sup> For residential, age restricted un Sources: Tables 2 and 3.	its included in n	ot restricted o	ategory.								

#### Table 5: Local Serving Employment

Land Use	Units	2018-2040 EDU	Local Serving Employ- ment Share	EDU Shift For Local Serving Business <sup>2</sup>	2018-2040 Adjusted EDU	Change
Residential	Dwelling Units	8,540	NA	2,071	10,611	24%
Nonresidential						
Commercial	1,000 SqFt	1,152	79%	(910)	242	
Office	1,000 SqFt	641	54%	(346)	295	
Medical	1,000 SqFt	644	100%	(644)	0	
Industrial / Other	1,000 SqFt	398	43%	(171)	227	
Total	1,000 SqFt	2,836	73%	(2,071)	765	(73%)
Total Equivalent Dwelli	ng Units (EDU)	11,375		-	11,375	

Note: Preliminary EDU rates for land use categories without development data (age-restricted housing, hotel / motel / B&B, and church) are adjusted based on the final versus preliminary rate for the related land use category, e.g. age-restricted housing rates are adjusted based on

the change in the not restricted housing rates, and the two nonresidential rates are adjusted based the change in the commercial rate.

<sup>1</sup> EDU rate for Office / Medical is the average for the Office and Medical categories, weighted by amount of 2015 development.

<sup>2</sup> Shift local serving share of nonresidential EDUs to residential EDUs. The remaining nonresidential EDUs are associated with export-based businesses (providing products and services outside the El Dorado County western slope unincorporated area).

<sup>3</sup> Final EDU rates are converted from revised EDU rates so that one single family dwelling equals 1.0 EDU.

Sources: U.S. Census Bureau, On The Map (http://onthemap.ces.census.gov) (2017 employment data); Urban Economics (local employment share); Table 4.

Page 8 of 39

### **Section 2**

# TIF CIP Cost Estimates and Cost Allocation By Zone

Page 9 of 39

20-1514 F 9 of 39

### Table 6: Bridge Replacement Projects

River	Crossing	<b>CIP Account</b>	Cost
Indian Creek	Green Valley Rd	Zones 1-7	\$ 5,663,000
Mound Springs Creek	Green Valley Rd	Zones 1-7	6,225,000
Weber Creek	Green Valley Rd	Zones 1-7	11,999,000
South Fork American River	Salmon Falls Rd	EDH Zone 8	25,000,000
Weber Creek	Cedar Ravine Rd	Zones 1-7	3,248,000
Carson Creek	White Rock Rd	EDH Zone 8	5,050,000
North Fork Cosumnes River	Mt. Aukum Rd	Zones 1-7	5,050,000
North Fork Cosumnes River	Bucks Bar Rd	Zones 1-7	8,658,000
South Fork Weber Creek	Newtown Rd	Zones 1-7	5,846,000
New York Creek	Malcolm Dixon Rd	EDH Zone 8	 4,500,000
Total			\$ 81,239,000
New Development Share <sup>1</sup>			<u>11.47%</u>
TIF Program Share			\$ 9,318,000
<sup>1</sup> Development share based on federal f could be allocated based on growth as a			
Sources: County of El Dorado.			

### Table 7: Intersection and Safety Improvements

		Cost per	New Development		Project	• /
Type of Deficiency	Location	Intersection <sup>1</sup>	Share <sup>2</sup>	Intersection	S	Cost
Tier 1 - Existing Deficiency Intersections	To Be Determined	\$ 2,200,000	13.41%	\$ 295,020	2	\$ 590,000
Safety Improvements	To Be Determined	1,260,000	13.41%		10	1,690,000
Tier 2 - Future Deficiency						
Intersections	To Be Determined	2,200,000	100.00%	2,200,000	16	35,200,000
Intersections	Cameron Park Dr / Hacienda Rd <sup>3</sup>	500,000	100.00%	500,000	1	500,000
Intersections	El Dorado Hill Blvd/Saratoga Way/Park Dr	979,000	100.00%	979,000	1	979,000
TIF Program Share						\$ 38,959,000
	) for signal equipment plus \$1,850,000 for channelization and projects completed between 2001 and 2016, adjusted for infla		intelligent transportat	ion systems (ITS). S	Safety improver	ments based on
<sup>2</sup> For existing deficiencies, TIF progra	m share is equal to new development as a share of total deve	elopment at the planni	ng horizon (see Table	e 5).		
<sup>3</sup> For signal equipment only.						
Sources: County of El Dorado; Table :	5.					

Page 11 of 39

### **Table 8: Transit Capital Projects**

						New	
					K	Develop-	TIF
			Unit			ment	Program
Capital Project	Source	No.	Cost		Total Cost	Share <sup>1</sup>	Share
Bus Stop Improvements	Short-range Capital Plan			\$	13,000	13.41%	\$ 2,000
Missouri Flat Transfer Point Expansion	Short-range Capital Plan				310,000	100.00%	310,000
Cambridge Park-and-Ride Improvements	Short-range Capital Plan				200,000	13.41%	27,000
Operations and Maintenance Facility Improvements	Short-range Capital Plan				40,000	13.41%	5,000
Fleet Expansion							
Paratransit Van	Short-range Capital Plan	1	\$67,000	\$	67,000		
Dial-A-Ride Vans	Long-range Capital Plan	5	42,000		210,000		
Local Route Buses	Long-range Capital Plan	2	504,000		1,008,000		
Subtotal				\$	1,285,000	100.00%	1,285,000
Cambridge Park-and-Ride Improvements	Long-range Capital Plan			\$	2,725,000	13.41%	365,000
County Line Transit Center	Long-range Capital Plan						
Land				\$	1,406,000		
Construction					7,117,000		
Subtotal				\$	8,523,000	13.41%	\$1,143,000
Total				\$	13,096,000		\$ 3,137,000
Notes:		<u> </u>		Ψ	13,030,000		\$ 3,137,000
Costs do not include planned transition to zero emission vehicle fleet.							
Costs exclude projects within the City of Placerville.							
Bass Lake Hills Park and Ride improvements are anticipated to be funded	directly by nearby development proj	ects.					
<sup>1</sup> For capital projects not directly related to growth, TIF program share is o	equal to new development as a share	of total	development at	the	planning horizon (	see Table 5).	
Sources: El Dorado County Transportation Commission, <i>Western El Dor</i> 165-167, 173-174; El Dorado Transit staff (cost estimates for fleet vehicles	· · · ·	-		ed k	by LSC Consultan	ts, Inc. Novemb	per 20, 2019, pp.

### Table 9: Program Administration

				Total
			20-уі	r. Program
Task	Unit Cost	Frequency	Units	Cost
Annual program updates <sup>1</sup>	45,000	Annually	20	900,000
Major program updates	1,000,000	Every 5 Years	4	4,000,000
Travel demand model updates	330,000	Every 5 Years	4	1,320,000
Total				6,220,000
<sup>1</sup> Includes periodic minor technical (transpor	tation analysis) up	odates.		

Sources: County of El Dorado.

EDC TIM Fee Nexus 201106 3-Zone Fee Structure.xlsx

Page 13 of 39

20-1514 F 13 of 39

Table 10: TIF Program Costs

Мар		Project			Prior Year	Future Local	
ID	CIP Acct.	No.	Project Name	Total Cost	Funding <sup>1</sup>	Funding <sup>2</sup>	Net Cost
	50 Auxiliary Lanes			iotal occi	. anang	T uniturity	
A-1	Hwy 50 Blackstone	53115	Auxiliary Lane Westbound	\$ 3,100,000	\$ 10,000	\$ -	\$ 3,090,000
			Subtotal	\$ 3,100,000	\$ 10,000	\$ -	\$ 3,090,000
Hwy :	50 Interchanges Pro	jects					
1-1	EDH Zone 8	71323	El Dorado Hills Blvd	\$ 9,517,000	\$ 550,000	\$ -	\$ 8,967,000
I-2	Silva Valley IC	71345/71368	Silva Valley Pkwy-Phases 1&2	10,793,000	250,000	-	10,543,000
I-3	Hwy 50 Zones 1-8	71330	Bass Lake Rd	5,417,000	22,000	405,000	4,990,000
1-4	Hwy 50 Zones 1-8	71332	Cambridge Rd	9,665,000	39,000	-	9,626,000
I-5	Hwy 50 Zones 1-8	72361	Cameron Park Dr	22,837,000	1,416,000	-	21,421,000
I-6	Hwy 50 Zones 1-8	71333/71338/71339	Ponderosa Rd/S Shingle Rd	21,900,000	1,456,000	-	20,444,000
I-7	Hwy 50 Zones 1-8	71347	El Dorado Rd	5,782,000	181,000	-	5,601,000
			Subtotal	\$ 85,911,000	\$ 3,914,000	\$ 405,000	\$ 81,592,000
Road	way Improvements						
R-1	Zones 1-7	72143	Cameron Park Dr Widening	\$ 3,621,000	\$ 146,000	\$-	\$ 3,475,000
R-2	EDH Zone 8	72376	Green Valley Rd Widening	t	Inder Constructi	on - See Table 1	4
R-3	EDH Zone 8	GP178	Green Valley Rd Widening	14,498,000	-	-	14,498,000
R-4	EDH Zone 8	72374	White Rock Rd Widening	9,467,000	5,000	-	9,462,000
R-5	Zones 1-7	72142	Missouri Flat Rd	7,629,000	-	-	7,629,000
R-6	EDH Zone 8	GP147	Saratoga Way Extension-Phs 2	13,290,000	-	-	13,290,000
R-7	EDH Zone 8	72377	Country Club Dr Extension	21,190,000	-	-	21,190,000
R-8	EDH Zone 8	71362	Country Club Dr Extension	11,703,000	-	-	11,703,000
R-9	EDH Zone 8	71361	Country Club Dr Extension	17,923,000	-	-	17,923,000
R-10	Zones 1-7	71360	Country Club Dr Realignment	Under Constru	uction - See Rei	mbursement Agn	nts & Table 14
R-11	Zones 1-7	72334	Diamond Springs Pkwy-Phs 1B	28,293,000	5,633,000	14,739,000	7,921,000
R-12	EDH Zone 8	66116	Latrobe Connection	2,874,000	353,000	-	2,521,000
R-13	Zones 1-7	71375	Headington Rd Extension	14,899,000	704,000	-	14,195,000
R-14	EDH Zone 8	72BASS	Bass Lake Rd	1,654,000	-	-	1,654,000
R-15	EDH Zone 8	72LATROBE	Latrobe Rd Widening		Deleted - N	Not Deficient	
R-16	EDH Zone 8	72381	White Rock Rd Widening	11,765,000	317,000	-	11,448,000
R-17	EDH Zone 8	NA	Latrobe Rd Widening	5,865,000	-	-	5,865,000
R-18	Zones 1-7	NA	Pleasant Valley Rd	409,000	-	-	409,000
			Subtotal	\$ 165,080,000	\$ 7,158,000	\$ 14,739,000	\$ 143,183,000

Table 10: TIF Program Costs

Map ID	CIP Acct.	Project No.	Project Name	Total Cost	Prior Year Funding <sup>1</sup>	Future Local Funding <sup>2</sup>	Net Cost
Reim	bursement Agreeme	nts	-				
R-6	EDH Zone 8	71324	Saratoga Way Extension-Phs 1	\$ 10,958,000	NA	NA	\$ 10,958,000
R-10	EDH Zone 8	71360	Country Club Dr Realignment	4,381,000	NA	NA	4,381,000
R-10	Zones 1-7	71360	Country Club Dr Realignment	7,256,000	NA	NA	7,256,000
R-10	Hwy 50 Zones 1-8	71360	Country Club Dr Realignment	148,000	NA	NA	148,000
R-12	EDH Zone 8	66116	Latrobe Connection	55,000	NA	NA	55,000
I-2	Silva Valley IC	71328	Silva Valley Interchange	193,000	NA	NA	193,000
I-2	Silva Valley IC	71328	Silva Valley Interchange-Design	5,602,000	NA	NA	5,602,000
NA	EDH Zone 8	71353	Bass Lake Rd (SIA)	1,477,000	NA	NA	1,477,000
NA	Zones 1-7	76107	Silver Springs Pkwy	2,127,000	NA	NA	2,127,000
NA	Zones 1-7	66108/76108	Silver Springs Pkwy	4,274,000	NA	NA	4,274,000
NA	Zones 1-7	76114	Deer Valley Rd	70,000	NA	NA	70,000
			Subtotal	\$ 36,541,000	NA	NA	\$ 36,471,000
Other	<sup>r</sup> Programs						
NA	EDH Zn 8 & Zn 1-7	NA	Bridge Replacement	\$ 9,318,000	NA	NA	9,318,000
NA	EDH Zn 8 & Zn 1-7	NA	Intersection Improvements	38,959,000	NA	NA	38,959,000
NA	EDH Zn 8 & Zn 1-7	53118	Transit	3,137,000	NA	NA	3,137,000
NA	EDH Zn 8 & Zn 1-7	NA	Fee Program Admin	6,220,000	NA	NA	6,220,000
			Subtotal	\$ 57,634,000	NA	NA	\$ 57,634,000
			Total	\$ 348,266,000	\$ 11,082,000	\$ 15,144,000	\$ 322,040,000
				100%	3%	4%	92%

Parkway (Map ID R-11) from Missouri Flats Master Ciculation and Funding Plan (MC&FP) and local Tribes.

Sources: Quincy Engineering; El Dorado County, Department of Transportation (DOT), Adopted 2020 Capital Improvement Program, June 9, 2020; El Dorado County, Department of Transportation staff; Tables 6, 7, 8, and 9.

### Table 11: Trip Allocation By Zone

		Zone	Zone	Zone	Zone	Zone	Zone	Zone	Zone	Internal		
Map ID	Project Name	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Subtotal	External <sup>1</sup>	Total
	Auxiliary Lanes											
A-1	Auxiliary Lane Westbound	1.42%	37.23%	8.89%	5.45%	4.85%	2.86%	2.12%	28.09%	90.92%	9.08%	100.00%
	Subtotal	1.42%	37.23%	8.89%	5.45%	4.85%	2.86%	2.12%	28.09%	90.92%	9.08%	100.00%
Hwy 50 li	nterchanges Projects											
I-1	El Dorado Hills Blvd	0.01%	1.95%	0.35%	1.65%	0.09%	0.03%	0.81%	93.34%	98.21%	1.79%	100.00%
I-2	Silva Valley Pkwy-Phases 1&2	0.11%	17.08%	3.27%	1.42%	0.82%	0.33%	0.44%	76.04%	99.50%	0.50%	100.00%
I-3	Bass Lake Rd	0.01%	41.18%	1.38%	0.16%	0.23%	0.07%	0.19%	56.79%	100.00%	0.00%	100.00%
1-4	Cambridge Rd	0.02%	85.26%	1.99%	0.38%	0.34%	0.12%	0.23%	11.65%	100.00%	0.00%	100.00%
I-5	Cameron Park Dr	0.05%	86.09%	3.53%	0.38%	0.78%	0.29%	0.27%	8.60%	100.00%	0.00%	100.00%
I-6	Ponderosa Rd/S Shingle Rd	0.21%	63.63%	12.52%	11.09%	0.90%	0.13%	4.49%	6.80%	99.77%	0.23%	100.00%
I-7	El Dorado Rd	0.16%	9.28%	79.77%	1.92%	4.92%	0.78%	0.37%	2.40%	99.61%	0.39%	100.00%
	Subtotal	0.09%	54.18%	10.32%	3.43%	0.94%	0.23%	1.40%	29.06%	99.66%	0.34%	100.00%
Roadway	Improvements											
R-1	Cameron Park Dr Widening	0.02%	38.55%	2.67%	0.19%	0.44%	0.14%	0.24%	57.75%	100.00%	0.00%	100.00%
R-2	Green Valley Rd Widening				U	nder Cor	nstructior	ı - See T	able 14			
R-3	Green Valley Rd Widening	0.08%	28.99%	0.34%	14.09%	0.07%	0.02%	0.02%	50.70%	94.30%	5.70%	100.00%
R-4	White Rock Rd Widening	0.14%	10.40%	2.12%	0.68%	0.64%	0.29%	0.71%	84.44%	99.41%	0.59%	100.00%
R-5	Missouri Flat Rd	1.24%	5.75%	70.31%	0.91%	0.55%	9.73%	6.02%	2.20%	96.71%	3.29%	100.00%
R-6	Saratoga Way Extension-Phs 2	0.00%	0.34%	0.00%	1.99%	0.00%	0.00%	0.05%	96.31%	98.69%	1.31%	100.00%
R-7	Country Club Dr Extension	0.05%	18.59%	2.83%	0.65%	0.66%	0.24%	0.20%	76.78%	100.00%	0.00%	100.00%
R-8	Country Club Dr Extension	0.00%	34.41%	0.00%	0.13%	0.00%	0.00%	0.07%	65.39%	100.00%	0.00%	100.00%
R-9	Country Club Dr Extension	0.00%	17.11%	0.00%	0.10%	0.00%	0.00%	0.07%	82.72%	100.00%	0.00%	100.00%
R-10	Country Club Dr Realignment				Under	Constru	iction - Se	ee Table	es 10 and	14		
R-11	Diamond Springs Pkwy-Phs 1B	2.24%	8.92%	58.91%	0.76%	1.06%	12.89%	8.36%	3.76%	96.89%	3.11%	100.00%
R-12	Latrobe Connection	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	5.97%	83.74%	89.71%	10.29%	100.00%
R-13	Headington Rd Extension	0.03%	12.08%	82.51%	0.13%	0.39%	0.90%	0.49%	3.47%	100.00%	0.00%	100.00%
R-14	Bass Lake Rd	0.02%	38.55%	2.67%	0.19%	0.44%	0.14%	0.24%	57.75%	100.00%	0.00%	100.00%
R-15	Latrobe Rd Widening				Delet	ed - Not	Deficient	in 2020	TIF Upda	ate		
R-16	White Rock Rd Widening	0.11%	2.75%	0.63%	0.52%	0.25%	0.14%	3.57%	85.76%	93.72%	6.28%	100.00%
R-17	Latrobe Rd Widening	0.02%	5.33%	1.01%	0.40%	0.27%	0.10%	2.80%	87.43%	97.36%	2.64%	100.00%
R-18	Pleasant Valley Rd	2.22%	8.26%	50.05%	0.89%	1.43%	22.45%	9.10%	2.61%	97.00%	3.00%	100.00%
	Subtotal	0.23%	15.20%	16.11%	1.95%	0.32%	1.46%	1.47%	61.37%	98.12%	1.88%	100.00%

#### Table 11: Trip Allocation By Zone

Map ID	Project Name	Zone 1	Zone 2	Zone 3	Zone 4	Zone 5	Zone 6	Zone 7	Zone 8	Internal Subtotal	External <sup>1</sup>	Total
	ement Agreements											
R-6	Saratoga Way Extension-Phs 1	0.00%	0.34%	0.00%	2.02%	0.00%	0.00%	0.05%	97.59%	100.00%	0.00%	100.00%
R-10	Country Club Dr Realignment	0.00%	71.87%	0.00%	0.04%	0.00%	0.00%	0.09%	28.01%	100.00%	0.00%	100.00%
R-10	Country Club Dr Realignment	0.00%	71.87%	0.00%	0.04%	0.00%	0.00%	0.09%	28.01%	100.00%	0.00%	100.00%
R-10	Country Club Dr Realignment	0.00%	71.87%	0.00%	0.04%	0.00%	0.00%	0.09%	28.01%	100.00%	0.00%	100.00%
R-12	Latrobe Connection	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	6.65%	93.35%	100.00%	0.00%	100.00%
I-2	Silva Valley Interchange	0.11%	17.17%	3.28%	1.43%	0.83%			76.42%		0.00%	100.00%
I-2	Silva Valley Interchange-Design	0.11%		3.28%	1.43%				76.42%		0.00%	100.00%
NA	Bass Lake Rd (SIA)	0.02%		2.67%	0.19%	0.44%	0.14%	0.24%	57.75%		0.00%	100.00%
NA	Silver Springs Pkwy	0.00%	17.21%	0.00%	0.79%	0.00%	0.00%	0.03%	81.97%	100.00%	0.00%	100.00%
NA	Silver Springs Pkwy	0.00%	17.21%	0.00%	0.79%	0.00%	0.00%	0.03%	81.97%	100.00%	0.00%	100.00%
NA	Deer Valley Rd	0.08%	30.75%	0.36%	14.94%	0.07%	0.02%	0.02%	53.76%	100.00%	0.00%	100.00%
	Subtotal	0.02%	30.64%	0.63%	1.02%	0.15%	0.06%	0.14%	67.35%	100.00%	0.00%	100.00%
Program	is <sup>2</sup>											
NA	Bridge Replacement	0.18%	17.75%	12.07%	1.76%	0.31%	1.10%	1.16%	65.67%	100.00%	0.00%	100.00%
NA	Intersection Improvements	0.18%	17.75%	12.07%	1.76%	0.31%	1.10%	1.16%	65.67%	100.00%	0.00%	100.00%
NA	Transit	0.18%	17.75%	12.07%	1.76%	0.31%	1.10%	1.16%	65.67%	100.00%	0.00%	100.00%
NA	Fee Program Admin	0.18%	17.75%	12.07%	1.76%	0.31%	1.10%	1.16%	65.67%	100.00%	0.00%	100.00%
	Subtotal	0.18%	17.75%	12.07%	1.76%	0.31%	1.10%	1.16%	65.67%	100.00%	0.00%	100.00%
Total Pro	gram Costs											
	Total	0.18%	27.50%	12.09%	2.22%	0.50%	0.94%	1.25%	54.32%	98.99%	1.01%	100.00%
	Hwy 50 TIF <sup>2</sup>	0.17%	66.58%		4.09%			1.67%		99.47%	0.53%	100.00%
	Local TIF <sup>3</sup>	0.18%	17.55%	11.93%	1.74%	0.31%			64.93%	98.87%	1.13%	100.00%
	ement agreements and programs have no are allocated by zone based on cost share	external s	hare to ens	ure full fund	ing.						•	

Sources: Kimley-Horn and Associates, Inc.

### Table 12: Cost Allocation By Zone

		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	14 1
Мар		Zone	Zone	Zone	Zone	Zone	Zone	Zone	Zone	Internal
ID	Project Name	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Subtotal
	50 Auxiliary Lanes									
A-1	Auxiliary Lane Westbound	43,905	1,150,451	274,838	168,418	149,801	88,459	65,454	868,107	2,809,433
	Subtotal	43,905	1,150,451	274,838	168,418	149,801	88,459	65,454	868,107	2,809,433
	50 Interchanges Projects									
I-1	El Dorado Hills Blvd	593	174,525	31,627	147,568	7,809	2,922	72,207	8,369,605	8,806,856
I-2	Silva Valley Pkwy-Phases 1&2	11,189	1,800,835	344,284	150,059	86,897	34,568	46,316	8,016,461	10,490,609
I-3	Bass Lake Rd	364	2,054,827	68,724	7,952	11,325	3,634	9,427	2,833,746	4,990,000
1-4	Cambridge Rd	1,450	8,207,447	191,676	36,408	33,196	11,553	22,368	1,121,902	9,626,000
I-5	Cameron Park Dr	10,355	18,441,754	756,410	82,127	167,415	61,905	57,873	1,843,161	21,421,000
I-6	Ponderosa Rd/S Shingle Rd	43,072	13,007,686	2,559,584	2,267,163	183,954	27,574	917,067	1,390,910	20,397,011
1-7	El Dorado Rd	9,119	519,941	4,467,865	107,799	275,657	43,532	20,789	134,640	5,579,343
	Subtotal	76,140	44,207,016	8,420,170	2,799,075	766,254	185,689	1,146,047	23,710,425	81,310,818
Road	way Improvements									
R-1	Cameron Park Dr Widening	644	1,339,534	92,857	6,462	15,349	4,896	8,408	2,006,850	3,475,000
R-2	Green Valley Rd Widening				Under Co	nstruction - S	See Table 14			
R-3	Green Valley Rd Widening	11,218	4,203,528	49,250	2,042,745	9,677	3,174	2,496	7,349,888	13,671,977
R-4	White Rock Rd Widening	13,467	983,809	200,201	64,031	60,870	27,155	67,240	7,989,795	9,406,568
R-5	Missouri Flat Rd	94,247	438,780	5,364,258	69,345	42,145	741,970	459,336	167,778	7,377,859
R-6	Saratoga Way Extension-Phs 2	-	44,931	-	264,543	-	-	6,556	12,799,469	13,115,499
R-7	Country Club Dr Extension	10,564	3,938,793	599,175	137,751	140,075	51,340	41,621	16,270,682	21,190,000
R-8	Country Club Dr Extension	-	4,026,621	-	15,134	_	-	8,465	7,652,780	11,703,000
R-9	Country Club Dr Extension	-	3,066,864	-	17,118	-	-	13,291	14,825,727	17,923,000
R-10	Country Club Dr Realignment	ı				uction - See	Tables 10 and		1 1	,,
R-11	Diamond Springs Pkwy-Phs 1B	177,514	706,852	4,666,387	60,005	83,773	1,020,683	661,873	297,897	7,674,985
R-12	Latrobe Connection	-	-	-	-	-		150,386	2,111,143	2,261,529
	Headington Rd Extension	3,588	1,714,869	11,711,721	19,138	55,192	128,154	69,716	492,623	14,195,000
	Bass Lake Rd	307	637,579	44,197	3,076	7,306	2,330	4,002	955,203	1,654,000
	Latrobe Rd Widening						TIF 2020 Upd			.,,
	White Rock Rd Widening	12,060	314,750	71,963	59,241	28,694	15,784	408,545	9,818,204	10,729,242
R-17	Latrobe Rd Widening	1,454	312,511	59,178	23,341	15,663	5,855	164,271	5,127,875	5,710,148
	Pleasant Valley Rd	9,072	33,767	204,686	3,661	5,830	91,804	37,218	10,677	396,714
	Subtotal	334,135	21,763,188	23,063,873	2,785,590	464,574	2,093,145	2,103,424	87,876,589	140,484,520

### Table 12: Cost Allocation By Zone

Мар		Zone	Zone	Zone	Zone	Zone	Zone	Zone	Zone	Internal
ID.	Project Name	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Subtotal
Reim	bursements									
R-6	Saratoga Way Extension-Phs 1	-	37,540	-	221,026	-	-	5,477	10,693,957	10,958,000
R-10	Country Club Dr Realignment	-	3,148,637	-	1,537		1	3,796	1,227,030	4,381,000
R-10	Country Club Dr Realignment	-	5,214,907	-	2,546	-	T	6,287	2,032,260	7,256,000
R-10	Country Club Dr Realignment	-	106,368	-	52	-	-	128	41,452	148,000
R-12	Latrobe Connection	-	-	-		-	-	3,657	51,343	55,000
I-2	Silva Valley Interchange	206	33,131	6,334	2,761	1,599	636	852	147,482	193,000
I-2	Silva Valley Interchange-Design	5,975	961,649	183,848	80,132	46,403	18,459	24,733	4,280,802	5,602,000
NA	Bass Lake Rd (SIA)	274	569,350	39,468	2,747	6,524	2,081	3,574	852,984	1,477,000
NA	Silver Springs Pkwy	-	366,087	-	16,699	·	-	653	1,743,561	2,127,000
NA	Silver Springs Pkwy	-	735,617	-	33,554	-	-	1,313	3,503,516	4,274,000
NA	Deer Valley Rd	57	21,522	252	10,459	50	16	13	37,631	70,000
	Subtotal	6,512	11,194,808	229,902	371,512	54,575	21,193	50,483	24,612,016	36,541,000
Prog	rams <sup>1</sup>									
	Bridge Replacement	16,740	1,654,227	1,124,272	164,092	29,157	102,208	107,931	6,119,373	9,318,000
NA	Intersection Imps.	69,990	6,916,400	4,700,636	686,075	121,908	427,338	451,264	25,585,390	38,959,000
NA	Transit	5,636	556,912	378,498	55,243	9,816	34,410	36,336	2,060,150	3,137,000
NA	Fee Program Admin	11,174	1,104,238	750,480	109,535	19,463	68,227	72,046	4,084,836	6,220,000
	Subtotal	103,540	10,231,777	6,953,887	1,014,945	180,344	632,183	667,577	37,849,749	57,634,000
Total	Program Costs									
	Hwy 50 TIF <sup>2</sup>	108,264	43,488,474	8,319,097	2,669,919	821,349	236,659	1,093,106	8,233,918	64,970,787
	Local Roads TIF <sup>3</sup>	455,968	45,058,765	30,623,572	4,469,621	794,200	2,784,011	2,939,879	166,682,969	253,808,984
	Total	564,232	88,547,239	38,942,669	7,139,540	1,615,549	3,020,670	4,032,985	174,916,887	318,779,771

Programs are allocated by zone based on cost shares by zone for all other TIF Program costs.

<sup>2</sup> Highway 50 TIF component includes all Highway 50 auxilliary lands and all interchanges except the El Dorado Hills Boulevard and Silva Valley Parkway interchanges.

<sup>3</sup> Local Roads TIF component includes all roadway improvements, reimbursements, and programs, plus El Dorado Hills Boulevard and Silva Valley Parkway interchanges.

Sources: Tables 10 and 11.

### Table 12: Cost Allocation By Zone

Мар			
ID	Project Name	External	Total
Hwy :	50 Auxiliary Lanes		
A-1	Auxiliary Lane Westbound	280,567	3,090,000
	Subtotal	280,567	3,090,000
Hwy :	50 Interchanges Projects		
I-1	El Dorado Hills Blvd	160,144	8,967,000
I-2	Silva Valley Pkwy-Phases 1&2	52,391	10,543,000
I-3	Bass Lake Rd	-	4,990,000
1-4	Cambridge Rd	-	9,626,000
I-5	Cameron Park Dr	-	21,421,000
I-6	Ponderosa Rd/S Shingle Rd	46,989	20,444,000
I-7	El Dorado Rd	21,657	5,601,000
	Subtotal	281,182	81,592,000
Road	way Improvements		
R-1	Cameron Park Dr Widening	-	3,475,000
R-2	Green Valley Rd Widening		
R-3	Green Valley Rd Widening	826,023	14,498,000
R-4	White Rock Rd Widening	55,432	9,462,000
R-5	Missouri Flat Rd	251,141	7,629,000
R-6	Saratoga Way Extension-Phs 2	174,501	13,290,000
R-7	Country Club Dr Extension	-	21,190,000
R-8	Country Club Dr Extension	-	11,703,000
R-9	Country Club Dr Extension	-	17,923,000
	Country Club Dr Realignment		
	Diamond Springs Pkwy-Phs 1B	246,015	7,921,000
	Latrobe Connection	259,471	2,521,000
R-13	Headington Rd Extension	-	14,195,000
	Bass Lake Rd	-	1,654,000
	Latrobe Rd Widening		
	White Rock Rd Widening	718,758	11,448,000
	Latrobe Rd Widening	154,852	5,865,000
R-18	Pleasant Valley Rd	12,286	409,000
	Subtotal	2,698,480	143,183,000

Page 20 of 39

### Table 12: Cost Allocation By Zone

Мар			
ID	Project Name	External	Total
Reim	bursements		
R-6	Saratoga Way Extension-Phs 1	-	10,958,000
R-10	Country Club Dr Realignment	-	4,381,000
R-10	Country Club Dr Realignment	-	7,256,000
R-10	Country Club Dr Realignment	-	148,000
R-12	Latrobe Connection	-	55,000
I-2	Silva Valley Interchange	-	193,000
I-2	Silva Valley Interchange-Design	-	5,602,000
NA	Bass Lake Rd (SIA)	-	1,477,000
NA	Silver Springs Pkwy	-	2,127,000
NA	Silver Springs Pkwy	-	4,274,000
NA	Deer Valley Rd	-	70,000
	Subtotal	-	36,541,000
Prog	rams <sup>1</sup>		
NA	Bridge Replacement	-	9,318,000
NA	Intersection Imps.	-	38,959,000
NA	Transit	-	3,137,000
NA	Fee Program Admin	-	6,220,000
	Subtotal	-	57,634,000
Total	Program Costs		
	Hwy 50 TIF <sup>2</sup>	349,213	65,320,000
	Local Roads TIF <sup>3</sup>	2,911,016	256,720,000
	Total	3,260,229	322,040,000
<sup>1</sup> Progr	ams are allocated by zone based on cost		
<sup>2</sup> Highv	vay 50 TIF component includes all Highw		
	Roads TIF component includes all roadw		
Source	s: Tables 10 and 11.		

## **Section 3**

# **Non-TIF Funding Estimates**

EDC TIM Fee Nexus 201106 3-Zone Fee Structure.xlsx

Page 22 of 39

20-1514 F 22 of 39

#### Table 13: State & Federal Funding for TIF Program

		Estimated An	nual Funding	20-year TIF P	rogram Fun	ding (\$2019 \$)
Funding Source	Federal / State Funding Distribution Method	EDCTC Total	El Dorado County Allocation	Potential	Maximum Potential Allocation for TIF Projects <sup>1</sup>	Maximum Potential TIF Program Funding
Federal						<b>.</b>
Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality (CMAQ)	Competitive <sup>2</sup>	\$1,588,088	\$ 619,354	\$12,387,080	50%	\$ 6,193,540
Urban Surface Transportation Block Grant	Formula	860,274	860,274	17,205,480	80%	13,764,384
Highway Infrastructure Program (HIP)	Formula <sup>3</sup>	522,678	422,322	8,446,440	<u>80%</u>	6,757,152
Subtotal		\$2,971,040	\$1,901,950	\$38,039,000	70%	\$26,715,076
State						
State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP)	Competitive <sup>4</sup>	6,044,000	2,115,400	42,308,000	80%	33,846,400
Exchange (Rural) Surface Transportation Block Grant	Formula <sup>5</sup>	831,597	548,437	10,968,740	<u>80%</u>	8,774,992
Subtotal		\$6,875,597	\$2,663,837	\$53,276,740	80%	\$42,621,392
Total		\$9,846,637	\$4,565,787	\$91,315,740	76%	\$69,336,468

Note: EDCTC is the El Dorado County Transportation Commission.

Note: Funding sources represent those likely applicable to TIF projects. Excluded sources that TIF projects would unlikely be eligible for such as funding for active transportation (bicycle and pedestrian), roadways maintenance, transit, and airport projects. Excluded funding sources that could apply to TIF projects but are too speculative or competitive to rely on for funding, such as SB 1 Local Partnership Program. Transit funding sources excluded because TIF transit projects costs represent the TIF share only.

<sup>1</sup> Share of El Doraco County funding allocated to the TIF program is based on estimate of funding needs for projects not included in the TIF program.

<sup>2</sup> CMAQ funding allocated through competitive process, approximately every three years. Funding estimate based on the County's historical share of CMAQ funding (39 percent) since 2009/10.

<sup>3</sup> HIP is a new funding source for EDCTC and currently not allocated by formula or competitive process. Currently funds are allocated to the City of Placerville to complete a specific project (WPI phases 2 and 2.2). Assume funds in the future are allocated using the same formula as the Exchange STBGP.

<sup>4</sup> STIP is programmed to regionally significant projects by the EDCTC and the California Transportation Commission. Funding based on the County's historical share of STIP funding since 2000. <sup>5</sup> The County receives 80.8% or the remaining balance of Rural STBGP funding after the City of Placerville receives a minimum of \$200,000

Source: El Dorado County Transportation Commissionl; El Dorado County (TIF program allocation).

### Table 14: TIF Program Fund Balances

TIF Account	Map ID	Project No.		
EDH TIF Zone 8 & Silva Valley Interchange Set-aside				
EDH TIF Zone 8 Fund Balance 6/30/2020				15,955,000
Silva Valley Interchange Set-aside Fund Balance 6/30/2020				2,227,000
Subtotal				18,182,000
Remaining Costs for Projects In Design / Under Construction				
Saratoga Way Extension - Phase 1	NA	71324	120,000	
Country Club Dr Realignment	R-10	71360	16,000	
Green Valley Rd Widening (County line to Sophia Pkwy)	R-2	72376	17,000	
Subtotal				153,000
Available EDH TIF Zone 8 & Silva Valley Interchange Fund Balance	e			\$18,029,000
TIF Zones 1-7				
TIF Zones 1-7 Fund Balance 6/30/2020				\$10,263,000
Remaining Costs for Projects In Design / Under Construction				
Country Club Dr Realignment		71360	24,000	
Missouri Flat Rd Widening - Plaza Dr to Headington Rd	NA	71374	42,000	
Enterprise Dr Signalization	NA	73365	302,000	
Silver Springs Pkwy Offsite (south segment to Bass Lake Rd)	NA	76108	58,000	
Green Valley Rd at Weber Creek - Bridge Replacement	NA	77114	36,000	
Bucks Bar Rd at N. Fork Consumnes River - Bridge Replacement	NA	77116	838,000	
Green Valley Rd at Indian Creek - Bridge Replacement	NA	77127	442,000	
Green Valley Rd at Mound Springs Creek - Bridge Replacement	NA	77136	510,000	
Cedar Ravine Rd at Weber Creek - Bridge Rehabilitation	NA	77142	232,000	
Subtotal				2,484,000
Available TIF Zones 1-7 Fund Balance				\$ 7,779,000
Hwy 50 Zones 1-8 & Hwy 50-Blackstone				
Hwy 50 TIF Fund Balance 6/30/2020				\$16,194,000
Hwy 50 TIF-Blackstone Fund Balance 6/30/2020				7,110,000
Subtotal				23,304,000

### Table 14: TIF Program Fund Balances

TIF Account	Map ID	Project No.		
Remaining Costs for Projects In Design / Under Construction				
U.S. 50 / Bass Lake Rd Eb Offramp Signalization		73367	687,000	
Subtotal				687,000
Available Hwy 50 Zones 1-8 & Blackstone Fund Balance				\$22,617,000
Total Available TIF Program Fund Balances				\$ 48,425,000
Sources: El Dorado County, Chief Fiscal Officer (fund balances); El Dorado County, Departr	mont of Tropon	ortation Ada	ntod 2020 Conit	al Improvement
Program, June 9, 2020 (project cost estimates).		ortation, Ado	pieu 2020 Capit	ai improvement

Page 25 of 39

### **Section 4**

# TIF Schedules and Budget Summaries

Page 26 of 39

20-1514 F 26 of 39

	Zone	Zone	Zone	Zone	Zone	Zone	Zone	Zone	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Total
Cost Allocation By Zone Adjusted I	For Fund Bala	ances							
Hwy 50 TIF Cost Share	108,264	43,488,474	8,319,097	2,669,919	821,349	236,659	1,093,106	8,233,918	64,970,787
Fund Balances (6/30/2020) <sup>1</sup>	(37,688)	(15,138,786)	(2,895,963)	(929,426)	(285,920)	(82,383)	(380,522)	(2,866,312)	(22,617,000)
Net	70,576	28,349,689	5,423,134	1,740,493	535,429	154,275	712,585	5,367,606	42,353,787
Cost Allocation By Land Use Adjus	ted For Loca	I-Serving Nonre	esidential						
Residential		Ŭ							
Initial	70,576	19,444,494	3,598,813	1,588,956	158,877	154,275	712,585	4,385,057	30,113,633
Local-Serving Nonresidential <sup>2</sup>	50,459	2,114,965	835,563	244,007	143,932	73,774	67,398	5,408,550	8,938,650
Final (before offset)	121,036	21,559,459	4,434,376	1,832,963	302,809	228,049	779,983	9,793,607	39,052,283
Nonresidential									
Initial	-	8,905,194	1,824,321	151,537	376,552	-	-	982,549	12,240,154
Local-Serving Nonresidential <sup>2</sup>	-	(6,503,220)	(1,332,252)	(110,663)	(274,986)	-	-	(717,529)	(8,938,650)
Final (before offset)	-	2,401,974	492,069	40,874	101,566	-	-	265,020	3,301,504
Equivalent Dwelling Units									
Residential	48	2,021	798	233	138	70	64	5,167	8,540
Nonresidential	-	925	405	22	326	-	-	1,158	2,836
Total	48	2,946	1,203	255	463	70	64	6,325	11,375
	3								
Cost per EDU Adjusted For Offsets Residential									
Initial	5,896	9,222	9,222	5,896	5,896	5,896	5,896	1,895	
Offset	5,890	9,222	9,222	5,890 65%	5,890 65%	<u>5,890</u> 65%	5,890	0%	
Final	2,064	7,377	7,377	2,064	2,064	2,064	2,064	1.895	
Nonresidential	2,004	1,311	1,511	2,004	2,004	2,004	2,004	1,095	
Initial	409	2,176	2,176	409	409	409	409	229	
Offset		30%	30%	403 0%				0%	
Final	409	1,523	1,523	409	409	409	409	229	
			,						

### Table 15: Hwy 50 TIF Cost Allocation, Cost Per Equivalent Dwelling Unit, and Revenue

	Zone	Zone	Zone	Zone	Zone	Zone	Zone	Zone	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Total
Revenue									
TIF Residential	99,487	14,906,090	5,888,978	481,089	283,780	145,454	132,884	9,793,607	31,731,370
TIF Nonresidential	-	1,409,477	616,353	9,096	133,344	-	-	265,020	2,433,291
Subtotal TIF Program	99,487	16,315,567	6,505,331	490,186	417,124	145,454	132,884	10,058,628	34,164,660
Fund Balances (6/30/2020) <sup>1</sup>	37,688	15,138,786	2,895,963	929,426	285,920	82,383	380,522	2,866,312	22,617,000
Residential Offset	184,761	3,726,522	1,472,245	893,452	527,020	270,129	246,784	-	7,320,913
Nonresidential Offset	-	604,062	264,151	-	-	-	-	-	868,213
Subtotal Offset	184,761	4,330,584	1,736,396	893,452	527,020	270,129	246,784	-	8,189,126
Total TIF Program	321,935	35,784,937	11,137,691	2.313.064	1,230,064	497.967	760,190	12.924.939	64.970.787

### Table 15: Hwy 50 TIF Cost Allocation, Cost Per Equivalent Dwelling Unit, and Revenue

<sup>1</sup> Fund balance allocated based on total Hwy. 50 cost shares by zone.

<sup>2</sup> Local-serving nonresidential cost allocation is based on the overall local-serving nonresidential percentage (see Table 5) applied to the initial nonresidential cost, by zone. The total local-serving cost share is then redistributed back to each zone based on each zone's residential EDUs as a share of total residential EDUs.

<sup>3</sup> Offsets are the percentage of the initial residential or nonresidential cost per equivalent dwelling unit (EDU) that is allocated to state and federal funding, resulting in a reduction in the TIF cost per EDU. Cost per EDU for zones that have no nonresidential cost allocation (because no nonresidential development is anticipated) are set equal to the zone with the lowest nonresidential cost per EDU.

Sources: Tables 4, 5, 12, and 14.

Page 28 of 39

	Zone	Zone	Zone	Zone	Zone	Zone	Zone	Zone	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Total
Cost Allocation By Zone Adjusted I	For Fund Bala	ances							
Local Roads TIF Cost Share	455,968	45,058,765	30,623,572	4,469,621	794,200	2,784,011	2,939,879	166,682,969	253,808,984
Fund Balances (6/30/2020) <sup>1</sup>	(40,711)	(4,023,048)	(2,734,209)	(399,068)	(70,910)	(248,569)	(262,486)	(18,029,000)	(25,808,000
Net	415,257	41,035,717	27,889,362	4,070,553	723,290	2,535,442	2,677,394	148,653,969	228,000,984
Cost Allocation By Land Use Adjus	ted For Loca	I-Serving Nonre	esidential						
Residential									
Initial	415,257	28,145,592	18,507,490	3,716,148	214,620	2,535,442	2,677,394	121,442,624	177,654,566
Local-Serving Nonresidential <sup>2</sup>	207,550	8,699,311	3,436,854	1,003,655	592,026	303,449	277,224	22,246,544	36,766,614
Final (before offset)	622,808	36,844,903	21,944,344	4,719,803	806,646	2,838,891	2,954,618	143,689,168	214,421,180
Nonresidential									
Initial	-	12,890,125	9,381,873	354,405	508,670	-	-	27,211,345	50,346,418
Local-Serving Nonresidential <sup>2</sup>	-	(9,413,306)	(6,851,325)	(258,813)	(371,467)	-	-	(19,871,702)	(36,766,614
Final (before offset)	-	3,476,819	2,530,547	95,593	137,202	-	-	7,339,643	13,579,804
Equivalent Dwelling Units									
Residential	48	2,021	798	233	138	70	64	5,167	8,540
Nonresidential	-	925	405	22	326	-	-	1,158	2,836
Total	48	2,946	1,203	255	463	70	64	6,325	11,375
Cost per EDU Adjusted For Offsets	3								
Residential	, 								
Initial	21,569	20,856	20,856	21,569	21,569	21,569	21,569	27,809	
Offset	65%	20%	20%	65%	65%	65%	65%	0%	
Final	7,549	16,685	16,685	7,549	7,549	7,549	7,549	27,809	
Nonresidential	.,		,	.,	.,	,	,		
Initial	669	4,517	4,517	669	669	669	669	6,339	
Offset	0%	30%	30%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	
Final	669	3,162	3,162	669	669	669	669	6,339	

	Zone	Zone	Zone	Zone	Zone	Zone	Zone	Zone	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Total
Revenue									
TIF Residential	363,921	33,712,524	13,318,873	1,759,822	1,038,065	532,071	486,089	143,689,168	194,900,533
TIF Nonresidential	-	2,925,750	1,279,407	14,866	217,929	1	-	7,339,643	11,777,594
Subtotal TIF Program	363,921	36,638,274	14,598,280	1,774,688	1,255,994	532,071	486,089	151,028,811	206,678,127
Fund Balances (6/30/2020) <sup>1</sup>	40,711	4,023,048	2,734,209	399,068	70,910	248,569	262,486	18,029,000	25,808,000
Residential Offset	675,854	8,428,131	3,329,718	3,268,241	1,927,835	988,131	902,736	-	19,520,647
Nonresidential Offset	-	1,253,893	548,317	-	1	-	-	-	1,802,210
Subtotal Offset	675,854	9,682,024	3,878,035	3,268,241	1,927,835	988,131	902,736	-	21,322,857
Total TIF Program	1,080,486	50,343,345	21,210,525	5,441,997	3,254,739	1,768,771	1,651,310	169,057,811	253,808,984

### Table 16: Local Roads TIF Cost Allocation, Cost Per Equivalent Dwelling Unit, and Revenue

<sup>1</sup> Fund balance allocated based on total Hwy. 50 cost shares by zone.

<sup>2</sup> Local-serving nonresidential cost allocation is based on the overall local-serving nonresidential percentage (see Table 5) applied to the initial nonresdiential cost, by zone. The total local-serving cost share is then redistributed back to each zone based on each zone's residential EDUs as a share of total residential EDUs.

<sup>3</sup> Offsets are the percentage of the initial residential or nonresidential cost per equivalent dwelling unit (EDU) that is allocated to state and federal funding, resulting in a reduction in the TIF cost per EDU. Cost per EDU for zones that have no nonresidential cost allocation (because no nonresidential development is anticipated) are set equal to the zone with the lowest nonresidential cost per EDU.

Sources: Tables 4, 5, 12, and 14.

Page 30 of 39

	Zone	Zone	Zone	Zone	Zone	Zone	Zone	Zone	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Total
Cost Allocation By Zone Adjusted	For Fund Bala	ances							
Total TIF Cost Share	564,232	88,547,239	38,942,669	7,139,540	1,615,549	3,020,670	4,032,985	174,916,887	318,779,771
Fund Balances (6/30/2020)	(78,399)	(19,161,834)	(5,630,173)	(1,328,494)	(356,830)	(330,952)	(643,007)	(20,895,312)	(48,425,000)
Net	485,834	69,385,406	33,312,496	5,811,046	1,258,719	2,689,717	3,389,978	154,021,575	270,354,771
Cost Allocation By Land Use Adjus	ted For Loca	I-Serving Nonre	esidential						
Residential									
Initial	485,834	47,590,086	22,106,302	5,305,103	373,497	2,689,717	3,389,978	125,827,681	207,768,199
Local-Serving Nonresidential <sup>1</sup>	258,010	10,814,276	4,272,417	1,247,663	735,958	377,223	344,623	27,655,094	45,705,264
Final (before offset)	743,843	58,404,362	26,378,720	6,552,766	1,109,455	3,066,940	3,734,601	153,482,775	253,473,463
Nonresidential									
Initial	-	21,795,320	11,206,194	505,942	885,222	-	-	28,193,894	62,586,571
Local-Serving Nonresidential <sup>1</sup>	-	(15,916,527)	(8,183,577)	(369,476)	(646,453)	-	-	(20,589,230)	(45,705,264)
Final (before offset)	-	5,878,793	3,022,617	136,466	238,768	-	-	7,604,663	16,881,308
Equivalent Dwelling Units									
Residential	48	2,021	798	233	138	70	64	5,167	8,540
Nonresidential	-	925	405	22	326	-	-	1,158	2,836
Total	48	2,946	1,203	255	463	70	64	6,325	11,375
	-								
Cost per EDU Adjusted For Offsets	2								
Residential									
Initial	27,466	30,078	30,078	27,466	27,466	27,466	27,466	29,704	
Offset	65%	20%	20%	65%	65%	65%	65%	0%	
Final	9,613	24,062	24,062	9,613	9,613	9,613	9,613	29,704	
Nonresidential									
Initial	1,078	6,693	6,693	1,078	1,078	1,078	1,078	6,568	
Offset	0%	30%	30%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	
Final	1,078	4,685	4,685	1,078	1,078	1,078	1,078	6,568	

Table 17: Total TIF Cost Allocation, Cost Per Equivale	ent Dwelling Unit, and Revenue

	Zama	7			7	7	7	7	
	Zone	Zone	Zone	Zone	Zone	Zone	Zone	Zone	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Total
Revenue									
TIF Residential	463,408	48,618,614	19,207,852	2,240,911	1,321,845	677,525	618,972	153,482,775	226,631,903
TIF Nonresidential	-	4,335,227	1,895,760	23,962	351,273	1	-	7,604,663	14,210,885
Subtotal TIF Program	463,408	52,953,841	21,103,611	2,264,874	1,673,118	677,525	618,972	161,087,438	240,842,788
Fund Balances (6/30/2020) <sup>1</sup>	78,399	19,161,834	5,630,173	1,328,494	356,830	330,952	643,007	20,895,312	48,425,000
Residential Offset	860,615	12,154,654	4,801,963	4,161,692	2,454,855	1,258,261	1,149,520	-	26,841,560
Nonresidential Offset	-	1,857,954	812,468	-	-	-	-	-	2,670,423
Subtotal Offset	860,615	14,012,608	5,614,431	4,161,692	2,454,855	1,258,261	1,149,520	-	29,511,983
Total TIF Program	1,402,422	86,128,283	32,348,216	7,755,060	4,484,803	2,266,738	2,411,500	181,982,750	318,779,771

### Table 17: Total TIF Cost Allocation, Cost Per Equivalent Dwelling Unit, and Revenue

<sup>1</sup> Local-serving nonresidential cost allocation is based on the overall local-serving nonresidential percentage (see Table 5) applied to the initial nonresidential cost, by zone. The total local-serving cost share is then redistributed back to each zone based on each zone's residential EDUs as a share of total residential EDUs.

<sup>2</sup> Offsets are the percentage of the initial residential or nonresidential cost per equivalent dwelling unit (EDU) that is allocated to state and federal funding, resulting in a reduction in the TIF cost per EDU. Cost per EDU for zones that have no nonresidential cost allocation (because no nonresidential development is anticipated) are set equal to the zone with the lowest nonresidential cost per EDU.

Sources: Tables 15 and 16.

Page 32 of 39

Table 18: Hwy 50 TIF Schedule

	EDU		Zone							
	Rate <sup>1</sup>	Fee per:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
Residential		Cost per EDU <sup>1</sup> >>	2,064	7,377	7,377	2,064	2,064	2,064	2,064	1,895
SFD Not Age Restricted										
Less than 1,000 SqFt	0.82	Dwelling Unit	1,692	6,049	6,049	1,692	1,692	1,692	1,692	1,554
1,000 to 1,499 SqFt	0.89	Dwelling Unit	1,837	6,566	6,566	1,837	1,837	1,837	1,837	1,687
1,500 to 1,999 SqFt	0.95	Dwelling Unit	1,961	7,008	7,008	1,961	1,961	1,961	1,961	1,801
2,000 to 2,999 SqFt	1.00	Dwelling Unit	2,064	7,377	7,377	2,064	2,064	2,064	2,064	1,895
3,000 to 3,999 SqFt	1.06	Dwelling Unit	2,188	7,820	7,820	2,188	2,188	2,188	2,188	2,009
4,000 SqFt or more	1.10	Dwelling Unit	2,270	8,115	8,115	2,270	2,270	2,270	2,270	2,085
MFD Not Age Restricted	0.57	Dwelling Unit	1,176	4,205	4,205	1,176	1,176	1,176	1,176	1,080
SFD Age Restricted	0.30	Dwelling Unit	NA	2,213	2,213	NA	NA	NA	NA	569
MFD Age Restricted	0.26	Dwelling Unit	NA	1,918	1,918	NA	NA	NA	NA	493
Nonresidential		Cost per EDU <sup>1</sup> >>	409	1,523	1,523	409	409	409	409	229
General Commercial	1.55	Bldg. Sq. Ft.	0.63	2.36	2.36	0.63	0.63	0.63	0.63	0.35
Hotel/Motel/B&B	0.28	Room	115	426	426	115	115	115	115	64
Church	0.25	Bldg. Sq. Ft.	0.10	0.38	0.38	0.10	0.10	0.10	0.10	0.06
Office/Medical	1.28	Bldg. Sq. Ft.	0.52	1.95	1.95	0.52	0.52	0.52	0.52	0.29
Industrial/Warehouse	0.51	Bldg. Sq. Ft.	0.21	0.78	0.78	0.21	0.21	0.21	0.21	0.12

<sup>1</sup> "EDU" (equivalent dwelling unit) equals the demand placed on the transportation network relative to one single family detached dwelling unit. EDU factors are expressed per dwelling unit for residential development, per room for hotel/motel/B&B, and per 1,000 square feet for all other nonresidential development.

Sources: Tables 4 and 15.

Table 19: Local Roads TIF Schedule

	EDU		Zone	Zone	Zone	Zone	Zone	Zone	Zone	Zone
	Rate <sup>1</sup>	Fee per:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
Residential		Cost per EDU <sup>1</sup> >>	7,549	16,685	16,685	7,549	7,549	7,549	7,549	27,809
SFD Not Age Restricted										
Less than 1,000 SqFt	0.82	Dwelling Unit	6,190	13,682	13,682	6,190	6,190	6,190	6,190	22,803
1,000 to 1,499 SqFt	0.89	Dwelling Unit	6,719	14,850	14,850	6,719	6,719	6,719	6,719	24,750
1,500 to 1,999 SqFt	0.95	Dwelling Unit	7,172	15,851	15,851	7,172	7,172	7,172	7,172	26,418
2,000 to 2,999 SqFt	1.00	Dwelling Unit	7,549	16,685	16,685	7,549	7,549	7,549	7,549	27,809
3,000 to 3,999 SqFt	1.06	Dwelling Unit	8,002	17,686	17,686	8,002	8,002	8,002	8,002	29,477
4,000 SqFt or more	1.10	Dwelling Unit	8,304	18,353	18,353	8,304	8,304	8,304	8,304	30,590
MFD Not Age Restricted	0.57	Dwelling Unit	4,303	9,510	9,510	4,303	4,303	4,303	4,303	15,851
SFD Age Restricted	0.30	Dwelling Unit	NA	5,005	5,005	NA	NA	NA	NA	8,343
MFD Age Restricted	0.26	Dwelling Unit	NA	4,338	4,338	NA	NA	NA	NA	7,230
Nonresidential		Cost per EDU <sup>1</sup> >>	669	3,162	3,162	669	669	669	669	6,339
General Commercial	1.55	Bldg. Sq. Ft.	1.04	4.90	4.90	1.04	1.04	1.04	1.04	9.83
Hotel/Motel/B&B	0.28	Room	187	885	885	187	187	187	187	1,775
Church	0.25	Bldg. Sq. Ft.	0.17	0.79	0.79	0.17	0.17	0.17	0.17	1.58
Office/Medical	1.28	Bldg. Sq. Ft.	0.85	4.04	4.04	0.85	0.85	0.85	0.85	8.10
Industrial/Warehouse	0.51	Bldg. Sq. Ft.	0.34	1.61	1.61	0.34	0.34	0.34	0.34	3.23

<sup>1</sup> "EDU" (equivalent dwelling unit) equals the demand placed on the transportation network relative to one single family detached dwelling unit. EDU factors are expressed per dwelling unit for residential development, per room for hotel/motel/B&B, and per 1,000 square feet for all other nonresidential development.

Sources: Tables 4 and 16.

#### Table 20: Total TIF Schedule

	EDU		Zone							
	Rate <sup>1</sup>	Fee per:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
Residential		Cost per EDU <sup>1</sup> >>	9,613	24,062	24,062	9,613	9,613	9,613	9,613	29,704
SFD Not Age Restricted										
Less than 1,000 SqFt	0.82	Dwelling Unit	7,882	19,731	19,731	7,882	7,882	7,882	7,882	24,357
1,000 to 1,499 SqFt	0.89	Dwelling Unit	8,556	21,416	21,416	8,556	8,556	8,556	8,556	26,437
1,500 to 1,999 SqFt	0.95	Dwelling Unit	9,133	22,859	22,859	9,133	9,133	9,133	9,133	28,219
2,000 to 2,999 SqFt	1.00	Dwelling Unit	9,613	24,062	24,062	9,613	9,613	9,613	9,613	29,704
3,000 to 3,999 SqFt	1.06	Dwelling Unit	10,190	25,506	25,506	10,190	10,190	10,190	10,190	31,486
4,000 SqFt or more	1.10	Dwelling Unit	10,574	26,468	26,468	10,574	10,574	10,574	10,574	32,675
MFD Not Age Restricted	0.57	Dwelling Unit	5,479	13,715	13,715	5,479	5,479	5,479	5,479	16,931
SFD Age Restricted	0.30	Dwelling Unit	NA	7,218	7,218	NA	NA	NA	NA	8,912
MFD Age Restricted	0.26	Dwelling Unit	NA	6,256	6,256	NA	NA	NA	NA	7,723
Nonresidential		Cost per EDU <sup>1</sup> >>	1,078	4,685	4,685	1,078	1,078	1,078	1,078	6,568
General Commercial	1.55	Bldg. Sq. Ft.	1.67	7.26	7.26	1.67	1.67	1.67	1.67	10.18
Hotel/Motel/B&B	0.28	Room	302	1,311	1,311	302	302	302	302	1,839
Church	0.25	Bldg. Sq. Ft.	0.27	1.17	1.17	0.27	0.27	0.27	0.27	1.64
Office/Medical	1.28	Bldg. Sq. Ft.	1.37	5.99	5.99	1.37	1.37	1.37	1.37	8.39
Industrial/Warehouse	0.51	Bldg. Sq. Ft.	0.55	2.39	2.39	0.55	0.55	0.55	0.55	3.35

<sup>1</sup> "EDU" (equivalent dwelling unit) equals the demand placed on the transportation network relative to one single family detached dwelling unit. EDU factors are expressed per dwelling unit for residential development, per room for hotel/motel/B&B, and per 1,000 square feet for all other nonresidential development.

Sources: Tables 18 and 19.

### Table 21: Allocation of State & Federal Funding

				Share	
Allocation of State & Federal Funding					
State & Federal Funding (Table 13)		\$	91,315,740	100%	
Reserve for Non-TIF Projects (Table 13)		21,979,272	24%		
Net Available Funding After TIF Program All	\$	69,336,468	76%		
TIF Program Allocation					
External Trip Share (Table 12)	\$ 3,260,229			4%	
Affordable Housing TIF <sup>1</sup>	20,000,000			22%	
Offsets (Table 17)	29,511,983			32%	
Total TIF Program Allocation			52,772,212	<u>58%</u>	
Net Available Funding After TIF Program All	ocation	\$	16,564,256	18%	
<sup>1</sup> "Affordable housing TIF" funding is used to fully fund TIF on at	fordable housing base	d on	20-year estimate of	f future affordable	
housing units.					
Source: Tables 12, 13, and 17.					

EDC TIM Fee Nexus 201106 3-Zone Fee Structure.xlsx

Page 36 of 39

### Table 22: TIF Program Budget Summary

			Sh	are
TIF Budget by Revenue Source				
TIF CIP Total Costs (Table 10)		\$ 348,266,00	00	100%
Non-TIF Funding (except state and federal fundin	g)			
Prior Year (Table 10)	\$ 11,08	32,000	3%	
Future Local Funding (Table 10)	15,14	4,000	4%	
Fund Balances (6/30/2020) (Table 17)	48,42	<u>25,000</u>	<u>14%</u>	
Subtotal		74,651,00	00	21%
State & Federal Funding <sup>1</sup>				•
External Trip Share (Table 12)	\$ 3,26	60,229	1%	
Offsets (Table 17)	29,51	<u>1,983</u>	<u>8%</u>	
Subtotal		32,772,2	<u>12</u>	<u>9%</u>
Total TIF Revenue Requirement <sup>1</sup>		\$ 240,842,78	38	69%
TIF Revenue Requirement by Land Use				Þ
Residential - Hwy 50 TIF (Table 15)	31,73	31,370	13%	
Residential - Local Roads TIF (Table 16)	194,90	00,533	81%	
Residential Subtotal		\$ 226,631,90	03	94%
Nonresidential - Hwy 50 TIF (Table 15)	2,43	33,291	1%	
Nonresidential - Local Roads TIF (Table 16)	11,77	7,594	5%	
Nonresidential Subtotal		14,210,88	35	<u>6%</u>
		\$ 240,842,78	38	100%

		EDU Zone Zone Z	Zone	Zone	Zone	Zone	Zone	Zone		
		Rate	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
2020 Update TIF										
Residential	Cost per EDU >>		9,613	24,062	24,062	9,613	9,613	9,613	9,613	29,704
SFD Not Age Restricted <sup>1</sup>	Dwelling Unit	1.00	9,613	24,062	24,062	9,613	9,613	9,613	9,613	29,704
MFD Not Age Restricted	Dwelling Unit	0.57	5,479	13,715	13,715	5,479	5,479	5,479	5,479	16,931
SFD Age Restricted	Dwelling Unit	0.30	NA	7,218	7,218	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	8,912
MFD Age Restricted	Dwelling Unit	0.26	NA	6,256	6,256	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	7,723
Nonresidential	Cost per EDU >>		1,078	4,685	4,685	1,078	1,078	1,078	1,078	6,568
General Commercial	Bldg. Sq. Ft.	1.55	1.67	7.26	7.26	1.67	1.67	1.67	1.67	10.18
Hotel/Motel/B&B	Room	0.28	302	1,311	1,311	302	302	302	302	1,839
Church	Bldg. Sq. Ft.	0.25	0.27	1.17	1.17	0.27	0.27	0.27	0.27	1.64
Office/Medical	Bldg. Sq. Ft.	1.28	1.37	5.99	5.99	1.37	1.37	1.37	1.37	8.39
Industrial/Warehouse	Bldg. Sq. Ft.	0.51	0.55	2.39	2.39	0.55	0.55	0.55	0.55	3.35
FY 2020-21 TIF (current)										
Residential	Cost per EDU >>		4,765	21,216	21,216	4,835	4,809	7,755	12,030	30,472
SFD Not Age Restricted <sup>1</sup>	Dwelling Unit	1.00	4,765	21,216	21,216	4,835	4,809	7,755	12,030	30,472
MFD Not Age Restricted	Dwelling Unit	0.62	2,954	13,154	13,154	2,997	2,982	4,808	7,459	18,892
SFD Age Restricted	Dwelling Unit	0.27	N/A	5,728	5,728	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	8,228
MFD Age Restricted	Dwelling Unit	0.25	N/A	5,304	5,304	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	7,618
Nonresidential	Cost per EDU >>		2,764	12,306	12,306	2,805	2,789	4,498	6,977	17,674
General Commercial	Bldg. Sq. Ft.	0.51	1.41	6.28	6.28	1.43	1.42	2.30	3.56	9.01
Hotel/Motel/B&B	Room	0.08	221	984	984	224	223	360	558	1,414
Church	Bldg. Sq. Ft.	0.10	0.28	1.23	1.23	0.28	0.28	0.45	0.70	1.77
Office/Medical	Bldg. Sq. Ft.	0.33	0.91	4.06	4.06	0.93	0.92	1.48	2.30	5.84
Industrial/Warehouse	Bldg. Sq. Ft.	0.23	0.64	2.83	2.83	0.65	0.64	1.03	1.60	4.06

Table 23: 2020 Update TIF and Current (	(FY 2020-21) Schedules
---	------------------------

Sources: Tables 4 and 20.

		Zone	Zone						
		 1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
Difference - Amount		1010	0.040	0.040	1 770	1.001	4 9 5 9	(0.447)	(7.0.0
Residential	Cost per EDU >>	4,848	2,846	2,846	4,778	4,804	1,858	(2,417)	(768
SFD Not Age Restricted <sup>1</sup>	Dwelling Unit	\$ 4,848	\$ 2,846	\$ 2,846	\$ 4,778	\$ 4,804	\$ 1,858	\$ (2,417)	\$ (768
MFD Not Age Restricted	Dwelling Unit	2,525	561	561	2,482	2,497	671	(1,980)	(1,961
SFD Age Restricted	Dwelling Unit	N/A	1,490	1,490	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	684
MFD Age Restricted	Dwelling Unit	 N/A	952	952	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	105
Nonresidential	Cost per EDU >>	(1,686)	(7,621)	(7,621)	(1,727)	(1,711)	(3,420)	(5,899)	(11,106
General Commercial	Bldg. Sq. Ft.	0.26	0.98	0.98	0.24	0.25	(0.63)	(1.89)	1.17
Hotel/Motel/B&B	Room	81	327	327	78	79	(58)	(256)	425
Church	Bldg. Sq. Ft.	(0.01)	(0.06)	(0.06)	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.18)	(0.43)	(0.13
Office/Medical	Bldg. Sq. Ft.	0.46	1.93	1.93	0.44	0.45	(0.11)	(0.93)	2.55
Industrial/Warehouse	Bldg. Sq. Ft.	(0.09)	(0.44)	(0.44)	(0.10)	(0.09)	(0.48)	(1.05)	(0.71
Difference - Percent									
Residential	Cost per EDU >>	102%	13%	13%	99%	100%	24%	(20%)	(3%
SFD Not Age Restricted <sup>1</sup>	Dwelling Unit	102%	13%	13%	99%	100%	24%	(20%)	(3%
MFD Not Age Restricted	Dwelling Unit	85%	4%	4%	83%	84%	14%	(27%)	(10%
SFD Age Restricted	Dwelling Unit	N/A	26%	26%	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	8%
MFD Age Restricted	Dwelling Unit	N/A	18%	18%	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	19
Nonresidential	Cost per EDU >>	(61%)	(62%)	(62%)	(62%)	(61%)	(76%)	(85%)	(63%)
General Commercial	Bldg. Sq. Ft.	18%	16%	16%	17%	18%	(27%)	(53%)	13%
Hotel/Motel/B&B	Room	37%	33%	33%	35%	35%	(16%)	(46%)	30%
Church	Bldg. Sq. Ft.	(4%)	(5%)	(5%)	(4%)	(4%)	(40%)	(61%)	(7%
Office/Medical	Bldg. Sq. Ft.	51%	48%	48%	47%	49%	(7%)	(40%)	44%
Industrial/Warehouse	Bldg. Sq. Ft.	(14%)	(16%)	(16%)	(15%)	(14%)	(47%)	(66%)	(17%

Sources: Table 23.