

Memorandum

To: Breann Mobius, Partner, Hefner Law

From: Matt Kowta, MCP, Managing Principal

Date: September 29, 2026

Re: Updated Willowgrove Fiscal Impact Analysis

Introduction

This memo presents updated results of a fiscal impact analysis for the proposed Willowgrove development project that BAE Urban Economics originally completed under contract to the City of Fall of 2025 and then subsequently updated in Spring of 2026 with updated County/City property tax revenue sharing assumptions. The purpose of the original fiscal impact analysis was to evaluate the potential fiscal impacts to the City of Davis General Fund in the event that the project is approved, and developed as proposed. As such, it did not consider one-time capital costs or the costs and revenues associated with City of Davis services that are financed using non-General Fund monies, such as water or sewer utility operations which are financed by enterprise funds that are separate from the General Fund.

This update, prepared under contract to Hefner Law, updates the Spring 2026 fiscal model to modify the cost projections for Fire Department services contained in the original analysis to remove the assumption that the City of Davis would add a fourth fire station in response to increased development at Willowgrove and other locations within the City of Davis. Thus, Fire Department costs projected under the Low- and Mid-Cost fiscal scenarios previously analyzed are reduced, and a third High-Cost scenario previously analyzed which assumed the full cost of the fourth fire station would be borne by Willowgrove has been eliminated. In addition, this update incorporates projections of the potential revenues from a Community Facilities District special tax levy that the City of Davis and the Willowgrove project applicant have agreed would be implemented in conjunction with the development project. All other aspects of the analysis prepared under contract to the City of Davis are un-modified.

Methodology

The fiscal analysis uses a current adaptation of the City of Davis fiscal model, which has been used to analyze major development projects in the City of Davis since the early 2000s, starting with the original Covell Village development proposal. The starting point for the current analysis was the fiscal model that BAE prepared in consultation with City staff for the Village Farms project in early 2025. BAE first modified the base fiscal model to reflect the current City of Davis General Fund services expenditures as defined by the 2025-2026 City Budget. With General Fund expenditures budgeted at \$97.9 million for the current fiscal year, this

represents an approximately 16.5 percent increase from the \$84.0 million in General Fund expenditures¹ for reflected in the 2024-2025 fiscal year base budget used for the Village Farms fiscal impact analysis. According to City staff, this increase is largely due to revised contracts with several City employee groups that brought their compensation levels in line with market area medians. Although the 2025-2026 budget figures do not translate to across-the-board 16.5 percent increases in every City Department, it is an indication that City service expenditures increased sharply between 2024-2025 and 2025-2026.

BAE also updated the base model with various data as needed to reflect other current fiscal conditions, including the current city service population (residents and workers); per capita retail sales and sales tax revenues; current tax rates for the local Municipal Service Tax, Park Maintenance Tax, and Public Safety Tax; per-acre park maintenance costs; and per-lane-mile roadway maintenance costs. The fiscal model updates for Willowgrove reflect a significant change to the local sales tax rate reflected in the 2025-2026 City Budget. This was the increase instituted with the passage of Measure Q in November of 2024, a new local sales tax add-on that is equal to one percent of local taxable sales. BAE retained the same long-term revenue and cost inflation rates as used in the Village Farms model.

After updating the base fiscal model, BAE then modified the fiscal model to reflect the specific project characteristics of the Willowgrove project as described in the Project Description for the project's Draft EIR.

Printouts of the base fiscal model are included as Attachment A, at the end of this memo.

Key Assumptions

Exhibit A, below, summarizes a range of key assumptions that are utilized in various places in the fiscal modeling effort. As noted in the table, the City expects personnel costs to increase more rapidly than general inflation for the next ten to 15 years. Unless noted on individual revenue or cost projection tables, the assumptions shown on Exhibit A are utilized to inflate revenues and costs in future years (i.e., Years 2 through 15 in the Fiscal Model).

As shown in the exhibit, the model assumes average annual price appreciation for all real estate types at 2.5 percent per year, in line with the general rate of revenue inflation.

BAE updated the population density figures with the latest data for the City of Davis from the 2023 American Community Survey. Employment densities are carried over from the U-Mall fiscal model. Also carried over from the U-Mall Fiscal model is the assumption that within the various General Fund departments, existing service costs will be approximately 75% variable in response to community growth (with 25% of existing department costs assumed to be fixed and not affected by community growth).

¹ Mid-Cycle Budget Update Fiscal Year 24-25, page 8.

Other key assumptions that are more applicable to a single revenue source or a single departmental cost projection are discussed separately in the General Fund Revenues and General Fund Expenditures sections of this memo.

A specific date has not been determined for the beginning of development of the Willowgrove project, if approved. The City of Davis General Fund would likely begin to see the effects of the project in terms of increasing revenues and increasing costs at about the time that residents would first start moving into new housing units in the project. Before this can occur, the proposed project must be considered by the voters of the City of Davis. If approved by the voters, additional time would lapse before project planning can be finalized, the developers can secure financing, and begin developing infrastructure. Once basic infrastructure is in place, the developers will need to make additional site improvements, create subdivisions, and potentially market lots to homebuilders. Homebuilders will need to prepare construction plans for individual housing units and obtain building permits. Finally, homes would need to be built, marketed, and sold before the first occupants would move into Willowgrove. Given uncertainty on the timing of all the requisite steps, which can be affected by various micro- and macro-economic factors beyond the control of local stakeholders, the Fiscal Model does not attempt to identify a specific start-date for the project. Rather, it models a 15-year projection period (discussed further below) and how the City of Davis General fund could be affected over the project buildout period and subsequent years within the projection period.

Exhibit A: Key Assumptions

City Revenue and Expenditure Inflation

General Rate of Revenue Inflation:	2.5% per year
Non-Residential Property Appreciation:	2.5% per year
Inflation for Personnel Costs (a):	4.0% per year
Inflation for Non-Personnel Costs:	2.5% per year

Annual Real Estate Market Appreciation

Single-Family for-sale units	2.5%
Multifamily for-sale units	2.5%
Multifamily rental units	2.5%
Non-residential properties	2.5%

Population and Employment Densities

For-Sale Residential Units

Residential High Density (Condos/Stacked Flats)	1.69 persons per household
Residential Medium Density	2.72 persons per household
Residential Low Density	2.72 persons per household

Multifamily Rental Units

Apartments (Market Rate)	2.10 persons per household
Apartments (Affordable)	2.10 persons per household

Non-Residential

Retail	500 square feet per employee
Daycare Center	1,000 square feet per employee
Gym/Classroom Building	n.a. square feet per employee

Variable vs. Fixed Costs for Service Expansion

Department or Function	Percent of General Fund Costs Variable
Department of Public Works Engineering and Transportation	75%
Department of Public Works Utilities & Operations	75%
Community Development Department	75%
Parks and Community Services	75%
Fire Department	75%
Police Department	75%
Social Services & Housing	75%
General Government Functions	75%
Information Systems	75%
Non-Departmental	75%

Note:

(a) According to the Finance Department, personnel costs are anticipated to escalate faster than the general rate of inflation, due to bringing salaries to market, and insurance and pension costs increasing at a higher rate through the mid-2030s.

Sources: City of Davis, 2025; American Community Survey, 2023; BAE, 2025.

Summary of Projected Fiscal Impacts

Tables 1a and 1b of Attachment A summarize the projected fiscal impacts for the proposed Willowgrove development. The two tables are the same except for variations in the amount of cost allocated to the Willowgrove project for the cost of citywide Fire Department operations costs and costs of operating a new gym that is under consideration for construction within the Willowgrove development.

Table 1a summarizes the projected net fiscal balance if Willowgrove is allocated only a pro-rata share of Citywide Fire Department costs and a pro-rata share of costs to maintain and program a new gym that would be built in Willowgrove and dedicated to the City, based on Willowgrove's share of the future total Dwelling Unit Equivalents (DUEs) citywide, considering the existing DUEs in the City of Davis plus DUEs absorbed in Willowgrove. Table 1b summarizes the projected net fiscal balance if Willowgrove is allocated only a pro-rata share of the Fire Department costs and gym maintenance and programming costs, based on Willowgrove's share of the total of existing DUEs citywide plus DUEs absorbed in Willowgrove, plus additional DUEs assumed to be absorbed elsewhere in the City of Davis outside of Willowgrove. These alternative cost allocation schemes are explained further in the Fire Department and Parks and Community Services Department portions of the Projected Expenditures section of this memo. The projected net fiscal impacts under both scenarios reflect revenues from a services Community Facilities District (CFD) that would be established to fund park maintenance for the project, per the proposed Development Agreement (DA) between the developer and the City of Davis. The CFD would levy a special tax of \$385 per year on residential properties within the Willowgrove project.

In the Mid Cost allocation scenario summarized in Table 1a, Willowgrove is allocated a pro-rata share of the cost of the future citywide Fire Department costs and Willowgrove gym operation and programming costs based on a total Davis service population that equals the existing citywide DUEs plus just the additional Willowgrove DUEs in place in a given year. Under this scenario, and considering all other projected General Fund costs and General Fund revenues, the fiscal model projects that Willowgrove would generate a cumulative General Fund fiscal surplus over the 15-year projection period. The net present value of the 15-year stream of projected net annual General Fund surpluses is approximately \$12 million. After the City is assumed to take responsibility for park maintenance in Year 5, the model projects that the annual fiscal surplus would shrink substantially but that annual fiscal surpluses would still be expected for the remainder of the projection period, although the annual fiscal surpluses are projected to decline over time until single-family homes are assumed to begin turning over in Year 13. This trend primarily is due to the fact that the fiscal model reflects the City's expectation that personnel costs will increase at an average of four percent per year over the next ten to 15 years, while the inflation rate assumed for non-personnel costs and for revenues is 2.5 percent per year. Additionally, the fiscal model assumes that annual property tax revenue increases for individual single-family for-sale residential units would be limited to Proposition 13's statutory 2.0 percent annual maximum increase until the original purchasers

have held the properties for 12 years, after which the properties would be sold and re-assessed at full-market values in accordance with the cumulative effect of the annual inflation rate assumption over the 12-year holding period. This means that the fiscal model projects that between the end of the assumed buildout period (Years 1-5) and Year 13, property tax revenue increases will lag the rate of inflation slightly, but that as home resales are assumed to begin occurring in Year 13 and beyond, the properties will be re-assessed at full market value, which will boost the property tax revenues and contribute to projected increases in the fiscal surpluses in Years 14 and 15.

In the Low Cost allocation scenario summarized in Table 1b, Willowgrove is allocated a pro-rata share of citywide Fire Department and Willowgrove gym maintenance and programming costs based on the project's share of a citywide service population that includes the City's existing service population, plus the Willowgrove service population, plus an additional allowance for an increase in the citywide service population due to ongoing development elsewhere within the City of Davis. Because the Fire Department and gym costs are spread over a slightly larger service population than under the Mid-Cost allocation scenario (Table 1a), the General Fund fiscal outlook for this scenario is slightly better as well, with a cumulative net fiscal surplus over the 15-year projection period that has a net present value of about \$12.5 million. The fiscal model projects the same pattern of fiscal surpluses as in the Mid-Cost scenario. This includes a growing first surplus for Years 1 through 4; a decline in the surplus in Year 5 when the City takes responsibility for park maintenance; a continued decline in the annual surplus amounts from Year 6 through Year 13, and then increased surpluses in years 14 and 15.

The results of both the Mid-Cost and Low-Cost fiscal modeling scenarios indicate that the City of Davis would likely experience fiscal surpluses if the Willowgrove project is approved and developed as proposed. It should be noted that the results for both scenarios assume that the City will be able to negotiate a 50/50 property tax sharing agreement for the project with Yolo County for the current share of property taxes for the affected area that are currently allocated to the County General Fund and the County Accumulated Capital Outlay fund, and that the current property tax shares allocated to County Road District #2 and Springlake Fire District are re-allocated fully to the City of Davis. These negotiations have yet to commence.

The elimination of the assumption that the City would establish and operate a fourth fire station to serve citywide fire protection and emergency medical services needs meaningfully improves the fiscal outlook for the Willowgrove project. This is because the Willowgrove project would substantially expand the City of Davis tax base without substantially increasing Fire Department expenditures beyond current levels.

Regardless of the modeling scenario, all other factors being equal, over an extended period of time (10+ years), the project could become more fiscally attractive if the City is able to reduce

the rate of service cost inflation to levels that are more aligned with, or lower, than the general rates of revenue inflation.

Development Program

Table 2 of Attachment A summarizes the Willowgrove development program, as provided in the Project Description included in the Draft EIR.

Project Absorption

The fiscal model assumes an aggressive absorption period for the project, based on development plans shared by the Willowgrove project team, with full absorption anticipated within approximately five years of when the first units in the project would be occupied. This includes the non-residential space as well as parks, greenbelts, the Urban Agricultural Transition Area, and all new publicly-maintained roads. Table 3 presents the project absorption schedule.

Dwelling Unit Equivalents (DUEs)

Dwelling Unit Equivalents are a means of expressing the quantity of development of various kinds of residential and non-residential development in terms of the equivalent service demand of a single-family house. For Willowgrove, Table 4 of Attachment A shows that the service demand for a single-family house is based on an average household size of 2.72 persons per household. Factoring in a current vacancy factor of 1.7 percent for single-family homes, the average population per single-family housing unit is 2.68. Table 4 calculates DUE factors for Multifamily rental units at 0.73, for Retail at 0.75 per 1,000 square feet, and for the Pre-K Early Learning Center at 0.37 per 1,000 square feet.

As shown on the table, the Willowgrove project would support approximately 2,900 new residents and 16 new employees, for a total of 1,079 total project DUEs.

Assessed Valuation

Table 5 of Attachment A summarizes assessed valuation assumptions that drive calculations of increased property tax, property transfer tax, and property tax in-lieu of vehicle license fees. BAE utilized property valuation assumptions for the Willowgrove Residential Medium Density units and Residential Low Density units that are substantially the same as the same per square foot valuation factors for the same residential density categories that BAE developed for use in the Village Farms fiscal impact analysis in early 2025, including an average valuation for Residential Medium Density Units of \$425 per square foot and an average valuation for Residential Low Density units of \$480 per square foot. This generated an average per unit valuation of \$868,000 for Residential Medium Density units and an average per unit valuation of \$1,437,000 for Willowgrove Residential Low Density units. The Village Farms proposal does not include Residential High Density for-sale units, so property tax projections for Willowgrove utilize a per square foot value of \$490 per square foot, based on input from the project applicant and consideration of market dynamics which suggest that

smaller units may sell at average per unit prices (\$563,500) that are significantly below those of medium- and low-density for sale units but because of the smaller unit sizes, their average price per square foot will be at a premium to the prices of medium- and low-density units.

Consistent with Village Farms, BAE estimated an average assessed value of \$400 per square foot for retail space. Other development types included in the Willowgrove project, including affordable apartments, are assumed to be property tax-exempt.

Projected General Fund Revenues

This section provides additional commentary on how the Willowgrove fiscal model projects increased general fund revenues attributable to the project.

Property Taxes. As shown on Table 6 of Attachment A, property taxes are a function of the quantity of each land use, the assessed valuation, the absorption schedule, the ad valorem property tax rate, and the portion of the property tax that would be allocated to the City of Davis. The ad valorem property tax rate is 1.0 percent per year. Although property owners in Davis typically have a property tax burden that is greater than one percent, due to the inclusion of various special taxes and assessments included in the annual tax levies, the amounts above the base 1.0 percent are directed for various designated uses and not available to support General Fund operations. In the case of a project requiring annexation of previously unincorporated land to the City of Davis, the portion of the base 1.0 percent that is ultimately allocated to the City of Davis is a function of the amount of property taxes currently allocated to Yolo County and the fire district that currently serves the unincorporated area and the portion of those taxes that the City and County agree will be transferred to the City. As the required revenue sharing negotiations have not yet occurred, this analysis assumes that the approximately 12.69 percent of the 1.0 percent base levy currently allocated to the Yolo County General Fund and to the Yolo County Accumulated Capital Outlay (ACO) Fund that is available for sharing would be split 50/50 between the City and the County, and that the entirety of the current County Road District #2 share (2.16 percent) and Springlake Fire District share (7.09 percent) would be transferred to the City, as was the case in the recent West Davis Active Adult/Bretton Woods annexation and development project. This results in a total property tax share for the City of Davis equal to 15.5928 percent of the 1.0 percent ad valorem property tax. Based on all of these factors, Table 6 calculates the future property tax revenue that would accrue to the Davis General Fund. For each year of the projection period, the Fiscal Model multiplies the inflated market rate property value by the quantity of development absorbed, to establish the initial property valuation. Then in each subsequent year the assessed value increases 2.0 percent per the Proposition 13 statutory maximum annual assessment increase until such time as the properties are assumed to be re-sold and re-assessed at the then current market value. Due to the limited projection time-frame and the time assumed to lapse between typical property turnovers, only some development absorbed in the early years of the project is assumed to turn over during the projection period.

Park Maintenance Community Facilities District Revenues. The proposed development agreement (DA) between the project applicant and the City of Davis calls for the formation of a park maintenance Community Facilities District (CFD), which would levy a special tax on residential properties within the Willowgrove project in the amount of \$385 per year, to be adjusted for inflation. A line at the bottom of Table 6 calculates the CFD revenues that would be generated each year, based on the number of housing units absorbed within the project.

Property Transfer Tax. The periodic turnover of real estate ownership will generate new property transfer tax revenues for the City General Fund. Property transfer tax of \$1.10 per \$1,000 in valuation is levied on property sales and is split evenly between the County and the City. Table 7 of Attachment A projects the increased property tax revenue from initial property sales in each year, and then adds an additional calculation for property transfer tax revenues for re-sales in each year after Year 1. Table 7 calculates an annual percentage of valuation of each product type that will turn over beginning in Year 2, based on the re-sale intervals indicated in the footnotes on Table 6.

Sales Tax Revenues. Although the Willowgrove project will have limited onsite retail activity, the influx of new households will increase the overall local pool of demand for retail products sold at other locations in Davis, which will generate new sales tax revenues for the City. Like all jurisdictions within the state, Davis receives an allocation of sales tax revenue equal to one percent of local taxable sales. This is called Bradley-Burns sales tax revenue, and it is a General Fund revenue source. In addition, Davis voters have approved two separate one percent local sales tax levies, the most recent being Measure Q in Fall, 2024. These locally-approved levies also accrue to the General Fund. The upper part of Table 8 of Attachment A calculates the increase in local demand for taxable retail goods based on the current per-capita retail sales in Davis, times the estimated average persons per housing unit in Residential High Density, Residential Medium Density, Residential Low Density, and Apartments housing units. The Fiscal Model conservatively assumes that the resident household expenditures will not be additive to onsite taxable sales in Willowgrove' onsite retail component, but that the taxable sales in the onsite retail component would be subsumed within the larger amount of sales from new local resident expenditures on taxable goods, which may occur within the project itself, or elsewhere within the City. Ultimately, the increase in local demand will be responsible for increased citywide sales tax revenues.

Public Safety Sales Tax. Public safety sales tax is an additional revenue that supports local police, fire protection, and emergency medical services. The lower part of Attachment A, Table 8 calculates the increase in public safety sales tax based on the increase in local sales tax revenue, assuming that the current ratio of public safety sales tax to sales tax will continue to apply.

Municipal Services Tax. Municipal Service Tax revenue is dependent upon the amount of development in place and the current tax schedule for this revenue source. The tax schedule

calls for a base tax per residential unit or per 1,000 square feet of non-residential development plus a charge per lot square footage. Table 9 of Attachment A shows the assumed average lot sizes for the residential units, based on the net acreages for each residential unit type divided by the number of units. The lot square footage for the Retail component assumes that the retail component would be subdivided into its own lot that would reflect a 0.20 Floor-Area-Ratio.

Park Maintenance Tax. Table 10 of Attachment A contains calculations for Park Maintenance Tax. Park Maintenance Tax revenues are based on a tax schedule that considers the number of residential units or the non-residential building square footage. Unlike most other revenue sources, annual inflation of revenue from this source was limited to 2.0 percent per year when the tax measure was approved in a local election.

Public Safety Tax. Public Safety Tax is calculated in a manner similar to Municipal Service Tax, with a base per unit or per non-residential square footage charge plus a lot size charge; however, with different rates for the two tax components. These calculations are shown on Table 11 of Attachment A.

Other Revenues. Table 12 of Attachment A contains calculations for several additional revenue sources, including Transient Occupancy Tax, Business License Tax, Franchise Fees, Property Tax In-Lieu of Vehicle License Fees, Gas Tax Revenues, and Fines and Forfeitures.

Transient Occupancy Tax. The Willowgrove fiscal model assumes that the Willowgrove project will not directly stimulate significant increases in Transient Occupancy Tax revenues since no lodging facilities are included in the proposed project. Increases in local lodging activity are expected to be driven primarily by the university, business activity, special events, and highway traffic as opposed to increases in the local residential population.

Business License Tax. The Willowgrove project would generate a limited amount of new business license tax revenue based on the gross sales of the onsite retail component, based on the City's business license tax schedule.

Franchise Fees. The projected increase in Franchise Fee revenues is calculated based on the current average rate of revenue generation per existing citywide DUE. Table 12 applies this figure to the anticipated Willowgrove DUEs to project the increased revenues.

Property Tax In-Lieu of Vehicle License Fees (ILVLF). ILVLF is a function of the increase in local assessed valuation driven by the project. The Fiscal Model identifies the current ratio of ILVLF revenue to total local assessed valuation and then applies that same ratio to the increase in assessed valuation from Table 6.

Gas Tax. Gas Tax revenues are primarily allocated to local jurisdictions on a per resident basis. The Fiscal Model projects the increase in Gas Tax revenues based on the current average Gas Tax revenues per residential DUE, applied to the project's future residential DUEs.

Fines and Forfeitures. The Fiscal Model projects Fines and Forfeitures revenue based on the current average revenues per citywide DUE, applying that figure to future DUEs associated with the project.

Projected General Fund Costs

This section provides an overview of the approach to modeling costs for different City departments that rely on General Fund revenues. For departments that rely on a combination of General Fund revenues and revenues from other restricted sources, the Fiscal Model considers only the portion of departmental operations financed with General Fund monies.

Public Works Engineering and Transportation (PWET) Department. Attachment A, Table 13 projects increased costs for PWET based on the current average General Fund cost per citywide DUE. The Fiscal Model applies this figure to future project-generated DUEs.

Public Works Utilities and Operations (PWUO) Department. As shown on Table 14 of Attachment A, the Fiscal Model projects the increased costs for roadway maintenance based on estimated current average annual roadway maintenance expenditures per lane mile, for the 2015 to 2024 time period, with adjustment for inflation and the annual streetlight maintenance expenditures per lane mile for the 2012 to 2024 time period, adjusted for inflation. These figures are then applied to the roadway lane miles associated with the proposed project in a given year. PWUO costs other than roadway and street light maintenance are projected on an average cost per DUE basis.

Community Development Department. Community Development Department costs, projected in Table 15 of Attachment A, are based on the current average cost per DUE, with a 75 percent adjustment factor for employee DUEs. This reflects the reduced demand for Community Development Department services from the non-residential development within the city as compared to the residential development. Increased costs are projected by applying the current average cost per adjusted DUE to the DUEs associated with Willowgrove (also incorporating the 75 percent employee DUE adjustment factor).

Parks and Community Services Department. Project costs for Parks and Community Services Department functions are shown on Tables 16a, 16b, and 17 of Attachment A. Tables 16a and 16b includes costs for existing Community Services (e.g., recreation programs), Aquatics programs, and for maintenance and programming of a new gym included in the Willowgrove plan. Table 16a includes a mid-range cost allocation to Willowgrove for gym maintenance and programming and Table 16b includes a low-range cost allocation. Table 17 of Attachment A includes costs for park land maintenance.

As shown on Tables 16a and 16b, costs for existing Community Services and Aquatics functions are calculated on an average cost per DUE basis, with employee DUEs receiving a 36 percent adjustment factor. The average cost per adjusted DUE is then applied to the estimated Willowgrove DUEs, also adjusted with the 36 percent employee DUE factor. Plans for the Willowgrove project include an approximately 9,500-square foot gymnasium/classroom building that the developers would build and then dedicate to the City to maintain and program. City staff provided an estimate of the annual General Fund costs, net of program revenues, as detailed in Appendix B in Attachment A. The cost estimate is based on the City's experience with maintaining and operating the City Hall gym and for custodial expenses for the Vets Memorial Center. These costs are inflation-adjusted and then applied to the new gym facility, for total estimated net annual cost of approximately \$278,125 (2025-2026\$). The Parks and Community Services Mid Cost estimate (Table 16a) assumes costs of the new gym are allocated only across the existing citywide DUEs plus the Willowgrove DUEs. Table 16b provides a second cost allocation scenario that recognizes that in addition to Willowgrove (assuming it is approved and built), there would likely be additional new development elsewhere in the city that would also benefit from the new gym. Based on projecting the City's current Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA) for the 2021 to 2029 time period through the 15-year Fiscal Model timeframe, the table estimates the additional development elsewhere in the city needed to accommodate growth needs implied by the RHNA numbers (expressed in DUEs), sums those numbers with the existing citywide DUE figure and the estimated Willowgrove DUE numbers to identify Willowgrove's share of the future citywide DUEs to assign the project a slightly reduced share of the new gym costs compared to Table 16a.

On Table 17 of Attachment A, park land maintenance costs are calculated on an average cost per acre basis, starting with the estimated current average cost of maintenance per park acre and then applying that cost to the proposed park land within the proposed project. Appendix A of Attachment A includes details on the current estimated per-acre parks maintenance costs. The Fiscal Model assumes that the Parks and Community Services Department will only be responsible to maintain the park land and that other greenspace features including greenbelts, roadway landscaping, and the Urban Agricultural Transition Area (UATA) will be maintained using non-General Fund financing sources, such as Community Facilities Districts (CFD), Lighting or Landscaping Maintenance Districts (LLMD), or be maintained by a third-party conservancy.

Police Department. Police Department expenditures are projected on Table 18 of Attachment A. As shown on the table, Police expenditures are based on the current average cost per citywide DUE, with no adjustments for employee DUEs. The current average cost per citywide DUE is applied to the proposed project's DUEs.

Fire Department. Tables 19a and 19b of Attachment A provide two different methods of allocating Fire Department service costs to the Willowgrove project. Table 19a projects a Mid

Cost allocation and Table 19b provides a slightly reduced Low Cost allocation compared to Table 19a.

Table 19a allocates the Willowgrove project a pro-rata share of the citywide Fire Department costs. Whereas the original analysis completed for the City of Davis incorporated costs for operating a fourth fire station into the future citywide Fire Department operating costs, this analysis does not incorporate costs for a fourth fire station, as BAE understands that the City is not planning to establish a fourth fire station in the event that the Willowgrove project is approved and developed. The fiscal model allocates Willowgrove a pro-rata share of the citywide Fire Department costs reflecting the operation of the City's current system with three fire stations based on Willowgrove's share of citywide DUEs that includes the existing citywide DUEs plus the new DUEs present in Willowgrove during a given year.

Table 19b provides a cost allocation scenario that recognizes that in addition to Willowgrove (assuming it is approved and built), there would likely be additional new development elsewhere in the city that would also provide an increased tax base to support citywide service costs, including Fire. Willowgrove's pro-rata share of citywide Fire Department costs, for the three-station system, is based on the DUEs in place in a given year in Willowgrove divided by the total of existing citywide DUEs, the developed Willowgrove DUEs, and additional DUE growth elsewhere in the city. Based on projecting the City's current Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA) for the 2021 to 2029 time period through the 15-year Fiscal Model timeframe, the table estimates the additional development elsewhere in the city needed to accommodate growth needs implied by the RHNA numbers (expressed in DUEs), sums those numbers with the existing citywide DUE figure and the estimated Willowgrove DUE numbers to identify Willowgrove's share of the citywide DUEs. Based on this Low Cost approach, the Willowgrove project is allocated a slightly reduced cost of citywide Fire Department services compared to Table 19a.

Analysis of a third, High-Cost scenario was included in the original fiscal impact analysis prepared for the City of Davis. That analysis allocated 100 percent of the cost of a 4th fire station to the Willowgrove project; however, based on the understanding that the City is not planning to add a fourth fire station in the event that Willowgrove is approved and developed, this evaluation does not include fiscal projections for that third scenario.

Social Services and Housing. Table 20 of Attachment A projects increased costs for the Social Services and Housing Department based on the current average cost per DUE. For this case, the Fiscal Model applies a 25 percent adjustment factor to existing citywide employee DUEs when calculating the current average cost per DUE. The average cost per adjusted DUE is then applied to the proposed project's adjusted DUEs.

General Government. General Government lumps together several City departments, including City Council, City Attorney, City Manager's Office, Finance, and Human Resources. Table 21 of Attachment A calculates increased General Government costs based on the

current average cost per citywide DUE for General Government services, with employee DUEs having a 36 percent adjustment factor. The average cost per DUE is then applied to the Willowgrove DUEs, also with employees adjusted to 36 percent.

Information Systems Department. As shown on Table 22 of Attachment A, the fiscal model does not project any increased General Fund expenditures for the Information Systems Department as a result of the Willowgrove project. This is because the Information Systems Department is currently funded by internal service funds (with the costs being incorporated into other departmental budgets).

Non-Departmental Transfers Out. In each budget, the City Council considers the availability of General Fund monies to transfer out for special purposes, such as capital projects or other one-time expenditures, once the operating expenditure needs of the various General Fund departments, needs for reserves, etc. are considered. Thus, the non-departmental transfers out can vary from year to year; however, as shown in Table 23 of Attachment A, there is a baseline expenditure of \$3.0 million per year for transfers out. This represents the City's required "maintenance of effort" expenditure of General Fund monies for roadway maintenance, as a condition of receiving an allocation of state Gas Tax monies for local roadway maintenance. Because the maintenance of effort requirement will not increase over time, the baseline transfers out will not increase over time as Willowgrove or other developments occur within the city. To the extent that the City has General Fund revenues in a given year that are more than necessary to fund basic departmental operations, the City may elect to increase the non-departmental transfers out, for designated purposes.

Attachment A: Willowgrove Fiscal Impact Model Printouts

Table 1a: Summary of Fiscal Impacts for City of Davis (Fire and PCS Departments Mid Cost Allocations)

General Fund Revenues	Cumulative Absorption (Year)														
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
Property Taxes	\$264,198	\$749,601	\$1,183,746	\$1,423,973	\$1,533,474	\$1,564,143	\$1,595,426	\$1,627,335	\$1,659,881	\$1,693,079	\$1,726,941	\$1,761,479	\$1,816,959	\$1,892,851	\$1,968,009
Property Tax In-Lieu of Vehicle License Fees	\$132,266	\$375,274	\$592,621	\$712,886	\$767,706	\$783,060	\$798,721	\$814,696	\$830,990	\$847,609	\$864,562	\$881,853	\$909,628	\$947,622	\$985,248
Property Transfer Tax	\$91,791	\$190,096	\$182,493	\$120,112	\$75,355	\$49,388	\$50,376	\$51,383	\$52,411	\$53,459	\$54,528	\$55,619	\$57,365	\$59,730	\$62,080
Sales and Use Taxes	\$168,448	\$480,217	\$921,137	\$1,058,083	\$1,123,108	\$1,151,185	\$1,179,965	\$1,209,464	\$1,239,701	\$1,270,693	\$1,302,461	\$1,335,022	\$1,368,398	\$1,402,608	\$1,437,673
Prop. 172 Public Safety Sales Tax	\$4,389	\$12,511	\$23,999	\$27,567	\$29,261	\$29,992	\$30,742	\$31,511	\$32,298	\$33,106	\$33,934	\$34,782	\$35,651	\$36,543	\$37,456
Municipal Service Tax	\$21,980	\$62,104	\$125,054	\$144,988	\$155,136	\$159,015	\$162,990	\$167,065	\$171,242	\$175,523	\$179,911	\$184,408	\$189,019	\$193,744	\$198,588
Parks Maintenance Tax	\$11,031	\$30,999	\$62,360	\$71,909	\$76,398	\$77,926	\$79,484	\$81,074	\$82,695	\$84,349	\$86,036	\$87,757	\$89,512	\$91,302	\$93,128
Public Safety Tax	\$17,251	\$48,745	\$98,126	\$113,773	\$122,091	\$125,143	\$128,272	\$131,478	\$134,765	\$138,134	\$141,588	\$145,127	\$148,756	\$152,475	\$156,286
Transient Occupancy Tax	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Business License Tax	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$1,325	\$1,358	\$1,392	\$1,426	\$1,462	\$1,499	\$1,536	\$1,575	\$1,614	\$1,654	\$1,696
Franchise Fees	\$12,891	\$36,751	\$70,495	\$80,976	\$86,433	\$88,594	\$90,808	\$93,079	\$95,406	\$97,791	\$100,235	\$102,741	\$105,310	\$107,943	\$110,641
Gas Tax Revenues	\$26,639	\$75,942	\$145,669	\$167,326	\$177,609	\$182,049	\$186,600	\$191,265	\$196,047	\$200,948	\$205,972	\$211,121	\$216,399	\$221,809	\$227,354
Fines and Forfeitures	\$2,926	\$8,343	\$16,003	\$18,382	\$19,621	\$20,112	\$20,614	\$21,130	\$21,658	\$22,199	\$22,754	\$23,323	\$23,906	\$24,504	\$25,117
Park Maintenance CFD Revenues	\$75,460	\$213,098	\$329,660	\$395,531	\$424,968	\$435,592	\$446,482	\$457,644	\$469,085	\$480,812	\$492,833	\$505,153	\$517,782	\$530,727	\$543,995
Sub-Total Revenues	\$829,270	\$2,283,682	\$3,751,361	\$4,335,505	\$4,592,483	\$4,667,556	\$4,771,873	\$4,878,549	\$4,987,641	\$5,099,202	\$5,213,289	\$5,329,961	\$5,480,298	\$5,663,512	\$5,847,272
Percentage change from prior year		63.69%	39.12%	13.47%	5.60%	1.61%	2.19%	2.19%	2.19%	2.19%	2.19%	2.19%	2.74%	3.23%	3.14%
General Fund Expenditures	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
Public Works Engineering and Transportation	\$25,508	\$72,938	\$140,334	\$161,693	\$173,127	\$178,014	\$183,046	\$188,227	\$193,562	\$199,055	\$204,711	\$210,536	\$216,536	\$222,714	\$229,078
Public Works Utilities and Operations	\$130,646	\$246,394	\$353,280	\$396,958	\$420,213	\$431,419	\$442,934	\$454,766	\$466,924	\$479,417	\$492,256	\$505,450	\$519,009	\$532,943	\$547,265
Community Development	\$13,440	\$38,316	\$73,497	\$84,424	\$89,987	\$92,237	\$94,543	\$96,907	\$99,329	\$101,813	\$104,358	\$106,967	\$109,641	\$112,382	\$115,192
Parks and Community Services	\$36,188	\$103,699	\$199,923	\$230,968	\$247,124	\$254,854	\$262,849	\$271,116	\$279,667	\$288,509	\$297,654	\$307,112	\$316,894	\$327,012	\$337,476
Park and Open Space Maintenance	\$0	\$0	\$49,056	\$50,623	\$596,127	\$615,234	\$634,987	\$655,409	\$676,524	\$698,355	\$720,929	\$744,272	\$768,412	\$793,376	\$819,194
Police	\$124,205	\$358,194	\$695,073	\$807,728	\$872,251	\$904,553	\$938,083	\$972,887	\$1,009,016	\$1,046,520	\$1,085,453	\$1,125,870	\$1,167,829	\$1,211,389	\$1,256,612
Fire	\$114,016	\$325,446	\$622,882	\$721,201	\$777,655	\$806,340	\$836,111	\$867,011	\$899,083	\$932,373	\$966,927	\$1,002,796	\$1,040,028	\$1,078,679	\$1,118,801
Social Services & Housing	\$12,395	\$35,476	\$68,320	\$78,793	\$84,092	\$86,549	\$89,081	\$91,691	\$94,381	\$97,155	\$100,015	\$102,963	\$106,003	\$109,138	\$112,370
General Government	\$40,382	\$115,630	\$222,784	\$257,056	\$274,643	\$282,800	\$291,213	\$299,889	\$308,839	\$318,070	\$327,592	\$337,415	\$347,549	\$358,005	\$368,792
Information Systems	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Non-Departmental/Transfers Out	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Sub-Total Expenditures	\$496,782	\$1,296,093	\$2,425,148	\$2,789,443	\$3,535,220	\$3,652,001	\$3,772,846	\$3,897,903	\$4,027,324	\$4,161,267	\$4,299,896	\$4,443,382	\$4,591,901	\$4,745,638	\$4,904,781
Percentage change from prior year		61.67%	46.56%	13.06%	21.10%	3.20%	3.20%	3.21%	3.21%	3.22%	3.22%	3.23%	3.23%	3.24%	3.24%
NET GENERAL FUND BALANCE	\$332,489	\$987,589	\$1,326,213	\$1,546,062	\$1,057,263	\$1,015,555	\$999,026	\$980,646	\$960,317	\$937,935	\$913,393	\$886,579	\$888,397	\$917,874	\$942,490
Present Value		\$963,502	\$1,262,309	\$1,435,672	\$957,828	\$897,603	\$861,457	\$824,983	\$788,177	\$751,031	\$713,541	\$675,702	\$660,573	\$665,844	\$667,026
Cumulative Total		\$1,320,078	\$2,646,292	\$4,192,353	\$5,249,616	\$6,265,172	\$7,264,198	\$8,244,844	\$9,205,161	\$10,143,096	\$11,056,489	\$11,943,069	\$12,831,466	\$13,749,340	\$14,691,830
Cumulative Total	\$14,691,830														
Net Present Value (a)	\$12,153,891														

Note:
(a) NPV is based on discount rate = general rate of revenue inflation from key assumptions.

Table 1b: Summary of Fiscal Impacts for City of Davis (Fire and PCS Departments Low Cost Allocation)

General Fund Revenues	Cumulative Absorption (Year)														
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
Property Taxes	\$264,198	\$749,601	\$1,183,746	\$1,423,973	\$1,533,474	\$1,564,143	\$1,595,426	\$1,627,335	\$1,659,881	\$1,693,079	\$1,726,941	\$1,761,479	\$1,816,959	\$1,892,851	\$1,968,009
Property Tax In-Lieu of Vehicle License Fees	\$132,266	\$375,274	\$592,621	\$712,886	\$767,706	\$783,060	\$798,721	\$814,696	\$830,990	\$847,609	\$864,562	\$881,853	\$909,628	\$947,622	\$985,248
Property Transfer Tax	\$91,791	\$190,096	\$182,493	\$120,112	\$75,355	\$49,388	\$50,376	\$51,383	\$52,411	\$53,459	\$54,528	\$55,619	\$57,365	\$59,730	\$62,080
Sales and Use Taxes	\$168,448	\$480,217	\$921,137	\$1,058,083	\$1,123,108	\$1,151,185	\$1,179,965	\$1,209,464	\$1,239,701	\$1,270,693	\$1,302,461	\$1,335,022	\$1,368,398	\$1,402,608	\$1,437,673
Prop. 172 Public Safety Sales Tax	\$4,389	\$12,511	\$23,999	\$27,567	\$29,261	\$29,992	\$30,742	\$31,511	\$32,298	\$33,106	\$33,934	\$34,782	\$35,651	\$36,543	\$37,456
Municipal Service Tax	\$21,980	\$62,104	\$125,054	\$144,988	\$155,136	\$159,015	\$162,990	\$167,065	\$171,242	\$175,523	\$179,911	\$184,408	\$189,019	\$193,744	\$198,588
Parks Maintenance Tax	\$11,031	\$30,999	\$62,360	\$71,909	\$76,398	\$77,926	\$79,484	\$81,074	\$82,695	\$84,349	\$86,036	\$87,757	\$89,512	\$91,302	\$93,128
Public Safety Tax	\$17,251	\$48,745	\$98,126	\$113,773	\$122,091	\$125,143	\$128,272	\$131,478	\$134,765	\$138,134	\$141,588	\$145,127	\$148,756	\$152,475	\$156,286
Transient Occupancy Tax	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Business License Tax	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$1,325	\$1,358	\$1,392	\$1,426	\$1,462	\$1,499	\$1,536	\$1,575	\$1,614	\$1,654	\$1,696
Franchise Fees	\$12,891	\$36,751	\$70,495	\$80,976	\$86,433	\$88,594	\$90,808	\$93,079	\$95,406	\$97,791	\$100,235	\$102,741	\$105,310	\$107,943	\$110,641
Gas Tax Revenues	\$26,639	\$75,942	\$145,669	\$167,326	\$177,609	\$182,049	\$186,600	\$191,265	\$196,047	\$200,948	\$205,972	\$211,121	\$216,399	\$221,809	\$227,354
Fines and Forfeitures	\$2,926	\$8,343	\$16,003	\$18,382	\$19,621	\$20,112	\$20,614	\$21,130	\$21,658	\$22,199	\$22,754	\$23,323	\$23,906	\$24,504	\$25,117
Park Maintenance CFD Revenues	\$75,460	\$213,098	\$329,660	\$395,531	\$424,968	\$435,592	\$446,482	\$457,644	\$469,085	\$480,812	\$492,833	\$505,153	\$517,782	\$530,727	\$543,995
Sub-Total Revenues	\$829,270	\$2,283,682	\$3,751,361	\$4,335,505	\$4,592,483	\$4,667,556	\$4,771,873	\$4,878,549	\$4,987,641	\$5,099,202	\$5,213,289	\$5,329,961	\$5,480,298	\$5,663,512	\$5,847,272
Percentage change from prior year		63.69%	39.12%	13.47%	5.60%	1.61%	2.19%	2.19%	2.19%	2.19%	2.19%	2.19%	2.74%	3.23%	3.14%
General Fund Expenditures	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
Public Works Engineering and Transportation	\$25,508	\$72,938	\$140,334	\$161,693	\$173,127	\$178,014	\$183,046	\$188,227	\$193,562	\$199,055	\$204,711	\$210,536	\$216,536	\$222,714	\$229,078
Public Works Utilities and Operations	\$130,646	\$246,394	\$353,280	\$396,958	\$420,213	\$431,419	\$442,934	\$454,766	\$466,924	\$479,417	\$492,256	\$505,450	\$519,009	\$532,943	\$547,265
Community Development	\$13,440	\$38,316	\$73,497	\$84,424	\$89,987	\$92,237	\$94,543	\$96,907	\$99,329	\$101,813	\$104,358	\$106,967	\$109,641	\$112,382	\$115,192
Parks and Community Services	\$36,126	\$103,608	\$199,942	\$230,909	\$247,050	\$254,761	\$262,755	\$271,021	\$279,569	\$288,410	\$297,554	\$307,010	\$316,790	\$326,905	\$337,368
Park and Open Space Maintenance	\$0	\$0	\$49,056	\$50,623	\$596,127	\$615,234	\$634,987	\$655,409	\$676,524	\$698,355	\$720,929	\$744,272	\$768,412	\$793,376	\$819,194
Police	\$124,205	\$358,194	\$695,073	\$807,728	\$872,251	\$904,553	\$938,083	\$972,887	\$1,009,016	\$1,046,520	\$1,085,453	\$1,125,870	\$1,167,829	\$1,211,389	\$1,256,612
Fire	\$110,035	\$315,541	\$606,285	\$695,282	\$748,193	\$774,790	\$803,397	\$833,087	\$863,905	\$895,892	\$929,095	\$963,560	\$999,336	\$1,036,474	\$1,075,026
Social Services & Housing	\$12,395	\$35,476	\$68,320	\$78,793	\$84,092	\$86,549	\$89,081	\$91,691	\$94,381	\$97,155	\$100,015	\$102,963	\$106,003	\$109,138	\$112,370
General Government	\$40,382	\$115,630	\$222,784	\$257,056	\$274,643	\$282,800	\$291,213	\$299,889	\$308,839	\$318,070	\$327,592	\$337,415	\$347,549	\$358,005	\$368,792
Information Systems	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Non-Departmental/Transfers Out	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Sub-Total Expenditures	\$492,738	\$1,286,098	\$2,408,570	\$2,763,466	\$3,505,683	\$3,620,359	\$3,740,038	\$3,863,884	\$3,992,049	\$4,124,687	\$4,261,963	\$4,404,043	\$4,551,104	\$4,703,326	\$4,860,898
Percentage change from prior year		61.69%	46.60%	12.84%	21.17%	3.17%	3.20%	3.21%	3.21%	3.22%	3.22%	3.23%	3.23%	3.24%	3.24%
NET GENERAL FUND BALANCE	\$336,532	\$997,584	\$1,342,792	\$1,572,040	\$1,086,800	\$1,047,197	\$1,031,834	\$1,014,665	\$995,592	\$974,515	\$951,327	\$925,918	\$929,194	\$960,185	\$986,374
Present Value		\$973,253	\$1,278,088	\$1,459,795	\$984,587	\$925,570	\$889,748	\$853,602	\$817,129	\$780,321	\$743,175	\$705,684	\$690,908	\$696,538	\$698,083
Cumulative Total		\$1,334,116	\$2,676,908	\$4,248,948	\$5,335,748	\$6,382,945	\$7,414,779	\$8,429,444	\$9,425,036	\$10,399,551	\$11,350,878	\$12,276,796	\$13,205,990	\$14,166,175	\$15,152,549
Cumulative Total	\$15,152,549														
Net Present Value (a)	\$12,520,013														

Note:
(a) NPV is based on discount rate = general rate of revenue inflation from key assumptions.

Table 2: Development Program

For-Sale Residential Units		Units	Parks and Open Space	Acres
Residential High Density		288	Park (Community Park, Mini-Park, Dog Park)	19.2
Residential Medium Density		515	Greenbelts	8.7
Residential Low Density		197	Urban Agricultural Transition Area	44.1
			Sub-Total Parks and Open Space	72.0
Multifamily Rental Units				
Apartments (Market Rate)		0		
Apartments (Affordable)		250	Streets	Lane Miles
			Phase 1 Publicly Maintained	13.40
			Phase 2 Publicly Maintained	0.00
Sub-Total Residential Units		1,250	Total Publicly Maintained Streets	13.40
Non-Residential		Square Feet		
Retail		5,000		
Gym/Classroom Building		9,500		
Daycare Center		6,300		
Sub-Total Non-Residential Square Feet		20,800		
			Acres	
Fire Station Site		t.b.d.		

Source: Willowgrove, 2025.

Table 3: Absorption Schedule

Ownership	Units	Cumulative Absorption (Year)														
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
Residential High Density	288	48	120	192	264	288	288	288	288	288	288	288	288	288	288	288
Residential Medium Density	515	128	364	501	515	515	515	515	515	515	515	515	515	515	515	515
Residential Low Density	197	20	56	122	175	197	197	197	197	197	197	197	197	197	197	197
Multifamily Rental Units																
Apartments (Market Rate)	0															
Apartments (Affordable)	250			250	250	250	250	250	250	250	250	250	250	250	250	250
Sub-Total Residential Units	1,250	196	540	1,065	1,204	1,250	1,250	1,250	1,250	1,250	1,250	1,250	1,250	1,250	1,250	1,250
Non-Residential	Square Feet															
Retail	5,000					5,000	5,000	5,000	5,000	5,000	5,000	5,000	5,000	5,000	5,000	5,000
Gym/Classroom Building	9,500					9,500	9,500	9,500	9,500	9,500	9,500	9,500	9,500	9,500	9,500	9,500
Daycare Center	6,300					6,300	6,300	6,300	6,300	6,300	6,300	6,300	6,300	6,300	6,300	6,300
Sub-Total Non-Residential Square Feet	20,800	0	0	0	0	20,800	20,800	20,800	20,800	20,800	20,800	20,800	20,800	20,800	20,800	20,800
Parks and Open Space	Acres															
Phase 1 Development Park	1.68			1.68	1.68	1.68	1.68	1.68	1.68	1.68	1.68	1.68	1.68	1.68	1.68	1.68
Phase 2 Development Park	17.49					17.49	17.49	17.49	17.49	17.49	17.49	17.49	17.49	17.49	17.49	17.49
Subtotal Parks	19.17	0.00	0.00	1.68	1.68	19.17	19.17	19.17	19.17	19.17	19.17	19.17	19.17	19.17	19.17	19.17
Phase 1 Backbone Greenbelt	2.27	2.27	2.27	2.27	2.27	2.27	2.27	2.27	2.27	2.27	2.27	2.27	2.27	2.27	2.27	2.27
Phase 1 Development Greenbelt	6.28					6.28	6.28	6.28	6.28	6.28	6.28	6.28	6.28	6.28	6.28	6.28
Phase 2 Backbone Greenbelt	0.14		0.14	0.14	0.14	0.14	0.14	0.14	0.14	0.14	0.14	0.14	0.14	0.14	0.14	0.14
Subtotal Greenbelts	8.69	2.27	2.41	2.41	2.41	8.69	8.69	8.69	8.69	8.69	8.69	8.69	8.69	8.69	8.69	8.69
Urban Agricultural Transition Area	44.10	44.10	44.10	44.10	44.10	44.10	44.10	44.10	44.10	44.10	44.10	44.10	44.10	44.10	44.10	44.10
Sub-Total Parks and Open Space	71.96	46.37	46.51	48.19	48.19	71.96	71.96	71.96	71.96	71.96	71.96	71.96	71.96	71.96	71.96	71.96
Streets	Lane Miles															
Phase 1 Backbone	5.23	5.23	5.23	5.23	5.23	5.23	5.23	5.23	5.23	5.23	5.23	5.23	5.23	5.23	5.23	5.23
Phase 2 Backbone	1.57		1.57	1.57	1.57	1.57	1.57	1.57	1.57	1.57	1.57	1.57	1.57	1.57	1.57	1.57
Phase 1 and 2 Development	6.53	1.28	3.53	5.32	6.23	6.53	6.53	6.53	6.53	6.53	6.53	6.53	6.53	6.53	6.53	6.53
Total Publicly Maintained Streets	13.33	6.51	10.33	12.12	13.03	13.33	13.33	13.33	13.33	13.33	13.33	13.33	13.33	13.33	13.33	13.33

Sources: Willowgrove, 2025; BAE, 2025.

Table 4: Estimated Dwelling Unit Equivalents

For-Sale Housing	Population Density	Population Per Housing Unit (a)	Estimated Population	DUE Factors	Estimated DUEs (b)	Cumulative DUE Absorption (Year) (b)														
						1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
Residential High Density	1.69 per household	1.66	478	0.62 per unit	178	30	74	119	164	178	178	178	178	178	178	178	178	178	178	178
Residential Medium Density	2.72 per household	2.68	1,378	1.00 per unit	515	128	364	501	515	515	515	515	515	515	515	515	515	515	515	515
Residential Low Density	2.72 per household	2.68	527	1.00 per unit	197	20	56	122	175	197	197	197	197	197	197	197	197	197	197	197
Multifamily Rental Units																				
Apartments (Market Rate)	2.10 per household	1.96	0	0.73 per unit	-	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Apartments (Affordable)	2.10 per household	1.96	525	0.73 per unit	183	0	0	183	183	183	183	183	183	183	183	183	183	183	183	183
Sub-Total Residential			2,908		1,073	178	494	925	1,037	1,074	1,074	1,074	1,074	1,074	1,074	1,074	1,074	1,074	1,074	1,074
Non-Residential			Employees																	
Retail	500 square feet per employee		10	0.75 per 1,000 square feet	4	0	0	0	0	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4
Gym/Classroom Building	n.a. square feet per employee		n.a.	n.a. per 1,000 square feet	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Daycare Center	1,000 square feet per employee		6	0.37 per 1,000 square feet	2	0	0	0	0	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
Sub-Total Non-Residential			16		6	0	0	0	0	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6
Total DUES (unadjusted)					1,079	178	494	925	1,037	1,080	1,080	1,080	1,080	1,080	1,080	1,080	1,080	1,080	1,080	1,080

Note:

(a) Average persons per housing unit incorporates vacancy rates:
1.7% for owner units
6.7% for rental units

(b) Cumulative DUEs may not exactly match Estimated DUEs due to independent rounding.

Sources: American Community Survey, 2023; City of Davis, 2025; BAE, 2025.

Table 5: Assessed Valuation (current \$)

	Estimated Valuation	Avg.	\$ per
For-Sale Residential Units	Market Rate Units	Sq. Ft.	Sq. Ft.
Phase 1 Units (Applicant Assumptions)			
Residential High Density	\$563,500	900-1,400	\$490
Residential Medium Density	\$850,000	1,550-2,600	\$410
Residential Low Density	\$1,300,000	2,800-4,000	\$382
Phase 2 Units (Applicant Assumptions)			
Residential Medium Density	\$910,000	1,650-2,600	\$428
Residential Low Density	\$1,248,000	2,200-3,000	\$480
Weighted Averages, Phase 1 and 2 Units (BAE Assumptions)			
Residential High Density	\$563,500	900-1,400	\$490
Residential Medium Density	\$868,000	1,550-2,600	\$425
Residential Low Density	\$1,437,000	2,200-4,000	\$480
Multifamily Rental Units			
Apartments (Market Rate)	n.a.		
Apartments (Affordable) (a)	n.a.		
Non-Residential (per sq. ft.)			
Retail	\$400		
Gym/Classroom Building (a)	\$0		
Daycare Center (a)	\$0		

Note

(a) Affordable apartments, gym/classroom building, and daycare center are assumed property tax-exempt.

Sources: Willowgrove; 2025; BAE, 2025.

Table 6: Property Tax Revenues

Existing County Share of Ad Valorem	12.6859% TRA 061-003, County General Fund and County ACO Fund														
Re-Allocation to City	50%														
New City Share	6.3430%														
County Road District #2	2.1602% 100% to City														
Springlake Fire District	7.0896% 100% to City														
Total City Share	15.5928%														
	Cumulative Absorption (Year)														
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
Single Family For-Sale															
Residential High Density															
Absorbed Year 1	\$27,048,000	\$27,588,960	\$28,140,739	\$28,703,554	\$29,277,625	\$29,863,178	\$30,460,441	\$31,069,650	\$31,691,043	\$32,324,864	\$32,971,361	\$33,630,788	\$36,376,553	\$37,104,084	\$37,846,166
Absorbed Year 2		\$41,586,300	\$42,418,026	\$43,266,387	\$44,131,714	\$45,014,349	\$45,914,636	\$46,832,928	\$47,769,587	\$48,724,979	\$49,699,478	\$50,693,468	\$51,707,337	\$55,928,950	\$57,047,529
Absorbed Year 3			\$42,625,958	\$43,478,477	\$44,348,046	\$45,235,007	\$46,139,707	\$47,062,501	\$48,003,751	\$48,963,826	\$49,943,103	\$50,941,965	\$51,960,804	\$53,000,020	\$57,327,174
Absorbed Year 4				\$43,691,606	\$44,565,439	\$45,456,747	\$46,365,882	\$47,293,200	\$48,239,064	\$49,203,845	\$50,187,922	\$51,191,681	\$52,215,514	\$53,259,824	\$54,325,021
Absorbed Year 5					\$14,927,966	\$15,226,525	\$15,531,055	\$15,841,676	\$16,158,510	\$16,481,680	\$16,811,314	\$17,147,540	\$17,490,491	\$17,840,301	\$18,197,107
Residential Medium Density															
Absorbed Year 1	\$111,104,000	\$113,326,080	\$115,592,602	\$117,904,454	\$120,262,543	\$122,667,794	\$125,121,149	\$127,623,572	\$130,176,044	\$132,779,565	\$135,435,156	\$138,143,859	\$149,422,528	\$152,410,978	\$155,459,198
Absorbed Year 2		\$209,969,200	\$214,168,584	\$218,451,956	\$222,820,995	\$227,277,415	\$231,822,963	\$236,459,422	\$241,188,611	\$246,012,383	\$250,932,631	\$255,951,283	\$261,070,309	\$282,385,231	\$288,032,935
Absorbed Year 3			\$124,936,123	\$127,434,845	\$129,983,542	\$132,583,213	\$135,234,877	\$137,939,574	\$140,698,366	\$143,512,333	\$146,382,580	\$149,310,232	\$152,296,436	\$155,342,365	\$168,025,195
Absorbed Year 4				\$13,086,375	\$13,348,102	\$13,615,064	\$13,887,366	\$14,165,113	\$14,448,415	\$14,737,384	\$15,032,131	\$15,332,774	\$15,639,429	\$15,952,218	\$16,271,262
Residential Low Density															
Absorbed Year 1	\$28,740,000	\$29,314,800	\$29,901,096	\$30,499,118	\$31,109,100	\$31,731,282	\$32,365,908	\$33,013,226	\$33,673,491	\$34,346,960	\$35,033,900	\$35,734,578	\$38,652,105	\$39,425,147	\$40,213,650
Absorbed Year 2		\$51,732,000	\$52,766,640	\$53,821,973	\$54,898,412	\$55,996,381	\$57,116,308	\$58,258,634	\$59,423,807	\$60,612,283	\$61,824,529	\$63,061,019	\$64,322,240	\$71,313,133	\$72,739,396
Absorbed Year 3			\$97,213,050	\$99,157,311	\$101,140,457	\$103,163,266	\$105,226,532	\$107,331,062	\$109,477,684	\$111,667,237	\$113,900,582	\$116,178,594	\$118,502,166	\$120,872,209	\$134,009,263
Absorbed Year 4				\$80,016,651	\$81,616,984	\$83,249,323	\$84,914,310	\$86,612,596	\$88,344,848	\$90,111,745	\$91,913,980	\$93,752,259	\$95,627,305	\$97,539,851	\$99,490,648
Absorbed Year 5					\$34,044,820	\$34,725,717	\$35,420,231	\$36,128,636	\$36,851,208	\$37,588,232	\$38,339,997	\$39,106,797	\$39,888,933	\$40,686,712	\$41,500,446
SUB-TOTAL RESIDENTIAL UNITS	\$166,892,000	\$473,517,340	\$747,762,817	\$899,512,705	\$966,475,745	\$985,805,260	\$1,005,521,365	\$1,025,631,792	\$1,046,144,428	\$1,067,067,317	\$1,088,408,663	\$1,110,176,836	\$1,145,172,149	\$1,193,061,023	\$1,240,484,989
Non-Residential															
Retail															
Absorbed Year 5					\$2,207,626	\$2,251,778	\$2,296,814	\$2,342,750	\$2,389,605	\$2,437,397	\$2,486,145	\$2,535,868	\$2,586,585	\$2,638,317	\$2,691,084
SUB-TOTAL NON-RESIDENTIAL	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$2,207,626	\$2,251,778	\$2,296,814	\$2,342,750	\$2,389,605	\$2,437,397	\$2,486,145	\$2,535,868	\$2,586,585	\$2,638,317	\$2,691,084
Total Secured Valuation	\$166,892,000	\$473,517,340	\$747,762,817	\$899,512,705	\$968,683,371	\$988,057,038	\$1,007,818,179	\$1,027,974,542	\$1,048,534,033	\$1,069,504,714	\$1,090,894,808	\$1,112,712,704	\$1,147,758,735	\$1,195,699,340	\$1,243,176,073
Unsecured Property Tax Valuation (e)	\$2,544,615	\$7,219,756	\$11,401,198	\$13,714,940	\$14,769,591	\$15,064,982	\$15,366,282	\$15,673,608	\$15,987,080	\$16,306,821	\$16,632,958	\$16,965,617	\$17,499,967	\$18,230,921	\$18,954,802
Total Assessed Valuation	\$169,436,615	\$480,737,096	\$759,164,015	\$913,227,645	\$983,452,961	\$1,003,122,021	\$1,023,184,461	\$1,043,648,150	\$1,064,521,113	\$1,085,811,535	\$1,107,527,766	\$1,129,678,321	\$1,165,258,701	\$1,213,930,261	\$1,262,130,875
Basic Property Taxes Paid	\$1,694,366	\$4,807,371	\$7,591,640	\$9,132,276	\$9,834,530	\$10,031,220	\$10,231,845	\$10,436,482	\$10,645,211	\$10,858,115	\$11,075,278	\$11,296,783	\$11,652,587	\$12,139,303	\$12,621,309
Basic Property Taxes Allocated to City (f)	\$264,198	\$749,601	\$1,183,746	\$1,423,973	\$1,533,474	\$1,564,143	\$1,595,426	\$1,627,335	\$1,659,881	\$1,693,079	\$1,726,941	\$1,761,479	\$1,816,959	\$1,892,851	\$1,968,009
CFD Special Taxes Paid (g)	\$75,460	\$213,098	\$329,660	\$395,531	\$424,968	\$435,592	\$446,482	\$457,644	\$469,085	\$480,812	\$492,833	\$505,153	\$517,782	\$530,727	\$543,995

Notes:

- (a) See Appendix A for property tax re-allocation assumptions.
- (b) Estimated average annual real estate appreciation rate (initial sales and for periodic turnover of property
- Single-Family for-sale units
- Multifamily for-sale units
- Multifamily rental units
- Non-residential properties
- (c) Prop. 13 maximum annual assessment increase when property held in same ownership.
- (d) Assumed average number of years between sales.
- Single-Family for-sale units
- Multifamily for-sale units
- Multifamily rental units
- Non-residential properties
- (e) Estimate is based on City of Davis' current ratio of unsecured property tax revenue to secured property tax revenue.
- (f) Based on existing City of Davis/Yolo County property tax sharing agreement for Area selected.
- (g) Maximum special tax of \$385 per market rate units per year is assumed., adjusted for inflation, after Year 1

	Study Years		
	1-5	6-10	11-15
	2.5%	2.5%	2.5%
	2.5%	2.5%	2.5%
	2.5%	2.5%	2.5%
	2.5%	2.5%	2.5%
	2.0%		
	12		
	8		
	20		
	20		

Table 7: Property Transfer Tax Revenues

	Cumulative Absorption (Year)														
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
For-Sale High Density (Multifamily) Units															
Value of Initial Sales	\$27,048,000	\$41,586,300	\$42,625,958	\$43,691,606	\$14,927,966										
Total Valuation In Place	\$27,048,000	\$69,175,260	\$113,184,723	\$159,140,024	\$177,250,790	\$180,795,805	\$184,411,721	\$188,099,956	\$191,861,955	\$195,699,194	\$199,613,178	\$203,605,442	\$209,750,699	\$217,133,180	\$224,742,996
Value of Resales		\$8,646,908	\$14,148,090	\$19,892,503	\$22,156,349	\$22,599,476	\$23,051,465	\$23,512,494	\$23,982,744	\$24,462,399	\$24,951,647	\$25,450,680	\$26,218,837	\$27,141,647	\$28,092,875
For-Sale Low and Medium Density (Single-Family) Units															
Value of Initial Sales	\$139,844,000	\$261,701,200	\$222,149,173	\$93,103,026	\$34,044,820										
Total Valuation In Place	\$139,844,000	\$404,342,080	\$634,578,094	\$740,372,681	\$789,224,955	\$805,009,454	\$821,109,644	\$837,531,836	\$854,282,473	\$871,368,123	\$888,795,485	\$906,571,395	\$935,421,450	\$975,927,843	\$1,015,741,993
Value of Resales		\$33,695,173	\$52,881,508	\$61,697,723	\$65,768,746	\$67,084,121	\$68,425,804	\$69,794,320	\$71,190,206	\$72,614,010	\$74,066,290	\$75,547,616	\$77,951,787	\$81,327,320	\$84,645,166
Multifamily Rental Units															
Value of Initial Sales (assumes no initial property turnover)															
Total Valuation In Place	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Value of Resales		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Non-Residential															
Value of Initial Sales (assumes no initial property turnover)															
Total Valuation In Place	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$2,207,626	\$2,251,778	\$2,296,814	\$2,342,750	\$2,389,605	\$2,437,397	\$2,486,145	\$2,535,868	\$2,586,585	\$2,638,317	\$2,691,084
Value of Resales		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$110,381	\$112,589	\$114,841	\$117,138	\$119,480	\$121,870	\$124,307	\$126,793	\$129,329	\$131,916	\$134,554
Total Valuation Subject to Transfer Tax	\$166,892,000	\$345,629,581	\$331,804,728	\$218,384,858	\$137,008,262	\$89,796,186	\$91,592,110	\$93,423,952	\$95,292,431	\$97,198,279	\$99,142,245	\$101,125,090	\$104,299,954	\$108,600,884	\$112,872,595
Property Transfer Tax Allocated to City	\$91,791	\$190,096	\$182,493	\$120,112	\$75,355	\$49,388	\$50,376	\$51,383	\$52,411	\$53,459	\$54,528	\$55,619	\$57,365	\$59,730	\$62,080

Note:

(a) Property transfer tax rate is \$1.10 per \$1,000 in value. The City of Davis receives half and Yolo County receives the other half.

(b) Proportion of existing units assumed sold annually:

Single-Family for-sale units	8.3%
Multifamily for-sale units	12.5%
Multifamily rental units	5.0%
Non-residential properties	5.0%

Table 8: Sales and Use Tax Revenues

PER CAPITA DEMAND-BASED REVENUES

	Estimated Persons Per Housing Unit	Estimated Taxable Expenditures / Hsg. Unit (a)	Cumulative Expenditures (Year)														
			1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
Phased Ownership																	
Residential High Density	1.66	\$18,166	\$871,980	\$2,234,449	\$3,664,497	\$5,164,650	\$5,775,018	\$5,919,393	\$6,067,378	\$6,219,062	\$6,374,539	\$6,533,902	\$6,697,250	\$6,864,681	\$7,036,298	\$7,212,206	\$7,392,511
Residential Medium Density	2.68	\$29,311	\$3,751,762	\$10,935,800	\$15,428,041	\$16,255,643	\$16,662,034	\$17,078,585	\$17,505,550	\$17,943,188	\$18,391,768	\$18,851,562	\$19,322,851	\$19,805,923	\$20,301,071	\$20,808,597	\$21,328,812
Residential Low Density	2.68	\$29,311	\$586,213	\$1,682,431	\$3,756,928	\$5,523,762	\$6,373,632	\$6,532,973	\$6,696,298	\$6,863,705	\$7,035,298	\$7,211,180	\$7,391,460	\$7,576,246	\$7,765,652	\$7,959,794	\$8,158,788
Multifamily																	
Apartments (Market Rate)	1.96	\$21,475	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Apartments (Affordable)	1.96	\$21,475	\$0	\$0	\$5,640,486	\$5,781,498	\$5,926,036	\$6,074,186	\$6,226,041	\$6,381,692	\$6,541,234	\$6,704,765	\$6,872,384	\$7,044,194	\$7,220,299	\$7,400,806	\$7,585,827
Total Annual Household Taxable Expenditures			\$5,209,955	\$14,852,680	\$28,489,952	\$32,725,553	\$34,736,720	\$35,605,138	\$36,495,266	\$37,407,648	\$38,342,839	\$39,301,410	\$40,283,945	\$41,291,044	\$42,323,320	\$43,381,403	\$44,465,938

INCREMENTAL SALES TAX RELATED TO EXPANSION OF CITYWIDE RETAIL BASE

Quantity of Proposed Commercial Space Generating Taxable Retail Sales (b)	0	0	0	0	2,500	2,500	2,500	2,500	2,500	2,500	2,500	2,500	2,500	2,500	2,500	2,500	2,500
Gross Potential Taxable Retail Sales (c)	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$1,000,000	\$1,000,000	\$1,000,000	\$1,000,000	\$1,000,000	\$1,000,000	\$1,000,000	\$1,000,000	\$1,000,000	\$1,000,000	\$1,000,000	\$1,000,000	\$1,000,000
Portion of Community Retail Sales Attributed as Additional Revenue Beyond Per-Capita Expenditures, Above (d)	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Total Net Increase in Local Taxable Retail Sales	\$5,209,955	\$14,852,680	\$28,489,952	\$32,725,553	\$34,736,720	\$35,605,138	\$36,495,266	\$37,407,648	\$38,342,839	\$39,301,410	\$40,283,945	\$41,291,044	\$42,323,320	\$43,381,403	\$44,465,938		
Local Sales Tax Revenues (e)	\$156,299	\$445,580	\$854,699	\$981,767	\$1,042,102	\$1,068,154	\$1,094,858	\$1,122,229	\$1,150,285	\$1,179,042	\$1,208,518	\$1,238,731	\$1,269,700	\$1,301,442	\$1,333,978		
Pooled County and State Sales Tax Revenues (f)	\$12,150	\$34,636	\$66,439	\$76,316	\$81,006	\$83,031	\$85,107	\$87,235	\$89,416	\$91,651	\$93,942	\$96,291	\$98,698	\$101,165	\$103,695		
Total Sales and Use Tax	\$168,448	\$480,217	\$921,137	\$1,058,083	\$1,123,108	\$1,151,185	\$1,179,965	\$1,209,464	\$1,239,701	\$1,270,693	\$1,302,461	\$1,335,022	\$1,368,398	\$1,402,608	\$1,437,673		
Public Safety Sales Tax (g)	\$4,389	\$12,511	\$23,999	\$27,567	\$29,261	\$29,992	\$30,742	\$31,511	\$32,298	\$33,106	\$33,934	\$34,782	\$35,651	\$36,543	\$37,456		

Notes:

(a) Sales tax revenue assumptions:

Local Per Capita Taxable Sales Q2, 2024 to Q1, 2025

\$10,955

January

Inflation Factor

102.03%

Oct-24

349.37

Local Per Capita Taxable Sales FY 25-26

\$11,177

Jun-25

356.46

Assumed future average annual rate of increase for per capita sales

2.5%

Increase

2.03%

(b) Percent of retail space assumed to be engaged in taxable retail sales:

50%

(c) Assumed annual \$ in sales per square foot of community retail space:

\$400

(d) Assumed portion not already counted in per capita expenditures equals total gross potential retail sales minus retail sales attributed to project resident expenditures.

(e) With passage of Measure Q (2024), local allocation of sales taxes is 3.0% of taxable sales.

(f) Based on CDTFA data for 2024 Q2 through 2025 Q1, the City of Davis pooled sales tax revenue is 23.32% of the base 1% sales tax revenues.

(g) Public Safety Sales Tax as Pct. Of Base 1% Sales Tax

8.42%

Sources: State Department of Tax and Fee Administration, State Department of Finance, U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, City of Davis, BAE, 2025.

Table 9: Municipal Services Tax Revenues

Ownership	Average Lot Size (Sq. Ft.)	Base Tax	Lot Size Charge	Average Revenue/Unit	Annual Revenues (Year)														
					1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
Residential High Density	1,214	\$31,415	\$264	\$110.00	\$5,280	\$13,530	\$22,189	\$31,272	\$34,968	\$35,842	\$36,738	\$37,657	\$38,598	\$39,563	\$40,552	\$41,566	\$42,605	\$43,670	\$44,762
Residential Medium Density	4,449	\$56,176	\$1,732	\$112.44	\$14,393	\$41,953	\$59,186	\$62,361	\$63,920	\$65,518	\$67,156	\$68,835	\$70,556	\$72,320	\$74,128	\$75,981	\$77,880	\$79,827	\$81,823
Residential Low Density	8,314	\$21,489	\$1,238	\$115.37	\$2,307	\$6,622	\$14,787	\$21,741	\$25,086	\$25,713	\$26,356	\$27,015	\$27,691	\$28,383	\$29,092	\$29,820	\$30,565	\$31,329	\$32,113
Multifamily																			
Apartments (Affordable)	1,214	\$27,270	\$229	\$110.00	\$0	\$0	\$28,892	\$29,614	\$30,354	\$31,113	\$31,891	\$32,688	\$33,505	\$34,343	\$35,202	\$36,082	\$36,984	\$37,908	\$38,856
SUB-TOTAL RESIDENTIAL UNITS					\$21,980	\$62,104	\$125,054	\$144,988	\$154,329	\$158,187	\$162,142	\$166,195	\$170,350	\$174,609	\$178,974	\$183,448	\$188,035	\$192,735	\$197,554
Non-Residential	Total Lot Area (Sq. Ft.)	Base Tax	Lot Size Charge	Average Revenue Per Sq. Ft.															
Retail	25,000	\$713	\$19	\$0.15	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$808	\$828	\$849	\$870	\$892	\$914	\$937	\$960	\$984	\$1,009	\$1,034
Daycare Center (a)	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.
Gym/Classroom Building (a)	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.
SUB-TOTAL NON-RESIDENTIAL LOT AREA					\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$808	\$828	\$849	\$870	\$892	\$914	\$937	\$960	\$984	\$1,009	\$1,034
TOTAL MUNICIPAL SERVICES TAX		\$713	\$19	\$0.15	\$21,980	\$62,104	\$125,054	\$144,988	\$155,136	\$159,015	\$162,990	\$167,065	\$171,242	\$175,523	\$179,911	\$184,408	\$189,019	\$193,744	\$198,588

Notes:
(a) Gym/Classroom Building and Daycare Center are assumed to be tax-exempt.

Tax schedule:	
Residential Base/unit	\$109.08 per year
Residential lot/s.f	\$0.000756 per year
Commercial Base/S.f.	\$0.142572 per year
Commercial Lot/S.f.	\$0.000756 per year
Annual Escalator	2.5%

Sources: City of Davis, 2025

Table 10: Parks Maintenance Tax Revenues															
	Annual Revenues (Year)														
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
For-Sale Residential Units															
Residential High Density	48	120	192	264	288	288	288	288	288	288	288	288	288	288	288
Residential Medium Density	128	364	501	515	515	515	515	515	515	515	515	515	515	515	515
Residential Low Density	20	56	122	175	197	197	197	197	197	197	197	197	197	197	197
Multifamily Rental Units															
Apartments (Market Rate)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Apartments (Affordable) (a)	0	0	250	250	250	250	250	250	250	250	250	250	250	250	250
SUB-TOTAL RESIDENTIAL UNITS	196	540	1,065	1,204	1,250	1,250	1,250	1,250	1,250	1,250	1,250	1,250	1,250	1,250	1,250
Non-Residential															
Retail	0	0	0	0	5,000	5,000	5,000	5,000	5,000	5,000	5,000	5,000	5,000	5,000	5,000
Gym/Classroom Building (a)	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.
Daycare Center (a)	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.
SUB-TOTAL NONRESIDENTIAL SQ. FT.	0	0	0	0	5,000	5,000	5,000	5,000	5,000	5,000	5,000	5,000	5,000	5,000	5,000
Total	\$11,031	\$30,999	\$62,360	\$71,909	\$76,398	\$77,926	\$79,484	\$81,074	\$82,695	\$84,349	\$86,036	\$87,757	\$89,512	\$91,302	\$93,128

Notes:
(a) Gym/Classroom Building and Daycare Center are assumed to be tax-exempt.

Tax schedule:
Maintenance Tax Per Residential Unit: \$56.28
Maint. Tax Per 1,000 Sq. Ft. Commercial building (Max of 10,000 Sq. Ft.): \$45.95
Annual escalator: 2.0%

Source: City of Davis, 2025.

Table 11: Public Safety Charge Revenues

	Average Lot Size	Base	Lot	Average Revenue	Cumulative Absorption (Year)														
	(Sq. Ft.)	Tax	Size Charge	Per Unit	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
For-Sale Residential Units																			
Residential High Density	1,214	\$24,607	\$222	\$86.21	\$4,138	\$10,604	\$17,391	\$24,510	\$27,407	\$28,092	\$28,794	\$29,514	\$30,252	\$31,008	\$31,783	\$32,578	\$33,392	\$34,227	\$35,083
Residential Medium Density	4,449	\$44,002	\$1,457	\$88.27	\$11,299	\$32,933	\$46,462	\$48,954	\$50,178	\$51,432	\$52,718	\$54,036	\$55,387	\$56,772	\$58,191	\$59,646	\$61,137	\$62,665	\$64,232
Residential Low Density	8,314	\$16,832	\$1,042	\$90.73	\$1,815	\$5,208	\$11,629	\$17,098	\$19,729	\$20,222	\$20,728	\$21,246	\$21,777	\$22,321	\$22,879	\$23,451	\$24,038	\$24,639	\$25,255
Multifamily Rental Units																			
Apartments (Market Rate)	-	\$0	\$0	\$0.00	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Apartments (Affordable) (a)	1,214	\$21,360	\$193	\$86.21	\$0	\$0	\$22,644	\$23,210	\$23,791	\$24,385	\$24,995	\$25,620	\$26,260	\$26,917	\$27,590	\$28,279	\$28,986	\$29,711	\$30,454
SUB-TOTAL RESIDENTIAL UNITS					\$17,251	\$48,745	\$98,126	\$113,773	\$121,104	\$124,132	\$127,235	\$130,416	\$133,676	\$137,018	\$140,444	\$143,955	\$147,554	\$151,242	\$155,023
Non-Residential (per sq. ft.)				Revenue / Sq. Ft.															
Retail	25,000	\$878	\$16	\$0.18	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$987	\$1,011	\$1,037	\$1,062	\$1,089	\$1,116	\$1,144	\$1,173	\$1,202	\$1,232	\$1,263
Gym/Classroom Building (a)	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.
Daycare Center (a)	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.
SUB-TOTAL NON-RESIDENTIAL SQUARE FEET					\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$987	\$1,011	\$1,037	\$1,062	\$1,089	\$1,116	\$1,144	\$1,173	\$1,202	\$1,232	\$1,263
TOTAL					\$17,251	\$48,745	\$98,126	\$113,773	\$122,091	\$125,143	\$128,272	\$131,478	\$134,765	\$138,134	\$141,588	\$145,127	\$148,756	\$152,475	\$156,286

Notes:

Tax schedule:

Base Rate Per Residential Unit \$85.44

Rate Per Square Foot of Residential Lot Size \$0.001

Base Rate Per Commercial Square Foot \$0.18

Rate Per Square Foot of Commercial Lot Size \$0.001

Annual Increase in Tax Rate 2.5%

Source: City of Davis, 2025.

Table 12: Other Revenues

				Cumulative Absorption (Year)														
				1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
Transient Occupancy Tax																		
2025/2026																		
Transient Occupancy Tax Revenues																		
\$2,987,000																		
Current Resident Population																		
65,423																		
Residents Per DUE (a)																		
2.68																		
Residential DUEs in Davis																		
24,452																		
Existing City Employment (b)																		
17,212																		
Employees Per DUE (c)																		
2.68																		
Employee DUEs in Davis																		
6,433																		
Total DUEs in Davis																		
30,885																		
Average Revenue Per DUE (a)				\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0

Table 13: Public Works Engineering & Transportation Department Expenditures

	25/26	Cumulative Absorption (Year)														
	Budget	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
Net General Fund Expenditures	\$5,909,658															
Residential DUEs in Davis	24,452															
Employee DUEs in Davis (unadjusted)	6,433															
Total DUEs in Davis (unadjusted)	30,885															
Average Cost Per DUE	\$191.34															
Assumed Percent of GF Expenditures Variable	75%															
Variable Costs Per DUE	\$143.51															
Total Project DUEs (unadjusted)		178	494	925	1,037	1,080	1,080	1,080	1,080	1,080	1,080	1,080	1,080	1,080	1,080	1,080
Non-Personnel Costs		\$20,263	\$57,766	\$110,804	\$127,277	\$135,854	\$139,251	\$142,732	\$146,300	\$149,958	\$153,707	\$157,549	\$161,488	\$165,525	\$169,663	\$173,905
Personnel costs		\$5,245	\$15,173	\$29,529	\$34,416	\$37,273	\$38,764	\$40,314	\$41,927	\$43,604	\$45,348	\$47,162	\$49,048	\$51,010	\$53,051	\$55,173
Total Public Works Engineering & Transportation Department Expenditures		\$25,508	\$72,938	\$140,334	\$161,693	\$173,127	\$178,014	\$183,046	\$188,227	\$193,562	\$199,055	\$204,711	\$210,536	\$216,536	\$222,714	\$229,078

Sources: City of Davis FY 2025-26 Budget; BAE, 2025.

Table 14: Public Works Utilities and Operations Department Expenditures

Street Maintenance	25/26 Budget	Cumulative Absorption (Year)														
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
General Fund Support - Pavement Maintenance 2015-2024, Inflation Adjusted																
Roadway Lane Miles in the City of Davis	357															
Average GF Pavement Maintenance Cost/ Per Line Mile	\$13,429															
Average General & Gas Tax Funds Street Light Cost Per Lane Mile	\$2,413															
Project Road Quantities (Lane-Miles)																
Subtotal Lane Miles		6.51	10.33	12.12	13.03	13.33	13.33	13.33	13.33	13.33	13.33	13.33	13.33	13.33	13.33	13.33
Subtotal, Projected General Fund Roadway Maintenance Cost Increase		\$103,133	\$167,682	\$201,764	\$222,293	\$233,103	\$238,931	\$244,904	\$251,027	\$257,302	\$263,735	\$270,328	\$277,087	\$284,014	\$291,114	\$298,392
Other PWUO Department General Fund Cost Increases																
Other Public Works Utilities and Operations (a)																
Net General Fund Expenditures (b)	\$6,374,336															
Assumed Percentage of Variable Costs	75%															
Total DUEs in Davis (unadjusted)	30,885															
Variable Cost Per DUE	\$154.79															
Total Project DUEs (unadjusted)		178	494	925	1,037	1,080	1,080	1,080	1,080	1,080	1,080	1,080	1,080	1,080	1,080	1,080
Non-Personnel Costs		\$20,935	\$59,682	\$114,480	\$131,500	\$140,361	\$143,870	\$147,467	\$151,153	\$154,932	\$158,806	\$162,776	\$166,845	\$171,016	\$175,292	\$179,674
Personnel costs		\$6,579	\$19,030	\$37,037	\$43,165	\$46,749	\$48,618	\$50,563	\$52,586	\$54,689	\$56,877	\$59,152	\$61,518	\$63,979	\$66,538	\$69,199
Other Public Works Utilities & Operations Department Expenditures		\$27,514	\$78,712	\$151,517	\$174,665	\$187,110	\$192,489	\$198,030	\$203,739	\$209,621	\$215,682	\$221,928	\$228,363	\$234,995	\$241,829	\$248,873
Total Public Works Utilities and Operations Department Expenditures		\$130,646	\$246,394	\$353,280	\$396,958	\$420,213	\$431,419	\$442,934	\$454,766	\$466,924	\$479,417	\$492,256	\$505,450	\$519,009	\$532,943	\$547,265

Notes:
(a) Includes Urban Forestry (incl. street tree maintenance).
(b) Includes total PWUO General Fund expenditures, minus 7252 (Street Maintenance and Repair) and 7257 (Street Lighting).

Sources: City of Davis FY 2025-26 Budget; City of Davis Public Works Utilities and Operations Department, 2025; BAE, 2025.

Table 15: Community Development Department Expenditures

	25/26	Cumulative Absorption (Year)														
	Budget	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
Net General Fund Expenditures	\$2,951,682															
Residential DUEs in Davis	24,452															
Employee DUEs in Davis (adjusted at 75%)	4,825															
Total DUEs in Davis (adjusted)	29,277															
Average Cost Per DUE	\$100.82															
Assumed Percent of GF Expenditures Variable	75%															
Variable Costs Per DUE	\$75.61															
Total Project DUEs (employees adjusted at 75%)		178	494	925	1,037	1,078	1,078	1,078	1,078	1,078	1,078	1,078	1,078	1,078	1,078	1,078
Non-Personnel Costs		\$4,678	\$13,336	\$25,580	\$29,383	\$31,320	\$32,103	\$32,906	\$33,728	\$34,571	\$35,436	\$36,322	\$37,230	\$38,160	\$39,114	\$40,092
Personnel costs		\$8,762	\$24,980	\$47,916	\$55,040	\$58,667	\$60,134	\$61,638	\$63,178	\$64,758	\$66,377	\$68,036	\$69,737	\$71,481	\$73,268	\$75,099
Total Community Development Department General Fund Expenditures		\$13,440	\$38,316	\$73,497	\$84,424	\$89,987	\$92,237	\$94,543	\$96,907	\$99,329	\$101,813	\$104,358	\$106,967	\$109,641	\$112,382	\$115,192

Sources: City of Davis FY 2025-26 Budget; BAE, 2025.

Table 16a: Parks and Community Services Expenditures (Mid Cost Allocation)

	25/26	Cumulative Absorption (Year)														
	Budget	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
Per DUE PCS General Fund Costs																
Community Services	\$4,988,176															
Aquatics	\$1,909,838															
Sub-total Per DUE CS and Aquatics Costs	\$6,898,014															
Residential DUEs in Davis	24,452															
Employment DUEs in Davis (adjusted at 36%)	2,316															
Total DUEs in Davis (adjusted)	26,768															
Estimated General Fund Per Adjusted DUE costs	\$257.69															
Assumed Percent of GF Expenditures Variable	75%															
Variable Costs Per DUE	\$193.27															
Total Project DUEs (employees adjusted at 36%)		178	494	925	1,037	1,076	1,076	1,076	1,076	1,076	1,076	1,076	1,076	1,076	1,076	1,076
Non-personnel Cost		\$18,698	\$53,304	\$102,246	\$117,447	\$124,916	\$128,039	\$131,239	\$134,520	\$137,883	\$141,331	\$144,864	\$148,485	\$152,198	\$156,002	\$159,903
Personnel Cost		\$15,656	\$45,286	\$88,137	\$102,722	\$110,853	\$115,287	\$119,899	\$124,694	\$129,682	\$134,870	\$140,264	\$145,875	\$151,710	\$157,778	\$164,089
Sub-Total Community Services and Aquatics Expenditures		\$34,354	\$98,590	\$190,383	\$220,169	\$235,769	\$243,326	\$251,138	\$259,215	\$267,566	\$276,200	\$285,128	\$294,360	\$303,907	\$313,781	\$323,992
Est. New Gym O&M and Programing Costs	25/26															
	Estimate (a)															
Non-personnel Cost	\$225,476	\$225,476	\$231,113	\$236,891	\$242,813	\$248,883	\$255,105	\$261,483	\$268,020	\$274,721	\$281,589	\$288,628	\$295,844	\$303,240	\$310,821	\$318,592
Personnel Cost	\$52,650	\$52,650	\$50,625	\$48,678	\$46,805	\$45,005	\$43,274	\$41,610	\$40,009	\$38,471	\$36,991	\$35,568	\$34,200	\$32,885	\$31,620	\$30,404
Total Gym Costs		\$278,126	\$281,738	\$285,568	\$289,618	\$293,889	\$298,380	\$303,093	\$308,030	\$313,191	\$318,580	\$324,197	\$330,044	\$336,125	\$342,441	\$348,996
New Total DUEs in Davis (employees adjusted at 36%)		26,946	27,263	27,693	27,805	27,844	27,844	27,844	27,844	27,844	27,844	27,844	27,844	27,844	27,844	27,844
Future Average Gym Cost Per DUE (inflation-adjusted)		\$10.32	\$10.33	\$10.31	\$10.42	\$10.55	\$10.72	\$10.89	\$11.06	\$11.25	\$11.44	\$11.64	\$11.85	\$12.07	\$12.30	\$12.53
Sub-Total Gym Cost Allocation to Project		\$1,835	\$5,109	\$9,540	\$10,799	\$11,355	\$11,529	\$11,711	\$11,901	\$12,101	\$12,309	\$12,526	\$12,752	\$12,987	\$13,231	\$13,484
Total Parks and Community Services Costs		\$36,188	\$103,699	\$199,923	\$230,968	\$247,124	\$254,854	\$262,849	\$271,116	\$279,667	\$288,509	\$297,654	\$307,112	\$316,894	\$327,012	\$337,476

Note:

(a) Assumes five years lapse before first units are absorbed in Willowgrove. Assumes total citywide DUE increase is average DUEs suggested by 2021-2029 RHNA average units per year. Assumes same annual average carries over throughout projection period.

Sources: City of Davis FY 2025-26 Budget; BAE, 2025.

Table 16b: Parks and Community Services Expenditures (Low Cost Allocation)

	25/26	Cumulative Absorption (Year)														
	Budget	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
Per DUE PCS General Fund Costs																
Community Services	\$4,988,176															
Aquatics	\$1,909,838															
Sub-total Per DUE CS and Aquatics Costs	\$6,898,014															
Residential DUEs in Davis	24,452															
Employment DUEs in Davis (adjusted at 36%)	2,316															
Total DUEs in Davis (adjusted)	26,768															
Estimated General Fund Per Adjusted DUE costs	\$257.69															
Assumed Percent of GF Expenditures Variable	75%															
Variable Costs Per DUE	\$193.27															
Total Project DUEs (employees adjusted at 36%)		178	494	925	1,037	1,076	1,076	1,076	1,076	1,076	1,076	1,076	1,076	1,076	1,076	1,076
Non-personnel Cost		\$18,698	\$53,304	\$102,246	\$117,447	\$124,916	\$128,039	\$131,239	\$134,520	\$137,883	\$141,331	\$144,864	\$148,485	\$152,198	\$156,002	\$159,903
Personnel Cost		\$15,656	\$45,286	\$88,137	\$102,722	\$110,853	\$115,287	\$119,899	\$124,694	\$129,682	\$134,870	\$140,264	\$145,875	\$151,710	\$157,778	\$164,089
Sub-Total Community Services and Aquatics Expenditures		\$34,354	\$98,590	\$190,383	\$220,169	\$235,769	\$243,326	\$251,138	\$259,215	\$267,566	\$276,200	\$285,128	\$294,360	\$303,907	\$313,781	\$323,992
	25/26															
Est. New Gym O&M and Programing Costs	Estimate (a)															
Non-personnel Cost	\$225,476	\$225,476	\$231,113	\$236,891	\$242,813	\$248,883	\$255,105	\$261,483	\$268,020	\$274,721	\$281,589	\$288,628	\$295,844	\$303,240	\$310,821	\$318,592
Personnel Cost	\$52,650	\$52,650	\$50,625	\$48,678	\$46,805	\$45,005	\$43,274	\$41,610	\$40,009	\$38,471	\$36,991	\$35,568	\$34,200	\$32,885	\$31,620	\$30,404
Total Gym Costs		\$278,126	\$281,738	\$285,568	\$289,618	\$293,889	\$298,380	\$303,093	\$308,030	\$313,191	\$318,580	\$324,197	\$330,044	\$336,125	\$342,441	\$348,996
Assumed New DUEs Elsewhere in City (a)		1,085	1,085	1,085	1,085	1,085	1,085	1,085	1,085	1,085	1,085	1,085	1,085	1,085	1,085	1,085
Other New Citywide DUEs (unadjusted)		39	-100	-214	105	174	217	217	217	217	217	217	217	217	217	217
New Total DUEs in Davis (unadjusted)		27,892	27,753	27,639	27,958	28,027	28,070	28,070	28,070	28,070	28,070	28,070	28,070	28,070	28,070	28,070
Future Average Cost Per DUE		\$9.97	\$10.15	\$10.33	\$10.36	\$10.49	\$10.63	\$10.80	\$10.97	\$11.16	\$11.35	\$11.55	\$11.76	\$11.97	\$12.20	\$12.43
Sub-Total Gym Cost Allocation to Project		\$1,772	\$5,019	\$9,559	\$10,740	\$11,281	\$11,436	\$11,617	\$11,806	\$12,004	\$12,210	\$12,425	\$12,649	\$12,883	\$13,125	\$13,376
Total Parks and Community Services Costs		\$36,126	\$103,608	\$199,942	\$230,909	\$247,050	\$254,761	\$262,755	\$271,021	\$279,569	\$288,410	\$297,554	\$307,010	\$316,790	\$326,905	\$337,368

Note:

(a) Assumes five years lapse before first units are absorbed in Willowgrove. Assumes total citywide DUE increase is average DUEs suggested by 2021-2029 RHNA average units per year. Assumes same annual average carries over throughout projection period.

Sources: City of Davis FY 2025-26 Budget; BAE, 2025.

Table 17: Parks and Open Space Maintenance Expenditures

Park and Open Space Maintenance (a)	25/26	Cumulative Absorption (Year)														
	Estimate	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
Parks	\$27,424 /ac.	\$0	\$0	\$49,056	\$50,623	\$596,127	\$615,234	\$634,987	\$655,409	\$676,524	\$698,355	\$720,929	\$744,272	\$768,412	\$793,376	\$819,194
Greenbelts (b)		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Urban Agricultural Transition Area (b)		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Total Parks and Open Space Maintenance Costs (c)		\$0	\$0	\$49,056	\$50,623	\$596,127	\$615,234	\$634,987	\$655,409	\$676,524	\$698,355	\$720,929	\$744,272	\$768,412	\$793,376	\$819,194

Notes:

(a) See Appendix A for detailed park maintenance cost calculations.

(b) These areas are assumed to be maintained with funding from a source such as a CFD, LLMD, third-party conservancy, or other non-General Fund mechanism.

(c) Annual maintenance costs are inflated based on weighted average inflation rate for non-personnel and personnel costs for Parks and Community Services Department. Assumes future expenditures will reflect 2024/25 split between personnel and non-personnel costs.

Sources: City of Davis FY 2025-26 Budget; City of Davis, Parks and Community Services Department, 2025; BAE, 2025.

Table 18: Police Department Expenditures																
Police Department Expenditures	25/26	Cumulative Absorption (Year)														
	Budget	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
Net General Fund Expense	\$28,775,416															
Total Current DUEs (unadjusted)	30,885															
Variable cost	75%															
Current Average Cost Per DUE	\$699															
Project DUEs (unadjusted)	1,079	178	494	925	1,037	1,080	1,080	1,080	1,080	1,080	1,080	1,080	1,080	1,080	1,080	1,080
Projected Non Personnel Costs		\$25,732	\$73,357	\$140,712	\$161,631	\$172,523	\$176,836	\$181,257	\$185,788	\$190,433	\$195,194	\$200,074	\$205,076	\$210,203	\$215,458	\$220,844
Projected Personnel Costs		\$98,473	\$284,837	\$554,361	\$646,097	\$699,728	\$727,717	\$756,826	\$787,099	\$818,583	\$851,326	\$885,379	\$920,794	\$957,626	\$995,931	\$1,035,768
Estimated Police Department Expenditures		\$124,205	\$358,194	\$695,073	\$807,728	\$872,251	\$904,553	\$938,083	\$972,887	\$1,009,016	\$1,046,520	\$1,085,453	\$1,125,870	\$1,167,829	\$1,211,389	\$1,256,612

Sources: City of Davis FY 2025-26 Budget; BAE, 2025.

Table 19a: Fire Department Expenditures (Mid Cost Allocation)

Fire Department Expenditures	25/26	Cumulative Absorption (Year)														
	Budget	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
Net General Fund Expenditure	\$19,925,240	\$19,925,240	\$20,657,287	\$21,416,992	\$22,205,421	\$23,023,680	\$23,872,921	\$24,754,338	\$25,669,175	\$26,618,722	\$27,604,321	\$28,627,364	\$29,689,302	\$30,791,637	\$31,935,935	\$33,123,821
Total Fire Dept. Systemwide GF Cost	\$19,925,240	\$19,925,240	\$20,657,287	\$21,416,992	\$22,205,421	\$23,023,680	\$23,872,921	\$24,754,338	\$25,669,175	\$26,618,722	\$27,604,321	\$28,627,364	\$29,689,302	\$30,791,637	\$31,935,935	\$33,123,821
Existing DUEs in Davis (unadjusted)	30,885	30,885	30,885	30,885	30,885	30,885	30,885	30,885	30,885	30,885	30,885	30,885	30,885	30,885	30,885	30,885
Project DUEs (unadjusted)		178	494	925	1,037	1,080	1,080	1,080	1,080	1,080	1,080	1,080	1,080	1,080	1,080	1,080
New Total DUEs in Davis (unadjusted)		31,063	31,380	31,811	31,922	31,965	31,965	31,965	31,965	31,965	31,965	31,965	31,965	31,965	31,965	31,965
Future Average Cost Per DUE		\$641	\$658	\$673	\$696	\$720	\$747	\$774	\$803	\$833	\$864	\$896	\$929	\$963	\$999	\$1,036
Cost Allocation to Project		\$114,016	\$325,446	\$622,882	\$721,201	\$777,655	\$806,340	\$836,111	\$867,011	\$899,083	\$932,373	\$966,927	\$1,002,796	\$1,040,028	\$1,078,679	\$1,118,801

Sources: City of Davis FY 2025-26 Budget; City of Davis, Fire Department, City of Davis, Finance Department; BAE, 2026.

Table 19b: Fire Department Expenditures (Low Cost Allocation)

Fire Department Expenditures	25/26	Cumulative Absorption (Year)														
	Budget	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
Net General Fund Expenditure	\$19,925,240	\$19,925,240	\$20,657,287	\$21,416,992	\$22,205,421	\$23,023,680	\$23,872,921	\$24,754,338	\$25,669,175	\$26,618,722	\$27,604,321	\$28,627,364	\$29,689,302	\$30,791,637	\$31,935,935	\$33,123,821
Total Fire Dept. Systemwide GF Cost	\$19,925,240	\$19,925,240	\$20,657,287	\$21,416,992	\$22,205,421	\$23,023,680	\$23,872,921	\$24,754,338	\$25,669,175	\$26,618,722	\$27,604,321	\$28,627,364	\$29,689,302	\$30,791,637	\$31,935,935	\$33,123,821
Total DUEs in Davis (unadjusted)	30,885	30,885	30,885	30,885	30,885	30,885	30,885	30,885	30,885	30,885	30,885	30,885	30,885	30,885	30,885	30,885
Project DUEs (unadjusted)		178	494	925	1,037	1,080	1,080	1,080	1,080	1,080	1,080	1,080	1,080	1,080	1,080	1,080
Assumed New DUEs Elsewhere in City Before Village Farms Begins Absorption (a)		1,085	1,085	1,085	1,085	1,085	1,085	1,085	1,085	1,085	1,085	1,085	1,085	1,085	1,085	1,085
Other New Citywide DUEs (unadjusted)		39	-100	-214	105	174	217	217	217	217	217	217	217	217	217	217
New Total DUEs in Davis (unadjusted)		32,187	32,365	32,681	33,112	33,224	33,267	33,267	33,267	33,267	33,267	33,267	33,267	33,267	33,267	33,267
Future Average Cost Per DUE		\$619	\$638	\$655	\$671	\$693	\$718	\$744	\$772	\$800	\$830	\$861	\$892	\$926	\$960	\$996
Cost Allocation to Project		\$110,035	\$315,541	\$606,285	\$695,282	\$748,193	\$774,790	\$803,397	\$833,087	\$863,905	\$895,892	\$929,095	\$963,560	\$999,336	\$1,036,474	\$1,075,026

Note:

(a) Assumes five years lapse before first units are absorbed in Willowgrove. Assumes total citywide DUE increase is average DUEs suggested by 2021-2029 RHNA average units per year. Assumes same annual average carries over throughout projection period.

Sources: City of Davis FY 2025-26 Budget; City of Davis, Fire Department, City of Davis, Finance Department; BAE, 2026.

Table 20: Social Services and Housing Department Expenditures

	25/26	Cumulative Absorption (Year)														
	Budget	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
Net General Fund Expenditures	\$2,423,100															
Residential DUEs in Davis	24,452															
Employee DUEs in Davis (adjusted at 25%)	1,608															
Total DUEs in Davis (adjusted)	26,061															
Average Cost Per DUE	\$92.98															
Assumed Percent of GF Expenditures Variable	75%															
Variable Costs Per DUE	\$69.73															
Total Project DUEs (employees adjusted at 25%)		178	494	925	1,037	1,075	1,075	1,075	1,075	1,075	1,075	1,075	1,075	1,075	1,075	1,075
Non-Personnel Costs		\$9,059	\$25,826	\$49,539	\$56,904	\$60,485	\$61,997	\$63,547	\$65,136	\$66,764	\$68,434	\$70,144	\$71,898	\$73,695	\$75,538	\$77,426
Personnel costs		\$3,336	\$9,650	\$18,781	\$21,889	\$23,607	\$24,551	\$25,533	\$26,555	\$27,617	\$28,722	\$29,870	\$31,065	\$32,308	\$33,600	\$34,944
Total Social Services and Housing Dept. General Fund Expenditures		\$12,395	\$35,476	\$68,320	\$78,793	\$84,092	\$86,549	\$89,081	\$91,691	\$94,381	\$97,155	\$100,015	\$102,963	\$106,003	\$109,138	\$112,370

Sources: City of Davis FY 2025-26 Budget; BAE, 2025.

Table 21: General Government Expenditures

	25/26	Cumulative Absorption (Year)														
	Budget	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
City Council	\$212,381															
City Attorney	\$121,725															
City Manager's Office	\$4,818,433															
Finance	\$2,202,339															
Human Resources	\$753,595															
Sub-Total General Government General Fund Expenditures	\$8,108,473															
Residential DUEs in Davis	24,452															
Employee DUEs in Davis (adjusted at 36%)	2,316															
Total DUEs in Davis (adjusted)	26,768															
Average Cost Per Adjusted DUE	\$303															
Percent Affected by Growth	75%															
Total Growth-Related Cost Per Adjusted DUE	\$227															
Total Project DUEs (employees adjusted at 36%)		178	494	925	1,037	1,076	1,076	1,076	1,076	1,076	1,076	1,076	1,076	1,076	1,076	1,076
Projected Non Personnel Costs		\$28,228	\$80,472	\$154,359	\$177,307	\$188,582	\$193,297	\$198,129	\$203,083	\$208,160	\$213,364	\$218,698	\$224,165	\$229,769	\$235,514	\$241,401
Projected Personnel Costs		\$12,155	\$35,158	\$68,425	\$79,748	\$86,061	\$89,503	\$93,083	\$96,807	\$100,679	\$104,706	\$108,894	\$113,250	\$117,780	\$122,491	\$127,391
Total General Government Expenditures		\$40,382	\$115,630	\$222,784	\$257,056	\$274,643	\$282,800	\$291,213	\$299,889	\$308,839	\$318,070	\$327,592	\$337,415	\$347,549	\$358,005	\$368,792

Sources: City of Davis FY 2025-26 Budget; BAE, 2025.

Table 22: Information Systems Department Expenditures

	25/26 Budget	Cumulative Absorption (Year)														
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
Net General Fund Expenditures	\$0															
Residential DUEs in Davis	24,452															
Employee DUEs in Davis (adjusted at 36%)	2,316															
Total DUEs in Davis (adjusted)	26,768															
Average Cost Per DUE	\$0.00															
Assumed Percent of GF Expenditures Variable	75%															
Variable Costs Per DUE	\$0.00															
Total Project DUEs (employees adjusted at 36%)		178	494	925	1,037	1,076	1,076	1,076	1,076	1,076	1,076	1,076	1,076	1,076	1,076	1,076
Non-Personnel Costs		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Personnel costs		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Total Community Development Dept. General Fund Expenditures		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0

Sources: City of Davis FY 2025-26 Budget; BAE, 2025.

Table 23: Non-Departmental Transfers Out

	25/26 Budget	Cumulative Absorption (Year)														
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
Net General Fund Expenditures (a)	\$3,000,000															
Total DUEs in Davis (unadjusted)	30,885															
Average Cost Per DUE	\$97.13															
Assumed Percent of GF Expenditures Variable (a)	0%															
Variable Costs Per DUE	\$0.00															
Total Project DUEs (unadjusted)		178	494	925	1,037	1,080	1,080	1,080	1,080	1,080	1,080	1,080	1,080	1,080	1,080	1,080
Non-Personnel Costs		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Personnel costs		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Total General Fund Transfers Out (a)		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0

Notes:

(a) Current Non-Departmental costs reflect an inflow of money to the General Fund. Based on information from the Finance Department, this is due to one time ARPA monies. The expenditure figure reflects a \$3 million/year General Fund expenditure. This amount is fixed, so it will not increase with inflation nor with an increase in service population due to new development. If the City has available budget after funding operations costs, the City Council may elect to allocate some available funds

Sources: City of Davis FY 2025-26 Budget; BAE, 2025.

Appendix A: Current Per Acre Parks and Open Space Maintenance Cost Calculation

2019-2020 Costs from U-Mall Fiscal Model

<u>Park and Open Space Maintenance</u>	<u>19/20 Costs</u>	<u>Per Acre Cost as % of Park Per Acre Cost</u>
Park	\$11,274 /ac.	100%
Mini-Park	\$11,274 /ac.	100%
Greenbelts	\$6,725 /ac.	60%
Linear Green	\$7,428 /ac.	66%
Habitat	\$876 /ac.	8%

2025-2026 Parks Maintenance Cost Estimates

2025-26 Parks Maintenance Division Costs	\$10,822,667		
		Per Acre Cost Relationship from 2019-2020 (a)	Park Acre Equivalents (b)
2025-26 Parks/Open Space Inventory			
Parks	259.87 acres	100%	259.9
Greenbelts	201.95 acres	66%	133.1
Downtown Streetscape	2.59 acres	66%	1.7
Total Park Acre Equivalents			394.6
Average 25-26 Cost per Park Acre Equivalent (c)			\$27,424

Estimated Willow Grove Annual Per Acre Maintenance Costs (d)

Park (Heritage Oak and Village Trails Park)	\$27,424
Greenbelts	\$16,359
Urban Agricultural Transition Area (e)	\$2,131

Notes:

- (a) Per acre cost relationship from 2019-2020 is the cost of maintaining an acre of a given park and open space category versus the cost of maintaining an acre of Park land.
- (b) Per acre equivalent is total acres times per acre cost relationship multiplier. Assumes that relative cost of maintaining parks, streetscapes, and greenbelts is the same in 25-26 as in 19-20.
- (c) Average cost per park acre equivalent is the 2025-26 Park Maintenance Division costs divided by Total Park Acre Equivalents.
- (d) Estimated Willowgrove per acre costs are the average 25-26 cost per park acre equivalent times the relevant Per Acre Cost as % of Park Per Acre Cost Relationship from 19/20.
- (e) Assumes that Urban Agricultural Transition Area maintenance costs will be similar to habitat areas.

Sources: City of Davis FY 2025-26 Budget; City of Davis, Parks and Community Services Department, 2025; City of Davis, U-Mall Fiscal Model; BAE, 2025.