



Economic &  
Planning Systems

*Public Finance*  
*Real Estate Economics*  
*Regional Economics*  
*Land Use Policy*

## FINAL DRAFT SUMMARY

### MEASURE "V" IMPACT ANALYSIS

Prepared for:

City of Oxnard

Prepared by:

Economic & Planning Systems, Inc.

August 29, 2008

EPS #18536

ATTACHMENT  
PAGE 1 OF 42

SACRAMENTO  
2150 River Plaza Drive, Suite 400  
Sacramento, CA 95833  
www.epsys.com

phone: 916-649-8010  
fax: 916-649-2070



BERKELEY  
phone: 510-841-9190  
fax: 510-841-9208

DENVER  
phone: 303-623-3557  
fax: 303-623-9069

## I. INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND

---

Pursuant to the State of California (State) statute covering municipal elections (Elections Code Section 9212), the City of Oxnard (City) may conduct an analysis to identify specific impacts related to proposed initiative measures before the public. The City Council authorized this report on July 8, 2008, to analyze the economic, fiscal, and land use impacts of the proposed "Oxnard Traffic Initiative" (Initiative), also known as Measure "V," on the November 4, 2008, ballot.

The City retained three firms to prepare independent analyses of the Initiative:

- Economic & Planning Systems, Inc., (EPS), an urban economics consulting firm, was selected to evaluate the economic and land use impacts.
- Dowling Associates was selected to evaluate traffic congestion issues.
- Weaver Research & Consulting Group (Weaver Group) was selected to evaluate fiscal impacts related to City revenue sources.

This analysis summarizes preliminary findings related to the economic and land use impacts related to this Initiative. This document also provides a brief summary of revenue impacts to the City as detailed by the Weaver Group in its study, "Estimated Revenue Impacts to the City of Oxnard Finances Associated with the Oxnard Traffic Initiative" (Revenue Report), dated August 20, 2008.

## EXISTING CITY POLICY

The Initiative relates to the following Oxnard 2020 General Plan economic and land use goals:

### GROWTH MANAGEMENT

- Sensible urban growth based on the ability to provide the necessary governmental services and municipal utilities.
- Maintain the quality of life desired by the residents of Oxnard.

### LAND USE

- A balanced community that meets housing, commercial and employment needs consistent with the holding capacity of the City.
- Preservation of scenic views, natural topography, natural physical amenities, and air quality.
- A balance between jobs and housing within reasonable commuting distance from each other.

### CIRCULATION

- A transportation system that supports existing, approved and planned land uses throughout the City while maintaining a level of service "C" on all streets and at all intersections.
- A public transportation system which serves the needs of residents and workers of Oxnard.
- Safe, accessible routes for bicyclists and pedestrians.

DRAFT – FOR DISCUSSION PURPOSES ONLY

## PUBLIC FACILITIES

- Public facilities and services adequate to serve existing and future development within the City.

## ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

- A stable, diversified, well-balanced economy.
- Optimum utilization of natural and man-made resources.
- A variety of economic opportunities throughout the City.
- A revitalized downtown area of the City.

**DRAFT – FOR DISCUSSION PURPOSES ONLY**

## THE INITIATIVE (MEASURE "V")

If enacted into law, the Initiative would require that certain development projects be approved by a majority of the voters unless the following traffic conditions are certified by a City Council finding supported by substantial traffic engineering data:

1. All intersections within a 5-mile radius of the project have been operating at Level of Service (LOS) "C" or higher for the preceding year.
2. The project will not result in any intersection within the 5-mile radius of that project to fall below LOS "C."

The Initiative would not apply to development projects as follows:

1. Vested right under State law.
2. Validly approved and fully executed Development Agreement with the City.
3. Legitimate governmental purpose (e.g., schools, parks, police station).
4. Affordable housing needed to meet the 2000 Housing Element Regional Housing Needs Allocation targets that was not yet developed as of the date of the Notice of Intent to Circulate.
5. Nonprofit religious (IRS Section 501 recognized).
6. Nonprofit educational (IRS Section 503 recognized).
7. Hospital or medical services facility.
8. Nonprofit religious (IRS Section 503 recognized).
9. Commercial under 10,000 sq. ft.
10. Residential of four or fewer units.

The Initiative would sunset in 2028 unless that date is extended by the voters.

**DRAFT—FOR DISCUSSION PURPOSES ONLY**

## SCOPE OF THE IMPACT ANALYSIS REPORT

This Impact Analysis evaluates the potential impacts of the Initiative on the following aspects affecting the daily activities of residents and businesses in the City:

- Fiscal and Financial Impacts
  - Ability to Fund Municipal Services
  - Ability to Fund Capital Improvements
  - Developer Exactions
  - Impact of Required Approval by Election
- Affordable Housing
- General Economic Impacts
  - Jobs
  - Employee Wages
  - Direct Output
- Redevelopment and Revitalization Impacts
  - Economic Development
  - Redevelopment Finance

The relative impact of the Initiative on each of these aspects depends on the extent to which currently proposed or anticipated development projects allowed under the current 2020 General Plan, or allowed by a General Plan Amendment, are deferred, rejected, or displaced.

Analyses prepared by Dowling Associates (traffic impacts) and the Weaver Group (public revenue impacts) are addressed in separate documents.

ATTACHMENT  
PAGE 6 OF 42

DRAFT—FOR DISCUSSION PURPOSES ONLY

## II. METHODOLOGY AND ASSUMPTIONS

---

### ANALYTICAL FRAMEWORK

The analytical framework is composed of two steps:

1. Identify likely projects subject to the Initiative.
2. Apply potential change in development to various possible aspects of impacts, using qualitative and quantitative measures.

It must be recognized that there are other development scenarios, such as:

- Some or all of the proposed projects could be approved by the voters.
- Some or all of the proposed development projects could be restructured so that they fall below the Initiative's thresholds requiring a vote.
- Some of the proposed projects would not trigger a vote because they were able to meet the traffic LOS minimum requirements.

## ANALYTICAL FRAMEWORK: FACTORS TO CONSIDER

This analysis assesses both quantitative and qualitative impacts related to the Initiative and assumes that none of the currently known projects subject to the Initiative are developed. The projects could be denied by the City, lose an Initiative election, or be withdrawn by the project proponent. These factors would influence developers' decisions:

- The cost of special elections or the timing of regular elections could deter developers from investing in a substantial predevelopment planning effort necessary to entitle projects that would subsequently be subject to voter approval.
- Developers could suboptimize use of the property, perhaps below zoned capacity, to avoid triggering the Initiative. This will likely result in lower intensity of use as intended in the City's General Plan.
- Smaller development projects (between 10,000 and 60,000 sq. ft., or fewer than 100 residential units) would likely have a difficult time achieving financial feasibility because of these:
  1. Additional costs associated with traffic mitigation efforts.
  2. Additional costs needed for voter approval.

## ASSUMPTIONS: POTENTIAL DEVELOPMENT SUBJECT TO THE INITIATIVE

Based primarily on the Planning Division's July 2008 Development Project List, City staff identified projects in the planning pipeline, vacant development sites, and potential redevelopment sites. EPS used these projects to determine potential residential units and commercial building square footage that would be subject to the Initiative. These estimates are the basis for the Impact Analysis calculations.

**Table 1**  
**Potential Development Subject to the Initiative**

	Units (Rounded)	Gross Bldg Sq. Ft. (Rounded)
<b>Residential</b>		
Residential	8,000	-
<b>Total Residential</b>	<b>8,000</b>	<b>-</b>
<b>Nonresidential</b>		
Retail	-	993,000
Office	-	310,000
Industrial	-	13,741,000
<b>Total Nonresidential</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>15,044,000</b>

DRAFT—FOR DISCUSSION PURPOSES ONLY

CURRENT (JULY 2008) PROJECT APPLICATIONS

The estimated developments subject to the Initiative are categorized by their current status in the City's planning and approval process. These "tiers" of development were grouped based on discussions with City staff related to each project's status in the development approval process and likelihood of being vested by the intended effective date of the proposed Initiative. These tiers were also used in the Weaver Group's Revenue Report. Several large projects (such as Riverpark and Seabridge) and several smaller projects fall within the Initiative exemptions. These are assumed to develop as currently proposed. Table A-2 provides additional detail on these projects.

**Table 2**  
**Impacted Projects by Approval Process Status**

	Residential Units (Rounded)	Nonresidential Gross Bldg Sq. Ft. (Rounded)
Tier 1: Approved/Under Review by City but No Vested Rights	3,400	4,644,200
Tier 2: Proposed Projects	3,500	10,079,800
Tier 3: Preliminary Planning Process	1,100	319,800
<b>Total</b>	<b>8,000</b>	<b>15,043,800</b>

The full list of identified impacted projects is found in **Appendix A**. Please note that EPS's July 29, 2008, draft summary and the Weaver Group's Revenue Report included the Levitz Tower project in its analysis. EPS has

DRAFT – FOR DISCUSSION PURPOSES ONLY

since excluded the Levitz project because it is not likely that the project will proceed with its entitlement application. The quantitative impacts have changed to reflect this reduction in land use.

ATTACHMENT 1  
PAGE 11 OF 42

DRAFT – FOR DISCUSSION PURPOSES ONLY

### III. FISCAL AND FINANCIAL IMPACTS OF THE INITIATIVE

---

Reduced or limited development will affect the following groups:

- City of Oxnard.
- Existing and future Oxnard residents and businesses.
- Current and future real estate developers.
- Other local governments and special districts.

The potential fiscal and financial impacts of the Initiative are highlighted in this section:

1. **Fiscal Impact on Municipal Services.** Impacts related to the ability of the City and other local agencies to provide ongoing services to residents and businesses, such as public safety, utilities, and park maintenance.
2. **Financing Impact on Capital Improvements.** Impacts related to the City's ability to fund one-time improvements, usually public facilities such as parks and police and fire stations, and infrastructure such as water, sewer, transit, and road improvements.
3. **Changes to Development-Approval Process.** Potential financial impacts to the development entitlement process.
4. **Impact of Required Elections.** The costs associated with voter approval of affected projects.

#### 1. FISCAL IMPACT ON MUNICIPAL SERVICES

Property, sales, and business license taxes generate revenues necessary to provide services, amenities, and infrastructure to the community. The ability to maintain and improve existing municipal service levels relies partly on an expanding tax base from new development (i.e., sales taxes from new retail development).

DRAFT – FOR DISCUSSION PURPOSES ONLY

However, limiting or preventing growth does not assure that municipal costs will not increase because municipal costs are often influenced by external factors, such as labor agreements or fuel costs, unrelated to the cost of providing services to new development. In addition, aging infrastructure is more costly to maintain.

Cities often aim to minimize increases in taxes and fees on existing residents and businesses while maintaining and improving service levels. In some instances, new development provides additional revenue in the form of user taxes and other fees, with no corresponding incremental increased need for personnel, or other associated capital or operating cost. This additional revenue helps reduce General Fund revenue needed to provide services for its residents.

The following impacts to existing residents and businesses could occur if the Initiative is approved and development is reduced:

- **Potential Foregone Revenue to the City.** The Weaver Group's Revenue Report provides detail on potential sales-tax and property-tax impacts. The estimated impact is an \$11.7 million reduction in annual property-tax and sales-tax revenue. Annual costs separately financed by development fees for services would be reduced by \$3.9 million (i.e., City personnel being directly involved in reviewing and permitting new development).

<b>Table 3</b>	
<b>Summary of Potential Foregone Revenue and Cost Reductions</b>	
<b>Annual Tax Revenue</b>	<b>Total [1]</b>
	<i>in million\$</i>
Property Taxes	\$10.0
Sales Taxes	\$1.7
Business License Taxes (Retail-only)	\$0.1
<b>Total [1]</b>	<b>\$11.7</b>
Personnel Reductions [2]	\$3.9
<i>"annual_fees"</i>	
Source: "Estimated Revenue Impacts to the City of Oxnard Finances Associated with the Oxnard Traffic Initiative," Weaver Research & Consulting Group (8/20/08)	
[1] Totals may not sum exactly due to rounding.	
[2] Select personnel are funded through permit and application fees.	

DRAFT—FOR DISCUSSION PURPOSES ONLY

- **Decline in Existing Services.** Without an expanding tax base provided by new development, municipal services may decline in the wake of higher costs.
- **Increase in Fees and Rates to Maintain Existing Service Levels.** Higher taxes or user fees on existing residents and businesses may be required to maintain service levels.

At this time, this analysis does not quantify the costs for services that would be associated with new development or the impact related to reduced new development on those services.

## 2. FINANCING IMPACT ON CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS

The City finances many of its Capital Improvement Program (CIP) projects through development impact fees, which assume that new development contributes its fair share to these CIP projects. Most City CIP projects are based on long-term needs, serving both to upgrade existing infrastructure and accommodate increased demand that results from new development. If the projected development does not occur, then the CIP fee programs will probably be short of funding. **However, less new development does not necessarily mean a corresponding reduction in the need for CIP projects.**

As noted in Table 4, if the Initiative is approved, approximately \$480 million in City revenue from various fees and exactions could be foregone. *Losing these revenues could result in delaying, cancelling, or re-scoping critical City projects.*

The following CIP impacts could occur if the Initiative is approved and new development is reduced:

- **Challenges in Scaling Infrastructure.** Infrastructure (e.g., roads, sewer, water, drainage, parks, and community centers) are large items and are difficult to scale to the amount of development. For example, the City cannot build half of a lane of roadway improvements. As a result, it is not always easy to adjust the sizing of the infrastructure to the level of development.

DRAFT—FOR DISCUSSION PURPOSES ONLY

- **Increased Impact Fees.** If the Initiative is adopted, then the City, school districts, and special agencies with impact fee programs may need to increase fees on future new development that does occur to fund the remaining CIP projects.
- **Funding Shortfalls.** The share of costs for CIP projects that benefit existing residents and businesses will also increase, and the City will need to find new funding sources to pay for these costs.

## IMPACT OF FOREGONE REVENUE ON EXISTING CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS

### Planning Fee

Planning fees are used to offset the cost of providing ongoing planning services, such as permit review, building inspections, and preparing special studies and State-required plans, such as the 2020 General Plan Update. Foregone revenue will likely result in increased user fees for planning services and increased dependence on the General Fund.

### Traffic Mitigation Fee

Impacted projects in the Circulation Fund are:

- Intelligent Transportation System (ITS) Master Plan.
- Rice-Santa Clara/101 and Del Norte/101 interchange improvements.
- Needed improvements to intersections, especially those with at-grade railroad crossings.

Table 4 Summary of Estimated Reduction in Development Impact Fees	
One-Time Fee	Total
	<i>in million\$</i>
Planning Fees	\$60.0
Traffic Mitigation Fees	\$129.0
Growth Requirement Capital Fees	\$26.3
Water Connection Fees	\$30.3
Sewer Fees	\$33.8
Storm Drainage Fees	\$127.4
Quimby Fees	\$76.2
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$480.0</b>
<i>"one_fees"</i>	
Source: "Estimated Revenue Impacts to the City of Oxnard Finances Associated with the Oxnard Traffic Initiative," Weaver Research & Consulting Group (8/20/08)	
[1] Totals may not sum exactly due to rounding.	

DRAFT—FOR DISCUSSION PURPOSES ONLY

### **Growth Requirement Capital Fee**

Annual debt service of \$1.8 million for two recently completed capital projects, the Permit Center and Downtown Library, assumed full funding from the City's Growth Requirement Capital Fees. Losing anticipated revenues to service this debt will place an additional burden on the City's General Fund revenues, which would typically be used to support basic City services, such as Police, Fire, and Parks and Recreation.

### **Water Connection Fee**

Facilities that may be impacted by losing new development fee revenues, which may result in increased rates to individual ratepayers, are these:

- Phase II of the GREAT Recycled Water Distribution Project.
- The Advanced Water Purification System (AWPS).

### **Sewer Fee**

Financing for the recently completed Headworks Wastewater Plant Capacity Improvements assume revenues from anticipated future new development impact fees. Foregone sewer fee revenue will likely result in increased sewer rates for existing users to cover the shortfalls.

### **Storm Drainage Fee**

Storm Drainage fees are collected by the City for the County's flood control and watershed programs and flood control channel improvements in Oxnard. Foregone revenue will result in reduced funding for planned drainage improvements in areas of Oxnard subject to periodic flooding.

### **Quimby Fee**

Quimby fees are used for acquisition, improvement, and expansion of park, playground and recreational facilities. Quimby fees from new development are used in that neighborhood, if needed, or for community parks. This initiative would make approximately \$76.2 million in anticipated Quimby fee revenue unavailable

**DRAFT – FOR DISCUSSION PURPOSES ONLY**

(unless voters approve projects subject to the Initiative), increasing reliance on the General Fund for parks or delaying improvement of College Park, Campus, Park, and other facilities.

## IMPACTS ON CITY-REQUIRED DEVELOPER EXACTIONS

**Under the current approval process, traffic mitigation is required by the City as a condition of project approval.** In addition to impact fees, developers often directly build small off-site street improvements as part of a new project's traffic mitigation. These improvements are typically not part of the CIP program (i.e., additional turn-lanes, signals, repaving). Without new development, these smaller neighborhood-level improvements may be foregone or delayed until the City has the capacity to finance these improvements.

Because the Initiative will raise the cost and risk of development approvals for projects that trigger voter approval, these projects will have less capacity to finance additional exactions that would benefit the City. The cost of traffic mitigation could also be too great a financial burden for a project developer to bear, resulting in projects not being constructed and no mitigation for existing traffic issues.

### 3. CHANGES TO DEVELOPMENT-APPROVAL PROCESS

According to the Initiative, the voters will vote on development projects that are not otherwise exempt from the Initiative.

While this process will provide additional opportunities for the electorate to review pending projects, there will also be delays and costs related to this additional step in the development-approval process.

DRAFT – FOR DISCUSSION PURPOSES ONLY

For projects subject to the Initiative:

- The costs of development approval will be significantly higher because of additional costs related to soliciting electorate approval.
- The length of time required for development approval would be considerably longer.
- The risk of approval will be greater, which is often reflected in higher financing costs paid by developers.
- Additional costs may be required to meet the Initiative LOS "C" standard and receive development approval.

#### 4. IMPACT OF REQUIRED ELECTIONS

##### DIRECT COST OF HOLDING AN ELECTION

According to the Initiative language, election costs would not be borne by the City; rather, they would be required to be paid by the project developer(s). Costs to hold the election would range from \$35,000 to \$300,000, depending on whether the election would occur during a general election or if a special election is required.

##### CAMPAIGN COSTS TO PROJECT PROPONENTS AND OPPONENTS

Significant costs will likely be incurred by project proponents and opponents as they campaign for electorate support. Proponents and opponents of a development project may incur high costs depending on the level of controversy and the size of the electorate. In similar elections held related to local land use approvals:

- Proponent costs have ranged from \$270,000 to \$3.2 million in comparable cities.
- Opponent costs have ranged from \$20,000 to \$210,000 in comparable cities.

DRAFT – FOR DISCUSSION PURPOSES ONLY

## ELECTION TIMING

Development would be delayed beyond that of a typical approval process as a result of the election calendar set by the California Secretary of State and County Clerk. Statewide general elections occur only in even-numbered calendar years. Special elections may occur in any year.

**Tables A-10 through A-13** provide examples of similar initiatives and development projects requiring local approval and estimated costs for select elections.

ATTACHMENT 1  
PAGE 19 OF 42

**DRAFT – FOR DISCUSSION PURPOSES ONLY**

## IV. GENERAL ECONOMIC IMPACTS

---

Economic impacts identify jobs and private-sector economic activity (expenditures) in the City including:

- Number of jobs (employment).
- Employee income.
- Local expenditures by households and businesses.

**Development results in dollars expended that ripple through the local economy and is measured by jobs, employee wages, and money spent by households and businesses. These measures are reported as multipliers to the local economy and may be classified into two types of impacts:**

- **One-time construction impacts** are related to employment generated, employee compensation generated, and direct output created as a result of constructing the development projects.
- **Ongoing annual impacts** are related to operations of the business enterprises located in the new development.

EPS estimated the direct impacts associated with a loss in economic activity as a result of the projects subject to the Initiative not being developed. While there also may be indirect and induced, or secondary and "spin-off," economic impacts as a result of the multiplier effect of economic activity, EPS did not estimate the results of this spin-off effect.

**From a business perspective**, the Initiative may cause employers to not move forward with expansion or relocation plans should additional development-approval requirements be imposed. The potential loss of economic activity in the form of jobs, income, and revenue generated by both the one-time construction impacts and the ongoing economic values created by this new development is depicted in **Table 5**. Additional details on calculating these impacts are found in **Tables A-3 through A-7**.

DRAFT—FOR DISCUSSION PURPOSES ONLY

**Table 5**  
**Potential Loss in Economic Activity Due to the Initiative**

	<b>One-Time Construction Impacts</b>	<b>Ongoing Annual Impacts</b>
<b>Job Years / Employment</b>	<b>29,700</b>	<b>17,200</b>
<b>Employee Compensation</b>	<b>\$1.7 billion</b>	<b>\$1.3 billion</b>
<b>Direct Output (Excluding Compensation)</b>	<b>\$2.0 billion</b>	<b>\$3.0 billion</b>
<b>Total Industry Output</b>	<b>\$3.8 billion</b>	<b>\$4.4 billion</b>

Source: Minnesota IMPLAN Group, City of Oxnard, and EPS.

Note: Impact rounded to nearest 50.

## V. REDEVELOPMENT AND REVITALIZATION IMPACTS

---

The City's redevelopment and revitalization efforts depend on the ability to adapt to changing demographics, demand for particular land uses (e.g., residential, retail, and office development), and the ability to attract outside investment to the City. Impacts related to economic development efforts, collaboration between the City and the private sector, and redeveloping blighted areas are addressed in this section.

At this time, the exact nature of these impacts is not quantifiable. However, the City's ability to provide feasible options for redevelopment and revitalization may be limited to choices that do not include developing new residential or commercial projects that would be subject to voter approval.

### IMPACT ON ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

The Initiative would likely have impacts on the following economic development activities, should voters not approve development projects:

- **Business Relocation.** Businesses looking to expand their existing location in the City or develop their own space may be more likely to relocate to an adjacent community rather than assume the additional risk and costs associated with voter approval and traffic mitigation.
- **Small Business Retention.** Similarly, small businesses not otherwise exempt from the initiative are more likely to be impacted by the Initiative's requirements as the cost of doing business increases related to expansion and development in Oxnard.
- **Downtown Revitalization.** Additional requirements to address traffic mitigation issues could impact smaller projects, affecting revitalization efforts in the downtown area.
- **Public-Private Partnership Opportunities.** With the increased costs of development associated with the Initiative, the City would likely be required to participate in increased public-private partnership

DRAFT – FOR DISCUSSION PURPOSES ONLY

opportunities to attract businesses and development to the City. Development impact fee revenue identified in **Chapter III** is often leveraged to encourage public-private partnerships. Finite resources would likely limit the City's ability to encourage catalyst development projects from developing as a result of the conditions imposed by the proposed Initiative.

- **Channel Islands Harbor Renovation and Redevelopment.** The Initiative would likely impact the City's ability, in collaboration with Ventura County, to encourage and stimulate harbor-related activity and development. Potential development of new retail, entertainment, and other uses would likely be subject to voter approval, adding additional hurdles for successful redevelopment of the Channel Islands Harbor.
- **Redevelopment and Revitalization of First Generation Commercial and Industrial Land Uses.** Much of Oxnard's commercial and industrial inventory is dated and shows a need for reinvestment and redevelopment. To revive these corridors and areas, redevelopment may be required to address market demands for specific types of commercial and industrial space, as well as the needs of consumers and businesses. Developing new or redeveloping existing nonresidential space may be limited should the Initiative place an additional requirement of voter passage or traffic mitigation beyond that of the immediate area affecting the project.

## IMPACT ON REDEVELOPMENT: FISCAL

Of the 48 projects in the development pipeline identified as being impacted by the initiative, 25 are located in the City's five redevelopment areas. Approximately 2,200 units, representing 38 percent of all residential units and approximately one-third of the potential office and retail square footage, are located in the redevelopment areas.

Although these financial impacts have not been estimated, if the projects in the redevelopment areas are unable to move forward as a result of the Initiative, there will be financial consequences to the City and the

DRAFT—FOR DISCUSSION PURPOSES ONLY

ATTACHMENT 1  
PAGE 23 OF 42

Redevelopment Agency. Sales-tax and tax-increment revenue generated for redevelopment purposes will be impacted if the Initiative is approved and development is reduced.

## IMPACT ON REDEVELOPMENT: PUBLIC-PRIVATE PARTNERSHIPS

Through its General Plan and related policies, the City is looking to encourage revitalization and redevelopment in its five project areas: Downtown, Central City Revitalization, Historic Enhancement and Revitalization of Oxnard (HERO), Ormond Beach, and Southwinds Project Areas. Redeveloping these areas requires significant public-private partnerships between the City, the Redevelopment Agency, and private development:

- **Limits the Ability of Projects to Redevelop.** In addition to limiting the ability of identified redevelopment projects to occur, the Initiative will also impact the ability of future redevelopment efforts by the City. Encouraging urban revitalization and requiring rezoning of land uses, assembling multiple parcels, developing higher density projects, and developing mixed uses will likely be difficult.
- **Increased Need for Public Participation as a Result of Increased Development Costs.** The extended approval process for redevelopment projects impacted by the Initiative would result in higher costs that would hamper project feasibility. Cities can partner with developers of priority projects by helping to fill the financial feasibility gap using public support. The Initiative could have the unintended consequence of reducing the financial feasibility of a redevelopment project, requiring additional assistance from the Redevelopment Agency.
- **Smaller Projects Not Subject to the Initiative Would Have Lesser Impact on Redevelopment Revenue.** Redevelopment projects generate tax-increment revenue, of which a portion returns to the City Redevelopment Agency to fund ongoing programs, such as façade improvement, streetscaping, and maintenance, as well as funds one-time grants and subsidies to redevelop new projects. Smaller projects would not generate the same level of revenue as larger projects. This reduction in revenue

DRAFT—FOR DISCUSSION PURPOSES ONLY

would negatively impact the Redevelopment Agency's ability to sustain its existing programs and support new projects.

## AFFORDABLE HOUSING IMPACTS

### CURRENT MARKET CONCERNS

The downturn in the national and statewide housing market has had an impact on Ventura County and the City, resulting in slower home sales, reduced home values, and an increased supply of homes. As a result, Oxnard housing is relatively more affordable now and for the near future, compared to just three years ago. The median price for an Oxnard single-family home peaked at more than \$617,000 in June 2006 and is now \$352,000 as of July 2008, compared with Ventura County median home prices of \$604,000 in June 2006 and \$420,000 as of July 2008.<sup>1</sup>

As a result, the City's supply of relatively affordable housing has increased and several new homes in the permitting and construction pipeline, which are exempt from the Initiative, will add to the supply in the short term. The impact of the Initiative on housing affordability and supply may not be significant over the next two to three years; however, in the long term, once the housing markets begin to recover, Oxnard home prices may increase as a result of a reduced supply of new homes. Any potential increases in home prices would impact the affordability of homeownership in the City.

### BARRIERS TO COMMUNITY-BASED DEVELOPERS

As mentioned previously, to the extent developers move forward with elections to win project approval, the cost in time and increased risk will likely mean that only the projects with the highest profit margins will

---

<sup>1</sup> Based on Dataquick data for those time periods.

DRAFT – FOR DISCUSSION PURPOSES ONLY

choose this route. Community-based affordable housing developers may not have the resources to endure the expense and additional project risk.

## IMPACT ON STATE-REQUIRED AFFORDABLE HOUSING OBLIGATIONS

The Initiative appears to provide a modest exception for affordable housing projects, which is related to the City's 1998–2005 Housing Element. Based on City Development Services' interpretation of the Initiative section, the City will be able to accommodate 862 additional very low, low, and moderate income-restricted homes after the effective date of the Initiative (see **Table A-8**). In addition, the City has a total of 611 homes for very low- and low-income families in the development pipeline, which is not impacted by the Initiative.

The City's ability to meet its obligation under State Housing Element Law to provide capacity for very low-, low-, and moderate-income housing development would be affected. This capacity is represented in the City's Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA). EPS estimates that for the current Housing Element compliance period (2006–2014), there would be approximately 1,275 units of below-market housing for which the City would have difficulty identifying development capacity (see **Table A-9**). If all proposed projects were to move forward, including those considered at-risk because of the Initiative, the City would be able to meet its RHNA obligation for the current period. At this time, the City has not adopted the 2006–2014 Housing Element and has not determined the Initiative's impact on City compliance with State RHNA requirements.

Potential issues related to affordable housing resulting from the Initiative include:

- Housing Element Non-Compliance:
  - Reduced access to State Housing and Community Development program funds.
  - Litigation by affordable housing advocates and residential developers.
- Violation of California's Anti-NIMBY statute (GC 65589.5):
  - Vulnerability to litigation.

DRAFT—FOR DISCUSSION PURPOSES ONLY

# APPENDIX A

## DETAILED TABLES

Table A-1	Summary of Potentially Impacted Residential, Commercial, and Industrial Land Uses.....	A-1
Table A-2	Impacted Residential, Commercial, and Industrial Land Uses by Type (3 pages) .....	A-2
Table A-3	Summary of Direct Economic Impacts Foregone.....	A-5
Table A-4	Estimated Annual Direct Output and Employment Impacts Foregone .....	A-6
Table A-5	Estimated Direct Economic Impact of New Residential and Nonresidential Construction .....	A-7
Table A-6	Residential and Nonresidential Construction Impact Assumptions.....	A-8
Table A-7	Construction Cost Estimates .....	A-9
Table A-8	Affordable Housing Impact.....	A-10
Table A-9	Regional Housing Needs Allocation Implications.....	A-11
Table A-10	Traffic Land Use Initiatives .....	A-12
Table A-11	Voter Initiative on Land Use .....	A-13
Table A-12	Land Use and Project Development Initiatives .....	A-14
Table A-13	Campaign Spending on Elections to Approve Projects Subject to Land Use Initiatives .....	A-15

**Table A-1**  
**City of Oxnard**  
**Measure "V" Initiative Analysis**  
**Summary of Potentially Impacted Residential, Commercial and Industrial Land Uses**

Land Use	No. of Projects	Total				Outside of Redevelopment Area			In Redevelopment Area		
		Units	Acres	Gross Sq. Ft. [1]	Estimated Employees	Units	Sq. Ft.	Estimated Employees	Units	sq. ft.	Estimated Employees
<b>Residential</b>											
Market Rate Residential	22	4,931	823.0	-	-	3,030	-	-	1,901	-	-
Residential - Affordable [1]	n/a	3,156	n/a	-	-	2,834	-	-	322	-	-
<b>Subtotal Residential</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>8,087</b>	<b>823.0</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>5,864</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>2,223</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>
<b>Nonresidential</b>											
Retail	16	-	97.7	993,172	2,216	-	663,156	1,478	-	330,016	738
Office	8	-	29.1	309,752	1,241	-	216,099	866	-	93,653	375
Industrial	15	-	822.0	13,740,839	13,746	-	13,740,839	13,746	-	0	0
<b>Subtotal Nonresidential</b>	<b>39</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>948.8</b>	<b>15,043,763</b>	<b>17,203</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>14,620,094</b>	<b>16,090</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>423,669</b>	<b>1,113</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>61</b>	<b>8,087</b>	<b>1,771.7</b>	<b>15,043,763</b>	<b>17,203</b>	<b>5,864</b>	<b>14,620,094</b>	<b>16,090</b>	<b>2,223</b>	<b>423,669</b>	<b>1,113</b>

"LU\_Sum"

Source: "Estimated Revenue Impacts to the City of Oxnard Finances Associated with the Oxnard Traffic Initiative," Weaver Research & Consulting Group (8/20/08), and EPS., City of Oxnard Planning Division, and EPS.

[1] Estimate based on Development Project List (July 2008) and assumptions regarding City's Inclusionary Ordinance and Redevelopment Area requirements.

**Table A-2  
City of Oxnard  
Measure "V" Initiative Analysis  
Impacted Residential, Commercial, and Industrial Land Uses by Type**

Project No.	Land Use	Units	Acres	Potential Gross Sq. Ft.	Redevelopment Project Area	Estimated Employees [1]
<b>Tier 1: Approved or Under Consideration for Approval before November 2008 [2]</b>						
<b>Residential Land Uses</b>						
1	DAL-Villa San Lorenzo	16	2.15	-	Yes	-
2	Gateway Walk	190	11.39	-	Yes	-
3	Cypress Road	159	9.00	-	Yes	-
4	Victoria/Hemlock	116	6.30	-	Yes	-
5	Wagon Wheel	1,144	58.00	-	Yes	-
6	Westwinds II	48	4.76	-	Yes	-
7	Casden	201	25.38	-	No	-
8	North Shore	292	9.00	-	No	-
9	South Shore (Ormond Beach North)	1,283	322.00	-	No	-
	<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>3,449</b>	<b>447.98</b>	<b>-</b>		<b>-</b>
<b>Retail Land Uses</b>						
10	Carriage Square/Lowe's	-	0.43	181,024	Yes	403
11	Wagon Wheel	-	2.40	58,612	Yes	131
12	Walgreen's	-	1.02	14,410	Yes	33
13	Gonzales & Rose - Rose Ranch	-	7.52	62,224	No	139
14	Statham Commercial	-	2.77	22,500	No	50
	<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>14.14</b>	<b>338,770</b>		<b>756</b>
<b>Office Land Uses</b>						
15	Wagon Wheel	-	0.60	14,653	Yes	59
16	Gonzales & Rose - Rose Ranch	-	7.00	15,556	No	63
	<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>7.60</b>	<b>30,209</b>		<b>122</b>
<b>Industrial Land Uses</b>						
17	1001 Del Norte - Quinn Rental	-	7.86	12,012	No	13
18	Teal Club / Victoria	-	9.42	80,407	No	81
19	Ormond Beach - South	-	375.00	4,000,000	No	4000
20	Rose at Eastman	-	0.63	33,000	No	33
21	Seagate	-	9.79	149,786	No	150
	<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>402.70</b>	<b>4,275,205</b>		<b>4,277</b>
<b>Subtotal - Tier 1</b>		<b>3,449</b>	<b>872.42</b>	<b>4,644,184</b>		<b>5,155</b>

ATTACHMENT 1  
PAGE 29 OF 42

**Table A-2  
City of Oxnard  
Measure "V" Initiative Analysis  
Impacted Residential, Commercial, and Industrial Land Uses by Type**

Project No.	Land Use	Units	Acres	Potential Gross Sq. Ft.	Redevelopment Project Area	Estimated Employees [1]
<b>Tier 2: Proposed Projects Unlikely to Receive Approval Before November</b>						
<b>Residential Land Uses</b>						
22	Arbor View (Mira Loma)	291	14.00	-	Yes	-
23	Colonial House - Mixed Use	40	0.41	-	Yes	-
24	Cypress Road - Paseo Nuevo	60	2.69	-	Yes	-
25	Rose/Pleasant Valley	99	5.27	-	Yes	-
26	Sixth Street Apartments	8	0.42	-	Yes	-
27	Press Courier Lofts	52	0.48	-	Yes	-
28	Artisan Apartments	272	12.29	-	No	-
29	Jones Ranch	2,500	165.00	-	No	-
30	Morton Condominiums	7	0.19	-	No	-
31	Reardon Apartments	8	0.48	-	No	-
32	Ventura/Vineyard	201	13.75	-	No	-
	<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>3,538</b>	<b>214.98</b>	<b>-</b>		<b>-</b>
<b>Retail Land Uses</b>						
33	Centerpoint Mall	-	6.75	12,780	Yes	29
34	Colonial House - Mixed Use	-	0.38	16,000	Yes	36
35	CVS Shopping Center	-	0.50	27,190	Yes	61
36	Shops at Vineyard	-	1.32	20,000	Yes	45
37	Jones Ranch	-	2.40	50,000	No	112
38	Oxnard Crossroads	-	0.17	11,326	No	26
39	Rose Ranch	-	9.88	77,800	No	173
40	Sakioka Farms	-	25.00	100,000	No	223
41	Tesco at Rose/Channel Islands	-	4.05	19,554	No	44
	<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>50.45</b>	<b>334,650</b>		<b>749</b>
<b>Office Land Uses</b>						
42	Radio Lazer	-	0.16	79,000	Yes	316
43	Sakioka Farms	-	20.00	67,233	No	269
44	Camino Real	-	0.60	101,250	No	405
45	Jones Ranch	-	0.60	12,500	No	50
46	Ventura Orthopedic	-	0.13	19,560	No	79
	<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>21.49</b>	<b>279,543</b>		<b>1,119</b>

ATTACHMENT 1  
 PAGE 30 OF 42

**Table A-2  
City of Oxnard  
Measure "V" Initiative Analysis  
Impacted Residential, Commercial, and Industrial Land Uses by Type**

Project No.	Land Use	Units	Acres	Potential Gross Sq. Ft.	Redevelopment Project Area	Estimated Employees [1]
<b>Tier 2 (Continued)</b>						
<b>Industrial Land Uses</b>						
47	1100 East Wooley	-	7.10	142,000	Yes	142
48	1950 Williams	-	12.46	74,430	No	75
49	2751 Statham - Lion's Gate	-	4.68	124,195	No	125
50	2801 Camino del Sol	-	6.41	27,903	No	28
51	3001 Paseo Mercado - Wallace	-	2.48	88,771	No	89
52	500 North Elevar - Gemini	-	1.58	30,797	No	31
53	Camino Real	-	34.00	573,750	No	574
54	Perkins Road/Magellan Ave	-	4.65	-	No	60
55	Sakioka Farms	-	343.00	8,332,767	No	8333
56	Sturgis/Del Norte	-	2.93	11,021	No	12
	<b>Subtotal</b>	-	<b>419.29</b>	<b>9,465,634</b>		<b>9,469</b>
<b>Subtotal - Tier 2</b>		<b>3,538</b>	<b>706.2</b>	<b>10,079,827</b>		<b>11,337</b>
<b>Tier 3: Preliminary Planning Process; Unlikely to Receive Approval Before November</b>						
<b>Residential Land Uses</b>						
57	Teal Club	1,100	160.00	-	No	-
	<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>1,100</b>	<b>160.00</b>	<b>-</b>		<b>-</b>
<b>Retail Land Uses</b>						
58	Teal Club	-	33.10	319,752	No	711
	<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>33.10</b>	<b>319,752</b>		<b>711</b>
<b>Subtotal - Tier 3</b>		<b>1,100</b>	<b>193.10</b>	<b>319,752</b>		<b>711</b>
<b>GRAND TOTAL</b>						
	Residential	8,087	822.96	-		-
	Retail	-	97.69	993,172		2,216
	Office	-	29.09	309,752		1,241
	Industrial	-	821.99	13,740,839		13,746
<b>TOTAL</b>		<b>8,087</b>	<b>1,771.73</b>	<b>15,043,763</b>		<b>17,203</b>

"LU"

Source: "Estimated Revenue Impacts to the City of Oxnard Finances Associated with the Oxnard Traffic Initiative," Weaver Research & Consulting Group (8/20/08), and EPS.

- [1] Assumes 450 sq. ft. per retail employee; 250 sq. ft. per office employee; and 1,000 sq. ft. per industrial employee, based on general employment assumptions by EPS.
- [2] Tier 1 projects are those that are 1) approved or 2) close to consideration for approval but unlikely to commence construction if approved. These projects are not likely to have vested rights to develop prior to the effective date of the voter-approved initiative.

ATTACHMENT 1  
PAGE 31 OF 42

Table A-3  
 City of Oxnard  
 Measure "V" Initiative Analysis  
 Summary of Direct Economic Impacts Foregone (2008\$)

Direct One-Time and Ongoing  
 Economic Impacts

Impact Category	One-Time Construction Impacts	Ongoing Annual Impacts
Direct Job Years/Employment [1]	29,687	17,187
<b>Direct Industry Output Impacts</b>		
Direct Industry Output (Excluding Compensation)	\$2,013,919,313	\$3,029,622,083
Direct Employee Compensation [2]	\$1,749,704,250	\$1,343,365,599
<b>Total Direct Industry Output</b>	<b>\$3,763,623,563</b>	<b>\$4,372,987,682</b>

*"sum\_impacts"*

Source: Minnesota IMPLAN Group and EPS.

[1] Reflects total job years over period of buildout of uses considered for one-time construction impacts.

    Reflects annual employment for ongoing annual impacts.

[2] A component of output representing industry profits and income earned by employees and business owners.

NOTE: Ongoing employment may not match Table A-1 because of rounding.

ATTACHMENT  
 PAGE 32  
 OF 42

Direct Annual  
Economic Impacts

**Table A-4**  
**City of Oxnard**  
**Measure "V" Initiative Analysis**  
**Estimated Annual Direct Output and Employment Impacts Foregone (2008\$)**

Land Use Category	Source/ Assumption	Formula	Nonresidential Land Uses			Total
			Retail	Office	Industrial	
Estimated Building Square Feet	Table A-3	<i>a</i>	993,172	309,752	13,740,839	<b>15,043,763</b>
Estimated Square Feet Per Employee	Table A-2	<i>b</i>	450	250	1,000	
<b>Estimated Total Employees</b>		$c = b / a$	<b>2,207</b>	<b>1,239</b>	<b>13,741</b>	<b>17,187</b>
Estimated Compensation per Employee [1]		<i>d</i>	\$29,581	\$72,668	\$86,460	
<b>Estimated Total Employee Compensation</b>		$e = c * d$	<b>\$65,285,145</b>	<b>\$90,035,147</b>	<b>\$1,188,045,306</b>	<b>\$1,343,365,599</b>
Estimated Industry Output per Employee [2]		<i>f</i>	\$70,772	\$186,248	\$290,083	
<b>Estimated Total Industry Output</b>		$g = c * f$	<b>\$156,193,611</b>	<b>\$230,761,318</b>	<b>\$3,986,032,753</b>	<b>\$4,372,987,682</b>

*"dir\_imp"*

Source: Minnesota Implan Group and EPS.

- [1] Estimated compensation per employee based on calculation of the weighted average compensation per employee for the 10 primary output generating industries in Ventura County for each land use category. Based on IMPLAN model of Ventura County economy as reported by IMPLAN using data from 2006. Values shown here inflated by U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, Consumer Price Index - All Urban Consumers Los Angeles Area to reflect 2008\$.
- [2] Estimated industry output per employee based on calculation of the weighted average industry output per employee for the 10 primary output generating industries in Ventura County for each land use category. Based on IMPLAN model of Ventura County economy as reported by IMPLAN using data from 2006. Values shown here inflated by U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, Consumer Price Index - All Urban Consumers Los Angeles Area to reflect 2008\$.

ATTACHMENT  
PAGE 33 OF 42

One-Time Direct  
Economic Impacts

**Table A-5**  
**City of Oxnard**  
**Measure "V" Initiative Analysis**  
**Estimated Direct Economic Impact of New Residential and Nonresidential Construction (2008\$)**

Land Use	Assumed Implan Sector	Construction Industry Output	Output per Employee	Employees (Job Years)	Compensation Per Employee	Construction Emp. Compensation
			[1,2]	[1,3]	[1,4,5]	
<i>Formula</i>		<i>A</i>	<i>B</i>	<i>C = A / B</i>	<i>D</i>	<i>E = C * D</i>
<b>Residential Land Uses</b>						
Single-Family Units						
Detached	New Residential 1-Unit Structures	\$512,845,525	\$171,193	2,996	\$58,709	\$175,875,481
Attached	New Multifamily Housing Structures - All	\$989,592,560	\$135,277	7,315	\$58,709	\$429,474,058
Multifamily Units	New Multifamily Housing Structures - All	\$217,871,422	\$135,277	1,611	\$58,100	\$93,572,631
Affordable Single-Family Units	New Multifamily Housing Structures - All	\$581,590,627	\$135,277	4,299	\$58,100	\$249,784,779
<b>Subtotal Residential Land Uses</b>		<b>\$2,301,900,135</b>		<b>16,221</b>		<b>\$948,706,948</b>
<b>Nonresidential Land Uses</b>						
Retail	Commercial and Institutional Buildings	\$135,038,220	\$117,520	1,149	\$58,640	\$67,381,423
Office	Commercial and Institutional Buildings	\$36,222,558	\$121,395	298	\$60,574	\$18,074,346
Industrial	Manufacturing and Industrial Buildings	\$1,290,462,650	\$107,375	12,018	\$59,538	\$715,541,533
<b>Subtotal Nonresidential Land Uses</b>		<b>\$1,461,723,428</b>		<b>13,466</b>		<b>\$800,997,301</b>
<b>Total Residential and Nonresidential Land Uses</b>		<b>\$3,763,623,563</b>		<b>29,687</b>		<b>\$1,749,704,250</b>

*"construction\_sum"*

Source: MIG Inc. and EPS.

- [1] Impacts are measured based on County level data.
- [2] Estimated output per employee based on 2006 countywide IMPLAN data for each industry sector. Output per employee has been inflated by the U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, Consumer Price Index - All Urban Consumers Los Angeles Area to reflect 2008\$.
- [3] Employment, which includes both full-time and part-time workers, represents total employment over buildout of the identified land uses, and therefore reflects total job years as opposed number of jobs. Not all workers are assumed to be residents of the City of Oxnard.
- [4] Employee compensation figures include self-employment and proprietary income.
- [5] Estimated compensation per employee based on 2006 countywide IMPLAN data for each industry sector. Employee compensation has been inflated by U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, Consumer Price Index - All Urban Consumers Los Angeles Area to reflect 2008\$.

ATTACHMENT  
PAGE 34 OF 42

Table A-6  
 City of Oxnard  
 Measure "V" Initiative Analysis  
 Residential and Nonresidential Construction Impact Assumptions (2008\$)

Development	Estimated Construction Cost			Number of Units	Total Construction Cost
	Cost per Sq. Ft. [1]	Estimated Bldg. Sq. Ft. [2]	Cost per Unit		
<i>Formula</i>	<i>a</i>	<i>b</i>	<i>c = a * b</i>	<i>d</i>	<i>e = c * d</i>
<b>Residential Land Uses</b>		<i>per unit</i>			
Single-Family Units					
Detached	\$126.07	2,430	\$306,359	1,674	\$512,845,525
Attached	\$126.94	2,075	\$263,400	3,757	\$989,592,560
<b>Subtotal</b>				<b>5,431</b>	<b>\$1,502,438,085</b>
Multifamily Units	\$178.62	870	\$155,400	1,402	\$217,871,422
Affordable Single-Family Units	\$178.62	1,000	\$178,621	3,256	\$581,590,627
<b>Subtotal Residential Land Uses</b>				<b>10,089</b>	<b>\$2,301,900,135</b>
<i>Formula</i>	<i>a</i>	<i>b</i>			<i>c = a * b</i>
<b>Nonresidential Land Uses</b>					
Retail Building Square Feet	\$135.97	993,172	-	-	\$135,038,220
Office Building Square Feet	\$167.62	216,099	-	-	\$36,222,558
Industrial Building Square Feet	\$93.91	13,740,839	-	-	\$1,290,462,650
<b>Subtotal Nonresidential Land Uses</b>		<b>14,950,110</b>			<b>\$1,461,723,428</b>
<b>Total Residential and Nonresidential Land Uses</b>					<b>\$3,763,623,563</b>

"constr"

Source: MIG, Inc.; Reed Construction Data 2008 RSMeans Square Foot Costs; and EPS.

- [1] EPS estimate based on 2008 RSMeans costs. See Table A-7 for detailed calculations.
- [2] Residential building square footage based on the following assumptions:
  - Single-Family (Detached) = 2,430 sq. ft.
  - Single-Family (Attached) = 2,075 sq. ft.
  - Multifamily (Attached) = 870 sq. ft.
  - Affordable = 1,000 sq. ft.

**Table A-7  
City of Oxnard  
Measure "V" Initiative Analysis  
Construction Cost Estimates (2008\$)**

Assumption	Project Land Uses					
	Single-Family (Detached)	Single-Family (Attached)	Multifamily/ Affordable	Commercial/ Retail	Commercial/ Office	Industrial
Building Type	Average 1 Story	Average 2 Story	1 - 3 Story Apartment Complex	M.630 Store, Retail	M.460 Office, 2-4 Story	M.690 Warehouse
Reference Building Size	2,400 sq. ft.	2,000 sq. ft.	36,000 sq. ft.	65,000 sq. ft.	80,000 sq. ft.	60,000 sq. ft.
Exterior Wall	Brick Veneer - Wood Frame	Brick Veneer - Wood Frame	Face Brick w/ Concrete Block Back-up	Face Brick w/ Concrete Block Back-up	Face Brick w/ Concrete Block Back- up	Concrete Block
Base Cost per Sq. Ft.	\$94.65	\$95.30	\$134.10	\$103.95	\$128.15	\$71.80
Total Cost	\$227,160	\$190,600	\$4,827,600	\$6,756,750	\$10,252,000	\$4,308,000
Contingency [1]	20%	20%	20%	20%	20%	20%
Total Cost per Sq. Ft.	\$113.58	\$114.36	\$160.92	\$124.74	\$153.78	\$86.16
Location Factor (Zip code 956-) [2]	1.11	1.11	1.11	1.09	1.09	1.09
Adjusted Cost per Sq. Ft.	\$126.07	\$126.94	\$178.62	\$135.97	\$167.62	\$93.91
<b>2008 Estimated Cost per Sq. Ft.</b>	<b>\$126.07</b>	<b>\$126.94</b>	<b>\$178.62</b>	<b>\$135.97</b>	<b>\$167.62</b>	<b>\$93.91</b>
<b>2008 Estimated Cost per Unit</b>	<b>\$303,000</b>	<b>\$254,000</b>	<b>\$6,430,000</b>			

"constr\_dtl"

Source: Reed Construction Data, 2008 RSMeans Square Foot Costs, 29th Annual Ed.; and EPS.

Note: Building type, size, and materials are all general references from RSMeans used to represent a typical building development in order to estimate typical construction costs. These references are not intended to specify the exact type, size, and materials in the Project area and should not be considered as such.

[1] EPS assumption.

[2] Assumes an adjusted cost related to geographical location, as provided by RSMeans.

**Table A-8  
City of Oxnard  
Measure "V" Initiative Analysis  
Affordable Housing Impact**

Based on Initiative Language [1]

Item	Formula	Income Range				Above Moderate (Mkt Rate)
		Very Low	Low	Moderate	Total Affordable	
RHNA Allocation (1998 - 2005)	a	797	489	505	1,791	1,507
Completed for 1998 - 2005	b	410	465	54	929	4,452
Remainder <i>(Additional Units Permitted After Initiative Effective Date)</i>	c = a - b	387	24	451	862	(2,945)
<b>Pipeline and Recently-Completed Affordable Projects</b>						
<b>Assisted Projects</b>						
Paseo De Luz		43			43	
Las Cortes		8	94		102	
Colonia Villas			24		24	
Sycamore Senior Apts.		23	205		228	
<b>Total Assisted Pipeline</b>	d	<b>74</b>	<b>323</b>		<b>397</b>	
Exempt Inclusionary Pipeline ( <i>Estimate</i> )	e	483	128		611	
<b>Total Exempt Affordable Units</b>	f = c + d + e	<b>944</b>	<b>475</b>	<b>451</b>	<b>1,870</b>	

"aff\_sum"

Sources: City of Oxnard, EPS

[1] Based on Interpretation of Section 5, Paragraph C of Initiative Language.

ATTACHMENT 1  
PAGE 37 OF 42

**Table A-9  
City of Oxnard  
Measure "V" Initiative Analysis  
Regional Housing Needs Allocation Implications**

Category	Total	Income Range			
		Very Low	Low	Moderate	Above Moderate (Mkt Rate)
RHNA Allocation (2006 - 2014)	7,093	1,491	1,221	1,445	2,936
Completed and Pipeline Projects Not Impacted [1]	5,818	1,101	688	580	4,834
Net RHNA Allocation (2006 - 2014)	1,275	390	533	865	(1,898)
At Risk Units	8,085	544	610	2,000	4,931

"aff\_projects"

Sources: City of Oxnard July 2008 Development Project List, and EPS.

Note: Affordability level breakdowns are EPS estimates base on assumptions regarding application of the City's Inclusionary Zoning Ordinance and other identified affordable developments.

[1] Reflects projects as of August 2008.

**Table A-10**  
**City of Oxnard**  
**Measure "V" Initiative Analysis**  
**Traffic Land Use Initiatives**

City	Year	Initiative	Election Results	Status	Description	Subsequent Elections
Newport Beach	2000	Measure S - Newport Beach Traffic Plan Initiative	Passed	N/A	Requires a vote on General Plan Amendments greater than: 100 housing units; 100 peak hour auto trips; 40,000 sq. ft. building space; than what the general plan allows.	1. Office Tower Koll Center Measure G 2001 (Failed)  2. Waterfront luxury hotel Measure L 2004 (Failed)
Newport Beach	2006	Measure X - Greenlight II	Failed	N/A	Would require a vote if project adds same amounts of housing units, auto trips, building space, regardless of general plan allowances	No
Ojai	2002	Measure C - Proposed zone changes and adverse traffic impacts	Failed	N/A	Should proposed zone changes and discretionary development projects which cause any adverse traffic impacts on local roadways be denied unless feasible, ascertainable mitigation measures are available and adopted? The measure excepts single family dwellings on existing legal lots and City special events. The measure does not exempt affordable housing.	N/A
Redondo Beach	2008	Petitioning for signatures	N/A	Signature Collection Deadline 12/31/07	Major change in allowable land use that surpasses certain density and traffic thresholds of more than 150 new vehicle trips during peak hours, building space of 40,000 sq. ft., the project would be tested in a citywide election where voters could block it.	N/A
Oxnard	2007	Petitioning for signatures	N/A	Recirculating new petition	N/A	N/A

"traffic\_initiatives"

Source: League of Women Voters, Building a Better Redondo Website, Daily Pilot, and Orange County Register.com.

ATTACHMENT  
 PAGE 39 OF 42

**Table A-11  
City of Oxnard  
Measure "V" Initiative Analysis  
Voter Initiative on Land Use - All Category**

---

**Other cities that vote on large scale development projects**

---

Newport Beach, CA	Huntington Beach, CA
Mission Viejo, CA	Imperial Beach, CA
Yorba Linda, CA	Livermore, CA
Alameda, CA	Loma Linda, CA
Chino Hills, CA	Modesto, CA
Davis, CA	Palo Alto, CA
El Dorado County, CA	Sierra Madre, CA
Escondido, CA	Tracy, CA

---

"voter"

Source: Building a Better Redondo Website.

Table A-12  
 City of Oxnard  
 Measure "V" Initiative Analysis  
 Land Use and Project Development Initiatives

City	Year	Initiative	Election Results	Project	Project Status	Description
Cotati	2003	Measure B	Passed	Lowes Home Improvement Store	Construction completed	This initiative measure proposes to amend the City of Cotati General Plan and Zoning Ordinance to modify an existing size limitation on retail occupancy within the City of Cotati. The measure, if approved by a simple majority of the electorate, would permit the use or occupancy by a commercial retail establishment of more than 43,000 square feet of gross floor area in a limited area of the City, west of U.S. 101 and north of State Highway 116. In all other areas of the City, the use or occupancy by a commercial retail establishment of more than 43,000 square feet of gross floor area would continue to be prohibited.
Davis	2006	Measure K	Passed	Target Store	Construction anticipated April 2008	Shall the City Council's approve the Second Street Crossing Project, a retail development of approximately 183,000 square feet, including a General Merchandise Store of 137,000 square feet and other retail buildings totaling 46,000 square feet, including a General Plan Amendment, be ratified?
Livermore	2005	Measure D	Failed	Residential Development	Project failed	Shall the people of Livermore amend the Livermore General Plan concerning the North Livermore Urban Growth Boundary and other provisions to permit 2,450 units of residential development and related public facilities in North Livermore?
Lodi	2004	Measure R	Failed	Retail Development	Project failed	Shall the ordinance prohibiting the construction of new, rebuilt, or expanded retail structures in excess of 125,000 square feet (including outside retail sales areas) unless approved by the City Council and a majority of the voters voting at a city wide election be adopted?
Newport	2001	Measure G	Failed	Koll Center	Project failed	The Koll Center Newport expansion project proposing a 10-story office building at MacArthur Boulevard and Jamboree Road.
Newport	2004	Measure L	Failed	Waterfront Luxury Hotel	Project failed	Shall the Newport Beach General Plan designations for Marinapark be amended from Recreation and Environmental Open Space to Recreational and Marine Commercial to permit a resort with a maximum of 110 guest units (including twelve timeshare units) and 96,000 square feet?
Pacifica	2006	Measure L	Failed	Mixed-Use Development	Project failed	Shall the Initiative authorizing the City of Pacifica City Council to approve a mixed-use residential and commercial development on the Rockaway Quarry, subject to specified conditions, be adopted?

*"initiative\_description"*

Source: Smartvoter Web site, City of Davis, El Toro Chronicles, and Orange County Register Web site.

ATTACHMENT 1  
 PAGE 41 OF 42

**Table A-13  
 City of Oxnard  
 Measure "V" Initiative Analysis  
 Campaign Spending on Elections to Approve Projects Subject to Land Use Initiatives**

	<b>Moorpark</b>	<b>Santa Paula</b>	<b>Newport</b>	<b>Newport</b>	<b>Livermore</b>	<b>Pacifica</b>	<b>Davis</b>
<b>County</b>	Ventura	Ventura	Orange	Orange	Alameda	San Mateo	Yolo
<b>Initiative</b>	Measure A6	Measure Y	Measure G	Measure L	Measure D	Measure L	Measure K
<b>Year</b>	2006	2006	2001	2004	2005	2006	2006
<b>Expenditures [1]</b>							
Administrative Costs	\$263,000	\$89,430	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Proponents	N/A	N/A	\$165,000	\$207,897	\$3,250,000	\$1,310,384	\$385,923
Opponents	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	\$210,203	N/A	\$24,815
<b>Subtotal of Expenditures</b>	<b>\$263,000</b>	<b>\$89,430</b>	<b>\$165,000</b>	<b>\$207,897</b>	<b>\$3,460,203</b>	<b>\$1,310,384</b>	<b>\$410,738</b>
<b>Election Type</b>	Special	Special	Special	General	General	General	General

"campaign\_spending"

Source: City of Moorpark, City of Santa Paula, City of Newport, City of Davis, Oakland Tribune, and Pacific Quarry Website.

[1] Based on unconfirmed reports from various jurisdictions.

ATTACHMENT 1  
 PAGE 42 OF 42