

| CITY Property Transfer Tax Revenue Summary Table | | | | |
|---|------------------------------|--------------------------------|----------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| | Buildout Phase | | | |
| | Phase I (Yrs 1-5) | Phase II (Yrs 6-10) | Phase III (Yrs 11-15) | Phase IV (Yrs 16-20) |
| Total tax revenue from residential development | \$172,301 | \$236,855 | \$292,053 | \$355,544 |
| Total tax revenue from industrial development | \$14,365 | \$14,874 | \$15,440 | \$16,012 |
| Total property transfer tax revenue from all development | \$186,666 | \$251,729 | \$307,493 | \$371,556 |

| RIVERSIDE COUNTY Property Transfer Tax Revenue Summary Table | | | | |
|---|------------------------------|--------------------------------|----------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| | Buildout Phase | | | |
| | Phase I (Yrs 1-5) | Phase II (Yrs 6-10) | Phase III (Yrs 11-15) | Phase IV (Yrs 16-20) |
| Total tax revenue from residential development | \$172,301 | \$236,855 | \$292,053 | \$355,544 |
| Total tax revenue from industrial development | \$14,364 | \$14,873 | \$15,440 | \$16,012 |
| Total property transfer tax revenue from all development | \$186,665 | \$251,728 | \$307,493 | \$371,556 |

**Public Safety Tax Revenue
 from Residential Development**

| <i>Land Use Designation: Rural Desert (0-1 du/10 ac)</i> <i>Total No. Acres Lost to Conservation: 936 acres</i> <i>No. of Potential Buildout Units: 72</i> | Buildout Phase | | | |
|--|-------------------------------|---------------------------------|-----------------------------------|----------------------------------|
| | Phase I (Yrs. 1-5) | Phase II (Yrs. 6-10) | Phase III (Yrs. 11-15) | Phase IV (Yrs. 16-20) |
| Number of acres developed during phase | 234 | 234 | 234 | 234 |
| Maximum density permitted (units/acre) | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 |
| Maximum potential units constructed during this phase ¹ | 18 | 18 | 18 | 18 |
| Number of total potential units constructed at buildout | 18 | 36 | 54 | 72 |
| Safety Tax Rate (per unit) | \$120.87 | \$120.87 | \$120.87 | \$120.87 |
| Public Safety Tax revenue from developed lands | \$2,176 | \$4,351 | \$6,527 | \$8,703 |
| Balance of vacant units at phase buildout | 54.00 | 36.00 | 18.00 | 0.00 |
| Safety Tax Rate (per vacant acre) | \$8.57 | \$8.57 | \$8.57 | \$8.57 |
| Public Safety Tax revenue from vacant lands | \$463 | \$309 | \$154 | \$0 |
| Total revenue from safety tax at phase buildout | \$2,639 | \$4,660 | \$6,681 | \$8,703 |

¹ = Assumes 75% of total number of units possible at maximum permitted density

| <i>Land Use Designation: Residential Estates (0-1 du/10 ac)</i> <i>Total No. Acres Lost to Conservation: 233 acres</i> <i>No. of Potential Buildout Units: 16</i> | Buildout Phase | | | |
|---|-------------------------------|---------------------------------|-----------------------------------|----------------------------------|
| | Phase I (Yrs. 1-5) | Phase II (Yrs. 6-10) | Phase III (Yrs. 11-15) | Phase IV (Yrs. 16-20) |
| Number of acres developed during phase* | 58.25 | 58.25 | 58.25 | 58.25 |
| Maximum density permitted (units/acre)* | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 |
| Maximum potential units constructed during this phase ¹ | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 |
| Number of total potential units constructed at buildout | 4 | 8 | 12 | 16 |
| Safety Tax Rate (per unit) | \$120.87 | \$120.87 | \$120.87 | \$120.87 |
| Public Safety Tax revenue from developed lands | \$483 | \$967 | \$1,450 | \$1,934 |
| Balance of vacant acreage at phase buildout | 12.00 | 8.00 | 4.00 | 0.00 |
| Safety Tax Rate (per vacant acre) | \$8.57 | \$8.57 | \$8.57 | \$8.57 |
| Public Safety Tax revenue from vacant lands | \$103 | \$69 | \$34 | \$0 |
| Total revenue from safety tax at phase buildout | \$586 | \$1,036 | \$1,484 | \$1,934 |

¹= Assumes 75% of total number of units possible at maximum permitted density

| Land Use Designation: Rural Residential (0-1 du/5ac) Total No. Acres Lost to Conservation: 465 acres No. of Potential Buildout Units: 68 | Buildout Phase | | | |
|---|-------------------------------|---------------------------------|-----------------------------------|----------------------------------|
| | Phase I (Yrs. 1-5) | Phase II (Yrs. 6-10) | Phase III (Yrs. 11-15) | Phase IV (Yrs. 16-20) |
| Number of acres developed during phase* | 116.25 | 116.25 | 116.25 | 116.25 |
| Maximum density permitted (units/acre)* | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.2 |
| Maximum potential units constructed during this phase ¹ | 17 | 17 | 17 | 17 |
| Number of total potential units constructed at buildout | 17 | 34 | 51 | 68 |
| Safety Tax Rate (per unit) | \$120.87 | \$120.87 | \$120.87 | \$120.87 |
| Public Safety Tax revenue from developed lands | \$2,055 | \$4,110 | \$6,164 | \$8,219 |
| Balance of vacant acreage at phase buildout | 51.00 | 34.00 | 17.00 | 0.00 |
| Safety Tax Rate (per vacant acre) | \$8.57 | \$8.57 | \$8.57 | \$8.57 |
| Public Safety Tax revenue from vacant lands | \$437 | \$291 | \$146 | \$0 |
| Total revenue from safety tax at phase buildout | \$2,492 | \$4,401 | \$6,310 | \$8,219 |

¹= Assumes 75% of total number of units possible at maximum permitted density

| Land Use Designation: Low Density (0-5 du/ac) Total No. Acres Lost to Conservation: 259 acres No. of Potential Buildout Units: 972 | Buildout Phase | | | |
|--|-----------------------|-------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------|
| | Phase I (Yrs. 1-5) | Phase II (Yrs. 6-10) | Phase III (Yrs. 11-15) | Phase IV (Yrs. 16-20) |
| Number of acres developed during phase | 64.75 | 64.75 | 64.75 | 64.75 |
| Maximum density permitted (units/acre) | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 |
| Maximum potential units constructed during this phase ¹ | 243 | 243 | 243 | 243 |
| Number of total potential units constructed at buildout | 243 | 486 | 729 | 972 |
| Safety Tax Rate (per unit) | \$120.87 | \$120.87 | \$120.87 | \$120.87 |
| Public Safety Tax revenue from developed lands | \$29,372 | \$58,743 | \$88,115 | \$117,487 |
| Balance of vacant acreage at phase buildout | 729.00 | 486.00 | 243.00 | 0.00 |
| Safety Tax Rate (per vacant acre) | \$8.57 | \$8.57 | \$8.57 | \$8.57 |
| Public Safety Tax revenue from vacant lands | \$6,248 | \$4,165 | \$2,083 | \$0 |
| Total revenue from safety tax at phase buildout | \$35,620 | \$62,908 | \$90,198 | \$117,487 |

¹= Assumes 75% of total number of units possible at maximum permitted density

| | Buildout Phase | | | |
|--|-----------------------|-------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------|
| | Phase I (Yrs. 1-5) | Phase II (Yrs. 6-10) | Phase III (Yrs. 11-15) | Phase IV (Yrs. 16-20) |
| Land Use Designation: Low Density, Specific Plan (0-5 du/acre) Total No. Acres Lost to Conservation: 1,167 acres No. of Potential Buildout Units: 4,376 | | | | |
| Number of acres developed during phase | 291.75 | 291.75 | 291.75 | 291.75 |
| Maximum density permitted (units/acre) | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 |
| Maximum potential units constructed during this phase ¹ | 1094 | 1094 | 1094 | 1094 |
| Number of total potential units constructed at buildout | 1094 | 2,188 | 3,282 | 4,376 |
| Safety Tax Rate (per unit) | \$120.87 | \$120.87 | \$120.87 | \$120.87 |
| Public Safety Tax revenue from developed lands | \$132,233 | \$264,466 | \$396,699 | \$528,932 |
| Balance of vacant acreage at phase buildout | 3,282.00 | 2,188.00 | 1,094.00 | 0.00 |
| Safety Tax Rate (per vacant acre) | \$8.57 | \$8.57 | \$8.57 | \$8.57 |
| Public Safety Tax revenue from vacant lands | \$28,127 | \$18,751 | \$9,376 | \$0 |
| Total revenue from safety tax at phase buildout | \$160,360 | \$283,217 | \$406,075 | \$528,932 |

¹= Assumes 75% of total number of units possible at maximum permitted density

| | Buildout Phase | | | |
|--|-----------------------|-------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------|
| | Phase I (Yrs. 1-5) | Phase II (Yrs. 6-10) | Phase III (Yrs. 11-15) | Phase IV (Yrs. 16-20) |
| Land Use Designation: Medium Density (0-8 du/acre) | | | | |
| Total No. Acres Lost to Conservation: 16 acres | | | | |
| No. of Potential Buildout Units: 96 | | | | |
| Number of acres developed during phase | 4.00 | 4.00 | 4.00 | 4.00 |
| Maximum density permitted (units/acre) | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 |
| Maximum potential units constructed during this phase ¹ | 24 | 24 | 24 | 24 |
| Number of total potential units constructed at buildout | 24 | 48 | 72 | 96 |
| Safety Tax Rate (per unit) | \$67.60 | \$67.60 | \$67.60 | \$67.60 |
| Public Safety Tax revenue from developed lands | \$1,622 | \$3,245 | \$4,867 | \$6,490 |
| Balance of vacant acreage at phase buildout | 72.00 | 48.00 | 24.00 | 0.00 |
| Safety Tax Rate (per vacant acre) | \$8.57 | \$8.57 | \$8.57 | \$8.57 |
| Public Safety Tax revenue from vacant lands | \$617 | \$411 | \$206 | \$0 |
| Total revenue from safety tax at phase buildout | \$2,239 | \$3,656 | \$5,073 | \$6,490 |

¹= Assumes 75% of total number of units possible at maximum permitted density

| | Buildout Phase | | | |
|---|-----------------------|-------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------|
| | Phase I (Yrs. 1-5) | Phase II (Yrs. 6-10) | Phase III (Yrs. 11-15) | Phase IV (Yrs. 16-20) |
| Land Use Designation: High Density, Specific Plan (0-14 du/acre) Total No. Acres Lost to Conservation: 47 acres No. of Potential Buildout Units: 492 | | | | |
| Number of acres developed during phase | 11.75 | 11.75 | 11.75 | 11.75 |
| Maximum density permitted (units/acre) | 14 | 14 | 14 | 14 |
| Maximum potential units constructed during this phase ¹ | 123 | 123 | 123 | 123 |
| Number of total potential units constructed at buildout | 123 | 246 | 369 | 492 |
| Safety Tax Rate (per unit) | \$38.72 | \$38.72 | \$38.72 | \$38.72 |
| Public Safety Tax revenue from developed lands | \$4,763 | \$9,525 | \$14,288 | \$19,050 |
| Balance of vacant acreage at phase buildout | 369.00 | 246.00 | 123.00 | 0.00 |
| Safety Tax Rate (per vacant acre) | \$8.57 | \$8.57 | \$8.57 | \$8.57 |
| Public Safety Tax revenue from vacant lands | \$3,162 | \$2,108 | \$1,054 | \$0 |
| Total revenue from safety tax at phase buildout | \$7,925 | \$11,633 | \$15,342 | \$19,050 |

¹= Assumes 75% of total number of units possible at maximum permitted density

| <i>Land Use Designation: Light Industrial (I-L)</i> <i>Total No. Acres Lost to Conservation: 28 acres</i> <i>Potential Square Feet at Buildout: 414,692</i> | Buildout Phase | | | |
|---|-------------------------------|---------------------------------|-----------------------------------|----------------------------------|
| | Phase I (Yrs. 1-5) | Phase II (Yrs. 6-10) | Phase III (Yrs. 11-15) | Phase IV (Yrs. 16-20) |
| Number of developable acres | 7.00 | 7.00 | 7.00 | 7.00 |
| Total number of acres constructed at phase buildout ¹ | 2.38 | 4.76 | 7.14 | 9.52 |
| Safety Tax Rate (per developed acre) | \$521.91 | \$521.91 | \$521.91 | \$521.91 |
| Public Safety Tax revenue from developed lands | \$1,242 | \$2,484 | \$3,726 | \$4,969 |
| Balance of vacant acreage at phase buildout | 21.00 | 14.00 | 7.00 | 0.00 |
| Safety Tax Rate (per vacant acre) | \$2.36 | \$2.36 | \$2.36 | \$2.36 |
| Public Safety Tax revenue from vacant lands | \$50 | \$33 | \$17 | \$0 |
| Total revenue from safety tax at phase buildout | \$1,292 | \$2,517 | \$3,743 | \$4,969 |

¹= Assumes 34% building coverage

| <i>Land Use Designation: Light Industrial (LI)</i> <i>Total No. Acres Lost to Conservation: 89 acres</i> <i>Potential Square Feet at Buildout: 1,318,124</i> | Buildout Phase | | | |
|--|-------------------------------|---------------------------------|-----------------------------------|----------------------------------|
| | Phase I (Yrs. 1-5) | Phase II (Yrs. 6-10) | Phase III (Yrs. 11-15) | Phase IV (Yrs. 16-20) |
| Number of developable acres | 22.25 | 22.25 | 22.25 | 22.25 |
| Total number of acres constructed at phase buildout ¹ | 7.57 | 15.13 | 22.70 | 30.26 |
| Safety Tax Rate (per developed acre) | \$521.91 | \$521.91 | \$521.91 | \$521.91 |
| Public Safety Tax revenue from developed lands | \$3,948 | \$7,897 | \$11,845 | \$15,793 |
| Balance of vacant acreage at phase buildout | 66.75 | 44.50 | 22.25 | 0.00 |
| Safety Tax Rate (per acre) | \$2.36 | \$2.36 | \$2.36 | \$2.36 |
| Public Safety Tax revenue from vacant lands | \$158 | \$105 | \$53 | \$0 |
| Total revenue from safety tax at phase buildout | \$4,106 | \$8,002 | \$11,898 | \$15,793 |

¹= Assume 34% building coverage

| Public Safety Tax Revenue Summary Table (Desert Hot Springs Only) | Buildout Phase | | | |
|--|----------------------|------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------|
| | Phase I (Yrs 1-5) | Phase II (Yrs 6-10) | Phase III (Yrs 11-15) | Phase IV (Yrs 16-20) |
| Total tax revenue from residential development | \$211,861 | \$371,511 | \$531,163 | \$690,815 |
| Total tax revenue from industrial development | \$5,398 | \$10,519 | \$15,641 | \$20,762 |
| Total Public Safety tax revenue from all development | \$217,259 | \$382,030 | \$546,804 | \$711,577 |

**TUMF Revenue
 from Residential Development**

| <i>Land Use Designation: Rural Desert (0-1 du/10 ac)</i> <i>Total No. Acres Lost to Conservation: 936 acres</i> <i>No. of Potential Buildout Units: 72</i> | Buildout Phase | | | |
|--|-------------------------------|---------------------------------|-----------------------------------|----------------------------------|
| | Phase I (Yrs. 1-5) | Phase II (Yrs. 6-10) | Phase III (Yrs. 11-15) | Phase IV (Yrs. 16-20) |
| Number of acres developed during phase | 234 | 234 | 234 | 234 |
| Maximum density permitted (units/acre) | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 |
| Maximum potential units constructed during this phase ¹ | 18 | 18 | 18 | 18 |
| TUMF fee rate (per dwelling unit) | \$1,837 | \$1,837 | \$1,837 | \$1,837 |
| TUMF fee collected | \$33,074 | \$33,074 | \$33,074 | \$33,074 |

¹= Assumes 75% of the total number of units possible, at maximum permitted density

| <i>Land Use Designation: Residential Estates (0-1 du/10 ac)</i> <i>Total No. Acres Lost to Conservation: 233 acres</i> <i>No. of Potential Buildout Units: 16</i> | Buildout Phase | | | |
|---|-------------------------------|---------------------------------|-----------------------------------|----------------------------------|
| | Phase I (Yrs. 1-5) | Phase II (Yrs. 6-10) | Phase III (Yrs. 11-15) | Phase IV (Yrs. 16-20) |
| Number of acres developed during phase | 58.25 | 58.25 | 58.25 | 58.25 |
| Maximum density permitted (units/acre) | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 |
| Maximum potential units constructed during this phase ¹ | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 |
| TUMF fee rate (per dwelling unit) | \$1,837 | \$1,837 | \$1,837 | \$1,837 |
| TUMF fee collected | \$7,350 | \$7,350 | \$7,350 | \$7,350 |

¹= Assumes 75% of the total number of units possible, at maximum permitted density

| Land Use Designation: Rural Residential (0-1 du/5ac) Total No. Acres Lost to Conservation: 465 acres No. of Potential Buildout Units: 68 | Buildout Phase | | | |
|--|-----------------------|-------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------|
| | Phase I (Yrs. 1-5) | Phase II (Yrs. 6-10) | Phase III (Yrs. 11-15) | Phase IV (Yrs. 16-20) |
| Number of acres developed during phase | 116.25 | 116.25 | 116.25 | 116.25 |
| Maximum density permitted (units/acre) | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.2 |
| Maximum potential units constructed during this phase ¹ | 17 | 17 | 17 | 17 |
| TUMF fee rate (per dwelling unit) | \$1,837 | \$1,837 | \$1,837 | \$1,837 |
| TUMF fee collected | \$31,236 | \$31,236 | \$31,236 | \$31,236 |

¹= Assumes 75% of the total number of units possible, at maximum permitted density

| Land Use Designation: Low Density (0-5 du/acre) Total No. Acres Lost to Conservation: 259 acres No. of Potential Buildout Units: 972 | Buildout Phase | | | |
|---|-------------------------------|---------------------------------|-----------------------------------|----------------------------------|
| | Phase I (Yrs. 1-5) | Phase II (Yrs. 6-10) | Phase III (Yrs. 11-15) | Phase IV (Yrs. 16-20) |
| Number of acres developed during phase | 64.75 | 64.75 | 64.75 | 64.75 |
| Maximum density permitted (units/acre) | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 |
| Maximum potential units constructed during this phase ¹ | 243 | 243 | 243 | 243 |
| TUMF fee rate (per dwelling unit) | \$1,837 | \$1,837 | \$1,837 | \$1,837 |
| TUMF fee collected | \$446,498 | \$446,498 | \$446,498 | \$446,498 |

¹= Assumes 75% of the total number of units possible, at maximum permitted density

| Land Use Designation: Low Density, Specific Plan (0-5 du/acre) Total No. Acres Lost to Conservation: 1,167 acres No. of Potential Buildout Units: 4,376 | Buildout Phase | | | |
|---|-------------------------------|---------------------------------|-----------------------------------|----------------------------------|
| | Phase I (Yrs. 1-5) | Phase II (Yrs. 6-10) | Phase III (Yrs. 11-15) | Phase IV (Yrs. 16-20) |
| Number of acres developed during phase | 291.75 | 291.75 | 291.75 | 291.75 |
| Maximum density permitted (units/acre) | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 |
| Maximum potential units constructed during this phase ¹ | 1,094 | 1,094 | 1,094 | 1,094 |
| TUMF fee rate (per dwelling unit) | \$1,837 | \$1,837 | \$1,837 | \$1,837 |
| TUMF fee collected | \$2,010,159 | \$2,010,159 | \$2,010,159 | \$2,010,159 |

¹= Assumes 75% of the total number of units possible, at maximum permitted density

| Land Use Designation: Medium Density (0-8 du/acre) Total No. Acres Lost to Conservation: 16 acres No. of Potential Buildout Units: 96 | Buildout Phase | | | |
|--|-------------------------------|---------------------------------|-----------------------------------|----------------------------------|
| | Phase I (Yrs. 1-5) | Phase II (Yrs. 6-10) | Phase III (Yrs. 11-15) | Phase IV (Yrs. 16-20) |
| Number of acres developed during phase | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 |
| Maximum density permitted (units/acre) | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 |
| Maximum potential units constructed during this phase ¹ | 24 | 24 | 24 | 24 |
| TUMF fee rate (per dwelling unit) | \$1,837 | \$1,837 | \$1,837 | \$1,837 |
| TUMF fee collected | \$44,099 | \$44,099 | \$44,099 | \$44,099 |

¹= Assumes 75% of the total number of units possible, at maximum permitted density

| <i>Land Use Designation: High Density, Specific Plan (0-14 du/ac) Total No. Acres Lost to Conservation: 47 acres No. of Potential Buildout Units: 492</i> | Buildout Phase | | | |
|---|-------------------------------|---------------------------------|-----------------------------------|----------------------------------|
| | Phase I (Yrs. 1-5) | Phase II (Yrs. 6-10) | Phase III (Yrs. 11-15) | Phase IV (Yrs. 16-20) |
| Number of acres developed during phase | 11.75 | 11.75 | 11.75 | 11.75 |
| Maximum density permitted (units/acre) | 14 | 14 | 14 | 14 |
| Maximum potential units constructed during this phase ¹ | 123 | 123 | 123 | 123 |
| TUMF fee rate (per dwelling unit) | \$1,277 | \$1,277 | \$1,277 | \$1,277 |
| TUMF fee collected | \$157,046 | \$157,046 | \$157,046 | \$157,046 |

¹= Assumes 75% of the total number of units possible, at maximum permitted density

**TUMF Revenue
 from Industrial Development**

| | Buildout Phase | | | |
|--|-----------------------|-------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------|
| | Phase I (Yrs. 1-5) | Phase II (Yrs. 6-10) | Phase III (Yrs. 11-15) | Phase IV (Yrs. 16-20) |
| <i>Land Use Designation: Light Industrial (LI)</i> | | | | |
| <i>Total No. Acres Lost to Conservation: 89 acres</i> | | | | |
| <i>Potential Square Feet at Buildout: 1,318,124</i> | | | | |
| Number of acres developed during phase | 22.25 | 22.25 | 22.25 | 22.25 |
| Total square feet constructed at phase buildout ¹ | 329,531 | 329,531 | 329,531 | 329,531 |
| TUMF fee rate (per 1,000 square feet) | \$1,031.56 | \$1,031.56 | \$1,031.56 | \$1,031.56 |
| TUMF fee collected | \$339,931 | \$339,931 | \$339,931 | \$339,931 |

¹= Assumes 34% building coverage

| Land Use Designation: Light Industrial (I-L) Total No. Acres Lost to Conservation: 28 acres Potential Square Feet at Buildout: 414,692 | Buildout Phase | | | |
|---|-------------------------------|---------------------------------|-----------------------------------|----------------------------------|
| | Phase I (Yrs. 1-5) | Phase II (Yrs. 6-10) | Phase III (Yrs. 11-15) | Phase IV (Yrs. 16-20) |
| Number of acres developed during phase | 7 | 7 | 7 | 7 |
| Total square feet constructed at phase buildout | 103,673 | 103,673 | 103,673 | 103,673 |
| TUMF fee rate (per 1,000 square feet) | \$1,032 | \$1,032 | \$1,032 | \$1,032 |
| TUMF fee collected | \$106,945 | \$106,945 | \$106,945 | \$106,945 |

1= Assumes 34% building coverage

| TUMF Revenue Summary Table | | | | |
|--|-----------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|
| | Buildout Phase | | | |
| | (Yrs 1-5) | (Yrs 6-10) | (Yrs 11-15) | (Yrs 16-20) |
| Total TUMF revenue from residential development | \$2,729,462 | \$2,729,462 | \$2,729,462 | \$2,729,462 |
| Total TUMF revenue from industrial development | \$446,876 | \$446,876 | \$446,876 | \$446,876 |
| Total TUMF revenue from all development | \$3,176,339 | \$3,176,339 | \$3,176,339 | \$3,176,339 |

| Sales Tax & Measure A Revenue from Single-Family Residential Development | | | | |
|--|------------------------------|--------------------------------|----------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| <i>Land Use Designation: Rural Desert (0-1 du/10 ac)</i> | | | | |
| <i>Total No. of Acres Lost to Conservation: 936</i> | | | | |
| <i>No. of Potential Buildout Units: 72</i> | | | | |
| | Buildout Phase | | | |
| | Phase I (Yrs 1-5) | Phase II (Yrs 6-10) | Phase III (Yrs 11-15) | Phase IV (Yrs 16-20) |
| Land Use Buildout Data | | | | |
| Number of acres developed during phase | 234.00 | 234.00 | 234.00 | 234.00 |
| Maximum density permitted (units/acre) | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 |
| Maximum potential units constructed during this phase ¹ | 18 | 18 | 18 | 18 |
| Number of total potential units constructed at phase buildout | 18 | 36 | 54 | 72 |
| Calculation of Total Expendable Income at Phase Buildout | | | | |
| Median housing value | \$207,000 | \$207,000 | \$207,000 | \$207,000 |
| Historic average mortgage lending rate | 5.02% | 5.02% | 5.02% | 5.02% |
| Average interest paid annually | \$10,391 | \$10,391 | \$10,391 | \$10,391 |
| Interest paid on 30-yr. mortgage | \$311,742 | \$311,742 | \$311,742 | \$311,742 |
| Total value of dwelling unit (median value + interest over 30 years) | \$518,742 | \$518,742 | \$518,742 | \$518,742 |
| Average monthly mortgage payment | \$1,441 | \$1,441 | \$1,441 | \$1,441 |
| Average monthly household income (assumes monthly mortgage payment is 30% of monthly income) | \$4,803 | \$4,803 | \$4,803 | \$4,803 |
| Average annual household income | \$57,638 | \$57,638 | \$57,638 | \$57,638 |
| Average annual expendable income per household (assumes expendable income is 19% of net household income) | \$10,951 | \$10,951 | \$10,951 | \$10,951 |
| Annual expendable income for all dwelling units at phase buildout | \$197,122 | \$394,244 | \$591,366 | \$788,488 |
| Allocation of Income Spent Within City vs. Outside City | | | | |
| Percent expendable income to be spent within City | 70% | 70% | 70% | 70% |
| Percent expendable income to be spent outside City | 30% | 30% | 30% | 30% |
| Amount spent within City annually | \$137,985 | \$275,971 | \$413,956 | \$551,941 |
| Amount spent outside City annually | \$59,137 | \$118,273 | \$177,410 | \$236,546 |
| Calculation of Sales Tax Revenues | | | | |
| City's sales tax rate | 1% | 1% | 1% | 1% |
| Annual sales tax revenue collected by City at phase buildout | \$1,380 | \$2,760 | \$4,140 | \$5,519 |
| Calculation of Measure A Revenues | | | | |
| Measure A tax rate | 0.50% | 0.50% | 0.50% | 0.50% |
| Annual Measure A revenue collected in City at phase buildout | \$690 | \$1,380 | \$2,070 | \$2,760 |
| Percent allocated to Coachella Valley | 24.0% | 24.0% | 24.0% | 24.0% |
| Annual amount allocated to Coachella Valley | \$166 | \$331 | \$497 | \$662 |
| Percent allocated to Streets/Roads Program | 35% | 35% | 35% | 35% |
| Annual amount allocated to Streets/Roads Program | \$58 | \$116 | \$174 | \$232 |
| Percent allocated to this jurisdiction | 3.0% | 3.0% | 3.0% | 3.0% |
| Annual amount allocated to this jurisdiction | \$1.74 | \$3.48 | \$5.22 | \$6.95 |

¹ = assumes 75% of the total number of units possible, at maximum permitted density

| | Buildout Phase | | | |
|--|----------------------|------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------|
| | Phase I (Yrs 1-5) | Phase II (Yrs 6-10) | Phase III (Yrs 11-15) | Phase IV (Yrs 16-20) |
| Land Use Designation: Residential Estates (0-1 du/10 ac) | | | | |
| Total No. of Acres Lost to Conservation: 233 | | | | |
| No. of Potential Buildout Units: 16 | | | | |
| Land Use Buildout Data | | | | |
| Number of acres developed during phase | 58.25 | 58.25 | 58.25 | 58.25 |
| Maximum density permitted (units/acre) | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 |
| Maximum potential units constructed during this phase ¹ | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 |
| Number of total potential units constructed at phase buildout | 4 | 8 | 12 | 16 |
| Calculation of Total Expendable Income at Phase Buildout | | | | |
| Median housing value | \$207,000 | \$207,000 | \$207,000 | \$207,000 |
| Historic average mortgage lending rate | 5.02% | 5.02% | 5.02% | 5.02% |
| Average interest paid annually | \$10,391 | \$10,391 | \$10,391 | \$10,391 |
| Interest paid on 30-yr. mortgage | \$311,742 | \$311,742 | \$311,742 | \$311,742 |
| Total value of dwelling unit (median value + interest over 30 years) | \$518,742 | \$518,742 | \$518,742 | \$518,742 |
| Average monthly mortgage payment | \$1,441 | \$1,441 | \$1,441 | \$1,441 |
| Average monthly household income | | | | |
| (assumes monthly mortgage payment is 30% of monthly income) | \$4,803 | \$4,803 | \$4,803 | \$4,803 |
| Average annual household income | \$57,638 | \$57,638 | \$57,638 | \$57,638 |
| Average annual expendable income per household (assumes expendable income is 19% of net household income) | \$10,951 | \$10,951 | \$10,951 | \$10,951 |
| Annual expendable income for all dwelling units at phase buildout | \$43,805 | \$87,610 | \$131,415 | \$175,220 |
| Allocation of Income Spent Within City vs. Outside City | | | | |
| Percent expendable income to be spent within City | 70% | 70% | 70% | 70% |
| Percent expendable income to be spent outside City | 30% | 30% | 30% | 30% |
| Amount spent within City annually | \$30,663 | \$61,327 | \$91,990 | \$122,654 |
| Amount spent outside City annually | \$13,141 | \$26,283 | \$39,424 | \$52,566 |
| Calculation of Sales Tax Revenues | | | | |
| City's sales tax rate | 1% | 1% | 1% | 1% |
| Annual sales tax revenue collected by City at phase buildout | \$307 | \$613 | \$920 | \$1,227 |
| Calculation of Measure A Revenues | | | | |
| Measure A tax rate | 0.50% | 0.50% | 0.50% | 0.50% |
| Annual Measure A revenue collected in City at phase buildout | \$153 | \$307 | \$460 | \$613 |
| Percent allocated to Coachella Valley | 24.0% | 24.0% | 24.0% | 24.0% |
| Annual amount allocated to Coachella Valley | \$37 | \$74 | \$110 | \$147 |
| Percent allocated to Streets/Roads Program | 35% | 35% | 35% | 35% |
| Annual amount allocated to Streets/Roads Program | \$13 | \$26 | \$39 | \$52 |
| *Percent allocated to this jurisdiction | 3.0% | 3.0% | 3.0% | 3.0% |
| Annual amount allocated to this jurisdiction | \$0.39 | \$0.77 | \$1.16 | \$1.55 |

¹ = assumes 75% of the total number of units possible, at maximum permitted density

| Land Use Designation: Rural Residential (0-1 du/5ac) Total No. of Acres Lost to Conservation: 465 No. of Potential Buildout Units: 68 | Buildout Phase | | | |
|---|----------------------|------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------|
| | Phase I (Yrs 1-5) | Phase II (Yrs 6-10) | Phase III (Yrs 11-15) | Phase IV (Yrs 16-20) |
| Land Use Buildout Data | | | | |
| Number of acres developed during phase | 116.25 | 116.25 | 116.25 | 116.25 |
| Maximum density permitted (units/acre) | 0.20 | 0.20 | 0.20 | 0.20 |
| Maximum potential units constructed during this phase ¹ | 17 | 17 | 17 | 17 |
| Number of total potential units constructed at phase buildout | 17 | 34 | 51 | 68 |
| Calculation of Total Expendable Income at Phase Buildout | | | | |
| Median housing value | \$207,000 | \$207,000 | \$207,000 | \$207,000 |
| Historic average mortgage lending rate | 5.02% | 5.02% | 5.02% | 5.02% |
| Average interest paid annually | \$10,391 | \$10,391 | \$10,391 | \$10,391 |
| Interest paid on 30-yr. mortgage | \$311,742 | \$311,742 | \$311,742 | \$311,742 |
| Total value of dwelling unit (median value + interest over 30 years) | \$518,742 | \$518,742 | \$518,742 | \$518,742 |
| Average monthly mortgage payment | \$1,441 | \$1,441 | \$1,441 | \$1,441 |
| Average monthly household income (assumes monthly mortgage payment is 30% of monthly income) | \$4,803 | \$4,803 | \$4,803 | \$4,803 |
| Average annual household income | \$57,638 | \$57,638 | \$57,638 | \$57,638 |
| Average annual expendable income per household (assumes expendable income is 19% of net household income) | \$10,951 | \$10,951 | \$10,951 | \$10,951 |
| Annual expendable income for all dwelling units at phase buildout | \$186,171 | \$372,341 | \$558,512 | \$744,683 |
| Allocation of Income Spent Within City vs. Outside City | | | | |
| Percent expendable income to be spent within City | 70% | 70% | 70% | 70% |
| Percent expendable income to be spent outside City | 30% | 30% | 30% | 30% |
| Amount spent within City annually | \$130,320 | \$260,639 | \$390,959 | \$521,278 |
| Amount spent outside City annually | \$55,851 | \$111,702 | \$167,554 | \$223,405 |
| Calculation of Sales Tax Revenues | | | | |
| City's sales tax rate | 1% | 1% | 1% | 1% |
| Annual sales tax revenue collected by City at phase buildout | \$1,303 | \$2,606 | \$3,910 | \$5,213 |
| Calculation of Measure A Revenues | | | | |
| Measure A tax rate | 0.50% | 0.50% | 0.50% | 0.50% |
| Annual Measure A Revenue Collected in City at phase buildout | \$652 | \$1,303 | \$1,955 | \$2,606 |
| Percent allocated to Coachella Valley | 24.0% | 24.0% | 24.0% | 24.0% |
| Annual amount allocated to Coachella Valley | \$156 | \$313 | \$469 | \$626 |
| Percent allocated to Streets/Roads Program | 35% | 35% | 35% | 35% |
| Annual amount allocated to Streets/Roads Program | \$55 | \$109 | \$164 | \$219 |
| Percent allocated to this jurisdiction | 3.0% | 3.0% | 3.0% | 3.0% |
| Annual amount allocated to this jurisdiction | \$1.64 | \$3.28 | \$4.93 | \$6.57 |

¹ = assumes 75% of the total number of units possible, at maximum permitted density

| Land Use Designation: Low Density (0-5 du/ac) Total No. of Acres Lost to Conservation: 259 No. of Potential Buildout Units: 972 | Buildout Phase | | | |
|---|----------------------|------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------|
| | Phase I (Yrs 1-5) | Phase II (Yrs 6-10) | Phase III (Yrs 11-15) | Phase IV (Yrs 16-20) |
| Land Use Buildout Data | | | | |
| Number of acres developed during phase | 64.75 | 64.75 | 64.75 | 64.75 |
| Maximum density permitted (units/acre) | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 |
| Maximum potential units constructed during this phase ¹ | 243 | 243 | 243 | 243 |
| Number of total potential units constructed at phase buildout | 243 | 486 | 729 | 972 |
| Calculation of Total Expendable Income at Phase Buildout | | | | |
| Median housing value | \$207,000 | \$207,000 | \$207,000 | \$207,000 |
| Historic average mortgage lending rate | 5.02% | 5.02% | 5.02% | 5.02% |
| Average interest paid annually | \$10,391 | \$10,391 | \$10,391 | \$10,391 |
| Interest paid on 30-yr. mortgage | \$311,742 | \$311,742 | \$311,742 | \$311,742 |
| Total value of dwelling unit (median value + interest over 30 years) | \$518,742 | \$518,742 | \$518,742 | \$518,742 |
| Average monthly mortgage payment | \$1,441 | \$1,441 | \$1,441 | \$1,441 |
| Average monthly household income | | | | |
| (assumes monthly mortgage payment is 30% of monthly income) | \$4,803 | \$4,803 | \$4,803 | \$4,803 |
| Average annual household income | \$57,638 | \$57,638 | \$57,638 | \$57,638 |
| Average annual expendable income per household | | | | |
| (assumes expendable income is 19% of net household income) | \$10,951 | \$10,951 | \$10,951 | \$10,951 |
| Annual expendable income for all dwelling units at phase buildout | \$2,661,146 | \$5,322,293 | \$7,983,439 | \$10,644,586 |
| Allocation of Income Spent Within City vs. Outside City | | | | |
| Percent expendable income to be spent within City | 70% | 70% | 70% | 70% |
| Percent expendable income to be spent outside City | 30% | 30% | 30% | 30% |
| Amount spent within City annually | \$1,862,803 | \$3,725,605 | \$5,588,408 | \$7,451,210 |
| Amount spent outside City annually | \$798,344 | \$1,596,688 | \$2,395,032 | \$3,193,376 |
| Calculation of Sales Tax Revenues | | | | |
| City's sales tax rate | 1% | 1% | 1% | 1% |
| Annual sales tax revenue collected by City at phase buildout | \$18,628 | \$37,256 | \$55,884 | \$74,512 |
| Calculation of Measure A Revenues | | | | |
| Measure A tax rate | 0.50% | 0.50% | 0.50% | 0.50% |
| Annual Measure A Revenue Collected in City at phase buildout | \$9,314 | \$18,628 | \$27,942 | \$37,256 |
| Percent allocated to Coachella Valley | 24.0% | 24.0% | 24.0% | 24.0% |
| Annual amount allocated to Coachella Valley | \$2,235 | \$4,471 | \$6,706 | \$8,941 |
| Percent allocated to Streets/Roads Program | 35% | 35% | 35% | 35% |
| Annual amount allocated to Streets/Roads Program | \$782 | \$1,565 | \$2,347 | \$3,130 |
| *Percent allocated to this jurisdiction | 3.0% | 3.0% | 3.0% | 3.0% |
| Annual amount allocated to this jurisdiction | \$23,471 | \$46,942 | \$70,413 | \$93,891 |

¹ = assumes 75% of the total number of units possible, at maximum permitted density

| Land Use Designation: Low Density w/SP (0-5 du/ac) Total No. of Acres Lost to Conservation: 1,167 No. of Potential Buildout Units: 4,376 | Buildout Phase | | | |
|--|----------------------|------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------|
| | Phase I (Yrs 1-5) | Phase II (Yrs 6-10) | Phase III (Yrs 11-15) | Phase IV (Yrs 16-20) |
| Land Use Buildout Data | | | | |
| Number of acres developed during phase | 291.75 | 291.75 | 291.75 | 291.75 |
| Maximum density permitted (units/acre) | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 |
| Maximum potential units constructed during this phase ¹ | 1,094 | 1,094 | 1,094 | 1,094 |
| Number of total potential units constructed at phase buildout | 1,094 | 2,188 | 3,282 | 4,376 |
| Calculation of Total Expendable Income at Phase Buildout | | | | |
| Median housing value | \$207,000 | \$207,000 | \$207,000 | \$207,000 |
| Historic average mortgage lending rate | 5.02% | 5.02% | 5.02% | 5.02% |
| Average interest paid annually | \$10,391 | \$10,391 | \$10,391 | \$10,391 |
| Interest paid on 30-yr. mortgage | \$311,742 | \$311,742 | \$311,742 | \$311,742 |
| Total value of dwelling unit (median value + interest over 30 years) | \$518,742 | \$518,742 | \$518,742 | \$518,742 |
| Average monthly mortgage payment | \$1,441 | \$1,441 | \$1,441 | \$1,441 |
| Average monthly household income | | | | |
| (assumes monthly mortgage payment is 30% of monthly income) | \$4,803 | \$4,803 | \$4,803 | \$4,803 |
| Average annual household income | \$57,638 | \$57,638 | \$57,638 | \$57,638 |
| Average annual expendable income per household | | | | |
| (assumes expendable income is 19% of net household income) | \$10,951 | \$10,951 | \$10,951 | \$10,951 |
| Annual expendable income for all dwelling units at phase buildout | \$11,980,635 | \$23,961,269 | \$35,941,904 | \$47,922,539 |
| Allocation of Income Spent Within City vs. Outside City | | | | |
| Percent expendable income to be spent within City | 70% | 70% | 70% | 70% |
| Percent expendable income to be spent outside City | 30% | 30% | 30% | 30% |
| Amount spent within City annually | \$8,386,444 | \$16,772,889 | \$25,159,333 | \$33,545,777 |
| Amount spent outside City annually | \$3,594,190 | \$7,188,381 | \$10,782,571 | \$14,376,762 |
| Calculation of Sales Tax Revenues | | | | |
| City's sales tax rate | 1% | 1% | 1% | 1% |
| Annual sales tax revenue collected by City at phase buildout | \$83,864 | \$167,729 | \$251,593 | \$335,458 |
| Calculation of Measure A Revenues | | | | |
| Measure A Tax Rate | 0.50% | 0.50% | 0.50% | 0.50% |
| Annual Measure A Revenue Collected in City at Phase Buildout | \$41,932 | \$83,864 | \$125,797 | \$167,729 |
| Percent allocated to Coachella Valley | 24.0% | 24.0% | 24.0% | 24.0% |
| Annual amount allocated to Coachella Valley | \$10,064 | \$20,127 | \$30,191 | \$40,255 |
| Percent allocated to Streets/Roads Program | 35% | 35% | 35% | 35% |
| Annual amount allocated to Streets/Roads Program | \$3,522 | \$7,045 | \$10,567 | \$14,089 |
| Percent allocated to this jurisdiction | 3.0% | 3.0% | 3.0% | 3.0% |
| Annual amount allocated to this jurisdiction | \$105.67 | \$211.34 | \$317.01 | \$422.68 |

¹ = assumes 75% of the total number of units possible, at maximum permitted density

| Land Use Designation: Medium Density (0-8 du/ac) Total No. of Acres Lost to Conservation: 16 acres No. of Potential Buildout Units: 96 | Buildout Phase | | | |
|--|----------------------|------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------|
| | Phase I (Yrs 1-5) | Phase II (Yrs 6-10) | Phase III (Yrs 11-15) | Phase IV (Yrs 16-20) |
| Land Use Buildout Data | | | | |
| Number of acres developed during phase | 4.00 | 4.00 | 4.00 | 4.00 |
| Maximum density permitted (units/acre) | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 |
| Maximum potential units constructed during this phase ¹ | 24 | 24 | 24 | 24 |
| Number of total potential units constructed at phase buildout | 24 | 48 | 72 | 96 |
| Calculation of Total Expendable Income at Phase Buildout | | | | |
| Median housing value | \$98,490 | \$98,490 | \$98,490 | \$98,490 |
| Historic average mortgage lending rate | 5.02% | 5.02% | 5.02% | 5.02% |
| Average interest paid annually | \$4,944 | \$4,944 | \$4,944 | \$4,944 |
| Interest paid on 30-yr. mortgage | \$148,326 | \$148,326 | \$148,326 | \$148,326 |
| Total value of dwelling unit (median value + interest over 30 years) | \$246,816 | \$246,816 | \$246,816 | \$246,816 |
| Average monthly mortgage payment | \$686 | \$686 | \$686 | \$686 |
| Average monthly household income (assumes monthly mortgage payment is 30% of monthly income) | \$2,285 | \$2,285 | \$2,285 | \$2,285 |
| Average annual household income | \$27,424 | \$27,424 | \$27,424 | \$27,424 |
| Average annual expendable income per household | \$5,211 | \$5,211 | \$5,211 | \$5,211 |
| Annual expendable income for all dwelling units at phase buildout | \$125,053 | \$250,107 | \$375,160 | \$500,214 |
| Allocation of Income Spent Within City vs. Outside City | | | | |
| Percent expendable income to be spent within City | 70% | 70% | 70% | 70% |
| Percent expendable income to be spent outside City | 30% | 30% | 30% | 30% |
| Amount spent within City annually | \$87,537 | \$175,075 | \$262,612 | \$350,150 |
| Amount spent outside City annually | \$37,516 | \$75,032 | \$112,548 | \$150,064 |
| Calculation of Sales Tax Revenues | | | | |
| City's sales tax rate | 1% | 1% | 1% | 1% |
| Annual sales tax revenue collected by City at phase buildout | \$875 | \$1,751 | \$2,626 | \$3,501 |
| Calculation of Measure A Revenues | | | | |
| Measure A Tax Rate | 0.50% | 0.50% | 0.50% | 0.50% |
| Annual Measure A Revenue Collected in City at Phase Buildout | \$438 | \$875 | \$1,313 | \$1,751 |
| Percent allocated to Coachella Valley | 24.0% | 24.0% | 24.0% | 24.0% |
| Annual amount allocated to Coachella Valley | \$105 | \$210 | \$315 | \$420 |
| Percent allocated to Streets/Roads Program | 35% | 35% | 35% | 35% |
| Annual amount allocated to Streets/Roads Program | \$37 | \$74 | \$110 | \$147 |
| Percent allocated to this jurisdiction | 3.0% | 3.0% | 3.0% | 3.0% |
| Annual amount allocated to this jurisdiction | \$1.10 | \$2.21 | \$3.31 | \$4.41 |

¹ = assumes 75% of the total number of units possible, at maximum permitted density

| Land Use Designation: High Density w/SP(0-14 du/ac) Total No. Acres Lost to Conservation: 47 acres No. of Potential Buildout Units: 492 | Buildout Phase | | | |
|---|----------------------|------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------|
| | Phase I (Yrs 1-5) | Phase II (Yrs 6-10) | Phase III (Yrs 11-15) | Phase IV (Yrs 16-20) |
| Land Use Buildout Data | | | | |
| Number of acres developed during phase | 11.75 | 11.75 | 11.75 | 11.75 |
| Maximum density permitted (units/acre) | 14 | 14 | 14 | 14 |
| Maximum potential units constructed during this phase ¹ | 123 | 123 | 123 | 123 |
| Number of potential units constructed at phase buildout | 123 | 246 | 369 | 492 |
| Calculation of Total Expendable Income at Phase Buildout | | | | |
| Average monthly apartment rental rate | \$768 | \$768 | \$768 | \$768 |
| Average monthly household income (assumes monthly rental payment is 30% of monthly income) | \$2,560 | \$2,560 | \$2,560 | \$2,560 |
| Average annual household income | \$30,720 | \$30,720 | \$30,720 | \$30,720 |
| Average annual expendable income per household (assumes expendable income is 19% of net household income) | \$5,837 | \$5,837 | \$5,837 | \$5,837 |
| Annual expendable income for all dwelling units at phase buildout | \$717,926 | \$1,435,853 | \$2,153,779 | \$2,871,706 |
| Allocation of Income Spent Within City vs. Outside City | | | | |
| Percent expendable income to be spent within City | 70% | 70% | 70% | 70% |
| Percent expendable income to be spent outside City | 30% | 30% | 30% | 30% |
| Amount spent within City annually | \$502,548 | \$1,005,097 | \$1,507,645 | \$2,010,194 |
| Amount spent outside City annually | \$215,378 | \$430,756 | \$646,134 | \$861,512 |
| Calculation of Sales Tax Revenues | | | | |
| City's sales tax rate | 1% | 1% | 1% | 1% |
| Annual sales tax revenue collected by City at phase buildout | \$5,025 | \$10,051 | \$15,076 | \$20,102 |
| Calculation of Measure A Revenues | | | | |
| Measure A Tax Rate | 0.50% | 0.50% | 0.50% | 0.50% |
| Annual Measure A Revenue Collected in City at Phase Buildout | \$2,513 | \$5,025 | \$7,538 | \$10,051 |
| Percent allocated to Coachella Valley | 24.0% | 24.0% | 24.0% | 24.0% |
| Annual amount allocated to Coachella Valley | \$603 | \$1,206 | \$1,809 | \$2,412 |
| Percent allocated to Streets/Roads Program | 35% | 35% | 35% | 35% |
| Annual amount allocated to Streets/Roads Program | \$211 | \$422 | \$633 | \$844 |
| Percent allocated to this jurisdiction | 3.0% | 3.0% | 3.0% | 3.0% |
| Annual amount allocated to this jurisdiction | \$6.33 | \$12.66 | \$19.00 | \$25.33 |

¹ = assumes 75% of the total number of units possible, at maximum permitted density

| Summary Table | | | | |
|--|------------------------------|--------------------------------|----------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| | Buildout Phase | | | |
| | Phase I (Yrs 1-5) | Phase II (Yrs 6-10) | Phase III (Yrs 11-15) | Phase IV (Yrs 16-20) |
| Total sales tax revenue from single-family residential development | \$106,358 | \$212,715 | \$319,073 | \$425,430 |
| Total sales tax revenue from multi-family residential development | \$5,025 | \$10,051 | \$15,076 | \$20,102 |
| Total sales tax revenue from all development | \$111,383 | \$222,766 | \$334,149 | \$445,532 |

| Measure A Revenue | | | | |
|---|------------------------------|--------------------------------|----------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| | Buildout Phase | | | |
| | Phase I (Yrs 1-5) | Phase II (Yrs 6-10) | Phase III (Yrs 11-15) | Phase IV (Yrs 16-20) |
| Total Measure A revenue from single-family resid. development | \$134 | \$268 | \$402 | \$536 |
| Total Measure A revenue from multi-family resid. development | \$6 | \$13 | \$19 | \$25 |
| Total Measure A revenue from all development | \$140 | \$281 | \$421 | \$561 |

| Utility Tax Revenue (Desert Hot Springs only) | | | | |
|---|------------------------------|--------------------------------|----------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| <i>Land Use Designation: Rural Desert (0-1 du/10 ac)</i> <i>Total No. of Acres Lost to Conservation: 936</i> <i>No. of Potential Buildout Units: 72</i> | Buildout Phase | | | |
| | Phase I (Yrs 1-5) | Phase II (Yrs 6-10) | Phase III (Yrs 11-15) | Phase IV (Yrs 16-20) |
| Land Use Buildout Data | | | | |
| Number of acres developed during phase | 234.00 | 234.00 | 234.00 | 234.00 |
| Maximum density permitted (units/acre) | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 |
| Maximum potential units constructed during this phase* | 18 | 18 | 18 | 18 |
| Number of potential units constructed at phase buildout | 18 | 36 | 54 | 72 |
| Calculation of Utility Tax Revenue | | | | |
| City's total annual Utility Tax revenue (FY 09-10) | \$2,529,180 | \$2,529,180 | \$2,529,180 | \$2,529,180 |
| Total no. of occupied dwelling units in City (2010 per CA DOF) | 9,223 | 9,223 | 9,223 | 9,223 |
| Annual utility tax per dwelling unit | \$274 | \$274 | \$274 | \$274 |
| Annual Utility Tax revenue at phase buildout | \$4,936.06 | \$9,872 | \$14,808 | \$19,744 |
| Land Use Designation: Residential Estates (0-1 du/10 ac) | | | | |
| <i>Total No. of Acres Lost to Conservation: 233</i> <i>No. of Potential Buildout Units: 16</i> | Buildout Phase | | | |
| | Phase I (Yrs 1-5) | Phase II (Yrs 6-10) | Phase III (Yrs 11-15) | Phase IV (Yrs 16-20) |
| Land Use Buildout Data | | | | |
| Number of acres developed during phase | 58.25 | 58.25 | 58.25 | 58.25 |
| Maximum density permitted (units/acre) | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 |
| Maximum potential units constructed during this phase* | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 |
| Number of potential units constructed at phase buildout | 4 | 8 | 12 | 16 |
| Calculation of Utility Tax Revenue | | | | |
| City's total annual Utility Tax revenue (FY 09-10) | \$2,529,180 | \$2,529,180 | \$2,529,180 | \$2,529,180 |
| Total no. of occupied dwelling units in City (2010 per CA DOF) | 9,223 | 9,223 | 9,223 | 9,223 |
| Annual utility tax per dwelling unit | \$274 | \$274 | \$274 | \$274 |
| Annual Utility Tax revenue at phase buildout | \$1,097 | \$2,194 | \$3,291 | \$4,388 |

| Land Use Designation: Rural Residential (0-1 du/5ac) Total No. of Acres Lost to Conservation: 465 No. of Potential Buildout Units: 68 Land Use Buildout Data | Buildout Phase | | | |
|---|----------------------|------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------|
| | Phase I (Yrs 1-5) | Phase II (Yrs 6-10) | Phase III (Yrs 11-15) | Phase IV (Yrs 16-20) |
| Number of acres developed during phase | 116.25 | 116.25 | 116.25 | 116.25 |
| Maximum density permitted (units/acre) | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.2 |
| Maximum potential units constructed during this phase* | 17 | 17 | 17 | 17 |
| Number of potential units constructed at phase buildout | 17 | 34 | 51 | 68 |
| Calculation of Utility Tax Revenue | | | | |
| City's total annual Utility Tax revenue (FY 09-10) | \$2,529,180 | \$2,529,180 | \$2,529,180 | \$2,529,180 |
| Total no. of occupied dwelling units in City (2010 per CA DOF) | 9,223 | 9,223 | 9,223 | 9,223 |
| Annual utility tax per dwelling unit | \$274 | \$274 | \$274 | \$274 |
| Annual Utility Tax revenue at phase buildout | \$4,662 | \$9,324 | \$13,985 | \$18,647 |

| Land Use Designation: Low Density (0-5 du/ac) Total No. of Acres Lost to Conservation: 259 No. of Potential Buildout Units: 972 | Buildout Phase | | | |
|---|----------------------|------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------|
| | Phase I (Yrs 1-5) | Phase II (Yrs 6-10) | Phase III (Yrs 11-15) | Phase IV (Yrs 16-20) |
| Land Use Buildout Data | | | | |
| Number of acres developed during phase | 64.75 | 64.75 | 64.75 | 64.75 |
| Maximum density permitted (units/acre) | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 |
| Maximum potential units constructed during this phase* | 243 | 243 | 243 | 243 |
| Number of potential units constructed at phase buildout | 243 | 486 | 729 | 972 |
| Calculation of Utility Tax Revenue | | | | |
| City's total annual Utility Tax revenue (FY 09-10) | \$2,529,180 | \$2,529,180 | \$2,529,180 | \$2,529,180 |
| Total no. of occupied dwelling units in City (2010 per CA DOF) | 9,223 | 9,223 | 9,223 | 9,223 |
| Annual utility tax per dwelling unit | \$274 | \$274 | \$274 | \$274 |
| Annual Utility Tax revenue at phase buildout | \$66,637 | \$133,274 | \$199,910 | \$266,547 |

| Land Use Designation: Low Density w/SF (0-5 du/ac) Total No. of Acres Lost to Conservation: 1,167 No. of Potential Buildout Units: 4,376 | Buildout Phase | | | |
|--|----------------------|------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------|
| | Phase I (Yrs 1-5) | Phase II (Yrs 6-10) | Phase III (Yrs 11-15) | Phase IV (Yrs 16-20) |
| Land Use Buildout Data | | | | |
| Number of acres developed during phase | 291.75 | 291.75 | 291.75 | 291.75 |
| Maximum density permitted (units/acre) | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 |
| Maximum potential units constructed during this phase* | 1,094 | 1,094 | 1,094 | 1,094 |
| Number of potential units constructed at phase buildout | 1,094 | 2,188 | 3,282 | 4,376 |
| Calculation of Utility Tax Revenue | | | | |
| City's total annual Utility Tax revenue (FY 09-10) | \$2,529,180 | \$2,529,180 | \$2,529,180 | \$2,529,180 |
| Total no. of occupied dwelling units in City (2010 per CA DOF) | 9,223 | 9,223 | 9,223 | 9,223 |
| Annual utility tax per dwelling unit | \$274 | \$274 | \$274 | \$274 |
| Annual Utility Tax revenue at phase buildout | \$300,003 | \$600,005 | \$900,008 | \$1,200,010 |

| <i>Land Use Designation: Medium Density (0-8 du/ac)</i> <i>Total No. of Acres Lost to Conservation: 16 acres</i> <i>No. of Potential Buildout Units: 96</i> | Buildout Phase | | | |
|---|-------------------------------|-------------------|--------------------|--------------------|
| | (Yrs 1-5) | (Yrs 6-10) | (Yrs 11-15) | (Yrs 16-20) |
| | Land Use Buildout Data | | | |
| Number of acres developed during phase | 4.00 | 4.00 | 4.00 | 4.00 |
| Maximum density permitted (units/acre) | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 |
| Maximum potential units constructed during this phase* | 24 | 24 | 24 | 24 |
| Number of potential units constructed at phase buildout | 24 | 48 | 72 | 96 |
| Calculation of Utility Tax Revenue | | | | |
| City's total annual Utility Tax revenue (FY 09-10) | \$2,529,180 | \$2,529,180 | \$2,529,180 | \$2,529,180 |
| Total no. of occupied dwelling units in City (2010 per CA DOF) | 9,223 | 9,223 | 9,223 | 9,223 |
| Annual utility tax per dwelling unit | \$274 | \$274 | \$274 | \$274 |
| Annual Utility Tax revenue at phase buildout | \$6,581 | \$13,163 | \$19,744 | \$26,326 |

| Land Use Designation: High Density w/SP(0-14 du/ac) Total No. Acres Lost to Conservation: 47 acres No. of Potential Buildout Units: 492 | Buildout Phase | | | |
|---|----------------------|------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------|
| | Phase I (Yrs 1-5) | Phase II (Yrs 6-10) | Phase III (Yrs 11-15) | Phase IV (Yrs 16-20) |
| Land Use Buildout Data | | | | |
| Number of acres developed during phase | 11.75 | 11.75 | 11.75 | 11.75 |
| Maximum density permitted (units/acre) | 14 | 14 | 14 | 14 |
| Maximum potential units constructed during this phase* | 123 | 123 | 123 | 123 |
| Number of potential units constructed at phase buildout | 123 | 246 | 369 | 492 |
| Calculation of Utility Tax Revenue | | | | |
| City's total annual Utility Tax revenue (FY 09-10) | \$2,529,180 | \$2,529,180 | \$2,529,180 | \$2,529,180 |
| Total no. of occupied dwelling units in City (2010 per CA DOF) | 9,223 | 9,223 | 9,223 | 9,223 |
| Annual utility tax per dwelling unit | \$274 | \$274 | \$274 | \$274 |
| Annual Utility Tax revenue at phase buildout | \$33,730 | \$67,459 | \$101,189 | \$134,919 |

| Utility Tax Revenue (Desert Hot Springs only) | | | | |
|--|----------------------|------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------|
| | Buildout Phase | | | |
| | Phase I (Yrs 1-5) | Phase II (Yrs 6-10) | Phase III (Yrs 11-15) | Phase IV (Yrs 16-20) |
| Total Utility Tax Revenue from all development | \$417,645 | \$835,290 | \$1,252,936 | \$1,670,581 |

| Motor Vehicle In-Lieu Revenue | | | | |
|---|------------------------------|--------------------------------|----------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| <i>Land Use Designation: Rural Desert (0-1 du/10 ac)</i> <i>Total No. of Acres Lost to Conservation: 936</i> <i>No. of Potential Buildout Units: 72</i> | Buildout Phase | | | |
| | Phase I (Yrs 1-5) | Phase II (Yrs 6-10) | Phase III (Yrs 11-15) | Phase IV (Yrs 16-20) |
| Land Use Buildout Data | | | | |
| Number of acres developed during phase | 234.00 | 234.00 | 234.00 | 234.00 |
| Maximum density permitted (units/acre) | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 |
| Maximum potential units constructed during this phase ² | 18 | 18 | 18 | 18 |
| Number of total potential units constructed at phase buildout | 18 | 36 | 54 | 72 |
| Calculation of Annual Motor Vehicle In-Lieu Revenue | | | | |
| Average No. of Persons Per Household | 2.880 | 2.880 | 2.880 | 2.880 |
| Potential Population at Phase Buildout | 52 | 104 | 156 | 207 |
| Anticipated Annual Per Capita Revenue ¹ | \$2.94 | \$2.94 | \$2.94 | \$2.94 |
| Annual Motor Vehicle In-Lieu Revenue at phase buildout | \$152 | \$305 | \$457 | \$610 |

¹ = data from "State of California Shared Revenue Estimates, Fiscal Year 2009-2010," prepared by State Controller's Office

² = assumes 75% of the total number of units possible, at maximum permitted density

Land Use Designation: Residential Estates (0-1 du/10 ac)
 Total No. of Acres Lost to Conservation: 233
 No. of Potential Buildout Units: 16

| | Buildout Phase | | | |
|--|----------------------|------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------|
| | Phase I (Yrs 1-5) | Phase II (Yrs 6-10) | Phase III (Yrs 11-15) | Phase IV (Yrs 16-20) |
| Land Use Buildout Data | | | | |
| Number of acres developed during phase | 58.25 | 58.25 | 58.25 | 58.25 |
| Maximum density permitted (units/acre) | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 |
| Maximum potential units constructed during this phase ² | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 |
| Number of total potential units constructed at phase buildout | 4 | 8 | 12 | 16 |
| Calculation of Annual Motor Vehicle In-Lieu Revenue | | | | |
| Average No. of Persons Per Household | 2.880 | 2.880 | 2.880 | 2.880 |
| Potential Population at Phase Buildout | 12 | 23 | 35 | 46 |
| Anticipated Annual Per Capita Revenue ¹ | \$2.94 | \$2.94 | \$2.94 | \$2.94 |
| Annual Motor Vehicle In-Lieu Revenue at phase buildout | \$34 | \$68 | \$102 | \$135 |

¹ = data from "State of California Shared Revenue Estimates, Fiscal Year 2009-2010," prepared by State Controller's Office

² = assumes 75% of the total number of units possible, at maximum permitted density

| Land Use Designation: Rural Residential (0-1 du/5ac) Total No. of Acres Lost to Conservation: 465 No. of Potential Buildout Units: 68 | Buildout Phase | | | |
|---|----------------------|------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------|
| | Phase I (Yrs 1-5) | Phase II (Yrs 6-10) | Phase III (Yrs 11-15) | Phase IV (Yrs 16-20) |
| Land Use Buildout Data | | | | |
| Number of acres developed during phase | 116.25 | 116.25 | 116.25 | 116.25 |
| Maximum density permitted (units/acre) | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.2 |
| Maximum potential units constructed during this phase ² | 17 | 17 | 17 | 17 |
| Number of total potential units constructed at phase buildout | 17 | 34 | 51 | 68 |
| Calculation of Annual Motor Vehicle In-Lieu Revenue | | | | |
| Average No. of Persons Per Household | 2.880 | 2.880 | 2.880 | 2.880 |
| Potential Population at Phase Buildout | 49 | 98 | 147 | 196 |
| Anticipated Annual Per Capita Revenue ¹ | \$2.94 | \$2.94 | \$2.94 | \$2.94 |
| Annual Motor Vehicle In-Lieu Revenue at phase buildout | \$144 | \$288 | \$432 | \$576 |

¹ = data from "State of California Shared Revenue Estimates, Fiscal Year 2009-2010," prepared by State Controller's Office

² = assumes 75% of the total number of units possible, at maximum permitted density

| Land Use Designation: Low Density (0-5 du/ac) Total No. of Acres Lost to Conservation: 259 No. of Potential Buildout Units: 972 | Buildout Phase | | | |
|---|----------------------|------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------|
| | Phase I (Yrs 1-5) | Phase II (Yrs 6-10) | Phase III (Yrs 11-15) | Phase IV (Yrs 16-20) |
| Land Use Buildout Data | | | | |
| Number of acres developed during phase | 64.75 | 64.75 | 64.75 | 64.75 |
| Maximum density permitted (units/acre) | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 |
| Maximum potential units constructed during this phase ² | 243 | 243 | 243 | 243 |
| Number of total potential units constructed at phase buildout | 243 | 486 | 729 | 972 |
| Calculation of Annual Motor Vehicle In-Lieu Revenue | | | | |
| Average No. of Persons Per Household | 2,880 | 2,880 | 2,880 | 2,880 |
| Potential Population at Phase Buildout | 700 | 1,400 | 2,100 | 2,799 |
| Anticipated Annual Per Capita Revenue ¹ | \$2.94 | \$2.94 | \$2.94 | \$2.94 |
| Annual Motor Vehicle In-Lieu Revenue at phase buildout | \$2,058 | \$4,115 | \$6,173 | \$8,230 |

¹ = data from "State of California Shared Revenue Estimates, Fiscal Year 2009-2010," prepared by State Controller's Office

² = assumes 75% of the total number of units possible, at maximum permitted density

| Land Use Designation: Low Density w/SP (0-5 du/ac) Total No. of Acres Lost to Conservation: 1,167 No. of Potential Buildout Units: 4,376 | Buildout Phase | | | |
|--|----------------------|------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------|
| | Phase I (Yrs 1-5) | Phase II (Yrs 6-10) | Phase III (Yrs 11-15) | Phase IV (Yrs 16-20) |
| Land Use Buildout Data | | | | |
| Number of acres developed during phase | 291.75 | 291.75 | 291.75 | 291.75 |
| Maximum density permitted (units/acre) | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 |
| Maximum potential units constructed during this phase ² | 1,094 | 1,094 | 1,094 | 1,094 |
| Number of total potential units constructed at phase buildout | 1,094 | 2,188 | 3,282 | 4,376 |
| Calculation of Annual Motor Vehicle In-Lieu Revenue | | | | |
| Average No. of Persons Per Household | 2.880 | 2.880 | 2.880 | 2.880 |
| Potential Population at Phase Buildout | 3,151 | 6,301 | 9,452 | 12,603 |
| Anticipated Annual Per Capita Revenue ¹ | \$2.94 | \$2.94 | \$2.94 | \$2.94 |
| Annual Motor Vehicle In-Lieu Revenue at phase buildout | \$9,263 | \$18,526 | \$27,789 | \$37,052 |

¹ = data from "State of California Shared Revenue Estimates, Fiscal Year 2009-2010," prepared by State Controller's Office

² = assumes 75% of the total number of units possible, at maximum permitted density

| Land Use Designation: Medium Density (0-8 du/ac) Total No. of Acres Lost to Conservation: 16 acres No. of Potential Buildout Units: 96 | Buildout Phase | | | |
|--|----------------------|------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------|
| | Phase I (Yrs 1-5) | Phase II (Yrs 6-10) | Phase III (Yrs 11-15) | Phase IV (Yrs 16-20) |
| Land Use Buildout Data | | | | |
| Number of acres developed during phase | 4.00 | 4.00 | 4.00 | 4.00 |
| Maximum density permitted (units/acre) | 8.0 | 8.0 | 8.0 | 8.0 |
| Maximum potential units constructed during this phase ² | 24 | 24 | 24 | 24 |
| Number of total potential units constructed at phase buildout | 24 | 48 | 72 | 96 |
| Calculation of Annual Motor Vehicle In-Lieu Revenue | | | | |
| Average No. of Persons Per Household | 2.880 | 2.880 | 2.880 | 2.880 |
| Potential Population at Phase Buildout | 69 | 138 | 207 | 276 |
| Anticipated Annual Per Capita Revenue ¹ | \$2.94 | \$2.94 | \$2.94 | \$2.94 |
| Annual Motor Vehicle In-Lieu Revenue at phase buildout | \$203 | \$406 | \$610 | \$813 |

¹ = data from "State of California Shared Revenue Estimates, Fiscal Year 2009-2010," prepared by State Controller's Office

² = assumes 75% of the total number of units possible, at maximum permitted density

| Land Use Designation: High Density w/SP(0-14 du/ac) Total No. Acres Lost to Conservation: 47 acres No. of Potential Buildout Units: 492 | Buildout Phase | | | |
|---|----------------------|------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------|
| | Phase I (Yrs 1-5) | Phase II (Yrs 6-10) | Phase III (Yrs 11-15) | Phase IV (Yrs 16-20) |
| Land Use Buildout Data | | | | |
| Number of acres developed during phase | 11.75 | 11.75 | 11.75 | 11.75 |
| Maximum density permitted (units/acre) | 14.0 | 14.0 | 14.0 | 14.0 |
| Maximum potential units constructed during this phase ² | 123 | 123 | 123 | 123 |
| Number of total potential units constructed at phase buildout | 123 | 246 | 369 | 492 |
| Calculation of Annual Motor Vehicle In-Lieu Revenue | | | | |
| Average No. of Persons Per Household | 2.880 | 2.880 | 2.880 | 2.880 |
| Potential Population at Phase Buildout | 354 | 708 | 1,063 | 1,417 |
| Anticipated Annual Per Capita Revenue ¹ | \$2.94 | \$2.94 | \$2.94 | \$2.94 |
| Annual Motor Vehicle In-Lieu Revenue at phase buildout | \$1,041 | \$2,083 | \$3,124 | \$4,166 |

¹ = data from "State of California Shared Revenue Estimates, Fiscal Year 2009-2010," prepared by State Controller's Office

² = assumes 75% of the total number of units possible, at maximum permitted density

| Motor Vehicle In-Lieu Revenue | Buildout Phase | | | |
|--|----------------------|------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------|
| | Phase I (Yrs 1-5) | Phase II (Yrs 6-10) | Phase III (Yrs 11-15) | Phase IV (Yrs 16-20) |
| Total Motor Vehicle In-Lieu Revenue from all development | \$12,896 | \$25,791 | \$38,687 | \$51,582 |

| Highway Users Gas Tax Revenue | | | | |
|---|------------------------------|--------------------------------|----------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| <i>Land Use Designation: Rural Desert (0-1 du/10 ac)</i> <i>Total No. of Acres Lost to Conservation: 936</i> <i>No. of Potential Buildout Units: 72</i> | Buildout Phase | | | |
| | Phase I (Yrs 1-5) | Phase II (Yrs 6-10) | Phase III (Yrs 11-15) | Phase IV (Yrs 16-20) |
| Land Use Buildout Data | | | | |
| Number of acres developed during phase | 234.00 | 234.00 | 234.00 | 234.00 |
| Maximum density permitted (units/acre) | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 |
| Maximum potential units constructed during this phase ¹ | 18 | 18 | 18 | 18 |
| Number of total potential units constructed at phase buildout | 18 | 36 | 54 | 72 |
| Calculation of Annual Gas Tax Revenue | | | | |
| Average no. persons per household | 2.880 | 2.880 | 2.880 | 2.880 |
| Potential population at phase buildout | 52 | 104 | 156 | 207 |
| Estimated annual per capita gas tax revenue ² | \$16.15 | \$16.15 | \$16.15 | \$16.15 |
| Annual gas tax revenue at phase buildout | \$837 | \$1,674 | \$2,512 | \$3,349 |

¹ = assumes 75% of the total number of units possible, at maximum permitted density

² = data from Fiscal Year 2009-2010, California State Controller's Office

| | Buildout Phase | | | |
|--|------------------------------|--------------------------------|----------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| | Phase I (Yrs 1-5) | Phase II (Yrs 6-10) | Phase III (Yrs 11-15) | Phase IV (Yrs 16-20) |
| <i>Land Use Designation: Residential Estates (0-1 du/10 ac)</i> | | | | |
| <i>Total No. of Acres Lost to Conservation: 233</i> | | | | |
| <i>No. of Potential Buildout Units: 16</i> | | | | |
| Land Use Buildout Data | | | | |
| Number of acres developed during phase | 58.25 | 58.25 | 58.25 | 58.25 |
| Maximum density permitted (units/acre) | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 |
| Maximum potential units constructed during this phase ¹ | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 |
| Number of total potential units constructed at phase buildout | 4 | 8 | 12 | 16 |
| Calculation of Annual Gas Tax Revenue | | | | |
| Average no. persons per household | 2.880 | 2.880 | 2.880 | 2.880 |
| Potential population at phase buildout | 12 | 23 | 35 | 46 |
| Estimated annual per capita gas tax revenue ² | \$16.15 | \$16.15 | \$16.15 | \$16.15 |
| Annual gas tax revenue at phase buildout | \$186 | \$372 | \$558 | \$744 |

¹ - assumes 75% of the total number of units possible, at maximum permitted density

² - data from Fiscal Year 2009-2010, California State Controller's Office^a

| Land Use Designation: Rural Residential (0-1 du/5ac) Total No. of Acres Lost to Conservation: 465 No. of Potential Buildout Units: 68 | Buildout Phase | | | |
|---|----------------------|------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------|
| | Phase I (Yrs 1-5) | Phase II (Yrs 6-10) | Phase III (Yrs 11-15) | Phase IV (Yrs 16-20) |
| Land Use Buildout Data | | | | |
| Number of acres developed during phase | 116.25 | 116.25 | 116.25 | 116.25 |
| Maximum density permitted (units/acre) | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.2 |
| Maximum potential units constructed during this phase ¹ | 17 | 17 | 17 | 17 |
| Number of total potential units constructed at phase buildout | 17 | 34 | 51 | 68 |
| Calculation of Annual Gas Tax Revenue | | | | |
| Average no. persons per household | 2,880 | 2,880 | 2,880 | 2,880 |
| Potential population at phase buildout | 49 | 98 | 147 | 196 |
| Estimated annual per capita gas tax revenue ² | \$16.15 | \$16.15 | \$16.15 | \$16.15 |
| Annual gas tax revenue at phase buildout | \$791 | \$1,581 | \$2,372 | \$3,163 |

¹ - assumes 75% of the total number of units possible, at maximum permitted density

² - data from Fiscal Year 2009-2010, California State Controller's Office

TN/MSHCP Fiscal Analysis
Desert Hot Springs
Gas Tax

| | Buildout Phase | | | |
|--|----------------------|------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------|
| | Phase I (Yrs 1-5) | Phase II (Yrs 6-10) | Phase III (Yrs 11-15) | Phase IV (Yrs 16-20) |
| <i>Land Use Designation: Low Density (0-5 du/ac)</i> | | | | |
| <i>Total No. of Acres Lost to Conservation: 259</i> | | | | |
| <i>No. of Potential Buildout Units: 972</i> | | | | |
| Land Use Buildout Data | | | | |
| Number of acres developed during phase | 64.75 | 64.75 | 64.75 | 64.75 |
| Maximum density permitted (units/acre) | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 |
| Maximum potential units constructed during this phase ¹ | 243 | 243 | 243 | 243 |
| Number of total potential units constructed at phase buildout | 243 | 486 | 729 | 972 |
| Calculation of Annual Gas Tax Revenue | | | | |
| Average no. persons per household | 2.880 | 2.880 | 2.880 | 2.880 |
| Potential population at phase buildout | 700 | 1,400 | 2,100 | 2,799 |
| Estimated annual per capita gas tax revenue ² | \$16.15 | \$16.15 | \$16.15 | \$16.15 |
| Annual gas tax revenue at phase buildout | \$11,302 | \$22,605 | \$33,907 | \$45,210 |

¹ = assumes 75% of the total number of units possible, at maximum permitted density

² = data from Fiscal Year 2009-2010, California State Controller's Office

| | Buildout Phase | | | |
|--|----------------------|------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------|
| | Phase I (Yrs 1-5) | Phase II (Yrs 6-10) | Phase III (Yrs 11-15) | Phase IV (Yrs 16-20) |
| <i>Land Use Designation: Low Density w/SP (0-5 du/ac)</i> | | | | |
| <i>Total No. of Acres Lost to Conservation: 1,167</i> | | | | |
| <i>No. of Potential Buildout Units: 4,376</i> | | | | |
| Land Use Buildout Data | | | | |
| Number of acres developed during phase | 291.75 | 291.75 | 291.75 | 291.75 |
| Maximum density permitted (units/acre) | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 |
| Maximum potential units constructed during this phase ¹ | 1,094 | 1,094 | 1,094 | 1,094 |
| Number of total potential units constructed at phase buildout | 1,094 | 2,188 | 3,282 | 4,376 |
| Calculation of Annual Gas Tax Revenue | | | | |
| Average no. persons per household | 2,880 | 2,880 | 2,880 | 2,880 |
| Potential population at phase buildout | 3,151 | 6,301 | 9,452 | 12,603 |
| Estimated annual per capita gas tax revenue ² | \$16.15 | \$16.15 | \$16.15 | \$16.15 |
| Annual gas tax revenue at phase buildout | \$50,884 | \$101,768 | \$152,652 | \$203,537 |

¹ - assumes 75% of the total number of units possible, at maximum permitted density

² - data from Fiscal Year 2009-2010, California State Controller's Office"

| Land Use Designation: Medium Density (0-8 du/ac) Total No. of Acres Lost to Conservation: 16 acres No. of Potential Buildout Units: 96 | Buildout Phase | | | |
|--|----------------------|------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------|
| | Phase I (Yrs 1-5) | Phase II (Yrs 6-10) | Phase III (Yrs 11-15) | Phase IV (Yrs 16-20) |
| Land Use Buildout Data | | | | |
| Number of acres developed during phase | 4.00 | 4.00 | 4.00 | 4.00 |
| Maximum density permitted (units/acre) | 8.0 | 8.0 | 8.0 | 8.0 |
| Maximum potential units constructed during this phase ¹ | 24 | 24 | 24 | 24 |
| Number of total potential units constructed at phase buildout | 24 | 48 | 72 | 96 |
| Calculation of Annual Gas Tax Revenue | | | | |
| Average no. persons per household | 2,880 | 2,880 | 2,880 | 2,880 |
| Potential population at phase buildout | 69 | 138 | 207 | 276 |
| Estimated annual per capita gas tax revenue ² | \$16.15 | \$16.15 | \$16.15 | \$16.15 |
| Annual gas tax revenue at phase buildout | \$1,116 | \$2,233 | \$3,349 | \$4,465 |

¹ = assumes 75% of the total number of units possible, at maximum permitted density

² = data from Fiscal Year 2009-2010, California State Controller's Office*

| Land Use Designation: High Density w/SP(0-14 du/ac) Total No. Acres Lost to Conservation: 47 acres No. of Potential Buildout Units: 492 | Buildout Phase | | | |
|---|----------------------|------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------|
| | Phase I (Yrs 1-5) | Phase II (Yrs 6-10) | Phase III (Yrs 11-15) | Phase IV (Yrs 16-20) |
| Land Use Buildout Data | | | | |
| Number of acres developed during phase | 11.75 | 11.75 | 11.75 | 11.75 |
| Maximum density permitted (units/acre) | 14.0 | 14.0 | 14.0 | 14.0 |
| Maximum potential units constructed during this phase ¹ | 123 | 123 | 123 | 123 |
| Number of total potential units constructed at phase buildout | 123 | 246 | 369 | 492 |
| Calculation of Annual Gas Tax Revenue | | | | |
| Average no. persons per household | 2,880 | 2,880 | 2,880 | 2,880 |
| Potential population at phase buildout | 354 | 708 | 1,063 | 1,417 |
| Estimated annual per capita gas tax revenue ² | \$16.15 | \$16.15 | \$16.15 | \$16.15 |
| Annual gas tax revenue at phase buildout | \$5,721 | \$11,442 | \$17,163 | \$22,884 |

¹ = assumes 75% of the total number of units possible, at maximum permitted density ² = data from Fiscal Year 2009-2010, California State Controller's Office*

| Highway User Gas Tax Revenue | | | | |
|---|------------------------------|--------------------------------|----------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| | Buildout Phase | | | |
| | Phase I (Yrs 1-5) | Phase II (Yrs 6-10) | Phase III (Yrs 11-15) | Phase IV (Yrs 16-20) |
| Total Gas Tax Revenue from all development | \$70,838 | \$141,676 | \$212,513 | \$283,351 |

| CSA 152 Revenue | | | | |
|--|-----------------------|-------------------|--------------------|--------------------|
| from Single-Family Residential Development | | | | |
| <i>Land Use Designation: Rural Desert (0-1 du/10 ac)</i> | Buildout Phase | | | |
| <i>Total No. of Acres Lost to Conservation: 936</i> | Phase I | Phase II | Phase III | Phase IV |
| <i>No. of Potential Buildout Units: 72</i> | (Yrs 1-5) | (Yrs 6-10) | (Yrs 11-15) | (Yrs 16-20) |
| Land Use Buildout Data | | | | |
| Number of acres developed during phase | 234.00 | 234.00 | 234.00 | 234.00 |
| Maximum density permitted (units/acre) | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 |
| Maximum potential units constructed during this phase ¹ | 18 | 18 | 18 | 18 |
| Number of total potential units constructed at phase buildout | 18 | 36 | 54 | 72 |
| Calculation of CSA 152 Revenue | | | | |
| BAU Value per dwelling unit | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| City's BAU Rate | \$1.56 | \$1.56 | \$1.56 | \$1.56 |
| Total Annual Revenue at Phase Buildout | \$28.08 | \$56.16 | \$84.24 | \$112.32 |

¹ = assumes 75% of the total number of units possible, at maximum permitted density

| | Buildout Phase | | | |
|--|----------------------|------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------|
| | Phase I (Yrs 1-5) | Phase II (Yrs 6-10) | Phase III (Yrs 11-15) | Phase IV (Yrs 16-20) |
| Land Use Designation: Residential Estates (0-1 du/10 ac) | | | | |
| Total No. of Acres Lost to Conservation: 233 | | | | |
| No. of Potential Buildout Units: 16 | | | | |
| Land Use Buildout Data | | | | |
| Number of acres developed during phase | 58.25 | 58.25 | 58.25 | 58.25 |
| Maximum density permitted (units/acre) | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 |
| Maximum potential units constructed during this phase ¹ | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 |
| Number of total potential units constructed at phase buildout | 4 | 8 | 12 | 16 |
| Calculation of CSA 152 Revenue | | | | |
| BAU Value per dwelling unit | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| City's BAU Rate | \$1.56 | \$1.56 | \$1.56 | \$1.56 |
| Total Annual Revenue at Phase Buildout | \$6.24 | \$12.48 | \$18.72 | \$24.96 |
| ¹ = assumes 75% of the total number of units possible, at maximum permitted density | | | | |

| Land Use Designation: Rural Residential (0-1 du/5ac) Total No. of Acres Lost to Conservation: 465 No. of Potential Buildout Units: 68 | Buildout Phase | | | |
|---|----------------------|------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------|
| | Phase I (Yrs 1-5) | Phase II (Yrs 6-10) | Phase III (Yrs 11-15) | Phase IV (Yrs 16-20) |
| Land Use Buildout Data | | | | |
| Number of acres developed during phase | 116.25 | 116.25 | 116.25 | 116.25 |
| Maximum density permitted (units/acre) | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.2 |
| Maximum potential units constructed during this phase ¹ | 17 | 17 | 17 | 17 |
| Number of total potential units constructed at phase buildout | 17 | 34 | 51 | 68 |
| Calculation of CSA 152 Revenue | | | | |
| BAU Value per dwelling unit | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| City's BAU Rate | \$1.56 | \$1.56 | \$1.56 | \$1.56 |
| Total Annual Revenue at Phase Buildout | \$26.52 | \$53.04 | \$79.56 | \$106.08 |

¹ = assumes 75% of the total number of units possible, at maximum permitted density

| Land Use Designation: Low Density (0-5 du/ac) Total No. of Acres Lost to Conservation: 259 No. of Potential Buildout Units: 972 | Buildout Phase | | | |
|---|----------------------|------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------|
| | Phase I (Yrs 1-5) | Phase II (Yrs 6-10) | Phase III (Yrs 11-15) | Phase IV (Yrs 16-20) |
| Land Use Buildout Data | | | | |
| Number of acres developed during phase | 64.75 | 64.75 | 64.75 | 64.75 |
| Maximum density permitted (units/acre) | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 |
| Maximum potential units constructed during this phase ¹ | 243 | 243 | 243 | 243 |
| Number of total potential units constructed at phase buildout | 243 | 486 | 729 | 972 |
| Calculation of CSA 152 Revenue | | | | |
| BAU Value per dwelling unit | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| City's BAU Rate | \$1.56 | \$1.56 | \$1.56 | \$1.56 |
| Total Annual Revenue at Phase Buildout | \$379.08 | \$758.16 | \$1,137.24 | \$1,516.32 |

¹ = assumes 75% of the total number of units possible, at maximum permitted density

| Land Use Designation: Low Density w/SP (0-5 du/ac) Total No. of Acres Lost to Conservation: 1,167 No. of Potential Buildout Units: 4,376 | Buildout Phase | | | |
|--|----------------------|------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------|
| | Phase I (Yrs 1-5) | Phase II (Yrs 6-10) | Phase III (Yrs 11-15) | Phase IV (Yrs 16-20) |
| Land Use Buildout Data | | | | |
| Number of acres developed during phase | 291.75 | 291.75 | 291.75 | 291.75 |
| Maximum density permitted (units/acre) | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 |
| Maximum potential units constructed during this phase ¹ | 1,094 | 1,094 | 1,094 | 1,094 |
| Number of total potential units constructed at phase buildout | 1,094 | 2,188 | 3,282 | 4,376 |
| Calculation of CSA 152 Revenue | | | | |
| BAU Value per dwelling unit | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| City's BAU Rate | \$1.56 | \$1.56 | \$1.56 | \$1.56 |
| Total Annual Revenue at Phase Buildout | \$1,706.64 | \$3,413.28 | \$5,119.92 | \$6,826.56 |

¹ = assumes 75% of the total number of units possible, at maximum permitted density

| Land Use Designation: Medium Density (0-8 du/ac) Total No. of Acres Lost to Conservation: 16 acres No. of Potential Buildout Units: 96 | Buildout Phase | | | |
|--|----------------------|------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------|
| | Phase I (Yrs 1-5) | Phase II (Yrs 6-10) | Phase III (Yrs 11-15) | Phase IV (Yrs 16-20) |
| Land Use Buildout Data | | | | |
| Number of acres developed during phase | 4.00 | 4.00 | 4.00 | 4.00 |
| Maximum density permitted (units/acre) | 8.0 | 8.0 | 8.0 | 8.0 |
| Maximum potential units constructed during this phase ¹ | 24 | 24 | 24 | 24 |
| Number of total potential units constructed at phase buildout | 24 | 48 | 72 | 96 |
| Calculation of CSA 152 Revenue | | | | |
| BAU Value per dwelling unit | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| City's BAU Rate | \$1.56 | \$1.56 | \$1.56 | \$1.56 |
| Total Annual Revenue at Phase Buildout | \$37.44 | \$74.88 | \$112.32 | \$149.76 |

¹ = assumes 75% of the total number of units possible, at maximum permitted density

| Land Use Designation: High Density w/SP(0-14 du/ac) Total No. Acres Lost to Conservation: 47 acres No. of Potential Buildout Units: 492 | Buildout Phase | | | |
|---|----------------------|------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------|
| | Phase I (Yrs 1-5) | Phase II (Yrs 6-10) | Phase III (Yrs 11-15) | Phase IV (Yrs 16-20) |
| Land Use Buildout Data | | | | |
| Number of acres developed during phase | 11.75 | 11.75 | 11.75 | 11.75 |
| Maximum density permitted (units/acre) | 14.0 | 14.0 | 14.0 | 14.0 |
| Maximum potential units constructed during this phase ¹ | 123 | 123 | 123 | 123 |
| Number of total potential units constructed at phase buildout | 123 | 246 | 369 | 492 |
| Calculation of CSA 152 Revenue | | | | |
| BAU Value per dwelling unit | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| City's BAU Rate | \$1.56 | \$1.56 | \$1.56 | \$1.56 |
| Total Annual Revenue at Phase Buildout | \$191.88 | \$383.76 | \$575.64 | \$767.52 |

¹ = assumes 75% of the total number of units possible, at maximum permitted density

| CSA 152 Revenue from Industrial Development | | | | |
|--|------------------------------|--------------------------------|----------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| <i>Land Use Designation: Light Industrial (I-L)</i> <i>Total No. Acres Lost to Conservation: 28acres</i> <i>Potential Square Feet at Buildout: 414,692</i> | Buildout Phase | | | |
| | Phase I (Yrs 1-5) | Phase II (Yrs 6-10) | Phase III (Yrs 11-15) | Phase IV (Yrs 16-20) |
| Land Use Buildout Data | | | | |
| Number of acres developed during phase | 7.00 | 7.00 | 7.00 | 7.00 |
| Percentage of acres developed (percent lot coverage) | 75% | 75% | 75% | 75% |
| Number of acres developed at phase buildout | 5.25 | 10.50 | 15.75 | 21.00 |
| Calculation of CSA 152 Revenue | | | | |
| BAU Value per developed acre | 12 | 12 | 12 | 12 |
| City's BAU Rate | \$1.56 | \$1.56 | \$1.56 | \$1.56 |
| Total Annual Revenue at Phase Buildout | \$98 | \$197 | \$295 | \$393 |

| <i>Land Use Designation: Light Industrial (LI)</i> <i>Total No. Acres Lost to Conservation: 89</i> <i>Potential Square Feet at Buildout: 1,318,124</i> | Buildout Phase | | | |
|--|------------------------------|--------------------------------|----------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| | Phase I (Yrs 1-5) | Phase II (Yrs 6-10) | Phase III (Yrs 11-15) | Phase IV (Yrs 16-20) |
| Land Use Buildout Data | | | | |
| Number of acres developed during phase | 22.25 | 22.25 | 22.25 | 22.25 |
| Percentage of acres developed (percent lot coverage) | 75% | 75% | 75% | 75% |
| Number of acres developed at phase buildout | 16.69 | 33.38 | 50.06 | 66.75 |
| Calculation of CSA 152 Revenue | | | | |
| BAU Value per developed acre | 12 | 12 | 12 | 12 |
| City's BAU Rate | \$1.56 | \$1.56 | \$1.56 | \$1.56 |
| Total Annual Revenue at Phase Buildout | \$312 | \$625 | \$937 | \$1,250 |

| CSA 152 Revenue | | | | |
|--|----------------------|------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------|
| | Buildout Phase | | | |
| | Phase I (Yrs 1-5) | Phase II (Yrs 6-10) | Phase III (Yrs 11-15) | Phase IV (Yrs 16-20) |
| Total CSA 152 Revenue from Residential Development | \$2,376 | \$4,752 | \$7,128 | \$9,504 |
| Total CSA 152 Revenue from Industrial Development | \$411 | \$821 | \$1,232 | \$1,643 |
| Total CSA 152 Revenue from all Development | \$2,787 | \$5,573 | \$8,360 | \$11,146 |

| CFD 2010-01 | | | | |
|--|------------------------------|--------------------------------|----------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| from Single-Family Residential Development | | | | |
| <i>Land Use Designation: Rural Desert (0-1 du/10 ac)</i> <i>Total No. Acres Lost to Conservation: 936 acres</i> <i>No. of Potential Buildout Units: 72</i> | Buildout Phase | | | |
| | Phase I (Yrs 1-5) | Phase II (Yrs 6-10) | Phase III (Yrs 11-15) | Phase IV (Yrs 16-20) |
| Land Use Buildout Data | | | | |
| *Number of acres developed during this phase | 234.00 | 234.00 | 234.00 | 234.00 |
| *Maximum density permitted (units/acre) | 0.10 | 0.10 | 0.10 | 0.10 |
| Potential dwelling units constructed during this phase ¹ | 18 | 18 | 18 | 18 |
| Total potential dwelling units constructed at phase buildout | 18 | 36 | 54 | 72 |
| Number of total parcels existing at phase buildout ² | 18 | 36 | 54 | 72 |
| Calculation of CFD Revenue | | | | |
| BU Value per dwelling unit | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| City's BU Rate | \$400.00 | \$400.00 | \$400.00 | \$400.00 |
| Total Annual Revenue at Phase Buildout | \$7,200.00 | \$14,400.00 | \$21,600.00 | \$28,800.00 |

| Land Use Designation: Residential Estates (0-1 du/10 ac) Total No. of Acres Lost to Conservation: 233 No. of Potential Buildout Units: 16 | Buildout Phase | | | |
|---|----------------------|------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------|
| | Phase I (Yrs 1-5) | Phase II (Yrs 6-10) | Phase III (Yrs 11-15) | Phase IV (Yrs 16-20) |
| Land Use Buildout Data | | | | |
| Number of acres developed during this phase | 58.25 | 58.25 | 58.25 | 58.25 |
| Maximum density permitted (units/acre) | 0.10 | 0.10 | 0.10 | 0.10 |
| Potential dwelling units constructed during this phase ¹ | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 |
| Total potential dwelling units constructed at phase buildout | 4 | 8 | 12 | 16 |
| Number of total parcels existing at phase buildout ² | 4 | 8 | 12 | 16 |
| Calculation of CFD Revenue | | | | |
| BU Value per dwelling unit | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| City's BU Rate | \$400.00 | \$400.00 | \$400.00 | \$400.00 |
| Total Annual Revenue at Phase Buildout | \$1,600.00 | \$3,200.00 | \$4,800.00 | \$6,400.00 |

² Assumes each future dwelling unit will occupy its own parcel.

| Land Use Designation: Rural Residential (0-1 du/5ac) Total No. of Acres Lost to Conservation: 465 No. of Potential Buildout Units: 68 | Buildout Phase | | | |
|---|----------------------|------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------|
| | Phase I (Yrs 1-5) | Phase II (Yrs 6-10) | Phase III (Yrs 11-15) | Phase IV (Yrs 16-20) |
| Land Use Buildout Data | | | | |
| Number of acres developed during this phase | 116.25 | 116.25 | 116.25 | 116.25 |
| Maximum density permitted (units/acre) | 0.20 | 0.20 | 0.20 | 0.20 |
| Potential dwelling units constructed during this phase ¹ | 17 | 17 | 17 | 17 |
| Total potential dwelling units constructed at phase buildout | 17 | 34 | 51 | 68 |
| Number of total parcels existing at phase buildout ² | 17 | 34 | 51 | 68 |
| Calculation of CFD Revenue | | | | |
| BU Value per dwelling unit | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| City's BU Rate | \$400.00 | \$400.00 | \$400.00 | \$400.00 |
| Total Annual Revenue at Phase Buildout | \$6,800.00 | \$13,600.00 | \$20,400.00 | \$27,200.00 |

² Assumes each future dwelling unit will occupy its own parcel.

| <i>Land Use Designation: Low Density (0-5 du/ac)</i> <i>Total No. of Acres Lost to Conservation: 259</i> <i>No. of Potential Buildout Units: 972</i> | Buildout Phase | | | |
|--|------------------------------|--------------------------------|----------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| | Phase I (Yrs 1-5) | Phase II (Yrs 6-10) | Phase III (Yrs 11-15) | Phase IV (Yrs 16-20) |
| Land Use Buildout Data | | | | |
| Number of acres developed during this phase | 64.75 | 64.75 | 64.75 | 64.75 |
| Maximum density permitted (units/acre) | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 |
| Potential dwelling units constructed during this phase ¹ | 243 | 243 | 243 | 243 |
| Total potential dwelling units constructed at phase buildout | 243 | 486 | 729 | 972 |
| Number of total parcels existing at phase buildout ² | 243 | 486 | 729 | 972 |
| Calculation of CFD Revenue | | | | |
| BU Value per dwelling unit | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| City's BU Rate | \$400.00 | \$400.00 | \$400.00 | \$400.00 |
| Total Annual Revenue at Phase Buildout | \$97,200.00 | \$194,400.00 | \$291,600.00 | \$388,800.00 |

² Assumes each future dwelling unit will occupy its own parcel.

| <i>Land Use Designation: Low Density w/SP (0-5 du/ac)</i> <i>Total No. of Acres Lost to Conservation: 1,167</i> <i>No. of Potential Buildout Units: 4,376</i> | Buildout Phase | | | |
|---|------------------------------|--------------------------------|----------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| | Phase I (Yrs 1-5) | Phase II (Yrs 6-10) | Phase III (Yrs 11-15) | Phase IV (Yrs 16-20) |
| Land Use Buildout Data | | | | |
| Number of acres developed during this phase | 291.75 | 291.75 | 291.75 | 291.75 |
| Maximum density permitted (units/acre) | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 |
| Potential dwelling units constructed during this phase ¹ | 1,094 | 1,094 | 1,094 | 1,094 |
| Total potential dwelling units constructed at phase buildout | 1,094 | 2,188 | 3,282 | 4,376 |
| Number of total parcels existing at phase buildout ² | 1,094 | 2,188 | 3,282 | 4,376 |
| Calculation of CFD Revenue | | | | |
| BU Value per dwelling unit | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| City's BU Rate | \$400.00 | \$400.00 | \$400.00 | \$400.00 |
| Total Annual Revenue at Phase Buildout | \$437,600.00 | \$875,200.00 | \$1,312,800.00 | \$1,750,400.00 |

² Assumes each future dwelling unit will occupy its own parcel.

| Land Use Designation: Medium Density (0-8 du/ac) Total No. of Acres Lost to Conservation: 16 acres No. of Potential Buildout Units: 96 | Buildout Phase | | | |
|--|----------------------|------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------|
| | Phase I (Yrs 1-5) | Phase II (Yrs 6-10) | Phase III (Yrs 11-15) | Phase IV (Yrs 16-20) |
| Land Use Buildout Data | | | | |
| Number of acres developed during this phase | 4.00 | 4.00 | 4.00 | 4.00 |
| Maximum density permitted (units/acre) | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 |
| Potential dwelling units constructed during this phase ¹ | 24 | 24 | 24 | 24 |
| Total potential dwelling units constructed at phase buildout | 24 | 48 | 72 | 96 |
| Number of total parcels existing at phase buildout ² | 24 | 48 | 72 | 96 |
| Calculation of CFD Revenue | | | | |
| BU Value per dwelling unit | 0.60 | 0.60 | 0.60 | 0.60 |
| City's BU Rate | \$400.00 | \$400.00 | \$400.00 | \$400.00 |
| Total Annual Revenue at Phase Buildout | \$424.60 | \$448.60 | \$472.60 | \$496.60 |

² Assumes each future dwelling unit will occupy its own parcel.

| Land Use Designation: High Density w/SP(0-14 du/ac) Total No. Acres Lost to Conservation: 47 acres No. of Potential Buildout Units: 492 | Buildout Phase | | | |
|---|-------------------------------|------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------|
| | Phase I (Yrs 1-5) | Phase II (Yrs 6-10) | Phase III (Yrs 11-15) | Phase IV (Yrs 16-20) |
| | Land Use Buildout Data | | | |
| Number of acres developed during this phase | 11.75 | 11.75 | 11.75 | 11.75 |
| Maximum density permitted (units/acre) | 14 | 14 | 14 | 14 |
| Potential dwelling units constructed during this phase ¹ | 123 | 123 | 123 | 123 |
| Total potential dwelling units constructed at phase buildout | 123 | 246 | 369 | 492 |
| | 123 | 246 | 369 | 492 |
| Calculation of CFD Revenue | | | | |
| BU Value per dwelling unit | 0.60 | 0.60 | 0.60 | 0.60 |
| City's BU Rate | \$20.00 | \$20.00 | \$20.00 | \$20.00 |
| Total Annual Revenue at Phase Buildout | \$143.60 | \$266.60 | \$389.60 | \$512.60 |

| Land Use Designation: Light Industrial (I-L) Total No. Acres Lost to Conservation: 38.48 acres No. of Potential Buildout Units: 569,904 | Buildout Phase | | | |
|---|----------------------|------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------|
| | Phase I (Yrs 1-5) | Phase II (Yrs 6-10) | Phase III (Yrs 11-15) | Phase IV (Yrs 16-20) |
| Number of acres developed during this phase | 9.62 | 9.62 | 9.62 | 9.62 |
| Calculation of CFD Revenue | | | | |
| BU Value per Acre | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 |
| City's BU Rate | \$400.00 | \$400.00 | \$400.00 | \$400.00 |
| Total Annual Revenue at Phase Buildout | \$7,696.00 | \$7,696.00 | \$7,696.00 | \$7,696.00 |

| Land Use Designation: Light Industrial (LI) Total No. Acres Lost to Conservation: 161.61 acres No. of Potential Buildout Units: 2,393,360 | Buildout Phase | | | |
|---|----------------------|------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------|
| | Phase I (Yrs 1-5) | Phase II (Yrs 6-10) | Phase III (Yrs 11-15) | Phase IV (Yrs 16-20) |
| Number of acres developed during this phase | 40.40 | 40.40 | 40.40 | 40.40 |
| Calculation of CFD Revenue | | | | |
| BU Value per Acre | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 |
| City's BU Rate | \$400.00 | \$400.00 | \$400.00 | \$400.00 |
| Total Annual Revenue at Phase Buildout | \$32,322.00 | \$32,322.00 | \$32,322.00 | \$32,322.00 |

¹ Assumes existing parcels will not be subdivided when developed.

| Lighting & Landscaping District Revenue | Buildout Phase | | | |
|---|----------------------|------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------|
| | Phase I (Yrs 1-5) | Phase II (Yrs 6-10) | Phase III (Yrs 11-15) | Phase IV (Yrs 16-20) |
| Total CFD Revenue from Single-Family Resid. Development | \$550,400 | \$1,100,800 | \$1,651,200 | \$2,201,600 |
| Total CFD Revenue from Multi-Family Resid. Development | \$568 | \$715 | \$862 | \$1,009 |
| Total CFD Revenue from Industrial Development | \$40,018 | \$40,018 | \$40,018 | \$40,018 |
| Total Annual CFD Revenue from all development | \$590,986 | \$1,141,533 | \$1,692,080 | \$2,242,627 |

| Costs of General Government | | | | |
|---|------------------------------|--------------------------------|----------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| <i>Land Use Designation: Rural Desert (0-1 du/10 ac)</i> <i>Total No. of Acres Lost to Conservation: 936</i> <i>No. of Potential Buildout Units: 72</i> | Buildout Phase | | | |
| | Phase I (Yrs 1-5) | Phase II (Yrs 6-10) | Phase III (Yrs 11-15) | Phase IV (Yrs 16-20) |
| Land Use Buildout Data | | | | |
| Number of acres developed during phase | 234.00 | 234 | 234 | 234 |
| Maximum density permitted (units/acre) | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 |
| Maximum potential units constructed during this phase ¹ | 18 | 18 | 18 | 18 |
| Number of total potential units constructed at phase buildout | 18 | 36 | 54 | 72 |
| Average number of persons per household (year 2010) | 2,880 | 2,880 | 2,880 | 2,880 |
| Total no. of potential residents at phase buildout | 52 | 104 | 156 | 207 |
| Calculating Annual Costs of General Government | | | | |
| General Fund Expenditures, FY 2010-11 | \$4,119,709 | \$4,119,709 | \$4,119,709 | \$4,119,709 |
| Population of Jurisdiction (year 2010) | 26,811 | 26,811 | 26,811 | 26,811 |
| Annual Per Capita Cost of General Government | \$153.66 | \$153.66 | \$153.66 | \$153.66 |
| Annual Cost of General Government at Phase Buildout | \$7,966 | \$15,931 | \$23,897 | \$31,862 |

| | Buildout Phase | | | |
|--|----------------------|------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------|
| | Phase I (Yrs 1-5) | Phase II (Yrs 6-10) | Phase III (Yrs 11-15) | Phase IV (Yrs 16-20) |
| <i>Land Use Designation: Residential Estates (0-1 du/10 ac)</i> | | | | |
| <i>Total No. of Acres Lost to Conservation: 233</i> | | | | |
| <i>No. of Potential Buildout Units: 16</i> | | | | |
| Land Use Buildout Data | | | | |
| Number of acres developed during phase | 58.25 | 58.25 | 58.25 | 58.25 |
| Maximum density permitted (units/acre) | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 |
| Maximum potential units constructed during this phase ¹ | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 |
| Number of total potential units constructed at phase buildout | 4 | 8 | 12 | 16 |
| Average number of persons per household (year 2010) | 2.880 | 2.880 | 2.880 | 2.880 |
| Total no. of potential residents at phase buildout | 12 | 23 | 35 | 46 |
| Calculating Annual Costs of General Government | | | | |
| General Fund Expenditures, FY 2010-11 | \$4,119,709 | \$4,119,709 | \$4,119,709 | \$4,119,709 |
| Population of Jurisdiction (year 2010) | 26,811 | 26,811 | 26,811 | 26,811 |
| Annual Per Capita Cost of General Government | \$153.66 | \$153.66 | \$153.66 | \$153.66 |
| Annual Cost of General Government at Phase Buildout | \$1,770 | \$3,540 | \$5,310 | \$7,081 |

| Land Use Designation: Rural Residential (0-1 du/5ac) Total No. of Acres Lost to Conservation: 465 No. of Potential Buildout Units: 68 | Buildout Phase | | | |
|---|----------------------|------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------|
| | Phase I (Yrs 1-5) | Phase II (Yrs 6-10) | Phase III (Yrs 11-15) | Phase IV (Yrs 16-20) |
| Land Use Buildout Data | | | | |
| Number of acres developed during phase | 116.25 | 116.25 | 116.25 | 116.25 |
| Maximum density permitted (units/acre) | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.2 |
| Maximum potential units constructed during this phase ¹ | 17 | 17 | 17 | 17 |
| Number of total potential units constructed at phase buildout | 17 | 34 | 51 | 68 |
| Average number of persons per household (year 2010) | 2,880 | 2,880 | 2,880 | 2,880 |
| Total no. of potential residents at phase buildout | 49 | 98 | 147 | 196 |
| Calculating Annual Costs of General Government | | | | |
| General Fund Expenditures, FY 2010-11 | \$4,119,709 | \$4,119,709 | \$4,119,709 | \$4,119,709 |
| Population of Jurisdiction (year 2010) | 26,811 | 26,811 | 26,811 | 26,811 |
| Annual Per Capita Cost of General Government | \$153.66 | \$153.66 | \$153.66 | \$153.66 |
| Annual Cost of General Government at Phase Buildout | \$7,523 | \$15,046 | \$22,569 | \$30,092 |

| <i>Land Use Designation: Low Density (0-5 du/ac)</i> <i>Total No. of Acres Lost to Conservation: 259</i> <i>No. of Potential Buildout Units: 972</i> | Buildout Phase | | | |
|--|------------------------------|--------------------------------|----------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| | Phase I (Yrs 1-5) | Phase II (Yrs 6-10) | Phase III (Yrs 11-15) | Phase IV (Yrs 16-20) |
| Land Use Buildout Data | | | | |
| Number of acres developed during phase | 64.75 | 64.75 | 64.75 | 64.75 |
| Maximum density permitted (units/acre) | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 |
| Maximum potential units constructed during this phase ¹ | 243 | 243 | 243 | 243 |
| Number of total potential units constructed at phase buildout | 243 | 486 | 729 | 972 |
| Average number of persons per household (year 2010) | 2.880 | 2.880 | 2.880 | 2.880 |
| Total no. of potential residents at phase buildout | 700 | 1,400 | 2,100 | 2,799 |
| Calculating Annual Costs of General Government | | | | |
| General Fund Expenditures, FY 2010-11 | \$4,119,709 | \$4,119,709 | \$4,119,709 | \$4,119,709 |
| Population of Jurisdiction (year 2010) | 26,811 | 26,811 | 26,811 | 26,811 |
| Annual Per Capita Cost of General Government | \$153.66 | \$153.66 | \$153.66 | \$153.66 |
| Annual Cost of General Government at Phase Buildout | \$107,536 | \$215,071 | \$322,607 | \$430,142 |

| Land Use Designation: Low Density w/SP (0-5 du/ac) Total No. of Acres Lost to Conservation: 1,167 No. of Potential Buildout Units: 4,376 | Buildout Phase | | | |
|--|----------------------|------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------|
| | Phase I (Yrs 1-5) | Phase II (Yrs 6-10) | Phase III (Yrs 11-15) | Phase IV (Yrs 16-20) |
| Land Use Buildout Data | | | | |
| Number of acres developed during phase | 291.75 | 291.75 | 291.75 | 291.75 |
| Maximum density permitted (units/acre) | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 |
| Maximum potential units constructed during this phase ¹ | 1,094 | 1,094 | 1,094 | 1,094 |
| Number of total potential units constructed at phase buildout | 1,094 | 2,188 | 3,282 | 4,376 |
| Average number of persons per household (year 2010) | 2.880 | 2.880 | 2.880 | 2.880 |
| Total no. of potential residents at phase buildout | 3,151 | 6,301 | 9,452 | 12,603 |
| Calculating Annual Costs of General Government | | | | |
| General Fund Expenditures, FY 2010-11 | \$4,119,709 | \$4,119,709 | \$4,119,709 | \$4,119,709 |
| Population of Jurisdiction (year 2010) | 26,811 | 26,811 | 26,811 | 26,811 |
| Annual Per Capita Cost of General Government | \$153.66 | \$153.66 | \$153.66 | \$153.66 |
| Annual Cost of General Government at Phase Buildout | \$484,131 | \$968,263 | \$1,452,394 | \$1,936,526 |

| <i>Land Use Designation: Medium Density (0-8 du/ac)</i> <i>Total No. of Acres Lost to Conservation: 16 acres</i> <i>No. of Potential Buildout Units: 96</i> | Buildout Phase | | | |
|---|------------------------------|--------------------------------|----------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| | Phase I (Yrs 1-5) | Phase II (Yrs 6-10) | Phase III (Yrs 11-15) | Phase IV (Yrs 16-20) |
| Land Use Buildout Data | | | | |
| Number of acres developed during phase | 4.00 | 4.00 | 4.00 | 4.00 |
| Maximum density permitted (units/acre) | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 |
| Maximum potential units constructed during this phase ¹ | 24 | 24 | 24 | 24 |
| Number of total potential units constructed at phase buildout | 24 | 48 | 72 | 96 |
| Average number of persons per household (year 2010) | 2.880 | 2.880 | 2.880 | 2.880 |
| Total no. of potential residents at phase buildout | 69.12 | 138.24 | 207.36 | 276.48 |
| Calculating Annual Costs of General Government | | | | |
| General Fund Expenditures, FY 2010-11 | \$4,119,709 | \$4,119,709 | \$4,119,709 | \$4,119,709 |
| Population of Jurisdiction (year 2010) | 26,811 | 26,811 | 26,811 | 26,811 |
| Annual Per Capita Cost of General Government | \$153.66 | \$153.66 | \$153.66 | \$153.66 |
| Annual Cost of General Government at Phase Buildout | \$10,621 | \$21,242 | \$31,862 | \$42,483 |

| Land Use Designation: High Density w/SP(0-14 du/ac) Total No. Acres Lost to Conservation: 47 acres No. of Potential Buildout Units: 492 | Buildout Phase | | | |
|---|----------------------|------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------|
| | Phase I (Yrs 1-5) | Phase II (Yrs 6-10) | Phase III (Yrs 11-15) | Phase IV (Yrs 16-20) |
| Land Use Buildout Data | | | | |
| Number of acres developed during phase | 11.75 | 11.75 | 11.75 | 11.75 |
| Maximum density permitted (units/acre) | 14 | 14 | 14 | 14 |
| Maximum potential units constructed during this phase ¹ | 123 | 123 | 123 | 123 |
| Number of total potential units constructed at phase buildout | 123 | 246 | 369 | 492 |
| Average number of persons per household (year 2010) | 2,880 | 2,880 | 2,880 | 2,880 |
| Total no. of potential residents at phase buildout | 354 | 708 | 1,063 | 1,417 |
| Calculating Annual Costs of General Government | | | | |
| General Fund Expenditures, FY 2010-11 | \$4,119,709 | \$4,119,709 | \$4,119,709 | \$4,119,709 |
| Population of Jurisdiction (year 2010) | 26,811 | 26,811 | 26,811 | 26,811 |
| Annual Per Capita Cost of General Government | \$153.66 | \$153.66 | \$153.66 | \$153.66 |
| Annual Cost of General Government at Phase Buildout | \$54,432 | \$108,863 | \$163,295 | \$217,726 |

| Costs of General Government | | | | |
|---|------------------------------|--------------------------------|----------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| | Buildout Phase | | | |
| | Phase I (Yrs 1-5) | Phase II (Yrs 6-10) | Phase III (Yrs 11-15) | Phase IV (Yrs 16-20) |
| Annual Costs of General Gov. for all development | \$673,978 | \$1,347,957 | \$2,021,935 | \$2,695,913 |

| Costs of Public Safety | | | | |
|--|-----------------------|-------------------|--------------------|--------------------|
| <i>Land Use Designation: Rural Desert (0-1 du/10 ac)</i> | Buildout Phase | | | |
| <i>Total No. of Acres Lost to Conservation: 936</i> | Phase I | Phase II | Phase III | Phase IV |
| <i>No. of Potential Buildout Units: 72</i> | (Yrs 1-5) | (Yrs 6-10) | (Yrs 11-15) | (Yrs 16-20) |
| Land Use Buildout Data | | | | |
| Number of acres developed during phase | 234.00 | 234 | 234 | 234 |
| Maximum density permitted (units/acre) | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 |
| Maximum potential units constructed during this phase ¹ | 18 | 18 | 18 | 18 |
| Number of total potential units constructed at phase buildout | 18 | 36 | 54 | 72 |
| Average number of persons per household (year 2010) | 2,880 | 2,880 | 2,880 | 2,880 |
| Total no. of potential residents at phase buildout | 52 | 104 | 156 | 207 |
| Calculating Annual Costs of Public Safety | | | | |
| Public Safety Expenditures, FY 2010-11 | \$9,573,455 | \$9,573,455 | \$9,573,455 | \$9,573,455 |
| Population of Jurisdiction (year 2010) | 26,811 | 26,811 | 26,811 | 26,811 |
| Annual Per Capita Cost of Public Safety | \$357.07 | \$357.07 | \$357.07 | \$357.07 |
| Annual Cost of Public Safety at Phase Buildout | \$18,511 | \$37,021 | \$55,532 | \$74,042 |

| | Buildout Phase | | | |
|--|----------------------|------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------|
| | Phase I (Yrs 1-5) | Phase II (Yrs 6-10) | Phase III (Yrs 11-15) | Phase IV (Yrs 16-20) |
| <i>Land Use Designation: Residential Estates (0-1 du/10 ac)</i> | | | | |
| <i>Total No. of Acres Lost to Conservation: 233</i> | | | | |
| <i>No. of Potential Buildout Units: 16</i> | | | | |
| Land Use Buildout Data | | | | |
| Number of acres developed during phase | 58.25 | 58.25 | 58.25 | 58.25 |
| Maximum density permitted (units/acre) | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 |
| Maximum potential units constructed during this phase ¹ | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 |
| Number of total potential units constructed at phase buildout | 4 | 8 | 12 | 16 |
| Average number of persons per household (year 2010) | 2,880 | 2,880 | 2,880 | 2,880 |
| Total no. of potential residents at phase buildout | 12 | 23 | 35 | 46 |
| Calculating Annual Costs of Public Safety | | | | |
| Public Safety Expenditures, FY 2010-11 | \$9,573,455 | \$9,573,455 | \$9,573,455 | \$9,573,455 |
| Population of Jurisdiction (year 2010) | 26,811 | 26,811 | 26,811 | 26,811 |
| Annual Per Capita Cost of Public Safety | \$357.07 | \$357.07 | \$357.07 | \$357.07 |
| Annual Cost of Public Safety at Phase Buildout | \$4,113 | \$8,227 | \$12,340 | \$16,454 |

| <i>Land Use Designation: Rural Residential (0-1 du/5ac)</i> <i>Total No. of Acres Lost to Conservation: 465</i> <i>No. of Potential Buildout Units: 68</i> | Buildout Phase | | | |
|--|------------------------------|--------------------------------|----------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| | Phase I (Yrs 1-5) | Phase II (Yrs 6-10) | Phase III (Yrs 11-15) | Phase IV (Yrs 16-20) |
| Land Use Buildout Data | | | | |
| Number of acres developed during phase | 116.25 | 116.25 | 116.25 | 116.25 |
| Maximum density permitted (units/acre) | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.2 |
| Maximum potential units constructed during this phase ¹ | 17 | 17 | 17 | 17 |
| Number of total potential units constructed at phase buildout | 17 | 34 | 51 | 68 |
| Average number of persons per household (year 2010) | 2.880 | 2.880 | 2.880 | 2.880 |
| Total no. of potential residents at phase buildout | 49 | 98 | 147 | 196 |
| Calculating Annual Costs of Public Safety | | | | |
| Public Safety Expenditures, FY 2010-11 | \$9,573,455 | \$9,573,455 | \$9,573,455 | \$9,573,455 |
| Population of Jurisdiction (year 2010) | 26,811 | 26,811 | 26,811 | 26,811 |
| Annual Per Capita Cost of Public Safety | \$357.07 | \$357.07 | \$357.07 | \$357.07 |
| Annual Cost of Public Safety at Phase Buildout | \$17,482 | \$34,964 | \$52,447 | \$69,929 |

| Land Use Designation: Low Density (0-5 du/ac) Total No. of Acres Lost to Conservation: 259 No. of Potential Buildout Units: 972 | Buildout Phase | | | |
|---|----------------------|------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------|
| | Phase I (Yrs 1-5) | Phase II (Yrs 6-10) | Phase III (Yrs 11-15) | Phase IV (Yrs 16-20) |
| Land Use Buildout Data | | | | |
| Number of acres developed during phase | 64.75 | 64.75 | 64.75 | 64.75 |
| Maximum density permitted (units/acre) | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 |
| Maximum potential units constructed during this phase ¹ | 243 | 243 | 243 | 243 |
| Number of total potential units constructed at phase buildout | 243 | 486 | 729 | 972 |
| Average number of persons per household (year 2010) | 2.880 | 2.880 | 2.880 | 2.880 |
| Total no. of potential residents at phase buildout | 700 | 1,400 | 2,100 | 2,799 |
| Calculating Annual Costs of Public Safety | | | | |
| Public Safety Expenditures, FY 2010-11 | \$9,573,455 | \$9,573,455 | \$9,573,455 | \$9,573,455 |
| Population of Jurisdiction (year 2010) | 26,811 | 26,811 | 26,811 | 26,811 |
| Annual Per Capita Cost of Public Safety | \$357.07 | \$357.07 | \$357.07 | \$357.07 |
| Annual Cost of Public Safety at Phase Buildout | \$249,893 | \$499,786 | \$749,680 | \$999,573 |

| Land Use Designation: Low Density w/SP (0-5 du/ac) Total No. of Acres Lost to Conservation: 1,167 No. of Potential Buildout Units: 4,376 | Buildout Phase | | | |
|--|----------------------|------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------|
| | Phase I (Yrs 1-5) | Phase II (Yrs 6-10) | Phase III (Yrs 11-15) | Phase IV (Yrs 16-20) |
| Land Use Buildout Data | | | | |
| Number of acres developed during phase | 291.75 | 291.75 | 291.75 | 291.75 |
| Maximum density permitted (units/acre) | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 |
| Maximum potential units constructed during this phase ¹ | 1,094 | 1,094 | 1,094 | 1,094 |
| Number of total potential units constructed at phase buildout | 1,094 | 2,188 | 3,282 | 4,376 |
| Average number of persons per household (year 2010) | 2,880 | 2,880 | 2,880 | 2,880 |
| Total no. of potential residents at phase buildout | 3,151 | 6,301 | 9,452 | 12,603 |
| Calculating Annual Costs of Public Safety | | | | |
| Public Safety Expenditures, FY 2010-11 | \$9,573,455 | \$9,573,455 | \$9,573,455 | \$9,573,455 |
| Population of Jurisdiction (year 2010) | 26,811 | 26,811 | 26,811 | 26,811 |
| Annual Per Capita Cost of Public Safety | \$357.07 | \$357.07 | \$357.07 | \$357.07 |
| Annual Cost of Public Safety at Phase Buildout | \$1,125,034 | \$2,250,067 | \$3,375,101 | \$4,500,134 |

TN/MSHCP Fiscal Analysis
Desert Hot Springs
Public Safety Costs

| Land Use Designation: Medium Density (0-8 du/ac) Total No. of Acres Lost to Conservation: 16 acres No. of Potential Buildout Units: 96 | Buildout Phase | | | |
|--|----------------------|------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------|
| | Phase I (Yrs 1-5) | Phase II (Yrs 6-10) | Phase III (Yrs 11-15) | Phase IV (Yrs 16-20) |
| Land Use Buildout Data | | | | |
| Number of acres developed during phase | 4.00 | 4.00 | 4.00 | 4.00 |
| Maximum density permitted (units/acre) | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 |
| Maximum potential units constructed during this phase ¹ | 24 | 24 | 24 | 24 |
| Number of total potential units constructed at phase buildout | 24 | 48 | 72 | 96 |
| Average number of persons per household (year 2010) | 2.880 | 2.880 | 2.880 | 2.880 |
| Total no. of potential residents at phase buildout | 69 | 138 | 207 | 276 |
| Calculating Annual Costs of Public Safety | | | | |
| Public Safety Expenditures, FY 2010-11 | \$9,573,455 | \$9,573,455 | \$9,573,455 | \$9,573,455 |
| Population of Jurisdiction (year 2010) | 26,811 | 26,811 | 26,811 | 26,811 |
| Annual Per Capita Cost of Public Safety | \$357.07 | \$357.07 | \$357.07 | \$357.07 |
| Annual Cost of Public Safety at Phase Buildout | \$24,681 | \$49,362 | \$74,042 | \$98,723 |

| <i>Land Use Designation: High Density w/SP(0-14 du/ac)</i> <i>Total No. Acres Lost to Conservation: 47 acres</i> <i>No. of Potential Buildout Units: 492</i> | Buildout Phase | | | |
|--|------------------------------|--------------------------------|----------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| | Phase I (Yrs 1-5) | Phase II (Yrs 6-10) | Phase III (Yrs 11-15) | Phase IV (Yrs 16-20) |
| Land Use Buildout Data | | | | |
| Number of acres developed during phase | 11.75 | 11.75 | 11.75 | 11.75 |
| Maximum density permitted (units/acre) | 14 | 14 | 14 | 14 |
| Maximum potential units constructed during this phase ¹ | 123 | 123 | 123 | 123 |
| Number of total potential units constructed at phase buildout | 123 | 246 | 369 | 492 |
| Average number of persons per household (year 2010) | 2.880 | 2.880 | 2.880 | 2.880 |
| Total no. of potential residents at phase buildout | 354 | 708 | 1,063 | 1,417 |
| Calculating Annual Costs of Public Safety | | | | |
| Public Safety Expenditures, FY 2010-11 | \$9,573,455 | \$9,573,455 | \$9,573,455 | \$9,573,455 |
| Population of Jurisdiction (year 2010) | 26,811 | 26,811 | 26,811 | 26,811 |
| Annual Per Capita Cost of Public Safety | \$357.07 | \$357.07 | \$357.07 | \$357.07 |
| Annual Cost of Public Safety at Phase Buildout | \$126,489 | \$252,978 | \$379,467 | \$505,957 |

| Costs of Public Safety | | | | |
|--|------------------------------|--------------------------------|----------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| | Buildout Phase | | | |
| | Phase I (Yrs 1-5) | Phase II (Yrs 6-10) | Phase III (Yrs 11-15) | Phase IV (Yrs 16-20) |
| Annual Costs of Public Safety for all development | \$1,566,203 | \$3,132,406 | \$4,698,609 | \$6,264,812 |

| Costs of Roadway Maintenance | | | | |
|--|------------------------------|--------------------------------|----------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| | Buildout Phase | | | |
| | Phase I (Yrs 1-5) | Phase II (Yrs 6-10) | Phase III (Yrs 11-15) | Phase IV (Yrs 16-20) |
| Roadway Data | | | | |
| Total land area in jurisdiction (square miles) | 29 | 29 | 29 | 29 |
| Number of paved road miles in jurisdiction (year 2011) | 135 | 135 | 135 | 135 |
| Number of road miles per square mile of land area | 4.6 | 4.6 | 4.6 | 4.6 |
| Total Area designated for conservation (square miles) ¹ | 10.10 | 10.10 | 10.10 | 10.10 |
| Total no. of potential road miles in conservation area | 46.5 | 46.5 | 46.5 | 46.5 |
| No. of potential road miles in conservation area at phase buildout | 11.6 | 23.3 | 34.9 | 46.5 |
| Calculation of Annual Roadway Maintenance Costs | | | | |
| Total Annual Roadway Maintenance Expenditures | \$88,777 | \$88,777 | \$88,777 | \$88,777 |
| Number of paved road miles in jurisdiction | 135 | 135 | 135 | 135 |
| Annual Cost of Roadway Maintenance Per Road Mile | \$658 | \$658 | \$658 | \$658 |
| Annual Cost of Roadway Maintenance at Phase Buildout | \$7,651 | \$15,301 | \$22,952 | \$30,602 |

| Total Potential Costs/Revenues Associated with Development of Conservation Lands | | | | |
|---|------------------------------|--------------------------------|----------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| Summary Table - City of Desert Hot Springs | | | | |
| | Buildout Phase | | | |
| | Phase I (Yrs 1-5) | Phase II (Yrs 6-10) | Phase III (Yrs 11-15) | Phase IV (Yrs 16-20) |
| ANNUAL REVENUES | | | | |
| <i>General Fund:</i> | | | | |
| Property Tax | \$540,002 | \$1,080,004 | \$1,620,005 | \$2,160,006 |
| Property Transfer Tax | \$186,666 | \$251,729 | \$307,493 | \$371,556 |
| Local Sales Tax | \$111,383 | \$222,766 | \$334,149 | \$445,532 |
| Transient Occupancy Tax | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Utility Tax | \$417,645 | \$835,290 | \$1,252,936 | \$1,670,581 |
| Motor Vehicle In-Lieu Revenue | \$12,896 | \$25,791 | \$38,687 | \$51,582 |
| <i>Restricted Funds:</i> | | | | |
| TUMF Fees | \$3,176,339 | \$3,176,339 | \$3,176,339 | \$3,176,339 |
| Highway Users Gas Tax | \$70,838 | \$141,676 | \$212,513 | \$283,351 |
| Measure A | \$140 | \$281 | \$421 | \$561 |
| CSA 152 (NPDES) | \$2,787 | \$5,573 | \$8,360 | \$11,146 |
| Community Facilities District | \$590,986 | \$1,141,533 | \$1,692,080 | \$2,242,627 |
| Public Safety Tax | \$217,259 | \$382,030 | \$546,804 | \$711,577 |
| ANNUAL COSTS | | | | |
| <i>General Fund:</i> | | | | |
| General Government Costs | \$673,978 | \$1,347,957 | \$2,021,935 | \$2,695,913 |
| <i>Restricted Funds:</i> | | | | |
| Public Safety Costs | \$1,566,203 | \$3,132,406 | \$4,698,609 | \$6,264,812 |
| Roadway Maintenance Costs | \$7,651 | \$15,301 | \$22,952 | \$30,602 |
| TUMF Allocation to CVAG | \$3,176,339 | \$3,176,339 | \$3,176,339 | \$3,176,339 |
| SUMMARY OF REVENUES/COSTS: | | | | |
| <i>Revenues:</i> | | | | |
| Total Annual General Fund Revenues | \$1,268,592 | \$2,415,581 | \$3,553,269 | \$4,699,257 |
| Total Annual Restricted Fund Revenues | \$4,058,348 | \$4,847,431 | \$5,636,517 | \$6,425,601 |
| Revenue Subtotal | \$5,326,940 | \$7,263,012 | \$9,189,786 | \$11,124,858 |
| Historic Average Interest Rate on 90-Day Treasury Bills | 5.03% | 5.03% | 5.03% | 5.03% |
| Anticipated Interest Earned on Revenues | \$267,945 | \$365,330 | \$462,246 | \$559,580 |
| Total Annual Revenues at Phase Buildout | \$5,594,885 | \$7,628,342 | \$9,652,032 | \$11,684,438 |
| <i>Costs:</i> | | | | |
| Total Annual General Fund Costs | \$673,978 | \$1,347,957 | \$2,021,935 | \$2,695,913 |
| Total Annual Restricted Fund Costs | \$4,750,192 | \$6,324,046 | \$7,897,900 | \$9,471,753 |
| Total Annual Costs at Phase Buildout | \$5,424,171 | \$7,672,002 | \$9,919,834 | \$12,167,666 |
| Annual Cashflow at Phase Buildout | \$170,715 | -\$43,661 | -\$267,802 | -\$483,228 |

EXHIBIT - B

FINAL
SUPPLEMENTAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT
REPORT/STATEMENT
(SCH No. 2000061079)
for the
MAJOR AMENDMENT TO THE COACHELLA VALLEY
MULTIPLE SPECIES HABITAT CONSERVATION PLAN
and Associated
NATURAL COMMUNITY
CONSERVATION PLAN

RESPONSES TO COMMENTS

Prepared For

Coachella Valley Conservation Commission
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
California Department of Fish and Wildlife

Prepared By

DUDEK
3685 Main Street, Suite 250
Riverside, California 92501

MARCH 2014

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| <u>Section</u> | <u>Page No.</u> |
|--|-----------------|
| PREFACE | P-I |
| RESPONSES TO COMMENTS | RTC-1 |
| Introduction..... | RTC-1 |
| Format of Responses to Comments | RTC-1 |
| Index of Comments Received..... | RTC-1 |
| Comments and Responses..... | RTC-3 |
| Federal Agency Comments and Responses | RTC-3 |
| Regional, County, and City Agency Comments and Responses | RTC-6 |
| Tribal Government Comments and Responses | RTC-6 |
| Interested Parties Comments and Responses..... | RTC-12 |
| Public Comments and Responses | RTC-55 |

TABLE

| | | |
|---|---|-------|
| 1 | Summary of Comments Received on the Draft SEIR/SEIS During, or Shortly After the Close of, the Public Circulation Period Ending October 21, 2013..... | RTC-2 |
|---|---|-------|

APPENDIX

| | |
|---|-----------------|
| A | Comment Letters |
|---|-----------------|

PREFACE

This document contains the comments received on the Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Report (SEIR)/Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SEIS) for the Major Amendment to the Coachella Valley Multiple Species Habitat Conservation Plan and Natural Community Conservation Plan (MSHCP) and the responses to those comments.

RESPONSES TO COMMENTS

Introduction

The Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Report (SEIR)/Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement (SEIS) for the proposed Major Amendment to the Coachella Valley Multiple Species Habitat Conservation Plan and Natural Community Conservation Plan (MSHCP) project was circulated for public review from September 6, 2013, through October 21, 2013. Comments received during, or shortly after the close of, the public circulation period include letters. Copies of all the written comments are included in this document.

Format of Responses to Comments

All the written comments received during, or shortly after the close of, the public review period are included in this document. Substantive environmental issues raised within each comment letter are numbered along the right-hand margin of each letter or comment in the transcript. The responses to the comments in each comment letter are referenced by the index numbers in the margins of the letters.

The format of the responses to comments is based on a unique letter and number code for each comment. The number at the end of the code refers to a specific comment within the individual letter. Therefore, each individual comment has a unique code assignment. For example, S-1-1 is the first substantive comment in letter S-1. "S" represents a comment letter from a state agency, "1" refers to the first letter from a state agency, and the second "1" refers to the first comment in that letter. The alphabetic codes used in this appendix are:

- "F" for federal agencies
- "R" for regional, county, and city agencies
- "TG" for Tribal Governments
- "IP" for interested parties
- "P" for comments from the public.

Index of Comments Received

Table 1 lists the agencies, organizations, and persons who commented on the Draft SEIR/SEIS during, or shortly after the close of, the public comment period. The individual comment letters are listed within each category (agencies, interested parties, etc.) by the date they were received. The comment letters are provided in this document in Appendix A.

Response to Comments

Table 1
Summary of Comments Received on the Draft SEIR/SEIS During, or Shortly After the
Close of, the Public Circulation Period Ending October 21, 2013

| | |
|------|---|
| | |
| F-1 | United States Environmental Protection Agency |
| | <i>Regional, County, and City Agencies</i> |
| R-1 | Riverside County Airport Land Use Commission |
| | <i>Tribal Governments</i> |
| TG-1 | Soboba Band of Luiseno Indians |
| TG-2 | Native American Heritage Commission |
| | <i>Interested Parties</i> |
| IP-1 | Desert Valleys Builders Association |
| IP-2 | Sierra Club and Center for Biological Diversity |
| | <i>Members of the Public</i> |
| P-1 | Dr. Mohammed A. Athar |

Comments and Responses

The comments received on the Draft SEIR/SEIS during, or shortly after the close of, the public comment period and the responses to those comments are provided in the following sections. The responses to the comments are provided following the last page of each coded letter in each category (e.g., each tribal government comment letter is followed by the responses to the comments in the letters; interested parties' comment letters are followed by the responses to those comments).

Federal Agency Comments and Responses

Comment Letter F-1

Comment F-1-1

The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency has reviewed the Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement for the Coachella Valley Multiple Species Habitat Conservation Plan (MSHCP or Plan) pursuant to the National Environmental Policy Act, Council on Environmental Quality regulations (40 CFR Parts 1500-1508), and Section 309 of the Clean Air Act.

The EPA reviewed the Draft EIS for the MSHCP and provided comments to the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (FWS) on March 7, 2005. We rated the DEIS as Environmental Concerns – Insufficient Information (EC-2) and requested additional information on impacts to waters of the U.S., consultation with Tribal governments, environmental justice issues, conformity with air quality standards, and impacts to cultural resources and migratory birds. The EPA reviewed the Final EIS and provided comments to the FWS on May 15, 2006.

Response F-1-1

Comment acknowledged. Comment relates the history of the EPA's consideration of the SEIR/SEIS and no specific response is necessary.

Response to Comments

Comment F-1-2

Based on our review of the DSEIS, we have rated the Preferred Alternative and the document as LO-1, Lack of Objections – Adequate (see the enclosed “Summary of EPA Rating Definitions”). The Preferred Alternative would result in the issuance of a Major Amendment to the approved Coachella Valley MSHCP to include the City of Desert Hot Springs and Mission Springs Water District as Permittees of the Plan. Since the City of Desert Hot Springs was previously a Permittee, and was, therefore, included in the analyses prepared for the Draft and Final EISs, and the limited Covered Activities proposed for the Mission Springs Water District have been adequately addressed in the DSEIS, we have no objections to this action.

Response F-1-2

This comment relates to the review of the Draft SEIR/SEIS and the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency’s (EPA’s) rating of LO-1 (Lack of Objections – Adequate). The commenter’s statement that they have no objections to the action is noted.

This comment also provides a brief summary of the addition of the City of Desert Hot Springs (DHS) and Mission Springs Water District (MSWD) as Local Permittees to the CVMSHCP and is not related to the adequacy of the SEIR/SEIS analysis. No specific response is necessary.

Comment F-1-3

We recommend that the Final SEIS include a section devoted to climate change. This section should contain not only a description of anticipated climate change impacts to Covered Species—and the habitats on which they depend—over the MSHCP permit term, but also the efforts that would be taken to minimize or mitigate these impacts. The EPA believes that the long duration of the permit term (75 years), and the extreme warming anticipated to occur in the planning area, warrants the inclusion of a climate change mitigation and adaptation plan in the MSHCP.

Response F-1-3

This comment makes the recommendation to include a section in the Final SEIR/SEIS devoted to climate change. An overview of climate change science and a general discussion of conservation planning for species and vegetation types in relation to climate change is presented in Appendix I of the CVMSHCP (2007), Section 3.0, Conservation Planning, Subsection 3.2.2.3, Key Concepts, Climate Change (page A1-28 to A1-30). This discussion concludes with the following: “So, by including geographically distinct sites, the multiple sites criterion will include the range of conditions a given species inhabits today. As the climate changes in the future, there is a possibility that the habitat at one or more sites will become unsuitable for a target species. But preserving multiple sites in this manner will increase the likelihood that some refugia for each of the species will be maintained if climatic conditions change over time.” To provide an updated analysis of the effects of climate change on Covered Species and habitat communities in relation

to the Covered Activities and Conservation Objectives of the Plan, a Climate Change section has been added to the Final SEIR/SEIS. Please refer to Section 4.1.4, Final SEIR/SEIS.

Comment F-1-4

~~We appreciate the opportunity to review this DSEIS, and are available to discuss our comments. When the FSEIS is released, please send one CD copy to this office (specify Mail Code CED-2). If you have any questions, please contact me at 415-947-3521, or contact Jason Gerdes, the lead reviewer for this project. Mr. Gerdes can be reached at 415-947-4221 or gerdes.jason@epa.gov.~~

Response F-1-4

Comment acknowledged; comment is not related to the adequacy of the SEIR/SEIS. As requested, the Coachella Valley Conservation Commission (CVCC) will send a copy of the Final SEIS/SEIR on CD to the EPA, Region IX office located in San Francisco, California.

Response to Comments

Regional, County, and City Agency Comments and Responses

Comment Letter R-1

Comment R-1-1

Thank you for providing the Riverside County Airport Land Use Commission (ALUC) with a copy of the Notice of Availability of the Draft Environmental Impact Report/Environmental Impact Statement for the proposed Major Amendment, whereby the City of Desert Hot Springs and Mission Springs Water District would be added to the list of participating Permittees of the Plan, and the Plan area boundaries would be amended to include areas within the City of Desert Hot Springs. This proposal will have no effect on airports or the

Response R-1-1

Comment acknowledged. The comment is not related to the adequacy of the SEIR/SEIS analysis and no specific response is necessary.

Comment R-1-2

within the City of Desert Hot Springs. This proposal will have no effect on airports or the safety of air navigation, and there are no Airport Influence Areas within the City of Desert Hot Springs. Therefore, we have no objections to, or comments regarding, this proposal.

Response R-1-2

This commenter states that the proposed Major Amendment will have no effect on airports or the safety of air navigation, and that there are no Airport Influence Areas within DHS. This commenter's lack of objection to the CVMSHCP Major Amendment is noted.

Tribal Government Comments and Responses

Comment Letter TG-1

Comment TG-1-1

The Soboba Band of Luiseño Indians appreciates your observance of Tribal Cultural Resources and their preservation in your project. The information provided to us on said

Response TG-1-1

Comment acknowledged. The comment is not related to the adequacy of the SEIR/SEIS and no specific response is necessary.

Comment TG-1-2

Resources and their preservation in your project. The information provided to us on said project(s) has been assessed through our Cultural Resource Department, where it was concluded that although it is outside the existing reservation, the project area does fall within the bounds of our Tribal Traditional Use Areas. At this time the Soboba Band

Response TG-1-2

Comment acknowledged. The CVMSHCP Major Amendment Draft SEIR/SEIS does not present supplemental information regarding cultural resources. As stated in Section 1.6 of the Draft SEIR/SEIS (page 1-11), "Based on the analysis contained in the Initial Study Checklist and comments received, it was determined that the SEIR/SEIS should focus on biological resources, land use, socioeconomic and fiscal impacts, and traffic and circulation." Cultural resources are addressed and analyzed in the approved 2007 Recirculated EIR/EIS in the following sections: Section 3.9, Cultural Resources and Native American Concerns; Section 4.9.2, Cultural Resources and Native American Concerns; Section 5.4, Cultural Resources and Native American Concerns for the Proposed Santa Rosa and San Jacinto Mountains Trails Plan; Section 9.9, Cumulative Impacts to Cultural Resources and Native American Concerns; Section 10.5, Cultural Consultants/Trails Plan; and Appendix F, Cultural Resources Background Report.

Comment TG-1-3

within the bounds of our Tribal Traditional Use Areas. At this time the Soboba Band does not have any specific concerns regarding this project, but wishes to defer to the Agua Caliente Band of Cahuilla Indians.

Response TG-1-3

This comment refers to no specific concerns with the CVMSHCP Major Amendment and states that this tribal government will defer to the Agua Caliente Band of Cahuilla Indians

Response to Comments

Comment Letter TG-2

Comment TG-2-1

The Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) has reviewed the above referenced project. The National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA 42 U.S.C 4321-43351) and Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act (16 U.S.C 470 et seq.) and 36 CFR Part 800.14(b) require consultation with culturally affiliated Native American tribes to determine if the proposed project may have an adverse impact on cultural resources. To adequately comply with this provision and mitigate project-related impacts on archaeological resources, the Commission notes the following:

Contact has been made to the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) for

- A list of appropriate and culturally affiliated Native American Contacts for consultation concerning the project site has been provided and is attached to this letter.
- A Sacred Lands File search did identify Native American traditional cultural places or properties.

Note that lack of additional surface evidence of archaeological resources does not preclude their subsurface existence once ground-breaking activity begins. If that occurs, the NAHC suggests that inadvertent discoveries of human remains comply with California Health & Safety Code 7060.5 and Public Resources Code Section 5097.98 and coordinate with the NAHC. Federal NAGPRA will apply. A Native American elder may be the only source of cultural data.

If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Sincerely,

Dave S. [unclear]
Program Analyst

cc: Mr. Tom Kirk
Coachella Valley Conserv. Comm.
72-710 Fred Waring Dr., Suite 200
Palm Desert CA 92260

**Native American Contacts
Riverside County
September 16, 2013**

Cabazon Band of Mission Indians
Doug Welmes, Chairperson
84-245 Indio Springs **Cahuilla**
Indio , CA 92509
(760) 342-2593
(760) 347-7880 Fax

Twenty-Nine Palms Band of Mission Indians
Darrell Mike, Chairperson
46-200 Harrison Place **Chemehuevi**
Coachella , CA 92236
kthomas@29palmsband-nai.gov
760-863-8444

760-863-2449 - Fax

Los Coyotes Band of Mission Indians
Shane Chapperras, Chairman
P.O. Box 189 **Cahuilla**
Warner , CA 92066
(760) 782-0711
(760) 782-2701 - FAX

Joseph R. Bonlez (Mike)
P.O. Box 1828 **Chemehuevi**
Indio , CA 92201
(760) 347-0488
(760) 405-4089 - cell

Ramona Band of Cahuilla Mission Indians
Joseph Hamilton, Chairman
P.O. Box 391670 **Cahuilla**
Anza , CA 92539
admin@ramonatribe.com
(951) 763-4105
(951) 763-4325 Fax

Colorado River Indian Tribe
Wayne Patch, Sr., Chairman
26800 Mojave Road **Mojave**
Parker , AZ 85344 **Chemehuevi**
crl.museum@yahoo.com
(928) 869-8211 - Tribal Office
(928) 869-8870 ext 21
(928) 869-1925 Fax

Torres-Martinez Desert Cahuilla Indians
Mary Resvaloso, Chairperson
PO Box 1160 **Cahuilla**
Thermal , CA 92274
mresvaloso@torresmartinez.com
(760) 387-6300
(760) 387-8146 Fax

Fort Yuma Quechan Indian Nation
Keeny Escalanti, Sr., President
PO Box 1899 **Quechan**
Yuma , AZ 85365
qnpres@quechantribe.com
(760) 572-0213
(760) 572-2102 FAX

Response to Comments

Native American Contacts Riverside County September 16, 2013

AhaMekav Cultural Society, Fort Mojave Indian
Linda Otero, Director
P.O. Box 8990 Mojave
Mohave Valley AZ 86440
(928) 768-4475
LindaOtero@fortmojave.com
(928) 768-7996 Fax

Santa Rosa Band of Mission Indians
John Marcus, Chairman
P.O. Box 391820 Cahulla
Anza, CA 92539
(951) 659-2700
(951) 659-2228 Fax

Augustine Band of Cahulla Mission Indians
Mary Ann Green, Chairperson
P.O. Box 846 Cahulla
Coachella, CA 92235
(760) 396-4722
760-389-7161 - FAX

Morongo Band of Mission Indians
William Madrigal, Jr., Cultural Resources Manager
12700 Pumarra Road Cahulla
Banning, CA 92220 Serrano
(951) 201-1866 - cell
wmadrigal@morongo-nan.gov
(951) 572-6004 Fax

San Manuel Band of Mission Indians
Daniel McCarthy, M.S., Director-CPM Dept.
2658 Community Center, Drive Serrano
Highland, CA 92346
(909) 864-8933, Ext 3246
dmccarthy@sanmanuel-nan.gov
(909) 862-5152 Fax

Torres-Martinez Desert Cahulla Indians
Matthew Krystal, Cultural Resources Manager
P.O. Box 1180 Cahulla
Thermal, CA 92274
mkrystal@tmdci-nan.gov
760) 397-0300,
(760) 409-2967 - cell
(760) 397-8146 Fax

Agua Caliente Band of Cahulla Indians
Jeff Grubbe, Chairperson
5401 Dinah Shore Drive Cahulla
Palm Springs, CA 92262
jgrubbe@aguacaliente-nan.gov
(760) 325-3400
(760) 325-0898 Fax

Morongo Band of Mission Indians
Robert Martin, Chairperson
12700 Pumarra Road Cahulla
Banning, CA 92220 Serrano
(951) 849-8807
(951) 755-5200
(951) 922-8146 Fax

**Native American Contacts
Riverside County
September 18, 2013**

**Agua Caliente Band of Cahulla Indians THPO
Patricia Garcia, Tribal Historic Preservation Officer
5401 Dinah Shore Drive Cahulla
Palm Springs, CA 92264
piuck@augacaliente-nai.gov
(760) 899-8907**

(760) 899-8924 - Fax

**Ah-Mut-Pipe Foundation
Preston J. Arrow-weed
P.O. Box 180 Quechan
Bard, CA 92222 Kumeyaay
ahmut@earthlink.net
(928) 388-9458**

**Cahulla Band of Indians
Luther Salgado, Chairperson
PO Box 391780 Cahulla
Anza, CA 92539
Chairman@cahulla.net
760-763-5548
760-763-2631 - Tribal EPA**

**Ernest H. Siva
Morongo Band of Mission Indians Tribal Elder
9576 Miss Canyon Road Serrano
Banning, CA 92220 Cahulla
siva@dishmail.net
(951) 849-4676**

**Twenty-Nine Palms Band of Mission Indians
Anthony Madrigal, Jr. THPO Officer
46-200 Harrison Place Chemehuevi
Coachella, CA 92236
amadrigal@29palmsbomt-nai.gov
760-863-2444
760-825-7672-cell
760-863-2449 - Fax**

Response to Comments

Response TG-2-1

This commenter's information regarding a list of culturally affiliated Native American Contacts and information on a Sacred Lands File search is noted. The CVMSHCP Major Amendment Draft SEIR/SEIS does not present supplemental information regarding cultural resources. As stated in Section 1.6 of the Draft SEIR/SEIS (page 1-11), "Based on the analysis contained in the Initial Study Checklist and comments received, it was determined that the SEIR/SEIS should focus on biological resources, land use, socioeconomic and fiscal impacts, and traffic and circulation." Similar to the 2007 recirculated EIR/EIS, this SEIR/SEIS does not analyze the potential impacts of Covered Activities on cultural resources, nor does it supplant other requirements that Covered Activities might be subject to regarding environmental analysis, including cultural resource surveys, through their environmental review and approval process. Any required mitigation would be determined through that process. Therefore, while Covered Activities would be provided Take Authorization with approval of the proposed Major Amendment, they would remain subject to existing applicable regulations for the assessment of potential impacts to cultural and other environmental resources under CEQA/NEPA review. As such, potential impacts to cultural resources due to implementation of the proposed Major Amendment would have a less than significant effect on cultural resources and Native American concerns. Additionally, Cultural resources are discussed in the approved 2007 Recirculated EIR/EIS in the following sections: Section 3.9, Cultural Resources and Native American Concerns, which includes a section on documentation of cultural resources; Section 4.9.2, Cultural Resources and Native American Concerns; Section 5.4, Cultural Resources and Native American Concerns for the Proposed Santa Rosa and San Jacinto Mountains Trails Plan; Section 9.9, Cumulative Impacts to Cultural Resources and Native American Concerns; Section 10.5, Cultural Consultants/Trails Plan; and Appendix F, Cultural Resources Background Report.

Interested Parties Comments and Responses

Comment Letter IP-1

Comment IP-1-1

The Desert Valleys Builders Association would like the Commission and those reviewing the draft Supplemental EIR/EIS regarding the Major Amendment to the Coachella Valley Multiple Species Habitat Conservation Plan to know that we fully support the intent and implementation of the CVMSHCP and the Major Amendment.

Response IP-1-1

This commenter's support of the CVMSHCP Major Amendment is appreciated.

Comment Letter IP-2

Comment IP-2-1

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the above document. These comments are submitted on behalf of the Sierra Club and the Center for Biological Diversity. The Sierra Club is a California non-profit corporation dedicated to the conservation and preservation of the nation's natural resources. The Sierra Club represents members who reside in San Bernardino, Imperial and Riverside Counties. The Sierra Club and its members utilize the natural, scenic and biological resources of the Coachella Valley through their corporate and individual activities including scientific research, planning, education, and recreation. The Center for Biological Diversity ("Center") is a non-profit environmental organization dedicated to the protection of native species and their habitats through science, policy, and environmental law. The Center has over 45,000 members throughout California and the western United States, including in Imperial and Riverside Counties.

The Sierra Club and the Center have a keen interest in ensuring that the sensitive biological resources within the proposed Major Amendment area

that both groups have fought to protect through the years are adequately preserved and protected. We believe that having the DHS of Desert Hot Springs ("DHS") and the Mission Springs Water District ("MSWD") participate in the Coachella Valley Multiple Species Habitat Conservation Plan Natural Community Conservation Plan ("CVMSHCP") has the potential to ensure the preservation and protection of these resources. However, the CVMSHCP must contain the appropriate conservation measures for all resources within the proposed Major Amendment ("Proposed MA") area, and the SEIR/SEIS must address all impacts of the proposed MA over time. Accordingly, these comments address relevant issues in the proposed MA to the CVMSHCP and the draft SEIR/SEIS.

Response IP-2-1

Comment acknowledged. The comment generally discusses the adequacy of the SEIR/SEIS analysis as an introduction to more specific-comments to follow in the letter, and no specific response is necessary as those comments are addressed in more detail below.

Response to Comments

Comment IP-2-2

The purpose of the MSHCP is to obtain Take Authorization (Take Permits) pursuant to FESA and the NCCP Act for Covered Activities in the Coachella Valley while balancing environmental protection with regional economic objectives and simplifying compliance with the State and Federal Endangered Species Acts and other applicable laws and regulations. (Proposed MA, page 1-2) "Covered activities" generally means "development", including the construction of homes and businesses, but can also include water facilities including:

"[N]ew projects approved pursuant to ... water ... management plans...

Public facility construction, operations, and maintenance and safety activities by the Permittees for existing and future facilities, including both on and off site activities. Such facilities include, but are not limited to... water development, production, storage, treatment, and transmission facilities; sewage treatment and transmission facilities; reclaimed water storage and transmission facilities[.]"
(Proposed MA, page 7-1, emphasis in original)

Response IP-2-2

As stated in Section 4.1 (page 4.1-13) of the Draft SEIR/SEIS, groundwater withdrawal is not a Covered Activity. "Covered Activities for MSWD would not include groundwater extraction and therefore, no direct impacts to sensitive species or associated Habitats related to such activity would occur as a result of the Major Amendment." The quoted text from Section 7.1 refers to Covered Activities including water development and production. Water development and production involves the installation of wells, reservoirs, underground pipelines and other structures. The ground disturbance associated with development of these facilities is a Covered Activity; the amount of ground disturbance resulting from the proposed Covered Activities listed for MSWD in Table 2-2 of the Draft SEIR/SEIS (page 2-8) was analyzed and described in Section 4.1.4. However, groundwater withdrawal is not a Covered Activity and Take of Covered Species that may result from the operations of groundwater wells is not authorized under this Major Amendment. In order to clarify, language has been added to CVMSHCP Section 7.1 (Covered Activities Outside Conservation Areas, page 7-1) to identify that groundwater withdrawal is not a Covered Activity as follows, "Public facility construction, operations (not including groundwater withdrawal), and maintenance and safety activities by the Permittees for existing and future facilities, including both on and off site activities."

It should also be noted that this Major Amendment does not provide project-level approval of the Covered Activities. Rather, the action analyzed in this SEIR/SEIS is the amendment of the existing CVMSHCP to include Desert Hot Springs and MSWD as Permittees to the Plan and authorize additional Take under the existing permit associated with Desert Hot Springs and MSWD Covered Activities. The approval of the Major Amendment is not a commitment of the

CVCC, CVAG, or the Permittees to a definite course of action regarding proposed Covered Activities or the groundwater withdrawal that the commenter is concerned about, which may or may not be proposed by MSWD in various unknown variations. At the time a Covered Activity is proposed, an analysis of the impacts of all of the aspects of that project (construction ground disturbance, as well as operational impacts, such as those from groundwater pumping) will be conducted pursuant to CEQA. During the CEQA/NEPA review process, the project must demonstrate consistency with the CVMSHCP in order for Take coverage under the Plan to be allocated for the Covered Activity. If the CEQA/NEPA analysis determines Take of a federal or state listed species would occur from the non-covered portions of that project (e.g., from groundwater withdrawal), a separate Take authorization would be required and additional mitigation proposed to offset that Take. Therefore, the issues raised in this comment will be addressed when there is an actual project proposal to be analyzed.

Notwithstanding the fact that mitigation for groundwater impacts is not required at the present time by CEQA, there are various features of the Major Amendment that will contribute to the overall goals and objectives of the CVMSHCP. For instance, as a Permittee, MSWD will be required to minimize and mitigate impacts of Covered Activities to the maximum extent practicable. As noted in the Final SEIR/SEIS (page 1-2), MSWD will be responsible to ensure that the Conservation Goals and Objectives of the Plan are met. They will also sign the Implementing Agreement and by so doing agree to all the obligations of a Permittee, including ensuring compliance with the required Avoidance, Minimization and Mitigation Measures as outlined in Section 4.4 of the CVMSHCP, committing to the conservation measures for the acres they own in the Conservation Areas, abiding by the terms and conditions of the permits, and completing the obligations described in Section 6.6.1 of the CVMSHCP.

Comment IP-2-3

It therefore appears that the Plan includes "operations" and "production" of water facilities such as wells. However, according to the SEIR/SEIS, the covered activities specifically do not include groundwater withdrawal, even though groundwater withdrawal could be considered part of "operations" and/or "production" of water, and even though groundwater withdrawal is linked to the health of mesquite hummocks, one of the natural communities protected under the CVMSHCP. (SEIR/SEIS, page 4.1-15) This is an ambiguity within the Proposed MA language that should be resolved.

Response IP-2-3

As stated on page 4.1-13 of the Draft SEIR/SEIS, groundwater withdrawal is not a Covered Activity. However, indirect impacts from groundwater withdrawal related to proposed operations and production of water facilities or activities such as water development, production, storage, treatment, and transmission facilities within Conservation Areas, including mesquite hummocks

Response to Comments

Conservation Areas could occur. As discussed in Response IP-2-2, while groundwater withdrawal is not included as a Covered Activity, the CVMSHCP does require protection, conservation, and management of 348 acres of the mesquite hummocks natural community. To ensure protection of the mesquite hummock natural community and associated Covered Species within Conservation Areas, Covered Activities for all Permittees, including MSWD, will be reviewed during the Joint Project Review (JPR) process as described in the CVMSHCP Major Amendment, Section 6.6.1.1. As stated in the Major Amendment Implementing Agreement, Section 7.5, Review of Development Proposals in Conservation Areas (page 18), "As set forth in Section 4.3 of the MSHCP, Development in Conservation Areas will be limited to uses that are compatible with the Conservation Objectives for the specific Conservation Area. Discretionary Projects in Conservation Areas, other than second units on parcels with an existing residence, shall be required to assess the project's ability to meet the Conservation Objectives in the Conservation Area. Additionally, the Permittees will participate in the Joint Project Review Process set forth in Section 6.6.1.1 of the MSHCP." Furthermore, as outlined in Response IP-2-2, any specific projects that either individually or cumulatively impact groundwater resources and thus, indirectly, mesquite hummocks, would be subject to additional mitigation requirements under CEQA/NEPA and the state and federal ESAs (to the extent that groundwater withdrawal results in impacts meeting the definition of Take).

Moreover, long-term management of groundwater in this area is being implemented through a cooperative effort among the three water agencies with jurisdiction in the Mission Creek subbasin, Coachella Valley Water District (CVWD), Desert Water Agency (DWA), and MSWD. The January 2013 *Mission Creek and Garnet Hill Subbasins Water Management Plan: Final Report* ("Water Management Plan") was developed as a result of a settlement agreement among these three water agencies. The Water Management Plan is available at: http://www.cvwd.org/news/publicinfo/2013_07_10_MissionCreekGarnetHillWMP-FinalReport-Sections.pdf. MSWD and CVWD both operate production wells within the Mission Creek subbasin in the vicinity of the mesquite hummocks. Figure 2-1 of the Water Management Plan (page 2-3) shows the boundaries for MSWD and CVWD; some of the mesquite hummock areas occur within the MSWD boundary; the remaining mesquite hummocks occur within the CVWD boundary.

To meet the goals of the Water Management Plan, an objective to eliminate long-term groundwater overdraft will be implemented by maintaining 2009 groundwater levels to the extent practicable based on water supply availability by 2015. (see Water Management Plan, page ES-9, Section on Water Management Objectives). One of the primary ways to accomplish stabilization of the groundwater is through recharge, as is being done at the facility constructed in 2002, located northwest of the mesquite hummock areas. According to the Water Management Plan, "groundwater levels in the subbasin have increased since 2003 as a result of artificial recharge activities (including normal and advanced deliveries) coupled with reduced pumping."