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## Introduction

In accordance with your request, Keyser Marston Associates, Inc. has prepared a conceptual pro forma analysis of high-density apartment development as background and context for the upcoming City Council hearing on the Housing Crisis Workplan, the Cost of Development, the Inclusionary Housing Ordinance and other housing-related items. The purpose of the conceptual pro forma analysis is to present current market conditions and provide an understanding of the general development economics of highdensity apartment development with a focus on selected Urban Villages, the Downtown Core and North San Jose.

The conceptual analysis uses prototypes developed with City staff to illustrate "typical" high density projects in selected areas under current market conditions. The findings of the analysis indicate that development economics are challenging for high-density apartment projects in San Jose due to rising construction costs and moderation of rent growth. While the market values of most apartment prototypes analyzed exceed their total development costs, the estimated profit falls below the targeted threshold except for the prototype in the strongest submarket (West San Jose / Stevens Creek). Despite challenges in the current market, a variety of factors could enable projects to proceed in the near term, such as projects with a low land basis due to long-term ownership, projects viewed as a longer-term investment, or projects that achieve programmatic efficiencies in parking, density, or unit size.
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## Analysis Approach and Limitations

The conceptual pro forma analysis utilizes a static financial model to evaluate the development economics of prototypical projects representative of "average" or "typical" high-density apartment projects in San Jose. By its nature the conceptual analysis can only provide an overview-level assessment of real estate development economics. The development economics may be better or worse when a specific project is proposed, due to any number of unique circumstances, such as site configuration and conditions, construction efficiencies, project design, land cost basis, and sources of capital. As a result, all financial and programmatic estimates are preliminary in nature.

The analysis presents a snapshot in time as of mid-2019. Real estate development economics are fluid and are impacted by constantly changing conditions with regard to rent potential, construction costs, land costs, and costs of financing. A year or two from now, conditions will undoubtedly be different, so the pro forma conclusions are not expected to hold over a longer-term time horizon.

A summary of the conceptual pro forma analysis is provided in this memorandum; financial and market inputs are detailed in the attached tables.

## Conceptual Development Programs

In collaboration with City staff, three generic prototypes were selected to serve as examples of high-density apartment development in San Jose:

- 5-story low-rise building (Type V construction over a podium)
- 7-story mid-rise building (Type III construction over a podium)
- 22-story high-rise building (Type I construction)

The building prototypes are assumed to exhibit a similar unit mix and size (an average of 900 sq. ft., consistent with recently built or approved projects). Average unit sizes are representative for projects occurring across a broad range of locations in the city recognizing that unit sizes for specific individual projects or specific areas of the city may vary.

While projects may be required to provide a minimum amount of ground floor commercial, this analysis focuses on the development economics of apartments and assumes that the commercial component is cost-neutral in that commercial rents support commercial space development costs.
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Exhibit 1. Conceptual Development Programs

| Building <br> Type | Building <br> Height | Density | Avg. Unit Size | Parking <br> Ratio |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Low-Rise: Type V | 5 stories | 65 du/ac | 900 SF | $1.0 / \mathrm{du}$ |
| Mid-Rise: Type III | 7 stories | 90 du/ac | 900 SF | $1.0 / \mathrm{du}$ |
| High-Rise: Type I | 22 stories | 350 du/ac | 900 SF | $0.8 / \mathrm{du}$ |

## San Jose Submarkets

The pro forma analysis compares the development economics of the three conceptual development programs based on market conditions in submarkets where high-density apartment development is most likely to occur. These submarkets include:

- South and East: Curtner Light Rail, Blossom Hill/ Snell, Alum Rock, and North Capitol Avenue Urban Villages
- Central: West San Carlos and North $1^{\text {st }}$ Street Urban Villages
- West San Jose: Stevens Creek Boulevard Urban Village
- North: North San Jose and Berryessa BART Urban Village
- Downtown Core

Pro forma assumptions including rents, land prices, and city fees differ by submarket. The low-rise (5-story) prototype is analyzed based on market conditions in the South and East and Central submarkets respectively. The mid-rise (7-story) prototype is analyzed based on market conditions in the Central, West, and North submarkets. The high-rise (22-story) prototype reflects market conditions in the Downtown Core. These pairings are based on where projects of each type have been occurring or are expected to occur in the future. They are intended to represent a range of market conditions and building types but are by no means comprehensive. For example, mid-rise development has also occurred in the downtown, but was not specifically analyzed based on the finding that rents are similar to other areas of Central San Jose.

Exhibit 2. Conceptual Development Programs Analyzed by Submarket

| Submarket | Type V <br> 5 Stories | Type III <br> 7 Stories | Type I <br> 22 Stories |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| South \& East | X |  |  |
| Central San Jose | X | X |  |
| West San Jose (Stevens Creek) |  | X |  |
| North San Jose |  | X |  |
| Downtown |  |  | X |
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## Development Pro Forma Assumptions

The financial and market assumptions informing the conceptual pro forma analysis are presented in the attached tables and charts. The assumptions were developed based on information provided by real estate professionals, developers, and investors actively participating in San Jose development. Data was also collected from published sources, such as land sales transactions and apartment rental rates. This information was adjusted to reflect the prototypes being evaluated and the local context of the submarkets.

## Apartment Rents

The estimated average rent of the prototypes is based on asking rents of recently built apartment projects that represent comparable projects. For purposes of the pro forma analysis, the estimated average apartment rent ranges from $\$ 2,900$ to $\$ 3,550$ per month depending on the submarket. The average rent is net of concessions, such as a month of free rent offered at lease signing.

Exhibit 3. Estimated Apartment Rents by Submarket

| Submarket | Monthly Rent <br> Per Unit | Per SF |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| South \& East | $\$ 2,900$ | $\$ 3.22$ |
| Central San Jose | $\$ 3,300$ | $\$ 3.67$ |
| West San Jose (Stevens Creek) | $\$ 3,550$ | $\$ 3.94$ |
| North San Jose | $\$ 3,300$ | $\$ 3.67$ |
| Downtown | $\$ 3,400$ | $\$ 3.78$ |

While estimated rents are strong by historical standards, they are less than the rents achieved by recently built projects in nearby cities such as Campbell, Sunnyvale, and Mountain View, where average rents exceed $\$ 3,900$ per month for a 900 square foot, newly built apartment unit (above $\$ 4.30$ per square foot; see appendix tables for detail).

The rent differential between San Jose and nearby cities presents a challenge for San Jose projects in the near term, because construction costs are the same as in communities with higher rents. To investors and developers with a longer horizon, however, the rent differential also represents an opportunity for San Jose submarkets to improve their competitive position and over time approach the rents achieved in nearby cities.
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## Development Costs

The development cost estimates include direct construction costs, indirect or soft costs of development, such as professional services, as well as financing costs during construction and lease-up.

The estimates of development costs are based on a combination of sources. First, KMA regularly works on new residential development projects in cities throughout the Bay Area. Through this experience, we review pro formas for numerous private development projects and work in conjunction with outside construction consultants and cost estimators, general contractors, architects, engineers, and public agencies. The development cost estimates also utilize third party construction cost data from sources such as Marshall \& Swift and RS Means which estimate costs for a wide variety of building types in varying locales.

Direct construction costs vary from project to project depending upon the quality of finishes and architecture, the level of amenities provided, and site-specific construction challenges such as demolition or environmental remediation requirements, unusual site grading or foundation costs, or tight/irregularly shaped parcels that result in cost inefficiencies. The construction cost estimates utilized in this study assume quality construction, architecture, and finishes but do not assume any extraordinary costs that would be atypical for the market. Construction is presumed to be open shop (open to both unionized and non-unionized contractors).

- For Type V construction over a podium, direct construction costs are estimated to be $\$ 315$ per square foot of gross building area, including parking at a ratio of 1.0 space per unit.
- For Type III construction over a podium, direct construction costs are estimated to be $\$ 335$ per square foot of gross building area, including parking at a ratio of 1.0 space per unit.
- For Type I (tower) construction, direct construction costs are estimated to be approximately $\$ 400$ per square foot of gross building area, including parking at a ratio of 0.8 spaces per unit.

Indirect costs, including architecture and engineering, school fees, taxes, insurance and developer overhead and administration, are estimated to represent $17 \%$ to $19 \%$ of direct construction costs. Financing costs represent an additional $7 \%$ to $8 \%$ of direct costs. Financing costs are estimated based on an interest rate of $5.5 \%$ per year, a loan to cost ratio of $65 \%$, a construction loan term of 24 to 30 months (varying by construction type), and an average outstanding balance of $55 \%$.
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## San Jose Reach Code Ordinance

In September 2019, the San Jose City Council approved a reach code ordinance that introduces building standards for new construction that go beyond the 2019 California Green Building Standards Code and California Building Efficiency Standards. Taking effect in 2020, the reach code requires greater energy efficiency from mixed-fuel buildings and increases requirements for electric vehicle charging infrastructure. The cost to comply with the reach code is not reflected in the analysis because there was not enough available information regarding the impact on the prototype projects.

## Trends in Rent Growth and Construction Cost Escalation

Market rate apartment rents recorded very strong growth for several years from 2013 through 2015. As shown in Exhibit 4, effective asking rents for properties built since 2005 in San Jose grew at an average rate of 7\% per year from 2013 to 2015. Over this period, apartment rents outpaced construction cost escalation in the Bay Area, which averaged 6\% annual growth.

Since 2016, however, rent growth has leveled to about 2\% per year while construction cost escalation has averaged $7 \%$ per year. The rate of construction cost escalation during the current economic cycle is roughly double the historical average for the Bay Area, according to a local cost consultancy which tracks construction bid pricing.

The conceptual pro forma reflects today's construction costs and rents consistent with the near-term horizon of the analysis. Future changes in rents and construction costs will undoubtedly alter the findings of the analysis. Forecasts indicate that construction cost escalation may continue to outpace rent growth for another year. A local construction bid index projects Bay Area construction costs to grow by $5 \%$ to $6 \%$ over the next year while Essex Property Trust projects apartment rents in San Jose to grow by under 4\%. In subsequent years, the rate of cost escalation is projected to subside, potentially bringing cost and rent growth back into balance.

Exhibit 4
Effective Rent Growth in San Jose vs. Construction Cost Escalation in the Bay Area


Rent growth source: Costar for market rate properties built since 2005.
Construction cost escalation source: San Francisco Bid Index by TBD Consultants.

## City Fees

City fees and permits costs are based on current estimates of impact fees and construction taxes. The City has five types of development-related fees:

- Inclusionary Housing In-Lieu Fee - San Jose's current Inclusionary Housing Ordinance requires that residential developers provide 15\% of housing units at rents affordable to low- and moderate-income households or pay an in-lieu fee based on a $20 \%$ requirement. Payment of the fee is estimated to represent a lower-cost option than providing affordable units on site for most projects. The current in-lieu fee of $\$ 125,000$ per affordable unit multiplied by the $20 \%$ in-lieu requirement is equivalent to $\$ 25,000$ per market rate unit. San Jose's existing inclusionary requirements are assumed for purposes of this memorandum. The City is in the process of updating its inclusionary ordinance.

Under the City's Affordable Housing Impact Fee (AHIF) transition program, downtown high-rise rentals that meet certain criteria, including receipt of first approvals prior to June 30, 2018 and a certificate of occupancy prior to December 31, 2023 (with the recent deadline extension), are not required to pay the AHIF or the inclusionary in-lieu fee. Accordingly, downtown high-rises are evaluated both with and without an in-lieu fee.

- Park In-Lieu Fee - San Jose’s Park Impact Ordinance requires that residential developers provide three acres of parkland per 1,000 new residents or pay an inlieu fee. Developers can satisfy up to half of the parkland requirement by
providing on-site amenities, such as swimming pools, plazas, and picnic areas. For the conceptual pro forma, it is assumed that projects offset $30 \%$ of the parkland requirement through private recreation credits and pay the in-lieu fee to satisfy the remainder of the requirement. Pursuant to the 2018 Parkland In-Lieu Fee Schedule, the park fee net of credits ranges from \$10,200 to $\$ 29,100$ per unit, varying by area.
- Traffic Impact Fees - San Jose has adopted traffic impact fees for Transportation Development Policy areas including North San Jose and 101/Oakland/Maybury. In North San Jose, the fee per residential unit is estimated to be $\$ 5,000$ per unit (net of demolition credits). The fee for the US 101/Oakland/ Maybury policy area is estimated to be approximately $\$ 2,200$ per unit. For the conceptual pro forma, a reduced US 101/ Oakland/ Maybury fee is assumed in recognition that the policy area covers only a portion of the Central submarket.
- Development Construction Taxes - Residential projects are subject to construction taxes totaling $3.96 \%$ of the building permit value, plus $\$ 200$ per unit. Construction taxes are estimated to range from $\$ 6,500$ to $\$ 6,800$ per unit based on the Building Division's current valuation table. For high-rise residential development in the downtown, City Council recently voted to support a 50\% suspension of the Building and Structure (B\&S) tax and the Commercial, Residential, Mobile Home Park (CRMP) tax, which would reduce the total tax from approximately $\$ 7,400$ per unit to $\$ 3,800$ per unit for projects completed prior to December 31, 2023.
- Development Permitting Fees - Residential projects are subject to development permitting fees aimed at recovering city costs associated with entitlement, plan check, permit review, inspection, and public improvements. Based on the experience of recently built projects, the cost of development permitting fees is estimated to total $\$ 6,500$ per unit.

Downtown Fee Scenarios: The pro forma analysis evaluates two fee scenarios for downtown high-rise development, per the direction of City staff. The "no incentive" scenario assumes that the downtown high-rise project is required to pay the current Inclusionary Housing In-Lieu Fee and 100\% of applicable construction taxes. The "incentive" scenario assumes an inclusionary in-lieu fee of \$0 and a 50\% suspension of construction taxes. ${ }^{1}$
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Exhibit 5 summarizes the estimated city fees by submarket. The estimate of city fees does not include the costs of CEQA mitigation, which vary substantially by project. Fees imposed by other jurisdictions, principally school fees, are included in the estimate of other indirect costs.

Exhibit 5: City Fees by Submarket

| Submarket | Afford. <br> Housing <br> per unit | Parks <br> (net) <br> per unit | Const. <br> Taxes <br> per unit | Traffic <br> (net) <br> per unit | Dev. <br> Permits <br> per unit | Total <br> per unit |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| South \& East | $\$ 25,000$ | $\$ 10,800$ | $\$ 6,500$ | $\$ 0$ | $\$ 6,500$ | $\$ 48,800$ |
| Central San Jose | $\$ 25,000$ | $\$ 15,800$ | $\$ 6,800$ | $\$ 1,100$ | $\$ 6,500$ | $\$ 55,200$ |
| West San Jose | $\$ 25,000$ | $\$ 13,500$ | $\$ 6,800$ | $\$ 0$ | $\$ 6,500$ | $\$ 51,800$ |
| North San Jose | $\$ 25,000$ | $\$ 29,100$ | $\$ 6,800$ | $\$ 5,000$ | $\$ 6,500$ | $\$ 72,400$ |
| Downtown (incentive) | $\$ 0$ | $\$ 10,200$ | $\$ 3,400$ | $\$ 0$ | $\$ 6,500$ | $\$ 20,100$ |
| Downtown (no incentive) | $\$ 25,000$ | $\$ 10,200$ | $\$ 6,700$ | $\$ 0$ | $\$ 6,500$ | $\$ 39,800$ |

## Land Costs

Land costs are informed by recent land transactions within or near the submarkets that represent comparable sales. Comparable sales include land with commercial improvements or land with residential development potential. Based on recent sales, land costs are estimated to range from $\$ 3.7$ million per acre in South and East submarkets to $\$ 21.0$ million per acre in the Downtown Core. Per entitled apartment unit, land costs are in the range of $\$ 48,000$ to $\$ 74,000$ per unit, depending on the density. While the estimated cost of land in the Downtown Core is many times greater than other submarkets on a per acre basis, the cost per residential unit is similar, due to the density supported by downtown sites.

Exhibit 6: Land Costs by Submarket

| Submarket | Building <br> Type | Land Cost <br> Per Acre | Conceptual <br> Density | Land Cost <br> Per Unit |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| South \& East | Type V | $\$ 3.7 \mathrm{M} / \mathrm{ac}$ | $65 \mathrm{du} / \mathrm{ac}$ | $\$ 56,600 / \mathrm{du}$ |
| Central San Jose | Type V | $\$ 4.8 \mathrm{M} / \mathrm{ac}$ | $65 \mathrm{du} / \mathrm{ac}$ | $\$ 73,500 / \mathrm{du}$ |
|  | Type III | $\$ 4.8 \mathrm{M} / \mathrm{ac}$ | $90 \mathrm{du} / \mathrm{ac}$ | $\$ 53,300 / \mathrm{du}$ |
| West San Jose | Type III | $\$ 5.2 \mathrm{M} / \mathrm{ac}$ | $90 \mathrm{du} / \mathrm{ac}$ | $\$ 57,800 / \mathrm{du}$ |
| North San Jose | Type III | $\$ 4.3 \mathrm{M} / \mathrm{ac}$ | $90 \mathrm{du} / \mathrm{ac}$ | $\$ 47,800 / \mathrm{du}$ |
| Downtown | Type I | $\$ 21.0 \mathrm{M} / \mathrm{ac}$ | $350 \mathrm{du} / \mathrm{ac}$ | $\$ 60,000 / \mathrm{du}$ |

## Value Upon Completion

Value is determined by capitalizing the net operating income, i.e. net operating income divided by the capitalization rate. The capitalization rate is based on developer inputs
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and upon benchmarks published by nationally recognized research firms. The conceptual pro forma estimates that the capitalization rate for residential projects is currently in the range of $4 \%$ to $5 \%$. The capitalization rate of downtown projects is estimated to fall at the lower end of the range, the capitalization rate of projects in South and East submarkets is estimated to fall at the upper end, while projects in remaining submarkets are estimated to achieve a capitalization rate close to the average.

Exhibit 7: Capitalization Rates by Submarket

|  | Central, West, <br> \& North | South \& East | Downtown |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Capitalization Rate | $4.5 \%$ | $4.75 \%$ | $4.25 \%$ |

## Profit

Profit is calculated as the difference between value and cost. The estimated minimum profit target for all prototypes is $10 \%$ to $15 \%$ of costs. It should be noted that many developers have expressed that a profit of more than $15 \%$ is necessary to attract investors.

Another metric that developers and investors use to evaluate real estate projects is return on cost. Return on cost is calculated as stabilized net operating income divided by the total development cost. Developers in San Jose have cited a return on cost of 5.0\% or greater as necessary to attract investors.

Exhibit 8 provides the equivalent return on cost based on a $10 \%, 15 \%$, or $20 \%$ profit. As shown, a profit of $10 \%$ to $15 \%$ translates to a return on cost of $5.0 \%$ or greater in all submarkets outside the downtown. In the downtown, a developer profit of $18 \%$ is needed to produce a return on cost of $5.0 \%$. The reason is that capitalization rates in the downtown are estimated to be lower than in other areas, implying a greater spread between the capitalized value of the project and the investment warranted by a 5.0\% return on cost.

Exhibit 8: Conversion of Profit to Return on Cost

|  | Equivalent Return on Cost |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Profit |  <br> North | South \& East | Downtown |
| $10 \%$ Profit | $5.0 \%$ ROC | $5.2 \%$ ROC | $4.7 \%$ ROC |
| $15 \%$ Profit | $5.2 \%$ ROC | $5.5 \%$ ROC | $4.9 \%$ ROC |
| $20 \%$ Profit | $5.4 \%$ ROC | $5.7 \%$ ROC | $5.1 \%$ ROC |
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## Conceptual Pro Forma Findings

The conceptual pro forma is based on the relationship between the revenue potential, the estimated value at completion, and the estimated development costs for the prototypes analyzed. A summary of the conceptual pro forma estimates is presented in Exhibit 8; detail on each component is provided in the appendix tables. It is important to note that specific projects may perform better or worse than the "typical" prototypes shown here, depending on the sources of capital and the developer's / investor's overall business strategy.

Per Exhibit 9, the mid-rise apartment prototype in West San Jose (Stevens Creek) is the only apartment prototype to demonstrate an estimated profit that exceeds the targeted profit threshold of $10 \%$ to $15 \%$. This scenario benefits from stronger rents in West San Jose which are estimated to be approximately $5 \%$ to $20 \%$ higher than other submarkets. The West San Jose prototype provides a benchmark for the rents required to meet the return expectations of developers and investors.

In Central and North San Jose submarkets, the conceptual pro forma indicates that the rental income generated by a low- or mid-rise multifamily apartment project is likely to be sufficient to support all of a project's development costs, including land acquisition, but is not likely to yield a profit that is commensurate with current industry targets for apartment projects.

In South and East San Jose, estimated costs and values are out of balance, making it more challenging for projects to move forward under current market conditions. The primary driver of this conclusion is that current market rents are lower than other submarkets and are unable to cover the rising cost of construction.

In the Downtown Core, the estimated value per unit is slightly less than the estimated cost to build a high-rise apartment unit and is therefore insufficient to generate a profit. Development economics improve with the partial suspension of construction taxes and an Inclusionary Housing fee of $\$ 0$, but the estimated profit remains below the minimum target.
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Exhibit 9: Summary of Pro Forma Findings

| Submarket | Bldg. <br> Type | Value <br> Per Unit | Total Cost <br> Per Unit | Est. Profit <br> Per Unit ${ }^{1}$ | Return <br> ${\text { on } \text { Cost }^{2}}^{2}$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| South \& East | Type V | $\$ 488,400$ | $\$ 529,300$ | None | $4.38 \%$ |
| Central San Jose | Type V | $\$ 616,200$ | $\$ 574,000$ | $\$ 42,200(7 \%)$ | $4.83 \%$ |
|  | Type III | $\$ 616,200$ | $\$ 579,800$ | $\$ 36,400(6 \%)$ | $4.78 \%$ |
| West San Jose | Type III | $\$ 677,300$ | $\$ 580,900$ | $\$ 96,400(17 \%)$ | $5.25 \%$ |
| North San Jose | Type III | $\$ 622,900$ | $\$ 592,000$ | $\$ 30,900(5 \%)$ | $4.73 \%$ |
| Downtown (no incentive) | Type I | $\$ 679,100$ | $\$ 689,300$ | None | $4.19 \%$ |
| Downtown (incentive) | Type I | $\$ 679,100$ | $\$ 659,300$ | $\$ 19,800(3 \%)$ | $4.38 \%$ |

${ }^{1}$ Profit is equal to the capitalized project value upon completion less development costs. It is stated as a percentage of development costs.
${ }^{2}$ Return on Cost (ROC) is an annual return metric equal to the un-trended stabilized net operating income (NOI) of the project divided by the total development cost.

Despite the challenges outside of the strongest submarket, developers and investors with a longer-term horizon might choose to move forward with projects today with the expectation that rents in these areas will appreciate more quickly over time, approaching the rents already achieved in West San Jose. For example, Central San Jose and downtown have attracted significant residential developer interest likely based on the expectation that rent growth will follow transit improvements and employment growth in the Diridon Station area. North San Jose is another submarket with significant developer interest, suggesting that developers see an upside to current rents.

The development prototypes analyzed reflect typical programmatic assumptions regarding unit size, density, and parking standards based on recently built projects. These common programmatic assumptions also change over time in response to market demand and cost considerations. For example, high-rise projects in downtown are now proposing parking ratios below 1.0 as a way of reducing construction costs. Lower parking ratios could become more common throughout the city in conjunction with improvements to public transit and trends in car ownership. At a ratio of one space per unit, the cost of parking currently accounts for approximately $13 \%$ of direct costs and $9 \%$ of total development costs for the seven-story apartment prototype.

In a few cases, developers in San Jose are exploring alternative housing types as a way of enhancing returns and enabling projects to be built in the near term. Two projects in downtown San Jose that were previously approved as traditional high-rise apartment towers are now being proposed as co-living communities. Co-living communities include individually leased bedrooms in the range of 150 to 250 square feet each and shared kitchen, bath and living areas. Local development professionals project that co-living bedrooms will lease for approximately $70 \%$ to $80 \%$ of market rents for studio apartments, which would support higher rental income on a square foot basis compared to a traditional apartment project. Residential construction costs are estimated to be
slightly higher for co-living communities, but parking costs are less due to lower parking ratios. While the development economics of co-living communities might be superior to traditional apartment projects in certain cases, co-living communities represent a small share of the city's pipeline of planned and proposed housing units, and no projects have been built in San Jose to verify that targeted rents can be achieved.

## Conclusions

The findings of the analysis indicate that development economics are likely to be challenging for apartment projects in San Jose due to rising construction costs and moderation of rent growth. While the market values of most apartment prototypes analyzed exceed development costs, the estimated profit falls below the targeted threshold except for the prototype in the strongest submarket (West San Jose / Stevens Creek). Despite challenges in the current market, a variety of factors could lead to projects proceeding in the near term, such as projects with a low land basis due to longterm ownership, projects viewed as a longer-term investment, or projects that achieve programmatic efficiencies in parking, density, or unit size.

# A. Rental Pro Forma Analysis 

Cost of Development Study<br>San Jose, CA<br>Prepared by Keyser Marston Associates<br>10/9/2019

Table A-1
Conceptual Pro Forma Analysis: Low-Rise Apartments
South \& East San Jose
Cost of Development Study
San Jose, CA10/9/2019
PROGRAM
Construction Type
Type V over podium
4 over 1
65 du/acre
900 SF/unit
85\% efficiency
1.0 /unit
DEVELOPMENT COSTS
Land
Direct Costs
Indirect Costs ..... (1)
City Fees (see below)
Construction Financing
Total Cost Per Unit\$3.7M /acre
\$/Unit\$315 /GSF\$56,600
$19 \%$ of direct costs ..... \$62,400\$336,500
5.50\% interest\$48,800
2.0 years
55\% avg drawdown
Total Cost Per Unit
Total Cost Per Unit ..... \$529,300
OPERATING INCOME
Weighted Average Rent Per Month\$3.22 /SF/mo.\$2,900
Other Income Per Month ..... \$100
Vacancy ..... 5\%
Operating Exp. (incl. Prop. Tax) Per Yr. ..... \$11,000
ESTIMATED PROFIT
Net Operating Income ..... \$23,200
Capitalized Value 4.75\% cap rate ..... \$488,400
(Less) Development Costs ..... -\$529,300Estimated Profit (as \% of costs)
-\$40,900 no profit
CITY FEES DETAIL
Affordable Housing ..... \$25,000
Parks (net) 30\% credit ..... \$10,800
Construction Tax ..... \$6,500
Development Svcs Fees ..... \$6,500
Total ..... \$48,800

[^1]Table A-2
Conceptual Pro Forma: Low-Rise Apartments
Central San Jose
Cost of Development Study
San Jose, CA

## PROGRAM

## Construction Type

Building Stories
Density
Average Unit Size
Building Efficiency
Parking Ratio

DEVELOPMENT COSTS
Land
Direct Costs
Indirect Costs ${ }^{(1)}$
City Fees (see below)
Construction Financing

## Total Cost Per Unit

## OPERATING INCOME

Weighted Average Rent Per Month
Other Income Per Month
Vacancy
Operating Exp. (incl. Prop. Tax) Per Yr.

ESTIMATED PROFIT
Net Operating Income
Capitalized Value
(Less) Development Costs
Estimated Profit (as \% of costs)

## CITY FEES DETAIL

Affordable Housing
Parks (net)
$30 \%$ onsite credit
\$25,000

Construction Tax
Development Svcs Fees
Traffic - Oak./101/Maybury
Total
\$3.67 /NSF/mo.
\$3,300
Type V over podium
4 over 1
65 du/acre
900 SF/unit
80\% efficiency
1.0 /unit
$\$ 4.8 \mathrm{M} / \mathrm{acre}$
\$/Unit
\$315 /GSF
$18 \%$ of direct costs
\$73,500
\$353,100
\$65,200
\$55,200
5.50\% interest
\$27,000
2.0 years

55\% avg drawdown
$\$ 150$
5\%
$\$ 11,600$
\$27,700
4.5\% cap rate $\$ 616,200$
-\$574,000
$\$ 42,200$
7\% profit

[^2]
## Table A-3

Conceptual Pro Forma Analysis: Mid-Rise Apartments
Central San Jose
Cost of Development Study
San Jose, CA

## PROGRAM

## Construction Type

Building Stories
Density
Average Unit Size
Building Efficiency
Parking Ratio

DEVELOPMENT COSTS
Land
Direct Costs
Indirect Costs ${ }^{(1)}$
City Fees (see below)
Construction Financing

## Total Cost Per Unit

## OPERATING INCOME

Weighted Average Rent Per Month
Other Income Per Month
Vacancy
Operating Exp. (incl. Prop. Tax) Per Yr.
ESTIMATED PROFIT
Net Operating Income
Capitalized Value
(Less) Development Costs
Estimated Profit (as \% of costs)

## CITY FEES DETAIL

Affordable Housing
\$25,000
Parks (net)
$30 \%$ onsite credit
\$15,800
Construction Tax
\$6,800
Development Svcs Fees
\$6,500
Traffic - Oak./101/Maybury
Total
\$3.67 /SF/mo.
\$3,300
$\begin{array}{lr}\$ 3.67 / \mathrm{SF} / \mathrm{mo} . & \begin{array}{r}300 \\ \$ 150\end{array}\end{array}$
\$27,700
4.5\% cap rate
\$616,200
Type III over podium
5 over 2
90 du/acre
900 SF/unit
80\% efficiency
1.0 /unit
\$4.8M /acre
\$335/GSF
\$/Unit
$18 \%$ of direct costs
$\$ 376,500$
\$67,400
5.50\% interest
\$55,200
2.0 years

55\% avg drawdown 5\%
$\$ 11,600$
-\$579,800
\$36,400
6\% profit

[^3]Table A-4
Conceptual Pro Forma Analysis: Mid-Rise Apartments
West San Jose
Cost of Development Study
San Jose, CA10/9/2019
PROGRAM

[^4]Construction Type
Building Stories
Density
Average Unit Size
Building Efficiency
Parking Ratio
DEVELOPMENT COSTS
Land
Direct Costs
Indirect Costs ..... ${ }^{(1)}$
City Fees (see below)
Construction Financing
Total Cost Per Unit
OPERATING INCOME
Weighted Average Rent Per Month \$3.94 /SF/mo. ..... \$3,550
Other Income Per Month ..... \$150
-
Vacancy ..... 5\%
Operating Exp. (incl. Prop. Tax) Per Yr. ..... \$11,700
ESTIMATED PROFIT
Net Operating Income\$30,500
Capitalized Value 4.50\% cap rate ..... \$677,300
(Less) Development Costs
Estimated Profit (as \% of costs)
CITY FEES DETAIL
Affordable Housing ..... \$25,000
Parks (net) $30 \%$ onsite credit ..... \$13,500
Construction Tax ..... \$6,800
Development Svcs Fees ..... \$6,500\$51,800

Type III over podium
5 over 2
90 du/acre
900 SF/unit
80\% efficiency
1.0 /unit
\$5.2M /acre \$/Unit \$57,800
\$335 /GSF
\$376,500
$18 \%$ of direct costs $\$ 67,400$
5.50\% interest $\$ 27,400$
2.0 years

55\% avg drawdown\$1,\$580,900
Total-\$580,900
\$96,400 17\% profit
Table A-5
Conceptual Pro Forma Analysis: Mid-Rise Apartments
North San Jose Cost of Development Study San Jose, CA ..... 10/9/2019
PROGRAM

Construction Type
Building Stories
DensityAverage Unit Size
Building Efficiency
Parking Ratio
DEVELOPMENT COSTS
Land
Direct Costs
Indirect Costs ..... ${ }^{(1)}$
City Fees (see below)
Construction Financing
Total Cost Per Unit
OPERATING INCOMEWeighted Average Rent Per Month
Other Income Per Month ..... \$150
Vacancy ..... 5\%
Operating Exp. (incl. Prop. Tax) Per Yr. ..... \$11,300
ESTIMATED PROFIT
Net Operating Income ..... \$28,000
Capitalized Value 4.50\% cap rate ..... \$622,900
(Less) Development Costs ..... -\$592,000Estimated Profit (as \% of costs)
CITY FEES DETAIL
Affordable Housing ..... \$25,000
Parks (net) 30\% credit ..... \$29,100
Construction Tax ..... \$6,800
Development Svcs Fees ..... \$6,500
Traffic - NSJ ..... \$5,000
Total$\$ 72,400$\$3.67 /SF/mo.\$3,300
Type III over podium
5 over 2
90 du/acre
900 SF/unit
80\% efficiency
1.0 /unit
\$4.3M /acre ..... \$47,800
\$/Unit\$335 /GSF\$376,500
$18 \%$ of direct costs ..... \$67,400
5.50\% interest ..... \$27,900\$72,4002 years
55\% avg drawdown
\$592,000
\$30,900 ..... 5\% profit

Table A-6
Conceptual Pro Forma Analysis: High-Rise Apartments, without Incentives
Downtown San Jose
Cost of Development Study
San Jose, CA

## PROGRAM

## Construction Type

Building Stories
Density
Average Unit Size
Building Efficiency
Parking Ratio

DEVELOPMENT COSTS
Land
Direct Costs
Indirect Costs ${ }^{(1)}$
City Fees (see below)
Construction Financing

Total Cost Per Unit

## OPERATING INCOME

Weighted Average Rent Per Month
Other Income Per Month
\$3.78/SF/mo.
\$3,400
Vacancy
\$21.0M /acre
$\$ 400 /$ GSF
$17 \%$ of direct costs
\$/Unit
$\$ 60,000$
\$462,000
\$79,800
5.50\% interest
\$48,400
2.5 years

55\% avg drawdown

Operating Exp. (incl. Prop. Tax) Per Yr.
ESTIMATED PROFIT
Net Operating Income
Capitalized Value
4.25\% cap rate
\$28,900
(Less) Development Costs
Estimated Profit (as \% of costs)

## CITY FEES DETAIL

Affordable Housing
\$25,000
Parks (net) 30\% credit
$\$ 10,200$
Construction Tax (CRMP, B\&S) \$6,500
Other Construction Tax \$200
Development Svcs Fees
\$6,500
Total

[^5]Table A-7
Conceptual Pro Forma Analysis: High-Rise Apartments, with Incentives
Downtown San Jose
Cost of Development Study
San Jose, CA ..... 10/9/2019
PROGRAM
Construction Type
Building Stories
Density
Average Unit Size
Building Efficiency
Parking Ratio
DEVELOPMENT COSTS
Land
Direct Costs
Indirect Costs ..... ${ }^{(1)}$
City Fees (see below)
Construction Financing
Total Cost Per Unit ..... \$659,300\$21.0M /acre\$400 /GSF\$/Unit
Type I tower22
350 du/acre
900 SF/unit
78\% efficiency
0.8 /unit
$17 \%$ of direct costs \$79,800\$60,000
\$462,000
5.50\% interest\$20,100
2.5 years
55\% avg drawdown
OPERATING INCOME
Weighted Average Rent Per Month\$3.78/SF/mo.\$3,400
Other Income Per Month ..... \$250
Vacancy ..... 5\%
Operating Exp. (incl. Prop. Tax) Per Yr. ..... \$12,750
ESTIMATED PROFIT
Net Operating Income\$28,900
Capitalized Value 4.25\% cap rate
.25\% ..... \$679,100
(Less) Development Costs
Estimated Profit (as \% of costs)
CITY FEES DETAIL
Affordable Housing ..... \$0
Parks (net)
Construction Tax (CRMP, B\&S)
\% credit ..... \$10,200
Other Construction Tax
Development Svcs Fees ..... \$3,200
Total ..... $\$ 6,500$-\$659,300
\$19,800 3\% profit

[^6]Table A-8
Rental Pro Forma Assumptions
Cost of Development Study
San Jose, CA

| Development Costs |  | Income/Revenues |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Land Costs |  | Market Apartment Rents (900 |  |
| Central | \$4.8M /acre | Central | \$3,300 /Unit/Month |
| West | \$5.2M /acre | West | \$3,550 /Unit/Month |
| South \& East | \$3.7M /acre | South \& East | \$2,900 /Unit/Month |
| North | \$4.3M /acre | North | \$3,300 /Unit/Month |
| Downtown | \$21.0M /acre | Downtown | \$3,400 /Unit/Month |
| Direct Construction Costs |  | Misc. Residential Income |  |
| Apartments: Type I* | \$350 /GSF | Central | \$150/Unit/Month |
| Apartments: Type III* | \$290 /GSF | West | \$150/Unit/Month |
| Apartments: Type V | \$270 /GSF | South \& East | \$100/Unit/Month |
| Retail (Warm Shell) | \$250 /GSF | North | \$150/Unit/Month |
| Parking (Above Grade) | \$50,000/space | Downtown | \$250/Unit/Month |
| Parking (Below Grade) | \$80,000/space |  |  |
| *Type I = Concrete/ steel; <br> Type V and III = Wood frame over podium |  |  |  |
| Indirect Construction Costs |  | Operating Expenses |  |
| Entitlements -Base $\quad \$ 500 \mathrm{~K} /$ project |  | Vacancy |  |
| Entilements - Tower | \$1.5M /project | Residential Vacancy | 5.0\% |
| Professional Fees | 6.0\% of directs |  |  |
| Taxes | 0.5\% of directs | Apartment OpEx |  |
| Insurance | 0.5\% of directs | Operating Expenses -Base Operating Expenses -Tower Property Taxes | $\$ 5,600$ per unit $\$ 6,250$ per unit Based on AV |
| Legal/Accounting | 0.4\% of directs |  |  |
| Developer Fee | 3.0\% of directs |  |  |
| Contingency | 5.0\% of directs |  |  |
| Marketing | \$2,000 /unit |  |  |
| Fees | Table A-9 |  |  |
| Financing |  |  |  |
| Loan-to-Cost | 65\% LTC | Investment Thresholds |  |
| Interest Rate | 5.50\% /year | Residential Cap Rates |  |
| Term - Type I | 30 months | North, Central \& West | 4.50\% cap rate |
| Term - Type III or V | 24 months | South \& East | 4.75\% cap rate |
| Avg Outstanding Balance | 55\% loan | Downtown | 4.25\% cap rate |
| Points and Fees | 1\% loan |  |  |

Table A-9
Calculation of Residential Development Fees
Cost of Development Study
San Jose, CA
10/9/2019

|  |  | Low-Rise Central | Low-Rise <br> South \& East | Mid-Rise Central | Mid-Rise West | Mid-Rise <br> North | High-Rise <br> No Incentives | High-Rise w/ Incentives |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| I. Assumptions |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Residential NSF/Unit |  | 900 | 900 | 900 | 900 | 900 | 900 | 900 |
| Residential Efficiency |  | 80\% | 85\% | 80\% | 80\% | 80\% | 78\% | 78\% |
| Residential GSF/Unit |  | 1,125 | 1,059 | 1,125 | 1,125 | 1,125 | 1,154 | 1,154 |
| Park Zone |  | 9 | Multiple | 9 | 15 | 07B | 9 | 9 |
| Base Park Fee |  | \$22,600 | \$15,360 | \$22,600 | \$19,300 | \$41,600 | \$14,600 | \$14,600 |
| Private Recreation Credits |  | 30\% | 30\% | 30\% | 30\% | 30\% | 30\% | 30\% |
| Traffic Impact Zone |  | 101/Mayb. | None | 101/Mayb. | None | North SJ | None | None |
| Traffic Impact Fee |  | \$2,200 | \$0 | \$2,200 | \$0 | \$5,000 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Traffic Impact Discount \% ${ }^{2}$ |  | 50\% | 0\% | 50\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% |
| II. Building Permit Valuation |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Residential | \$118 /SF | \$133,000 | \$125,000 | \$133,000 | \$133,000 | \$133,000 | \$137,000 | \$137,000 |
| Parking | \$84 /SF | \$33,000 | \$33,000 | \$33,000 | \$33,000 | \$33,000 | \$27,000 | \$27,000 |
| Total |  | \$166,000 | \$158,000 | \$166,000 | \$166,000 | \$166,000 | \$164,000 | \$164,000 |
| III. Fees and Permits Per Unit |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Parkland (net credits) |  | \$15,800 | \$10,800 | \$15,800 | \$13,500 | \$29,100 | \$10,200 | \$10,200 |
| Affordable Housing | \$25,000 /du | \$25,000 | \$25,000 | \$25,000 | \$25,000 | \$25,000 | \$25,000 | \$0 |
| Construction Taxes |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| CRMP and B\&S | 4.0\% BPV | \$6,600 | \$6,300 | \$6,600 | \$6,600 | \$6,600 | \$6,500 | \$3,200 |
| Other Cxn Taxes | \$200 /du | \$200 | \$200 | \$200 | \$200 | \$200 | \$200 | \$200 |
|  |  | \$6,800 | \$6,500 | \$6,800 | \$6,800 | \$6,800 | \$6,700 | \$3,400 |
| School Fees | \$3.48 /SF | \$3,900 | \$3,700 | \$3,900 | \$3,900 | \$3,900 | \$4,000 | \$4,000 |
| Traffic |  | \$1,100 | \$0 | \$1,100 | \$0 | \$5,000 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Other Permits and Fees |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Entitlement | \$400 /du | \$400 | \$400 | \$400 | \$400 | \$400 | \$400 | \$400 |
| Improvement Plan | \$1,300 /du | \$1,300 | \$1,300 | \$1,300 | \$1,300 | \$1,300 | \$1,300 | \$1,300 |
| Permit Review Fees | \$2,700 /du | \$2,700 | \$2,700 | \$2,700 | \$2,700 | \$2,700 | \$2,700 | \$2,700 |
| Offsite/ Public Works | \$2,100 /du | \$2,100 | \$2,100 | \$2,100 | \$2,100 | \$2,100 | \$2,100 | \$2,100 |
|  |  | \$6,500 | \$6,500 | \$6,500 | \$6,500 | \$6,500 | \$6,500 | \$6,500 |
| Total Development Fees |  | \$59,100 | \$52,500 | \$59,100 | \$55,700 | \$76,300 | \$52,400 | \$24,100 |

[^7]
# B. Rental Market Data 

Cost of Development Study<br>San Jose, CA<br>Prepared by Keyser Marston Associates<br>10/9/2019

Table B-1
Recent Multifamily Residential Land Transactions (2015-2019)
Cost of Development Study
San Jose, CA
10/9/2019
Source: Costar

| Property | Acres | Sale Yr | Price <br> \$000s | \$/ Acre \$000s | \$/ Land SF | \$/Unit |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Multifamily (MF) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Central SJ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1530 W San Carlos St | 0.9 | 2019 | \$12,750 | \$14,415 | \$331 | \$123,000 |
| 117 N 5th St | 0.2 | 2017 | \$1,600 | \$6,626 | \$152 | \$57,000 |
| Shea Properties / Jackson St | 5.3 | 2017 | \$30,000 | \$5,660 | \$130 | \$58,000 |
| 341 Page St (affordable) | 0.2 | 2017 | \$1,291 | \$5,554 | \$128 | \$48,000 |
| 153 E Julian St | 2.6 | 2018 | \$10,289 | \$3,927 | \$90 | \$27,000 |
| West SJ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4300 Stevens Creek ${ }^{1}$ | 9.9 | 2017 | \$53,000 | \$5,354 | \$123 | \$65,000 |
| North San Jose/ Berryessa |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Berryessa BART site | 6.5 | 2017 | \$35,000 | \$5,385 | \$124 | \$63,000 |
| South \& East SJ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1695 Alum Rock (affordable) | 0.8 | 2017 | \$3,950 | \$4,748 | \$109 | \$56,000 |
| Downtown SJ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 199 Bassett (co-living) ${ }^{2}$ | 0.8 | 2019 | \$18,000 | \$23,261 | \$534 | \$60,000 |
| 70 South Almaden Ave | 1.6 | 2016 | \$39,000 | \$24,314 | \$558 | \$50,000 |
| S San Pedro St | 0.5 | 2015 | \$8,800 | \$18,723 | \$430 | \$39,000 |
| 618 S 1st St | 0.4 | 2019 | \$6,000 | \$14,975 | \$344 | \$21,000 |
| 477 S Market St (mid-rise) | 0.6 | 2019 | \$6,525 | \$11,447 | \$263 | \$50,000 |
| 201 W Julian St (City transfer) | 1.5 | 2017 | \$10,000 | \$6,667 | \$153 | \$32,000 |
| 252 N 1st St | 1.3 | 2017 | \$8,000 | \$6,041 | \$139 | \$36,000 |
| Diridon |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 341-383 Delmas Ave | 0.9 | 2018 | \$12,000 | \$12,903 | \$296 | \$92,000 |
| 715 W Julian St | 1.2 | 2019 | \$12,200 | \$9,924 | \$228 | \$49,000 |
| 496-498 Park Ave | 0.3 | 2018 | \$2,000 | \$7,143 | \$164 | \$50,000 |
| 740 W San Carlos St | 0.7 | 2018 | \$3,900 | \$5,821 | \$134 | \$62,000 |
| 267-279 Delmas Ave. | 0.5 | 2015 | \$1,350 | \$2,836 | \$65 | \$40,000 |

[^8]Table B-2
Recent Commercial Land Transactions
Cost of Development Study
San Jose, CA
10/9/2019
Source: Costar

| Property | Acres | Sale Yr | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Price } \\ & \text { (\$000s) } \end{aligned}$ | \$/Acre (\$000s) | \$/ Land SF | Notes |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Page 1 of 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Central SJ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1555 W San Carlos St | 0.5 | 2018 | \$2,489 | \$5,184 | \$119 | Mixed Use |
| 1800 W San Carlos St | 0.6 | 2016 | \$2,106 | \$3,611 | \$83 |  |
| 2347 N 1st St | 43.0 | 2015 | \$138,172 | \$3,213 | \$74 | Apple |
| 2165 The Alameda | 0.6 | 2016 | \$1,750 | \$3,125 | \$72 |  |
| 567 Columbia Ave | 0.1 | 2018 | \$315 | \$2,864 | \$66 |  |
| 1131 Auzerais Ave | 1.0 | 2018 | \$2,800 | \$2,772 | \$64 | Industrial |
| Orchard Ct | 12.3 | 2015 | \$33,682 | \$2,742 | \$63 | Apple |
| 1080-1090 Oakland Rd | 1.3 | 2018 | \$2,905 | \$2,306 | \$53 | Industrial |
| 935-995 Oakland Rd | 2.6 | 2019 | \$6,000 | \$2,273 | \$52 |  |
| 1343 The Alameda | 0.2 | 2017 | \$363 | \$2,167 | \$50 |  |
| 1605 Industrial Ave | 10.2 | 2018 | \$21,000 | \$2,053 | \$47 | Industrial |
| 1123 Coleman Ave | 12.7 | 2018 | \$24,845 | \$1,956 | \$45 | Office |
| Coleman Ave @ Taylor St | 22.8 | 2015 | \$41,053 | \$1,799 | \$41 | Office |
| 1400 Parkmoor Ave | 5.1 | 2016 | \$8,910 | \$1,764 | \$41 | Office |
| Coleman Ave | 20.2 | 2018 | \$33,969 | \$1,681 | \$39 | Mixed Use |
| 1420 Old Bayshore Hwy | 3.8 | 2019 | \$5,458 | \$1,436 | \$33 | Industrial |
| 1336-1420 Old Bayshore Hwy | 3.2 | 2019 | \$4,165 | \$1,305 | \$30 | Industrial |
| 172 The Alameda | 2.2 | 2015 | \$2,113 | \$965 | \$22 |  |
| 21 E Virginia St | 0.2 | 2016 | \$76 | \$506 | \$12 |  |
| West SJ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1366 S De Anza Blvd | 0.8 | 2019 | \$7,000 | \$8,861 | \$203 | Asstd. Living |
| 125 Richfield Ave | 1.0 | 2017 | \$4,750 | \$4,750 | \$109 | Auto |
| 930 S Winchester Blvd | 0.2 | 2017 | \$950 | \$4,439 | \$102 | Frmr. SF |
| 1143 Minnesota Ave | 0.4 | 2016 | \$1,312 | \$3,545 | \$81 | Office |
| 1030 Lincoln Ave | 0.2 | 2015 | \$850 | \$3,522 | \$81 |  |
| Huff Ave | 2.9 | 2015 | \$5,152 | \$1,801 | \$41 |  |
| South \& East SJ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1015 S Bascom Ave | 1.3 | 2018 | \$9,550 | \$7,127 | \$164 | Asstd. Living |
| 1410 S Bascom Ave | 6.3 | 2018 | \$37,250 | \$5,903 | \$136 | Resi. + office |
| 1499 Monterey Rd | 0.3 | 2018 | \$1,050 | \$3,500 | \$80 |  |
| 2123 Quimby Rd | 0.2 | 2019 | \$830 | \$3,458 | \$79 |  |
| 1221 S Capitol Ave | 1.1 | 2015 | \$3,000 | \$2,752 | \$63 | Medical |
| 3500 San Felipe Rd | 0.3 | 2018 | \$680 | \$2,345 | \$54 |  |
| 1110 Foxworthy Ave | 0.9 | 2015 | \$2,100 | \$2,289 | \$53 |  |
| 1499 Monterey Rd | 0.3 | 2017 | \$650 | \$2,022 | \$46 |  |
| 5855 Silver Creek Valley PI (b) | 3.0 | 2016 | \$6,000 | \$2,000 | \$46 | Retail |
| 5855 Silver Creek Valley PI (a) | 5.9 | 2015 | \$11,000 | \$1,877 | \$43 | Medical |
| Pala Ave | 0.1 | 2015 | \$196 | \$1,786 | \$41 |  |
| 6320-6340 San Ignacio Ave | 7.5 | 2018 | \$12,192 | \$1,617 | \$37 | Data center |
| 1288 N Capitol Ave | 1.4 | 2016 | \$2,000 | \$1,481 | \$34 |  |
| 2829 Monterey Hwy | 7.4 | 2018 | \$10,500 | \$1,419 | \$33 | Storage |
| 1302 S 1st Ave | 1.9 | 2015 | \$2,551 | \$1,355 | \$31 |  |

Table B-2
Recent Commercial Land Transactions
Cost of Development Study
San Jose, CA
Source: Costar

| Property | Acres | Sale Yr | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Price } \\ & \text { (\$000s) } \end{aligned}$ | \$/Acre (\$000s) | \$/ Land SF | Notes |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Page 2 of 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| South \& East, Cont. |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Monterey Rd | 1.4 | 2016 | \$1,800 | \$1,314 | \$30 | Retail |
| 1770 Alum Rock Ave | 0.2 | 2018 | \$221 | \$961 | \$22 | SA parcel |
| Ave A \& Capitol Ave | 0.4 | 2015 | \$295 | \$686 | \$16 |  |
| Great Oaks Blvd | 15.2 | 2016 | \$9,412 | \$619 | \$14 | Costco |
| Downtown/Diridon |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 333 W San Fernando St | 2.5 | 2018 | \$68,000 | \$27,200 | \$624 | Adobe |
| 300-322 S 1st St (Valley Title) | 2.8 | 2018 | \$61,500 | \$21,731 | \$499 | Mixed Use |
| 35 S 2nd St (Fountain Alley) | 1.3 | 2018 | \$25,700 | \$20,560 | \$472 | Mixed Use |
| 450 W Santa Clara St | 0.6 | 2017 | \$11,000 | \$18,966 | \$435 | Google |
| 597 W San Carlos St | 0.6 | 2018 | \$6,500 | \$10,656 | \$245 | Mixed Use |
| San Jose Diridon Station | 6.5 | 2018 | \$67,000 | \$10,308 | \$237 | Google |
| 140 S Montgomery St | 0.6 | 2017 | \$5,500 | \$9,167 | \$210 | Google |
| 557-587 Cinnabar St | 6.1 | 2017 | \$51,500 | \$8,498 | \$195 | Google |
| 74 S Autumn St | 0.1 | 2017 | \$1,000 | \$7,692 | \$177 | Google |
| 92 S Montgomery St | 0.2 | 2017 | \$1,136 | \$7,282 | \$167 | Google |
| 440 W Julian St | 5.4 | 2019 | \$38,750 | \$7,176 | \$165 |  |
| 260 N Montgomery St | 0.5 | 2018 | \$3,000 | \$6,383 | \$147 | Google |
| 374 W Santa Clara St | 8.2 | 2015 | \$49,786 | \$6,104 | \$140 | Google |
| 559/573 W Julian St | 0.7 | 2017 | \$3,625 | \$4,899 | \$112 | Google |
| 466-470 W San Carlos St | 0.2 | 2016 | \$1,515 | \$4,734 | \$109 |  |
| 292 Stockton Ave | 0.9 | 2018 | \$4,000 | \$4,706 | \$108 | Hotel/ condos |
| North San Jose |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Montague Expy @ N First St | 11.2 | 2018 | \$31,000 | \$2,770 | \$64 |  |
| Hwy 237 | 3.5 | 2015 | \$6,750 | \$1,929 | \$44 |  |
| 140 Holger Way | 4.0 | 2017 | \$7,100 | \$1,762 | \$40 |  |
| N 1st St | 21.5 | 2016 | \$26,200 | \$1,217 | \$28 |  |
| Microsoft -Zanker Road | 65.0 | 2017 | \$76,000 | \$1,169 | \$27 |  |
| Orchard Pky | 5.3 | 2015 | \$5,787 | \$1,089 | \$25 |  |

Table B-3
Land Costs of Downtown High-Rise Residential Projects
Cost of Development Study
San Jose, CA
Source: Costar, RealQuest, KMA research

|  | Acres | SF Land |  | Land | Purchase | Price / | Price / |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Project | $(G r o s s)$ | $(G r o s s)$ | Units | Price $(\$ \mathrm{M})$ | Year | Land SF | Unit |


| Completed |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 The 88 | 1.3 | 57,209 | 197 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2 Axis | 1.2 | 54,080 | 329 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3360 Residences | 1.0 | 44,431 | 213 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4 City Heights | 0.8 | 33,541 | 124 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5 One South Market | 1.0 | 42,253 | 312 | \$16.0M | 2013 | \$379 | \$51,000 |  |
| 6 Centerra | 1.3 | 54,886 | 347 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Under Construction |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 7180 W St. James | 1.9 | 81,022 | 643 | \$45.3M | 2014 | \$558 | \$70,000 |  |
| 8 The Graduate | 1.5 | 63,162 | 260 | \$18.1M | 2017 | \$286 | \$69,000 | Student housing |
| 9 Miro | 1.4 | 60,984 | 630 | \$12.8M | 2015 | \$210 | \$20,000 |  |
| Approved |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 10 NSP Tower 3 | 1.5 | 65,340 | 313 | \$10.0M | 2017 | \$153 | \$32,000 | City transaction |
| 11 Parkview Tower | 1.3 | 57,687 | 220 | \$8.0M | 2017 | \$139 | \$36,000 |  |
| 12 Gateway Tower | 0.5 | 21,780 | 300 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 13 Greyhound | 1.6 | 69,872 | 781 | \$39.0M | 2016 | \$558 | \$50,000 |  |
| 14 Aviato (prior) | 0.8 | 33,708 | 302 | \$4.0M | 2017 | \$119 | \$13,000 | Now co-living (803 du) |
| Starcity |  |  | 803 | \$18.0M | 2019 | \$534 | \$22,000 | \$60K/ standard unit |
| 1527 West | 0.6 | 24,829 | 342 | \$2.0M | 2003 | \$81 | \$6,000 |  |
| 16 Post \& San Pedro | 0.5 | 20,473 | 228 | \$8.8M | 2015 | \$430 | \$39,000 |  |
| Pending |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 17 Garden Gate Tower | 0.4 | 17,424 | 285 | TBD | 2018 |  |  | Co-living option |
| 18 Davidson Plaza | 1.8 | 77,537 | 653 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 19 4th St Metro Station | 0.5 | 21,780 | 101 | \$4.0M | 2007 | \$185 | \$40,000 |  |

Table B-4
Recent Multifamily Property Transactions
Cost of Development Study
San Jose, CA
10/9/2019
Source: Costar, Institutional Property Advisors

| Property | Year Built | Units | Acres | Sale Date | Price (\$000s) | /Unit (\$000s) | Cap Rate | Submarket |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| San Jose Transactions |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 360 Residences (Tower) | 2010 | 213 |  | 2017 | \$133,500 | \$627 | 4\%-4.5\% | Downtown |
| 3101 Magliocco Dr | 2008 | 50 | 0.8 | 2016 | \$28,500 | \$570 | 4.0\% | West |
| 175 Baypointe Pky | 2011 | 183 |  | 2015 | \$93,000 | \$508 |  | North |
| 688 N 7th St (Mio) | 2015 | 103 | 2.01 | 2016 | \$51,250 | \$498 | 4.8\% | Central |
| Meridian at Midtown | 2015 | 218 | 3.43 | 2018 | \$104,000 | \$477 | 4.3\% | Central |
| Foundry Commons | 2016 | 238 | 3.87 | 2018 | \$110,250 | \$463 | 4.5\% | South of DT |
| Marquis* | 2015 | 166 | 2.72 | 2018 | \$70,942 | \$427 |  | Central |
| Domain | 2013 | 444 |  | 2019 | \$255,000 | \$574 |  | North |
| One South Market* | 2015 | 312 |  |  | \$175,000 | \$560 |  | Downtown |
| Median |  |  |  |  |  | \$508 |  |  |
| Avg |  |  |  |  |  | \$523 |  |  |
| Max |  |  |  |  |  | \$627 |  |  |
| Nearby transactions |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | City |
| Loft House | 2014 | 133 |  | 2017 | \$104,000 | \$782 | 3.9\% | Sunnyvale |
| Revere Campbell | 2015 | 168 |  | 2017 | \$118,897 | \$708 | 4.0\% | Campbell, CA |
| 865-881 E El Camino Real | 2015 | 149 |  | 2015 | \$110,000 | \$738 | 3.8\% | Mountain View |
| Median |  |  |  |  |  | \$738 |  |  |
| Avg |  |  |  |  |  | \$743 |  |  |
| Max |  |  |  |  |  | \$782 |  |  |

* Partial interest transfer. Sale price/ price per unit reflects implied market value.

Table B-5
Average Effective Rents - Recently Built Projects In San Jose
Cost of Development Study
San Jose, CA
10/9/2019
Source: Costar

| Building Name | Year Built | Stories | SF/Unit | Asking Rent/Unit | Effective Rent/Unit ${ }^{(1)}$ | $900 \text { SF }$ $\text { Equiv. }{ }^{(2)}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| West SJ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Levare | 2012 | 4 | 1,081 | \$4,676 | \$4,645 | \$3,870 |
| Misora | 2013 | 5 | 1,111 | \$4,135 | \$4,135 | \$3,350 |
| Average |  |  | 1,096 | \$4,406 | \$4,390 | \$3,610 |
| Central SJ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| The Standard | 2017 | 6 | 761 | \$3,005 | \$2,988 | \$3,530 |
| Hanover Cannery Park | 2018 | 5 | 842 | \$3,278 | \$3,238 | \$3,460 |
| Silver San Jose | 2019 | 5 | 903 | \$3,297 | \$3,297 | \$3,290 |
| Modera the Alameda | 2018 | 5 | 879 | \$3,484 | \$3,115 | \$3,190 |
| The Pierce (Downtown) | 2016 | 7 | 939 | \$3,162 | \$3,140 | \$3,010 |
| Meridian | 2015 | 4 | 847 | \$2,847 | \$2,818 | \$3,000 |
| Marquis | 2015 | 3 | 835 | \$2,778 | \$2,765 | \$2,980 |
| Mio Japantown | 2015 | 4 | 897 | \$2,985 | \$2,959 | \$2,970 |
| 808 West Apartments | 2018 | 7 | 974 | \$3,184 | \$2,734 | \$2,530 |
| Avalon Morrison Park | 2014 | 4 | 1,229 | \$3,428 | \$3,415 | \$2,500 |
| Mosaic | 2012 | 5 | 1,055 | \$2,840 | \$2,811 | \$2,390 |
| Average |  |  | 924 | \$3,117 | \$3,025 | \$2,990 |
| Top 3 Effective Rent |  |  | 835 | \$3,193 | \$3,174 | \$3,430 |
| North SJ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| River View | 2014 | 4 | 922 | \$3,356 | \$3,342 | \$3,270 |
| 251 Brandon | 2015 | 4 | 811 | \$2,957 | \$2,940 | \$3,260 |
| AIRE | 2014 | 4 | 847 | \$3,025 | \$3,025 | \$3,210 |
| The Verdant | 2014 | 5 | 877 | \$2,967 | \$2,880 | \$2,950 |
| Epic | 2013 | 5 | 880 | \$2,869 | \$2,869 | \$2,930 |
| Crescent Village | 2012 | 4 | 991 | \$3,180 | \$3,163 | \$2,870 |
| Vista 99 | 2015 | 5 | 1,082 | \$3,393 | \$3,378 | \$2,810 |
| 121 Tasman | 2013 | 4 | 975 | \$3,033 | \$3,033 | \$2,800 |
| Enso | 2011 | 4 | 902 | \$2,814 | \$2,799 | \$2,790 |
| Venue Apartments | 2015 | 5 | 1,049 | \$3,311 | \$3,250 | \$2,790 |
| Verona | 2015 | 5 | 905 | \$2,754 | \$2,742 | \$2,730 |
| Domain Apartments | 2013 | 5 | 1,031 | \$3,114 | \$3,085 | \$2,690 |
| Average |  |  | 939 | \$3,064 | \$3,042 | \$2,930 |
| Top 3 Effective Rent |  |  | 860 | \$3,113 | \$3,102 | \$3,250 |

Table B-5
Average Effective Rents - Recently Built Projects In San Jose
Cost of Development Study
San Jose, CA
Source: Costar

| Building Name | Year Built | Stories | SF/Unit | Asking <br> Rent/Unit | Effective <br> Rent/Unit ${ }^{(1)}$ | 900 SF <br> Equiv. ${ }^{(2)}$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Downtown Tower |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Century Towers (N 1st) | 2017 | 14 | 878 | $\$ 3,107$ | $\$ 3,088$ | $\$ 3,170$ |
| Centerra | 2015 | 20 | 1,001 | $\$ 3,447$ | $\$ 3,425$ | $\$ 3,080$ |
| One South Market | 2015 | 23 | 899 | $\$ 3,121$ | $\$ 3,070$ | $\$ 3,070$ |
| Average |  |  | 926 | $\$ 3,225$ | $\$ 3,194$ | $\$ 3,110$ |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| South \& East SJ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| LINQ Apartment Homes | 2016 | 5 | 834 | $\$ 2,665$ | $\$ 2,594$ | $\$ 2,800$ |
| Aviara | 2012 | 4 | 845 | $\$ 2,631$ | $\$ 2,616$ | $\$ 2,780$ |
| VIO Luxury Apartments | 2016 | 4 | 902 | $\$ 2,730$ | $\$ 2,730$ | $\$ 2,730$ |
| Latitude Phase II | 2018 | 5 | 1,189 | 3,820 | $\$ 3,502$ | $\$ 2,660$ |
| Lex Apartments | 2017 | 5 | 874 | $\$ 2,659$ | $\$ 2,432$ | $\$ 2,500$ |
| Ascent | 2015 | 6 | 1,032 | $\$ 3,123$ | $\$ 2,867$ | $\$ 2,500$ |
| Anton La Moraga | 2014 | 4 | 1,033 | $\$ 2,832$ | $\$ 2,807$ | $\$ 2,450$ |
| Latitude 37 | 2012 | 5 | 1,016 | $\$ 2,580$ | $\$ 2,563$ | $\$ 2,270$ |
| Average |  |  | 966 | $\$ 2,880$ | $\$ 2,764$ | $\$ 2,586$ |
| Top 3 Effective Rent |  |  | 860 | $\$ 2,675$ | $\$ 2,647$ | $\$ 2,770$ |

${ }^{(1)}$ Average rent net of concessions, per Costar.
${ }^{(2)}$ Effective Rent PSF $\times 900$ SF, per Costar.

Table B-6
Average Effective Rents - Recently Built Projects In Nearby Cities
Cost of Development Study
San Jose, CA
Source: Costar

| Building Name | Year Built | Stories | SF/Unit | Asking Rent/Unit | Effective $\text { Rent/Unit }{ }^{(1)}$ | 900 SF <br> Equiv. ${ }^{(2)}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Campbell |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 300 Railway Apartments | 2018 | 5 | 762 | \$3,493 | \$3,493 | \$4,126 |
| Orchard City Lofts | 2018 | 3 | 925 | \$3,872 | \$3,872 | \$3,767 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | \$3,950 |
| Mountain View |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Revela | 2019 | 4 | 808 | \$4,209 | \$4,209 | \$4,688 |
| Elan Mountain View | 2018 | 4 | 789 | \$4,195 | \$4,097 | \$4,673 |
| 100 Moffett | 2016 | 4 | 896 | \$4,563 | \$4,527 | \$4,547 |
| Domus on the Boulevard | 2015 | 4 | 881 | \$4,445 | \$4,429 | \$4,525 |
| Montrose | 2016 | 4 | 884 | \$4,371 | \$4,184 | \$4,260 |
| Verve | 2017 | 4 | 1,112 | \$5,116 | \$5,081 | \$4,112 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | \$4,450 |
| Sunnyvale |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Encasa Apartments | 2016 | 3 | 966 | \$4,699 | \$4,652 | \$4,334 |
| Naya | 2016 | 4 | 856 | \$3,871 | \$3,871 | \$4,070 |
| 481 On Mathilda | 2016 | 4 | 863 | \$3,891 | \$3,867 | \$4,033 |
| The Flats at CityLine | 2018 | 5 | 1,171 | \$5,035 | \$4,932 | \$3,791 |
| Ironworks | 2017 | 7 | 1,105 | \$4,375 | \$4,350 | \$3,543 |
| 6tenEAST | 2017 | 4 | 996 | \$3,944 | \$3,929 | \$3,550 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | \$3,900 |

[^9]
[^0]:    ${ }^{1}$ For purposes of this analysis, it is assumed that incentives would not constitute a subsidy for purposes of San Jose Municipal Code Section 14.10.110.

[^1]:    ${ }^{(1)}$ Includes school fees.

[^2]:    ${ }^{(1)}$ Includes school fees.

[^3]:    ${ }^{(1)}$ Includes school fees.

[^4]:    ${ }^{(1)}$ Includes school fees.

[^5]:    ${ }^{(1)}$ Includes school fees.

[^6]:    ${ }^{(1)}$ Includes school fees.

[^7]:    ${ }^{1}$ Assuming developers receive credit for provision of private open space.
    ${ }^{2}$ Traffic fee reduced in recognition that not all projects are located in the Transportation Development Policy plan area.

[^8]:    1 Per unit price assumes $50 \%$ of the site dedicated to commercial at a value of $\$ 70 / \mathrm{sf}$.
    2 Per unit price reflects original entitlements of 300 traditional multifamily units.

[^9]:    ${ }^{(1)}$ Average rent net of concessions, per Costar.
    ${ }^{(2)}$ Effective Rent PSF x 900 SF, per Costar.

